

Hans Rainer Sepp
Lester Embree
Editors

Handbook of Phenomenological Aesthetics



Springer

HANDBOOK
OF PHENOMENOLOGICAL AESTHETICS

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PHENOMENOLOGY

IN COOPERATION WITH

THE CENTER FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH IN PHENOMENOLOGY

Volume 59

Series Editors:

Nicolas de Warren, Wellesley College, MA, USA
Dermot Moran, University College Dublin, Ireland.

Editorial Board:

Lilian Alweiss, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland
Elizabeth Behnke, Ferndale, WA, USA
Rudolf Bernet, Husserl-Archief, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
David Carr, Emory University, GA, USA
Chan-Fai Cheung, Chinese University Hong Kong, China
James Dodd, New School University, NY, USA
Lester Embree, Florida Atlantic University, FL, USA
Alfredo Ferrarin, Università di Pisa, Italy
Burt Hopkins, Seattle University, WA, USA
Kwok-Ying Lau, Chinese University Hong Kong, China
Nam-In Lee, Seoul National University, Korea
Dieter Lohmar, Universität zu Köln, Germany
William R. McKenna, Miami University, OH, USA
Algis Mickunas, Ohio University, OH, USA
J.N. Mohanty, Temple University, PA, USA
Junichi Murata, University of Tokyo, Japan
Thomas Nenon, The University of Memphis, TN, USA
Thomas M. Seebohm, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Germany
Gail Soffer, Rome, Italy
Anthony Steinbock, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, IL, USA
Shigeru Taguchi, Yamagata University, Japan
Dan Zahavi, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Richard M. Zaner, Vanderbilt University, TN, USA



Scope

The purpose of the series is to serve as a vehicle for the pursuit of phenomenological research across a broad spectrum, including cross-over developments with other fields of inquiry such as the social sciences and cognitive science. Since its establishment in 1987, *Contributions to Phenomenology* has published nearly 60 titles on diverse themes of phenomenological philosophy. In addition to welcoming monographs and collections of papers in established areas of scholarship, the series encourages original work in phenomenology. The breadth and depth of the Series reflects the rich and varied presence of phenomenological thinking to seminal questions of human inquiry as well as the increasingly international reach of phenomenological thinking.

HANDBOOK OF PHENOMENOLOGICAL AESTHETICS

edited by

HANS RAINER SEPP

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

and

LESTER EMBREE

Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL, USA



Springer

Editors

Prof. Hans Rainer Sepp
Charles University Prague
Faculty of Humanities
U Kříže 10
CZ-158 00 Praha 5
Czech Republic
hr.sepp@web.de

Prof. Lester Embree
Florida Atlantic University
College of Arts and Letters
P.O. Box 3091
Boca Raton, FL 33431-0881
USA
embree@fau.edu

ISSN 0923-9545

ISBN 978-90-481-2470-1

e-ISBN 978-90-481-2471-8

DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-2471-8

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009929301

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2010

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

Aesthetic Experience	1
Edward S. Casey	
Aisthesis	9
Jagna Brudzińska	
Appearance	17
TANI Toru	
Architecture	25
Timothy K. Casey	
Antonio Banfi	29
Gabriele Scaramuzza	
Beauty	33
Simone Neuber	
Simone de Beauvoir	41
Sara Heinämaa	
Oskar Becker	45
Markus Ophälders	
Chinese Aesthetics	49
CHEN Zhiyuan	
Waldemar Conrad (1878–1915)	53
Daniela Angelucci	
Creativity	57
Mario Teodoro Ramírez	
Cubism	63
Andrea Pinotti	
Dance	67
Gediminas Karoblis	
Jacques Derrida (1930–2004)	71
Terri J. Hennings	
Dream	75
Hans Rainer Sepp	

Mikel Dufrenne (1910–1995)	81
Edward S. Casey	
Ecological Aesthetics	85
Ted Toadvine	
Empathy	93
Andrea Pinotti	
Enjoyment	99
Mădălina Diaconu	
Fashion	107
César Moreno Márquez	
Film	111
Elena del Río	
Eugen Fink (1905–1975)	119
Hans Rainer Sepp	
Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900–2002)	123
Mirko Wischke	
Moritz Geiger (1880–1937)	127
Licia Fabiani	
Gender Aesthetics	131
Gayle Salamon	
Nicolai Hartmann (1882–1950)	135
Mirko Wischke	
Martin Heidegger (1889–1976)	137
Françoise Dastur	
Michel Henry (1922–2002)	141
Ruud Welten	
Dietrich von Hildebrand (1889–1977)	145
John F. Crosby	
Edmund Husserl (1859–1938)	151
John B. Brough	
Imagination	155
Natalie Depraz	
India and Intercultural Aesthetics	161
Ram Adhar Mall	
Roman Ingarden (1893–1970)	167
Andrzej Gniazdowski	
Japanese Worlds	171
ŌHASHI Ryōsuke	
Fritz Kaufmann (1891–1958)	177
Christian Lotz	

Emmanuel Levinas (1906–1995)	181
Daniel Marcelle	
Literature	187
Pol Vandeveld	
Henri Maldiney (1912–)	193
Eliane Escoubas	
Jean-Luc Marion (1946–)	197
Michael Staudigl	
Media	201
Paul Majkut	
Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908–1961)	207
Galen A. Johnson	
Metaphor	211
Annamaria Lossi	
Methodology	215
Lester Embree	
Music	223
Augusto Mazzoni	
Maurice Natanson (1924–1996)	231
Michael D. Barber	
Nature	235
Cathrin Nielsen	
NISHIDA Kitaro (1870–1945)	241
KANATA Susumu	
José Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955)	245
Javier San Martín	
Painting	249
Eliane Escoubas	
Jan Patočka (1907–1977)	255
Ludger Hagedorn	
Photography	259
CHEUNG Chan-Fai	
Play	265
Cathrin Nielsen	
Political Culture	269
Helmut Kohlenberger	
Religion	275
Bálazs M. Mezei	
Representation	281
John B. Brough	

Marc Richir (1943–)	287
Jürgen Trinks	
Paul Ricoeur (1913–2005)	291
Yvanka B. Raynova	
Heinrich Rombach (1923–2004)	295
Georg Stenger	
Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980)	299
Philippe Cabestan	
Max Scheler (1874–1928)	303
Wolfhart Henckmann	
Hermann Schmitz (1928–)	307
Anna Blume	
Alfred Schutz (1899–1959)	311
Andreas Georg Stascheit	
Secondary Senses	317
Mădălina Diaconu	
Gustav Gustavovich Špet (1879–1937)	321
Tatyana Schedrina	
Style	325
Andrea Pinotti	
Theater	331
NUKI Shigeto	
France Veber (1890–1975)	339
Dean Komel	
Virtual Reality	343
Christian Rabanus	
Work of Art	351
Cathrin Nielsen	
The Core of Phenomenological Aesthetics: A Suggested Bibliography . .	359
About the Authors	365
Index	377

Preface

Historically, phenomenology began in Edmund Husserl's theory of mathematics and logic, went on to focus for him on transcendental first philosophy and for others on metaphysics, philosophical anthropology, and theory of interpretation. The continuing focus has thus been on knowledge and being. But if one began without those interests and with an understanding of the phenomenological style of approach, one might well see that art and aesthetics make up the most natural field to be approached phenomenologically. Contributions to this field have continually been made in the phenomenological tradition from very early on, but, so to speak, along the side. (The situation has been similar with phenomenological ethics.) A great deal of thought about art and aesthetics has nevertheless accumulated during a century and a handbook like the present one is long overdue.

The project of this handbook began in conversations over dinner in Sepp's apartment in Baden-Baden at one evening of the hot European summer in the year 2003. As things worked out, he knew more about whom to ask and how much space to allocate to each entry and Embree knew more about how to conduct the inviting, preliminary editing, and prodding of contributors who were late returning their criticized drafts and copyedited entries and was able to invest the time and other resources from his endowed chair. That process took longer than anticipated and there were additional unfortunate delays due to factors beyond the editors's control.

The contributors are thanked first of all for their contributions from which we editors have been the first to learn a great deal, but also for their patience with the delays. We regret to say that one of our authors, Anna Blume, died in 2008 in the age of 41. Her article on Hermann Schmitz reflects her great interest in subjectivity, art, and aesthetic experience from a phenomenological point of view. We thank Steffen Kammler (Rostock) for correcting the proof on the copyedited final version of this article.

Dr. Daniel Marcelle, Embree's research assistant at Florida Atlantic University, is thanked for his quick understanding of the tasks involved and his utterly reliable efforts. And Maja de Keijzer of Springer Publishers was her usual cheerful, understanding, and supportive self.

Prague, Czech Republic
Boca Raton, Florida
November 2008

Hans Rainer Sepp
Lester Embree

Contributors

Daniela Angelucci Università di Roma Tre, Rome, Italy

Michael D. Barber Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO, USA

Anna Blume University at Lüneburg, Lüneburg, Germany

John B. Brough Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

Jagna Brudzińska Universität zu Köln, Köln, Germany

Philippe Cabestan Lycée Janson de Sailly, Paris, France

Edward S. Casey State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York, USA

Timothy K. Casey University of Scranton, Scranton, PA, USA

CHEN Zhiyuan Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China; Chinese Academy of Social Science, Beijing, China

CHEUNG Chan-Fai Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong

John F. Crosby Franciscan University of Steubenville, Steubenville, OH, USA

Françoise Dastur Archives Husserl de Paris, École Française de Daseinsanalyse, Paris, France

Natalie Depraz Université de Rouen, Rouen, France

Mădălina Diaconu Institute of Philosophy, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Lester Embree Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL, USA

Eliane Escoubas Department of Philosophy, Université de Paris XII—Val de Marne, Paris, France

Licia Fabiani Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

Andrzej Gniazdowski Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa, Poland

Ludger Hagedorn Czech Academy of Sciences—AV CR, Prague, Czech Republic

Sara Heinämaa University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Wolfhart Henckmann University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Terri J. Hennings Department of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies,
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Galen A. Johnson University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, USA

KANATA Susumu Hiroshima University, Higashihiroshima, Hiroshima, Japan

Gediminas Karoblis Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania; Norwegian
University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Helmut Kohlenberger University of Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria

Dean Komel Department of Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana,
Slovenia

Annamaria Lossi University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

Christian Lotz Michigan State University, Detroit, MI, USA

Paul Majkut National University La Jolla, La Jolla, CA, USA

Ram Adhar Mall Department of Philosophy, Ludwig-Maximilians-University of
Munich, Munich, Germany; Department of Philosophy, University of Cologne,
Cologne, Germany

Daniel Marcelle Katholieke Universiteit Leuven; Florida Atlantic University, Boca
Raton, FL, USA

Javier San Martín Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid, Spain

Augusto Mazzoni Istituto musicale “O. Vecchi”, Modena, Italy

Bálázs M. Mezei P. P. Hungarian Catholic University, Piliscsaba, Hungary

César Moreno Márquez University of Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain

Simone Neuber Eberhard Karls-Universität Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

Cathrin Nielsen Eugen Fink Archive, Freiburg, Germany

NUKI Shigeto Senshu University, Tokyo, Japan

Markus Ophälders Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

Andrea Pinotti Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

Christian Rabanus Institut für Phänopraxie, Wiesbaden, Germany

Mario Teodoro Ramírez Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo,
Morelia, México

Yvanka B. Raynova Institute for Philosophical Research at the Bulgarian Academy
of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria; Institut für Axiologische Forschungen, Vienna, Austria

Elena del Río University of Alberta, Alberta, Canada

ŌHASHI Ryōsuke Ryūkoku University, Kyoto, Japan

Gayle Salamon Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

Gabriele Scaramuzza Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

Tatyana Schedrina Moscow Pedagogical State University, Moscow, Russia

Hans Rainer Sepp Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Andreas Georg Stascheit Dortmund University of Applied Sciences and Arts,
Dortmund, Germany

Michael Staudigl Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna, Austria

Georg Stenger University of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany

Ted Toadvine University of Oregon, Charleston, OR, USA

TANI Toru Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan

Jürgen Trinks Österreichische Gesellschaft für philosophischen Ost-West-Dialog,
Vienna, Austria

Pol Vandavelde Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, USA

Ruud Welten Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands

Mirko Wischke Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Wittenberg, Germany

Introduction

Hans Rainer Sepp
Lester Embree

What happens when the traditional philosophical subdiscipline of aesthetics is approached phenomenologically? Is it changed? What are the consequences for phenomenology? Aesthetics is a late emerging subdiscipline within philosophy, and during the last three centuries has been for the most part considered inferior to logic and epistemology, as well as to ontology and ethics. To some extent it has also suffered the same fate within phenomenology, where it has yet to attain the same status as ethics. Nevertheless, it is astonishing to see how many phenomenologists have previously worked in aesthetics and how aesthetics is of central interest for such a considerable group of them today. Thus not only students, but also phenomenologists of different specialties as well as colleagues in different philosophical traditions may find the contents of the present handbook interesting.

Due to several factors, the rise of phenomenological aesthetics has been comparatively rapid. First, there is the important part that intuition plays in both aesthetics and phenomenological research. The visibility of the phenomena that phenomenology deals with not only raises the question of invisibility, but already contains most aesthetic themes. Then again, phenomenology prefers nearby things, things that are experienced in everyday life and shaped in action. The world near us, the lifeworld, is obviously an aesthetic one in this sense. Of course, this does not yet belong to the core of aesthetics as concerned with the fine arts. But phenomenology clearly analyzes phenomena of the lifeworld and the artistic relation to that world; hence phenomenological and artistic reflection are connected insofar as both “neutralize” the original attitude of experience and practical action in order to focus on it explicitly. In addition, phenomenology occasionally resorts to artistic standpoints in order to clarify other problems of a phenomenological nature.

Aesthetics has not only acquired esteem within phenomenological research, but evinced a certain philosophical explosiveness. The explosive tendency lies first in the fact that due to its rising status, the borderlines of aesthetics have begun to fade away, a process that also affects the sharply demarcated disciplines of logic and ethics. This does not signify that everything is now considered aesthetic. Rather, it means an opening in which the field of the sensuous, the sphere of *aisthēsis*, has been integrated into

H.R. Sepp (✉)
Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

L. Embree
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL, USA

the problematics of phenomenology. *Aisthēsis* marks the realm in which aesthetics as a traditional discipline meets phenomenology—a meeting in which aesthetics has changed and phenomenology has expanded its framework. At the same time, phenomenology has cleared the way to ideal spheres in relation to aesthetic phenomena. And finally, *aisthēsis* and aesthetic behavior are bound to the sensuous concretum that is the human body in its relation to world and history. These points are to be kept in mind when phenomenological aesthetics is in question. What is grasped with the new concept of aesthetics can no longer be grasped by the traditional sense of this word.

Outwardly considered, aesthetics has been changed more by phenomenology than vice versa. This impression results from the fact that phenomenology has long and deeply dealt with aesthetics, but mostly without exploring the broader philosophical connections of these treatments. And because the frames of reference themselves have more often been expanded in an operative than in a thematic way, the phenomenological tradition contains a variety of heterogeneous or even opposed topics. This should also be taken into account when phenomenological aesthetics is in question.

This handbook is the first attempt to present in print an extensive overview of this philosophical subdiscipline as pursued in the century-old and worldwide tradition begun by EDMUND HUSSERL.¹ Because it is not an encyclopedia, this handbook does not cover all facets of its subject matter. Instead, it aims, first, to cover the main aspects of phenomenological work done in the past, and second, to indicate some of the new results. In other words, the concern is to foster insight not only into historical developments, but also into current efforts. Within this framework, authors were given discretionary power in how to compose their entries. It is to be hoped that future accomplishments will be motivated on these bases. Some comments about the future will be offered here after some discussion of basic concepts as well as figures and a sketch of the history of phenomenological aesthetics.

Figures and Basic Themes

Where *figures* are concerned, this handbook is devoted to the core of phenomenology. Central are MORITZ GEIGER, ROMAN INGARDEN, FRITZ KAUFMANN, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE, MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY, and MIKEL DUFRENNE. Then there are authors who are not centrally focused on phenomenological aesthetics but nevertheless make major contributions. These include Husserl and a long list of others: ANTONIO BANFI, SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR, OSKAR BECKER, JACQUES DERRIDA, EUGEN FINK, HANS-GEORG GADAMER, NICOLAI HARTMANN, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, MICHEL HENRY, DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND, EMMANUEL LEVINAS, MAURICE NATANSON, NISHIDA KITARŌ, JOSÉ ORTEGA Y GASSET, JAN PATOČKA, PAUL RICOEUR, HEINRICH ROMBACH, MAX SCHELER, ALFRED SCHUTZ, GUSTAV ŠPET, and FRANCE VEBER, as well as WALDEMAR CONRAD, who wrote mainly on aesthetics but died young. Finally, there are those whose work is still unfinished because they are alive, as is the case of HENRY MALDINEY, JEAN-LUC MARION, MARC RICHIR, and HERMANN SCHMITZ.

¹ As here, the figures on whom there are entries are referred to on first occurrence in each part of this handbook, in this introduction to begin with, by use of SMALL CAPITAL LETTERS. The family names of East Asians are written in ALL CAPITALS.

There are a number of other widely known phenomenologists who have also had important things to say that are relevant for phenomenological aesthetics, e.g., Hannah Arendt, Hans Jonas, Hedwig Conrad-Martius, and Jean-Luc Nancy, and there are, in addition, some who are not yet well-known internationally—e.g., HISAMATSU Shin'ichi in Japan, Luciano Anceschi, Dino Formaggio, and Luigi Pareyson in Italy; and Maximilian Beck in Germany. Such figures could not be afforded separate entries, but are mentioned in the sketch history of phenomenological aesthetics below (and included in the index); their most pertinent writings on aesthetics are listed in the bibliography of this introduction.

Not considered in this handbook are philosophers who are related to phenomenology in a broader sense, such as Gaston Bachelard, Walter Benjamin, Gilles Deleuze, Michel Foucault, Luce Irigaray, or Julia Kristeva; philosophers who developed original theories of appearance, such as Heinrich Barth; or philosophers who represent the psychology of art, such as Rudolf Arnheim, or cultural theory of art, such as Jean Gebser. To study the connections of such figures and their environments with phenomenology exceeds the scope of this handbook, but they deserve this mention.

Basic themes have been selected for entries with the goal of focusing on themes that have already been covered in relevant research. From the beginning, phenomenological aestheticians have reflected on the correlation of an object and its AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE,² and it is precisely phenomenological aesthetics that has pointed out the limits both of traditional relations between subjectivity and objectivity and of the model of prototypes and their images.

Phenomenological aesthetics includes above all the processes of CREATIVITY and the relation of the WORK OF ART to humans, NATURE, RELIGION, and PLAY. There are also the modes of sensation or AISTHESIS, IMAGINATION, and the different ways of realizing the mode of imagination in phantasy and (day) dreaming as well as in art. DREAM, for example, is relevant not only for the interpretation of modern art, above all of surrealism, but because consciousness builds its own imaginary worlds in dreaming.

In the light of these and further basic themes such as BEAUTY, EMPATHY, ENJOYMENT, APPEARANCE, METAPHOR, REPRESENTATION, and STYLE, it can be shown how phenomenological thinking supplements or even transcends traditional aesthetics. It also deals with recent themes of aesthetic thinking, e.g., with developments in highly technological civilization such as VIRTUAL REALITY or, in the wider context of new perspectives on the phenomenology of the body, with touching, smelling, tasting, which are the long-neglected SECONDARY SENSES. Then again, topical fields and themes like POLITICAL CULTURE, ECOLOGY, GENDER, and interculturality (see INDIA AND INTERCULTURAL AESTHETICS) are also of interest for current research. And finally, a meditation on how aesthetics can be pursued in a phenomenological manner, i.e., the METHODOLOGY of phenomenological aesthetics, must not be omitted.

Apart from reflecting on such basic concepts, questions of methodology, and current fields of aesthetics, phenomenologists also reflect on the different ways in which

² Within this introduction, titles of entries other than on figures are also given in SMALL CAPITAL LETTERS on first mention in order to orient the reader to the scope of this handbook. However, in the entries themselves, only names of figures on whom there are entries are treated in this way.

art becomes manifest in genres, styles, and movements, which can lead to analyses of particular works of art. In this handbook the reader will find articles on ARCHITECTURE, DANCE, FASHION, FILM, LITERATURE, MEDIA, MUSIC, PAINTING, PHOTOGRAPHY, and THEATER. The extensive phenomenological research done on music in particular disproves the widely held opinion that phenomenological research is exclusively confined to the visual.

Because it is not possible to cover all of the particular types of art and art movements, two cases are offered as samples: CUBISM and aesthetics in East Asia, especially in CHINESE AESTHETICS and in JAPANESE WORLDS. This selection is in no way by chance. Cubism is the movement most intensely analyzed by phenomenologists in different countries and periods thus far. Moreover, the phenomenon of cubism evokes the genuine phenomenological problems of the perception and representation of the world encountered within a picture. Phenomenological art theory in China is a new and prosperous branch on the trunk of worldwide phenomenological research, and it looks back on several thousand years of China's vast tradition in artistic creativity. Moreover, considering the aesthetic of Japanese lifeworlds presents a concrete contribution to intercultural phenomenology: it helps facilitate insight into the ways in which phenomenological research is established in non-Western cultures and reveals their modes of aesthetic understanding.

One can find further information on aesthetic concepts in entries on persons. Overlappings show how the same theme or problem of phenomenological aesthetics is seen from different points of view. The reader is again encouraged to use the index for this purpose.

The Historical Development of Phenomenological Aesthetics

Phenomenological aesthetics can be found in the work of the founder of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl (1859–1938), and in the circle of young philosophers around the Munich philosopher and psychologist Theodor Lipps (1851–1914) (see Schuhmann 1997). While Husserl himself was mainly interested in questions of perception, imagination, and image-consciousness, most members of the Munich circle had interests in problems of aesthetics and art. This insistent presence of aesthetics and art in the research done by the early phenomenologists results, first, from the reaction of both phenomenology and art to the deep mood of crisis that came over Europe at the turn of the century, and second, from an initial tendency focus on visual perception.

Theodor Lipps wrote on aesthetics from a psychological point of view within the framework of his theory of empathy. Some of his disciples connected their teacher's psychological method with Husserl's phenomenological approach, especially in research into values. The most famous representative of Munich school aesthetics is Moritz Geiger (1880–1937). He focuses in his phenomenology of aesthetic enjoyment on the aesthetic experiencing that receives values that are not relative to it.

Still less well known is the work of Johannes Daubert (1877–1947). He introduced the Munich phenomenologists to Husserl and left behind unpublished manuscripts on aesthetics. In his interpretation of impressionism, he emphasizes that the human being as a whole is no longer a theme; the sheer mode of appearing is at the center

of interest, and the human being is considered only insofar as s/he is looking, feeling, tensing, etc. (Schuhmann 1998).

Theodor Conrad (1881–1969) supported the position that only phenomenological research is able to keep aesthetics from psychological interpretation and to establish it as an independent discipline (Scaramuzza 1998). This contrasted with Aloys Fischer (1888–1937), who made use of a mixed phenomenological–psychological method in order to analyze both the aesthetic object and aesthetic enjoyment (Rollinger 1998).

The senior figure of the Munich phenomenological group, Alexander Pfänder (1870–1945), wrote only a few reflections on aesthetics, but one of his disciples, Maximilian Beck (1887–1950), went further in Chapters V–VIII of the first book of his *Wesen und Wert* (1925). For both Beck and Geiger, the aesthetic object is a value, but Beck claims that values cannot be analyzed phenomenologically. Such an analysis is for him an analysis of eidetic structures, and value is not an eidetic species, but “in contrast to the sphere of species as a sphere of the rational it is *the irrational* itself,” the “pure *that* of being.” (1929: 314). Hedwig Conrad-Martius (1888–1966), the wife of Theodor Conrad and famous for her phenomenological ontology of nature, also contributed an essay on the irreality of the artwork.

Edmund Husserl’s lecture course on “Main parts of a phenomenology and theory of cognition” (*Hauptstücke aus der Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*), which was delivered at the University of Göttingen during winter semester 1904/1905, contains detailed analyses of phantasy and image-consciousness. This research provided important elements for the great plan of the new critique of reason that he wanted to develop. In his later work, this aim was transformed into the conception of a transcendental “logic of absolute science.” The foundational part of such a logic is transcendental aesthetics. Aesthetics in this sense is the theme of both an eidetic and a constitutive-phenomenological investigation that discloses the world of “pure experience” in correlation with its constitution by transcendental subjectivity.

Husserl’s work contains, however, only a few remarks on topics of art. Waldemar Conrad (1878–1915), his disciple at Göttingen and not to be confused with Theodor Conrad (see above), also dealt with the correlation of aesthetic object and aesthetic experience, yet his work, published in 1908–1909, emphasizes the correlation of artistic genres—including both the correlation of music with arts realized by words and within space and its correlation with theater.

Wilhelm Schapp (1884–1965) also studied with Husserl in Göttingen, and his doctoral thesis of 1909 is on the phenomenology of perception. His later works on the “philosophy of stories” were published during the 1950s and refer occasionally to aesthetic themes, especially when he examines the status of the story in fairytales, legends, and myths. His thoughts about telling and hearing are fundamental for a phenomenological inquiry into narrative structures.

Dietrich von Hildebrand (1889–1977), son of the sculptor Adolf von Hildebrand, studied with Theodor Lipps and Alexander Pfänder and wrote his doctoral thesis under the guidance of Husserl. He carries out eidetic analyses of the value of beauty from an ontological-metaphysical point of view in the two volumes of his *Ästhetik* (1977, 1984). He stresses that beauty as a value can be immediately grasped by intuition, but since it is a quality of the object, it is not relative to the one who grasps it.

To a certain extent, Max Scheler (1874–1928), Roman Ingarden (1893–1970), and Nicolai Hartmann (1882–1950) also belong to the intellectual milieu of the Göttingen

group. Whereas Ingarden studied with Husserl, Scheler taught at the University of Munich from 1906 to 1910 and linked the Munich phenomenology with the younger generation at Göttingen. His aesthetic fragments mainly focus on an aesthetics of the creative processes and cover three themes: a theory of aesthetic values, an aesthetics of nature, and a philosophy of art.

Just as Scheler contends that an artwork develops its representative character only within the process of its creation, Hartmann too pointed out the incompleteness of a work, but stresses that this applies only to its reception: the diversity of ways in which an artwork can be interpreted is infinite, whereas the work in its presence does not change.

After its beginnings in Germany, phenomenology spread throughout the world. The first countries in which it took root were Poland, Russia, Japan, and Spain. Since the roots of phenomenological thinking betray its affinity to aesthetics, it is no accident that the carriers of phenomenological research to other nations were often interested in problems of aesthetics and a philosophy of art. Thus there were Ingarden in Poland, Špet in Russia, NISHIDA in Japan, Ortega y Gasset in Spain, Banfi in Italy, Veber in Slovenia, and Sartre and Merleau-Ponty in France.

The first reception of phenomenological thinking by Polish philosophers goes back to the year 1905. For Ingarden, the most prominent representative of that reception, research in aesthetics is only one part within his whole position, but an essential one. He inquires into the structure of the literary artwork only to differentiate the artistic object as “purely intentional” from real objects on the one hand and from ideal objects on the other, and to show that the latter cannot be attributed to the pure intentionality of consciousness. He founded an ontology of the artwork in his aesthetic investigations, analyzed the work of art in correlation to its being-grasped, and emphasized the mode of value pertaining to each kind of work.

Roman Ingarden’s investigations in aesthetics met with a wide response in his country. Evidences for that influence can be seen in the research work of Danuta Gierulanka (1909–1995), Andrzej Póltawski (1923–), and Władysław Stróżewski (1933–), as well as in the artistic work of “colorists” like Waclaw Taranczewski (1903–1987) and his son Paweł (1940–). Outside Poland, Ingarden’s studies had a substantial effect both on the phenomenological aesthetics of Nicolai Hartmann and Mikel Dufrenne and on the literary theories of Emil Staiger, Wolfgang Kayser, Käte Hamburger, René Wellek, and Austin Warren; they also influenced the theory of reception developed by Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss. In the recent past, Józef Tischner (1931–2000) in Kraków was famous for his study of drama within the context of his theory of intersubjectivity.

Phenomenological thinking in Russia was primarily introduced and propagated by Gustav Špet (1879–1937). He studied with Husserl in Göttingen and pursued phenomenological investigations in the field of the cultural sciences. With regard to the relation of aesthetic consciousness and the structure of its object, he is convinced that aesthetic reality is fictitious but nevertheless correlates with empirical reality. He is particularly concerned with hermeneutical analyses of poetic forms. Regarding words, he differentiates between the aesthetic meaning and the emotional content; the latter correlates with a “sympathetic understanding,” and requires a common context of understanding.

Mediated by Špet, Husserl’s phenomenology inspired trends of Russian formalism and early structuralism. In Prague during the late 1920s and early 1930s and encouraged by Roman Jakobson (1896–1982) in particular—structuralism met with

phenomenology again (Holenstein 1975, Chvatík 1987, Mathauser 2005 and 2006). Aleksei Losev (1893–1988) wrote on aesthetics and theory of language and devoted himself to the phenomenology of music.

NISHIDA Kitarō (1870–1945) founded phenomenological thinking in Japan before World War I. He is also famous in Japan for his artistic calligraphy and art is a major theme of his later work. NISHIDA's concept of *basho* (place or locus), central for his late philosophy in general, means a sphere where the conscious I has been realized; this concept is the basis of his studies of art, especially the process of artistic creation. Art is for NISHIDA not only the individual action of an artist but the self-production of the historical world taking place within the artist him/herself as well as in his/her creation.

Philosophy of art is also an important topic in the work of many representatives of the Kyoto School (OHASHI 1990) founded by NISHIDA, e.g., for TANABE Hajime (1885–1962) and HISAMATSU Shin'ichi (1889–1980). TANABE studied with Husserl in Freiburg and developed a theory of poetry focused on Paul Valéry and Stéphane Mallarmé. He emphasizes that art has a dialectical function for ethics, religion, and philosophy by virtue of its being a “symbol of nothingness,” an absolute mediating on account of self-denial. Hisamatsu, a master of Zen Buddhism and founder of an association for Zen praxis, also wrote on aspects of a “religion of awakening” from the standpoint of a philosophy of art. His opinion is that Zen art leaves every kind of formation behind. Like the religion of awakening Zen art should promote the “formless self.”

José Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955) was the important pioneer of phenomenological philosophy in the Spanish-speaking world. His aesthetics contains three main topics: a general theory of art; studies of literary genres; and the attempt to prove his own theories by analyzing concrete works of art by, e.g., Diego Velázquez and Francisco Goya. Artistic creation for Ortega gives rise to an unreal, “virtual” world. The poetic metaphor is key to such virtuality as long as it takes human reality away from the object and links it to a new world without any references to the real.

Rafael Dieste (1899–1981) wrote on such themes as authorship, reception and aesthetic experience, modes of literary reason, the place of myths within literary and philosophical discourses, the semiotics of theater, and the connection of tragedy and history.

Like the situation of phenomenological philosophy in general, the realm of phenomenological aesthetics has not yet been completely determined. Phenomenological aesthetics has its roots in phenomenological-psychological investigations and amounts to a large extent to investigations of values. However, it has gradually become clear that for phenomenological research as a whole, neither the relation between subject and object nor the reference to values had been clarified. The result for phenomenological aesthetics is that the center of analysis has shifted from the correlation of experience and object to the historical horizon within which the aesthetic experiencing of an artwork is anchored in relation to its creator and its recipients. After World War I, phenomenological research in all its early tendencies turned increasingly towards ontological and metaphysical perspectives on human existence, and it is no contradiction that problems of historicity were simultaneously approached.

Phenomenological aesthetics in Germany was at that time developed above all by representatives of the Freiburg group, who were mainly inspired by Martin Heidegger (1889–1976). Heidegger did not deal with problems of art before the 1930s, when

he wrote “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerks” (1935–1936) and interpreted Friedrich Hölderlin, but already in his early Freiburg lectures he encouraged other phenomenologists to develop new conceptions of aesthetics. His ontological way of interpreting artworks radically challenges the positions that understand the experiencing of an artwork from a subjective standpoint. For him, by opening the world and hiding the earth, the artwork testifies to an initial kind of truth as *a-lētheia*.

Fritz Kaufmann (1891–1959) was a student in Husserl’s Göttingen group before the war, but during the 1920s he tried to combine Husserl’s and Heidegger’s positions. His doctoral thesis under Husserl is an analysis of the consciousness of the picture from a specific point of view. Oriented to a phenomenological history (“*phänomen-geschichtlich*”) of the development of seeing something as a picture, it also shows Heidegger’s influence. Such influence can further be noticed where in referring to Heidegger’s concept of mood, Kaufmann remodels the early theories of empathy in the direction of an existential ontology.

Oskar Becker (1889–1964) also drew on Heidegger insofar as he forced Heidegger’s historical-hermeneutical conception open by transcending the sphere of the world into cosmic dimensions. His thesis is that an outer suprahistorical sphere complements the dimension of history, and that in its “fragility” the artwork is stretched between both spheres.

Through his “cosmological” philosophy, Eugen Fink (1905–1975) went beyond Heidegger in a similar way. The ground of Fink’s philosophy is an interlocking of visualization, phenomenality, and transphenomenality. His theory has its roots in his doctoral thesis (directed by Husserl) wherein he presents a new version of a theory of the picture-consciousness. The way that the environment is co-present within such an image Fink calls “transparency.” This determination marks the starting point for the theory of representation he developed later under the title of “play.” His interpretation is of play as a “symbol” (in the original Greek sense of fragment) of being not only in the world, but also toward the world. This concept of symbol moves away from the traditional understanding of phenomenality as a representation depicted from a prototype.

Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900–2001) similarly established his philosophical hermeneutics on the foundations laid by Husserl and Heidegger. He assumes an infinite process of interpretation, as his teacher Nicolai Hartmann did, but unlike Hartmann, he emphasizes how an artwork comes to pass for each concrete understanding.

During the 1930s, Hannah Arendt (1906–1975) occasionally studied the personalities of the writers Karen Blixen, Hermann Broch, Nathalie Sarraute, and Bertold Brecht, but she also wrote short texts on Dostoevsky, Proust, and Kipling (cf. Arendt 2007). Together with her first husband Günther Anders (1902–1992), whose dissertation was directed by Husserl, she also published an article on Rilke’s *Duineser Elegien* (Anders and Arendt 1930). Anders published books on Kafka (1951) and Brecht (1962b), as well as writing on the painter George Grosz (1961).

In his late work, Karl Löwith (1897–1973) investigated the philosophical structure of Paul Valéry’s work that TANABE Hasime had already dealt with. And aesthetic problems are also central in the case of later representatives of Freiburg phenomenology such as Walter Biemel (1918–). The comprehensive studies that he has written on temporality and the structure of the novel, on particular artworks, e.g., the *Bau* (1923/1924) by Franz Kafka, and also on trends in art are influenced by Heidegger.

Heinrich Rombach (1923–2004) developed his “philosophy of the picture” within the frame of his ontology of structure founded mainly on the basis of Husserl’s and

Heidegger's thinking, but going decisively beyond both of them to "read" works of art as evidences of structural phenomena. In his "hermetics" he also analyzes pictures of non-European cultures, especially works from Asian cultures. Rombach's thinking radicalizes the encounter of human being and world that had already played an important role in the later work of Heidegger by referring to the "con-creative" origin in which the human and nature or the human and the artwork participate.

The aesthetic theory of Hermann Schmitz (1928–) is embedded in his phenomenology of bodily feeling. Since the flesh is the medium for having atmospheres as modes of feeling, art for him undertakes a revolt against the defeat of the power of feeling by objectification.

Inspired by Michel Henry's phenomenology of life, Rolf Kühn (1944–) asks the question of an aesthetics of current interest. With respect to aesthetic phenomena in painting, architecture, landscape, and cultural processes, Kühn not only demonstrates the close alliance between art and life within the invisible immediacy of flesh, but reflects on the possibilities of aesthetics as self-enhancement of life in view of the general situation today that tends more and more to flaunt their phenomena.

Antonio Banfi (1886–1957) introduced phenomenology into Italy at the end of the 1920s and saw in phenomenological research an opportunity to realize an open-minded behavior toward the various fields of experience. He objects to the neo-idealistic aesthetics of Benedetto Croce and Giovanni Gentile, and made an effort both to distinguish different spheres of aesthetic experience and to fix their demarcations. He also pays attention to relations with other cultural spheres as well as to the historical place of aesthetic object without giving preference to historical moments over a priori—ontological features.

Banfi's research was continued primarily by Dino Formaggio (1914–) and Luciano Anceschi (1911–1995). Formaggio analyzes the process of artistic creation and distinguishes between art and aesthetics, both as a theory of sensation and a theory of art. Anceschi offers a phenomenological theory of poetry and literature. Enzo Paci (1911–1976) wrote a book on Kierkegaard and Thomas Mann. Luigi Pareyson (1918–1991) characterizes the artistic process by the term of "formativity," which is an intensified interaction of creation and discovery, a process that invents its manner of acting within the very course of its own realization. Umberto Eco (1932–) and Gianni Vattimo (1936–) rank among his disciples.

Finally, Giovanni Piana (1940–) has published a very large book on *Filosofia della musica* (1991) in which he draws on Husserl's theory of time-consciousness. Phenomenological aesthetics is thus a particularly important subject in Italy. A number of phenomenologists are currently dealing with problems of aesthetics from a phenomenological point of view at the Università degli Studi di Milano, where Banfi once worked.

The regional school of Slovenian phenomenology is to a large extent characterized by investigations in aesthetics. This discipline is already central to the philosophical research of France Veber (1890–1975). He studied with Alexius Meinong and long wrestled with the positions of Husserl and Heidegger. His *Estetika* (1925) also examines the relation of aesthetic experience and its object, just as various phenomenologists had done before him, but he includes reflections on the artwork and distinguishes a threefold function of art: art as realization of irreal figures, art as liberation of passions and emotions, and art as a link with science and religion.

The philosophers who followed Veber absorbed Heidegger's later philosophy. Dusan Pirjevec (1921–1977) published analyses on the European novel,

including works by Miguel de Cervantes, Feodor Dostoevsky, Franz Kafka, Alain Robbe-Grillet, and others, and Tine Hribar (1941–) published studies of the artwork, primarily religious contexts. Hribar makes a sharp distinction between the aesthetic object and the artwork: only the latter can open the dimension of the “holy play of the world.”

The thinking of Jan Patočka (1907–1977) in the former Czechoslovakia was also beholden to Freiburg phenomenology, to the tension of Husserl’s late philosophy and Heidegger’s thinking as well as to impulses given by Fink. His studies of Hegel’s *Ästhetik*, along with his essays on great representatives of Czech art as well as on such works as Sophocles’ *Antigone* and Goethe’s *Faust* are only facets of his extensive work. But they are important insofar as they are central elements of his great philosophy of European history.

Representatives of phenomenological aesthetics in the Czech Republic today are Zdeněk Mathauser (1920–2007) and Antonín Mokrejš (1932–) (Blecha 2003). As a successor of Jan Mukařovský (1891–1975), Mathauser linked Prague structuralism with Husserl’s phenomenology and developed his own conception of the structural-phenomenological interpretation of artworks, especially of poetry. Art for Mokrejš is the form of human existence itself, an expression of the creative power of life. In contrast with the objectifying sciences, art helps to discover new perspectives but also new conflicts arising within the world.

Phenomenological aesthetics has made great headway in France. A distinguishing mark there is the inclusion of the human body into the theory of art and aesthetics. Pioneering studies on phenomenological aesthetics were *L’imagination* (1936) and *L’imaginaire* (1940) by Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980). Both works deal with the relation of sensation and imagination to presentation and representation. The later Sartre is known for his essay on committed literature, his writings on theater, and his voluminous work on Gustave Flaubert.

Simone de Beauvoir’s (1908–1986) work includes reflections about the status of the artist and about the nature of fiction. For her philosophy and literature both aim to understand the condition of human existence; however, while philosophers use fiction to analyze the essential structures of experience, novelists use fiction to present individual lives as “singular universals” (Beauvoir 1972: 163).

In Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s (1908–1961) investigations *aisthēsis* and aesthetics are deeply intertwined. For him art stands for the realm in which the bodily contact with reality presents itself in an original and vivid way. Reflections in aesthetics can be found especially in his collection of essays, *L’œil et l’esprit* (1961). His aesthetic analyses are particularly concerned with the progresses of the creation of artistic work. He points to a reversibility between artist and artwork, a network of exchange between body and world.

The work of Mikel Dufrenne (1910–1995) is of fundamental relevance for a phenomenological aesthetics. In his main work *Phénoménologie de l’expérience esthétique* (1953), he analyzes aesthetic experiencing and the close intertwining of aesthetic object and artwork: through its bodily affection, the aesthetic experiencing “liberates” the motion implied in the work and facilitates the genesis of the aesthetic object.

Picking up the thread of Husserl and Heidegger, Henry Maldiney (1912–) investigates poetry and painting, draws on psychoanalysis and existential analysis, and examines the relationship of creativity and eroticism.

Emmanuel Levinas (1906–1995), though, reacts to Heidegger’s ontological analyses of the work of art. Rather than being the establishment of a kind of world in a sensational medium, Levinas shows us how an artistic image works instead as a symbol in reverse. Art does not reveal some truth of the world, but instead obscures it and celebrates its absence, revealing instead existence in general.

Paul Ricoeur (1913–2005) approached aesthetics from the standpoint of narrative and was especially concerned with the structure of the metaphor as well as with the relations of time and narration. A three-fold mimesis mediates between time and narrative: the projection into the context of the world of actions, the textual structure of a fictive work, and the reorganization of a text during reading by the pre-understanding of the course of events. By thinking the relationship of reception dialectically—so that a work affects its reader, and s/he fits it into his/her ethical criteria and value system—Ricoeur also calls attention to the relation of poetics to ethics and politics.

Michel Henry (1922–2002) interprets Wassily Kandinsky’s work from the position of a phenomenology of life. He shows that this work uncovers a primary, non-intentional affectivity that becomes manifest in original self-affectation.

The “deconstructionism” of Jacques Derrida (1930–2004) challenges the borderlines of disciplines like philosophy and theory of literature; it had an enormous influence on the self-image of the latter discipline, and especially affected a group of literary critics in the United States, including Paul de Man at Yale University. Derrida’s reflections on art are particularly concerned with the problem of “frame” that is seemingly able to separate realms in an obvious way.

Jean-Luc Nancy (1940–) analyzes the relation between image and the sacral, which he calls the “distinct.” Accordingly, the image is understood as an opening that is inseparably presence as well as distance, and since it tears up every secluded immanence, the extreme violence of cruelty lurks at its margins.

Marc Richir (1943–) recognizes that since aesthetic experience is based on the body in its affectivity and capacity for imagination, such experience opens itself to incalculable and inexhaustible possibilities. And for him, the exuberance of these possibilities is equivalent to the sublime in Immanuel Kant’s philosophy. The rhythm of the subject being swallowed up by the immeasurable object and reappearing once again increasingly corresponds to the phenomenalization of the phenomenon that cannot be fixed in principle.

Confronting icon and idol, Jean-Luc Marion (1946–) distinguishes two modes of phenomenalization. In later writings he uncovers the philosophical as well as the religious-theological contexts of both and deepens his analyses about visibility by studies devoted to the problem of the donation of phenomenality.

Influenced by Husserl and by Heidegger in particular, Jean-Louis Chretien (1952–) analyzes the relation of call and response and asks how responses to art shape human life. In this context he examines the work of such poets and painters as Ferdinand Delacroix, John Keats, Edouard Manet, Rembrandt van Rijn, and Paul Verlaine.

Aesthetics in the United States was initially of only marginal phenomenological interest. First there were contributions by those who fled Nazism. Thus there is the work of Fritz Kaufmann and Siegfried Kracauer (1889–1966), who had also attended lectures by Husserl and dealt with sociological problems of film theory. Then Alfred Schutz (1899–1959) left some indications, especially for music in its various contexts of social relations and strata of meaning, but also for the forms of literature, and Hans Jonas (1903–1993) offered reflections on a theory of the picture in an article on *homo pictor*.

But there have been other figures more recently. CHO Kah Kyung (1927–) is Korean by birth, a disciple of Gadamer and Löwith, and teaches at the State University of New York in Buffalo. He began with a critical analysis of basic thoughts by Heidegger, and has gone on to forge links between Western philosophy and East Asian aesthetics. Others born in the United States include Arnold Berleant (1932–), who has developed an ecological aesthetics phenomenologically. Eugene Francis Kaelin (1926–) who followed Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Sartre in pursuing aesthetics within the context of a philosophy of existence and has written on aesthetics for art teachers; and Maurice Natanson (1924–1996) who wrote about the phenomenology of literature and the artwork as such, distinguishing between the phenomenology manifested in a literary work (and uncoverable by phenomenological means) and the phenomenology that analyzes the artwork. Finally, as in France and Italy, there has also been phenomenologically inspired film theory in the United States, particularly in writings by Allan Casebier and Vivian Sobchack (1940–).

About the Future

Worldwide there are over 180 phenomenological organizations today and phenomenological exchanges transcend the borders of cultural complexes far more than they did in the past. Thus we have the chance to clarify and transform our own traditions through dialogue. This of course concerns phenomenology in general, but regarding phenomenological aesthetics a specific possibility of further development has emerged. The history of phenomenological aesthetics already shows that interculturality provides many different aesthetic starting points. Such starting points tend to be more specific than occur in logic, in epistemology, or even in ethics, and once again demonstrate how deeply rooted aesthetic themes are in different lifeworlds.

Accordingly, one of the main goals of future phenomenological research in aesthetics may be the attempt to bring different cultural efforts regarding aesthetic topics together. Phenomenological investigation is able not only to lay bare the various contents of aesthetic thinking embedded in their cultural foundations, but also to promote ways toward intercultural understanding. This is far from a simple comparison. It is rather a reciprocal existential relation in which by facing the other, one discovers one's own roots.

Seen in this light, the tendency to contrast historical and original philosophical research is evidently inadequate. But the alternative is not simply carrying out both approaches side by side. A sharp distinction between historical and systematic research does not yet see that a philosophical position is always strictly bound to a particular realm, yet at the same time always transcends this sphere so that others can participate in it. Because from its beginnings phenomenology defined itself as a community of researchers, individual positions may be starting points for other phenomenologists to develop these positions further and take them up into their own research, not in the interest of a conservation of historical standpoints, but in service of an interest in the things themselves. Phenomenology is not an antique shop, an omnium-gatherum of curiosities.

This is true for phenomenological aesthetics in particular insofar as many of its results are included in investigations done in a more operative way, in the sense that the assumptions of many different treatments made at the intersections of *aisthēsis*,

aesthetics, and philosophy of art have not yet been thematically elucidated. Many basic questions are still unanswered, and what may have been thought through in some places—for instance, on the relation of experience and its content, on modes of representation, and on the lifeworldly function of imagination—might be unknown elsewhere. The topics of *image* and *place* may be mentioned here as two concrete examples.

One of the great themes of phenomenological research in aesthetics is the topic of image. Phenomenology has propounded about fifteen theories of the image to date. But the fundamental ideas and consequences of most of them have yet to be analyzed within phenomenology, not to mention in intertraditional research. Should a 16th version be added? Or is it sufficient merely to list the existing theories, or at most to continue some of them? This cannot be a judicious alternative for future phenomenological research because the topic of the image (and many other basics) is not only implied within the whole Western tradition from Plato to the present, in Buddhist thinking, and in the religions of Judaism and Islam, but is also integrated into all facets of the lifeworld. It belongs to all strata of basic culture as well as to the regions of the so-called higher levels of cultural activity in art, science, and religion. This suggests that aesthetics is not at all a fringe area of philosophical thinking. On the contrary, it is anchored within the core of the lifeworld where all human activities are intertwined with one other.

Aesthetics also has a fundamentally ethical relevance. Future phenomenological research should clearly demarcate the ethical significance and force of aesthetics. Some first indications of this development can be seen in gender analysis and in the realm of ecological aesthetics. First of all, the connection between ethics and aesthetics at the basis of these efforts should be clarified: it is necessary to demonstrate how the sojourn of human beings in the world is formed by both ethical and aesthetic factors from the outset. Starting from the non-interchangeable place to which every human life is bound in its particularity, it can be asked how the specific *ethos* of such places imply a primary capacity to reflect on their roots and conceive of them in traditions, norms, and rules by imaginative faculties and their aesthetic potential. Furthermore, it is possible to analyze how the establishment of ethical measurement is mediated by aesthetic categories as well as how every aesthetic formation of a worldly place is con-substantiated in ethical principles.

Phenomenological aesthetics in particular could analyze the genesis of different modes of experiencing space and time; the relations of inner and outer; and—as a main theme of an intercultural aesthetics—the relations of the own, the alien, and the *oikos* (living space). Up to now, such themes have been concentrated on by either ethics or aesthetics. Yet there have been some exceptions: phenomenological analyses done by NISHIDA on “*basho*” within the framework of his “logic of place,” by the late Heidegger on “*Ort*,” or by WATSUJI on “*fūdo*” offer perspectives combining both ethical and aesthetic analyses.

Such cooperation should not only be realized by an inner-phenomenological or inner-philosophical dialogue, but should also include other disciplines and intercultural exchange. Interdisciplinary and intercultural discussions could certainly spur fruitful phenomenological research. Since phenomenology is not burdened with the ballast of a closed school tradition, then as long as it does not degenerate into an epigonic continuation of singular standpoints, the so-called phenomenological “movement” will continue to be one whose *movement* possesses genuine *motive power*; a faculty of mobility and flexibility. Phenomenological analyses work out

modules at their times and their places that can be absorbed by others, and thus allow new connections and networks of ideas to arise. Such flexibility will be relevant for future phenomenology inasmuch as it can gain access to other disciplines where phenomenological analyses can be applied; conversely, phenomenology can provide impulses by these contacts with disciplines that will then define themselves in new ways.

We might also speculate about what results might be obtained through cooperation between phenomenological aesthetics and such diverse fields as art, history, sociology, political science, biosciences, and theology, on the one hand, and the creative process of artistic work on the other. In doing so, however, one should not lose sight of the fact that fruitful phenomenological research, like the breath of life, can creatively bring established research work back into its own while simultaneously propelling it forward into newly opened horizons.

Note: The items listed below are either by authors cited in this introduction or by writers discussed above who do not have entries on them. Bibliographies on the others, whose names are in SMALL CAPITAL LETTERS above, are attached to the entries on them.

Bibliography

- Anceschi, Luciano. *Autonomia ed eteronomia dell'arte: Sviluppo e teoria di un problema estetico*. Florence: Sansoni, 1936; rpt. Milan: Garzanti, 1992.
- Anceschi, Luciano. *Progetto di una sistematica dell'arte*. Milan: Mursia, 1962a. rpt. Modena: Mucchi, 1983.
- Anceschi, Luciano. *Bert Brecht. Gespräche und Erinnerungen*, Zürich: Arche, 1962b. Anders, Günther, and Hannah Arendt. "Rilkes Duineser Elegien." *Neue Schweizer Rundschau* 23, 1930.
- Anceschi, Luciano. *Gli specchi della poesia*. Turin: Einaudi, 1981. Anders, Günther. *Kafka pro und contra*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1951.
- Anceschi, Luciano. *George Grosz*. Zürich: Arche, 1961.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Reflections on Literature and Culture*. Ed. Susannah Young-Ah Gottlieb. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. *Tout compte fait*. Paris: Gallimard, 1972; *All Said and Done*. Trans. Patrick O'Brian. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.
- Beck, Maximilian. *Wesen und Wert. Grundlegung einer Philosophie des Daseins*. 2 Vols. Berlin: Konrad Grethlein, 1925.
- Beck, Maximilian. "Die neue Problemlage der Ästhetik." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 23, 1929, 305–25.
- Biemel, Walter. *Philosophische Analysen zur Kunst der Gegenwart*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.
- Biemel, Walter. *Zeitigung und Romanstruktur. Philosophische Analysen zum modernen Roman*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1986.
- Biemel, Walter. *Schriften zur Kunst. Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 2. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996.
- Blaschek-Hahn, Helga, and Hans Rainer Sepp (eds.), *Heinrich Rombach. Strukturontologie—Bildphilosophie—Hermetik*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2009.
- Blecha, Ivan. "Fenomenologie a estetika." In his *Edmund Husserl a česká filosofie*. Ed. Olomouc 2003, 161–71.
- Casebier, Allan. *Film and Phenomenology: Toward a Realist Theory of Cinematic Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- CHO, Kah Kyung. "Die Idee der Unvollkommenheit in der taoistischen Ästhetik." In his *Bewußtsein und Natursein*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1987, 313–44.
- Chretien, Jean-Louis. *L'effroi du beau*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987.
- Chretien, Jean-Louis. *L'arche de la parole*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998.
- Chretien, Jean-Louis. *Corps à corps: À l'écoute de l'oeuvre d'art*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1997; *Hand to Hand: Listening to the Work of Art*. Trans. Stephen E. Lewis. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.

- Chvatík, Květoslav. "Jan Mukařovský, Roman Jakobson und der Prager linguistische Kreis." In his *Mensch und Struktur. Kapitel aus der neostrukturellen Ästhetik und Poetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1987, 171–96.
- Conrad, Theodor. *Definition und Forschungsgehalt der Ästhetik*. Doctoral thesis, Munich, 1908.
- Conrad-Martius, Hedwig. "Die Irrealität des Kunstwerks." In her *Schriften zur Philosophie*, Vol. 3. Ed. Eberhard Avé-Lallemant. Munich: Kösel, 1965, 249–60.
- Daubert, Johannes. Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Daubertiana* A I 15.
- Dieste, Rafael. *El alma y el espero. Textos e crítica de arte*. Madrid: Alianza, 1981; rpt. Vigo, 1995.
- Fink, Eugen. "Vergegenwärtigung und Bild." 1930. In his *Studien zur Phänomenologie 1930–1939*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966, 1–78.
- Fink, Eugen. *Mode—ein verführerisches Spiel*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1969.
- Fink, Eugen. *Epiloge zur Dichtung*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1971.
- Fischer, Aloys. *Zur Bestimmung des ästhetischen Gegenstandes*. Munich: Stein, 1907.
- Formaggio, Dino. *Fenomenologia della tecnica artistica*. Milan: Nuvoletti, 1953; rpt. Pratiche, 1979.
- Formaggio, Dino. *Problemi di estetica*. Palermo: Aesthetica, 1991.
- Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975.
- Jonas, Hans. "Homo Pictor. Von der Freiheit des Bildens." In *Was ist ein Bild?* Ed. Gottfried Boehm. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1994, 105–24.
- Kaelin, Eugene Francis. *Art and Existence: A Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1970.
- Kaelin, Eugene Francis. *An Aesthetics for Art Educators*. New York: Teacher's College Papers, 1989.
- Kaelin, Eugene Francis. *Texts on Texts and Textuality: A Phenomenology of Literary Art*. Ed. E. J. Burns. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.
- Komel, Dean, ed. *Kunst und Sein. Beiträge zur phänomenologischen Ästhetik und Aletheiologie*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2004.
- Kracauer, Siegfried. *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Kühn, Rolf. *Ästhetische Existenz heute. Zum Verhältnis von Leben und Kunst*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2007.
- Lipps, Theodor. *Ästhetik. Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst*. 2 Vols.. Hamburg: Leopold Voss, 1903, 1906.
- Losev, Alexei. *Dialektika chudozestvennoj formy*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1983.
- Losev, Alexei. Феноменология абсолютной, или чистой, музыки с точки зрения абстрактно-логического знания [Phenomenology of the absolute or pure music from the standpoint of the abstract-logical knowledge]. In his *Из ранних произведений* [From the Early Writings]. Moscow: Pravda, 1990, 196–336.
- Löwith, Karl. "Paul Valéry. Grundzüge seines philosophischen Denkens." 1971. In his *Gott, Mensch und Welt—G. B. Vico—Paul Valéry. Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. 9. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1986, 229–400.
- Mathauser, Zdeněk. *Básen na dosah eidosu. Ke stopám fenomenologie v ruské literatuře a literární vědě*. Prague: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, 2005.
- Mathauser, Zdeněk. *Básnivé nápovědi Husserlovy fenomenologie*. Prague: Filosofia, 2006.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Aufond des images*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 2003.
- ŌHASHI Ryōsuke ed. *Die Philosophie der Kyoto-Schule. Texte und Einführung*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1990. 2nd, revised ed. 2008.
- Paci, Enzo. *Relazioni e significati*, Vol. 2. *Kierkegaard e Thomas Mann*. Milan: Lampugnani Nigri, 1965; rpt. Bompiani, 1991.
- Pareyson, Luigi. *Estetica: Teoria della formatività*. Florence: Sansoni, 1954; rpt. Milan: Bompiani 2002.
- Pareyson, Luigi. *Teoria dell'arte*. Milan: V. Mursia, 1965.
- Pfänder, Alexander. "Malerei und Zeichnung." Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Pfänderiana* E III 1.
- Pfänder, Alexander. "Zum Problem des Stils." Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Pfänderiana* E III 2.
- Pfänder, Alexander. "Materialien zur Ästhetik." Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Pfänderiana* E V.
- Piana, Giovanni. *Filosofia della musica*. Milan: Guerini, 1991.
- Poli, Roberto and Gabriele Scaramuzza, eds. *Phenomenological Aesthetics. Axiomathes* 9, 1998.
- Rollinger, Robin D. "The Phenomenological Aesthetics of Aloys Fischer." *Axiomathes* 9, 1998, 81–92.

- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der kommende Gott. Hermetik—eine neue Weltsicht*, Freiburg: Rombach, 1991.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der Ursprung. Philosophie der Konkreativität von Mensch und Natur*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1994.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der Drachenkampf. Der philosophische Hintergrund der blutigen Bürgerkriege und die brennenden Zeitfragen*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1996.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele. "Theodor Conrad and Phenomenological Aesthetics." *Axiomathes* 9, 1998, 93–103.
- Schapp, Wilhelm. *Beiträge zur Philosophie der Wahrnehmung*. 1910. New ed. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1981.
- Schapp, Wilhelm. *Philosophie der Geschichten*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1981.
- Schapp, Wilhelm. *In Geschichten verstrickt. Zum Sein von Mensch und Ding*. 3rd ed. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985.
- Schuhmann, Karl. "Philosophy and Art in Munich around the Turn of the Century." In *In Itinere. European Cities and the Birth of Modern Scientific Philosophy*. Ed. Roberto Poli. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997, 35–51.
- Schuhmann, Karl. "Johannes Daubert als Ästhetiker" *Axiomathes* 9, 1998, 61–79.
- Sobchack, Vivian. *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Stenger, Georg, and Margarete Röhrig, eds. *Philosophie der Struktur—"Fahrzeug" der Zukunft? Für Heinrich Rombach*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1995.
- Tischner, Josef. *Das menschliche Drama. Phänomenologische Studien zur Philosophie des Dramas*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1989.
- Warren, Austin, and René Wellek. *Theory of Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949; rpt. London: Penguin Books, 1980.
- Weidtmann, Niels. *Der Weltcharakter der Kulturen in der interkulturellen Welt. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Hermeneutik und Strukturphänomenologie am Beispiel Afrika*. Ph.D. dissertation, Würzburg, 1998.

Aesthetic Experience

Edward S. Casey

Immanuel Kant held that the judgment of taste bears on formal features that inhere in works of art as these inspire certain feelings in the subject. “Taste is the faculty for judging an object or a kind of representation through a satisfaction or dissatisfaction without any interest. The object of such a satisfaction is called beautiful” (Kant, 2000: 96). According to Kant, in matters of knowledge, it is the object that is primarily at stake; in the case of taste, it is the experience that counts. His *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790) opens as follows: “In order to decide whether or not something is beautiful, we do not relate the representation by means of understanding to the object for cognition, but rather relate it by means of the imagination (perhaps combined with the understanding) to the subject and its feeling of pleasure or displeasure” (ibid: 89). Despite this emphasis on the indispensability of the subject’s experience in aesthetic judgment, Kant’s overall presumption is that the domain of art is to be understood in terms of the two poles of subject and object, experience and thing.

The predominance of this bipolar model is inseparable from the era of representationalism in modern Western philosophy. A “representation” (*Vorstellung*) is the response of a human subject to the appearance of discrete entities in space and time; the parade of these entities would be lost on a given human subject unless s/he had some capacity for representing them in memory or projecting them in imagination. This twofold activity of representation forms the very medium for the experience of art, where “experience” (*Erfahrung*) signifies the immanent relationship between such

activity and its proper objects. But is such experience adequate for grasping the actuality of art?

MARTIN HEIDEGGER thinks not. In “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” (1935–1936), he maintains that the modernist emphasis on experience as the basis for the creation and enjoyment of art is misguided: “Everything [has become] an experience. Yet perhaps experience is the element in which art dies” (Heidegger, 1971: 79). From the 18th century onward, recourse to experience has meant the subjectification of the artwork in the abyss of mental representations. Neglected are dimensions of the artwork that surpass the domain of subjectivity and representation, e.g., Being and the Open, Earth and World. Rather than being the contents of any possible subjective experience, these factors transcend such experience. From the very start, they take us somewhere else.

Nevertheless, the matter is not quickly settled. Phenomenological accounts of art, from EDMUND HUSSERL to MIKEL DUFRENNE, insist on the pertinence of the experience-object schema to the appreciation, creation, and understanding of artworks. This suggests that there is something right and relevant about thinking of art in terms of its being experienced by human subjects. Once the dogma of representationalism is removed from the schema, there is room for a more constructive and expansive notion of aesthetic experience and its contents. The major phenomenological aestheticians offer us a model for experiencing art in enriched and nuanced ways without being committed to the primacy of representation and its associated subjectivism.

Edmund Husserl’s analysis of Dürer’s engraving *Knight, Death, and the Devil*, one of his rare allusions to art, is concerned with depiction and imagination. Depiction is certainly a matter of representation, yet

E.S. Casey (✉)
State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York, USA

not in the narrow modernist sense. Husserl's focus is not upon the generation of representations in human subjects. Instead, he stresses the depictive properties of the engraving, and in particular how its lines, though perceived as physical entities on one level, are grasped as only quasi-existing on another: "this depicting picture-Object is present to us neither as existing nor as not existing, nor in any other positional modality; or rather, there is consciousness of it as existing, but as quasi-existing in the neutrality modification of being" (Husserl, 1982: 262). At stake here is imagination (*Phantasie*), conceived as the neutralizing of "positing" presentations or presentifications such as memories and perceptions. (This is not to confuse neutrality modification with phantasy, since every phantasy is such a modification, but the modification itself has universal application; cf. *ibid.*, §111, "The Neutrality Modification and Phantasy.")

Husserl singles out a visual work of art composed of lines, with no color. Linearity is well suited to bring out issues of depiction, given that contour lines often stand in for the edges of objects. It does not matter that these objects do not come directly from the artist's (or the spectator's) personal experience. What matters is the effort to delineate all that is depicted in the engraving, thereby demonstrating that the realm of "objects" may include wholly imaginary entities such as the Devil or the Knight. Thus the spectator as well as the artist is invited to engage in an imaginative activity whose contents exceed the deliverances of ordinary perceptual experience. By invoking this invitation to imagine freely under the guidance of linear depictions, Husserl extends the notion of experience in art beyond the narrow limits of "objective representation," which is tied to definite objects in a spatiotemporal field that pre-exists the representing subject. This is a crucial step toward formally acknowledging the pertinence of a much more expansive model of experience than was permitted in early modern thought under the regime of mental representation.

ROMAN INGARDEN provides a more comprehensive view of aesthetic experience than does Husserl. Where Husserl had been content to remark that literature allows unusual latitude in the employment of imagination (*ibid.*: 160), Ingarden carefully analyzes what a literary work and its experience consist in. *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931) opens with a critique of psychologistic interpretations in which the meaning

of a literary work is equivalent to the mental experiences of the author or the reader. He considers this an "absurdity" that refuses to recognize that the work has a being of its own: "each literary work of art is something that in itself is one and identical" (Ingarden, 1973a: 16). This identity relies upon "ideal meaning units" and cannot be reduced to any set of psychic experiences, no matter how wide-ranging and complete they may be. Such experiences do not belong to the literary work. Not even imagined objects can make up the fabric of the literary work, for these remain part of the psychic life of the author or reader, and are disparate from the meaning-formations and represented objects that make up a given work's distinctive identity. Nothing that is psychic, whether as actual experience or as imagined object, can be a proper constituent of the literary work. It must be excluded as ruthlessly and surely as a thinker's actual thoughts from logic or mathematics. Thus scientific truth and artistic creation, once purged of their psychologistic reductions, converge despite their many manifest differences.

What distinguishes the literary work from a scientific theory is its peculiar *structure*: every work of literature presents itself to the reader as a series of strata that, though organically bound together in the reader's experience, are distinguishable upon analysis. These strata are: linguistic sound formations, meaning units, schematized aspects, and represented objects. Each stratum conditions all the others in the conjoint action that makes up the work as a whole. Inspired by MAX SCHELER's model of the stratification of value in ethical life, Ingarden holds that each stratum bears its own particular form of value. "There thus arises a manifold of aesthetic value qualities in which a polyphonic yet uniform value quality of the whole is constituted" (*ibid.*: 30). Such value qualities are no more reducible to experiences than are the ideal meanings that guarantee the coherence of represented objects. Together, such meanings and qualities ensure that the literary work is neither the physical object, e.g., the perceived page, nor the subjective experience of its author or reader. Nor is it the mere repository of representations at stake in the Cartesian subject; the final stratum of represented objects contains entities that are the creation of the work itself, not of any human subjectivity that purports to capture the perceived world in ideational or pictorial formats. On

Ingarden's conception, the only objects that matter are the "purely intentional objects projected by units of meaning" (ibid: 218).

This model has had considerable influence, e.g., on the formalist school of New Criticism in the United States, but is not without its complications. Ultimately, the ideal identity and unity of the work are not independent of the reader's intervention. The animation of all four strata, above all the intentional objects they variously support, requires the interventions of consciousness to such an extent that these objects exhibit an "ontical heteronomy." "The purely intentional object in its total existence and essence is dependent on the existence and essence of the appertaining act of consciousness" (ibid.: 122). To avoid subjective idealism, Ingarden immediately qualifies this claim by denying any "creative power" to consciousness. "We say that it is 'projected,' 'created' by intentional thought: but, in accordance with the proper essence of the intentional act of thought, this creation is not genuine creation" (ibid.). Ingarden wants to have it both ways: he maintains at once "the total submission to the sphere of influence of the 'I' of consciousness" and yet a "lack of a genuinely creative power of pure consciousness" (ibid.).

Not that human beings are never creative—where this means that what is created "immanently contains the determinations assigned to it by the [creative] act" (ibid.)—but in the case of reading a literary work (and, by extension, looking at paintings, listening to music, etc.), no such creativity is at play. At most, as Ingarden concedes in *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks* (1968), we can speak of a "co-creative attitude" when we are reading "actively" (Ingarden, 1973b: 40). We collaborate with the author in actively moving through the strata of the work toward its "portrayed objectivities," and in this way we discover "its peculiar, characteristic structure in its full detail" (ibid.: 41). Indeed, we may even "supplement" what we thus animate by adding "various details explicitly indicated by the sentence meanings" (ibid.). And yet this latter contribution does not amount to creation in any strong sense, i.e., any sense comparable to the creation effected by the author of the work when s/he was in the process of writing it. For the reader, there is nothing like creating from whole cloth, much less creation ex nihilo: the text presents itself as a verbal plenum that saturates his/her field. This is not to say, however, that the text is an entirely determinate entity. There are

"spots of indeterminacy" in every text; (1973a: 246, 250, 280, 331).

In the end, the reader is involved not in "a purely receptive reading" (ibid.: 41), but in what we might call a *co-performance* in which the reader depends on the text of the literary work even as s/he animates it. The text gives readers every essential stage direction, and we have no choice but to *follow* its lead, however actively we enliven and supplement it along the way.

Ingarden provides a theory of aesthetic experience that is true to its Husserlian origins in its respect for the purely intentional character of consciousness. It construes aesthetic experience exclusively in terms of this character and the objects of this experience in keeping with their sheer noematic core of sense. His groundbreaking work shows the wide applicability of the original Husserlian model. Yet it also shows the limits within which there is little room for the detailed actualities of lived experience, the genuine creativity of the reader's imagination, or the systematic ambiguity of many texts. The consistency and rigor of intentionality means the exclusion of much that art brings with it.

Mikel Dufrenne's *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique* (1953) is the preeminent and most fully accomplished work in phenomenological aesthetics. It illuminates all the major arts, while taking account of aspects of aesthetic experience neglected by Ingarden, e.g., reflection, feeling, and expression. Dufrenne insists on the rich diversity of aesthetic experience for the spectator, "a subject who, instead of making himself a consciousness in general so as to think the objective world, responds to the subjectivity of the work through his own subjectivity" (Dufrenne, 1973: 198). Without falling into psychologism, he emphasizes a depth of feeling that rejoins the depth of the aesthetic object in a special bond of "reciprocity" (ibid.: 483).

If the spectator of the artwork, whose point of view is here admittedly privileged (ibid.: xlv), is broadened and deepened, the artwork is expanded in scope by an emphasis on the "world" of the aesthetic object. No longer just a sum of represented objects, the world is an open whole with no prescribed limits. "The aesthetic object is, like subjectivity itself, the source of a peculiar world that cannot be reduced to the objective world" (ibid.: 197). The world of the work is a lived world (*Lebenswelt* in Husserl) fabricated from cultural and historical strands.

If Ingarden proposes a one-many model of aesthetic experience in which one subject links up with several levels of the artwork, Dufrenne's strategy is to show how an initial one-one dichotomy between subject and object gives way to a deeper connection that includes both. This dissolution of a provisional dualism is also evident in the distinction between the aesthetic object and the work of art. While the latter is the existing thing, art in its physicality, the former is the work as experienced, and more particularly, as *perceived*. While the work of art can be considered an ordinary thing (e.g., a painting as an object to be packed), when it is perceived for its own sake, it becomes an aesthetic object. As he puts it, "the aesthetic object is the work of art perceived as a work of art, that is, the work of art that gets the perception it solicits and deserves" (ibid.: 14; cf. 16). Thus it is by means of perception that work and object conjoin in a common bond: "aesthetic object and work of art are distinct in that aesthetic perception must be joined to the work of art in order for the aesthetic object to appear" (ibid.: lxv).

More importantly still, the augmented subject and object rejoin across their very differences. As poles of one and the same aesthetic experience, they are linked by a shared sensuousness that is "the act common to the sensing being and to what is sensed" (ibid.: 225). The sensuous (*le sensible*) is an intensification and epiphany of perception. A work of art delivers to us "the sensuous in its glory" (ibid.: 14). Reinforcing the annealing role of the sensuous is *feeling* (*senti-ment*), a key term that is bilocated between subject and object: Dufrenne links the affectivity of feeling with an "affective a priori" that belongs to subject and object alike: "feeling, itself affective, *knows* the affective [quality] as the primary sign of the object" (ibid.: 441). Between aesthetic object and appreciative subject there is a sensing-feeling "communion" (ibid.: 50–1, 63, 70, 375).

The result of such synthesizing of otherwise diremptive dichotomies between aesthetic object and work of art, subject- and object-pole, is that we can consider the aesthetic object a "quasi-subject." Far from subjectivity being confined to the individuated human being, in the actual experience of art it is also found in the aesthetic object: "a subject always appears in the aesthetic object . . . [which] contains the subjectivity of the subject who has created it and expresses himself in it, and whom in turn it manifests" (ibid.: 196). Here, finally, is the proper place for the creator

of art, not merely as efficient cause but as manifested in the work s/he brings forth. Such manifestation is in turn made possible by the world of the work, which is roomy enough to contain the subjectivity of the creator as well as the various traits that belong properly to the aesthetic object. The spectator's subjectivity is also contained in the same world—not by psychological projection, but by an inhabitation or immersion in this world that is at once affective and expressive. Creator and spectator rejoin, and another dichotomy is dissolved, when each comes to feel and express him/herself in the world of the work.

We have come a long way from anything like "mental representation"! Not only have we exceeded the domain of mind—the traditional repository of such representations—but we are into an arena where world has replaced mind and the work its own creator or spectator. This is the realm of aesthetic perception as such: "aesthetic experience, which is a form of perceptual experience, furnishes evidence that the perceived is not just the mentally represented" (ibid.: 16). Rather than being enclosed in the dank den of subjective representations, such outgoing but intensive perceptual experience engenders "the apotheosis of the sensuous" (ibid.: 339), where expressivity rather than representation is the guiding force.

The culmination of aesthetic experience lies in expression, which carries the intensification of feeling to a new (and strictly post-representational) level. In Dufrenne's striking formulation, we "read expression by means of feeling" (ibid.: 384). Expression is at once "inexhaustible"—a matter of depth—and yet "given to me immediately" and "in a single stroke" (ibid.: 379, 386). In the accomplishment of expression, all parts of a work of art play an active role, nothing is irrelevant to expressivity. When expression has been attained, it takes the form of affective qualities that are the articulation of feeling, qualities that give to each work its unique expressive identity. Such identity is no longer built on meaning units, as in Ingarden, but consists instead in an evolving expressive matrix of affective a priori structures. This affective-cum-expressive nexus allows the aesthetic object to be a quasi-subject, i.e., to occupy a world that is the embodiment of its creator's aims while calling to its percipient to valorize it as a single work of art. But this can happen only if our acquaintance with the aesthetic object derives from our concrete perception of it, if our finding it fully expressive is "rooted in the perception of the sensuous aspects

of the work, culminating in the feeling that thrusts us, within the heart of meaning, into a world immanent in the work" (ibid.: 212).

Dufrenne achieves what cannot be found in MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY—that is to say, a systematic aesthetic theory based upon the primacy of perception. Merleau-Ponty's brilliant forays into art, starting from "Le doute de Cézanne" (1948) and culminating in "Le langage indirect et les voix du silence" (1960) and "L'Oeil et l'Esprit" (1961), are of immense suggestive value. But they do not offer a theory of art as such, or even a consistent model for its experience. In this respect, he is in much the same position as JACQUES DERRIDA, despite the enormous differences in emphasis and approach between them. Derrida fiercely resisted constructing any comprehensive, much less complete, aesthetics, instead choosing to emphasize factors like trace, frame, and other "parergonal" elements that lie outside the domain of experience or subjectivity. His most developed treatment of art, *La vérité en peinture* (1978), contends that, despite this title, there is no truth in painting in any classical or conventional sense.

For Dufrenne, however, art attains truth in the guise of an ontological signification that belongs to aesthetic experience itself, not to Being or the Open, language or Region, nearness or gathering. The last chapter of his *magnum opus* is entitled "The Ontological Signification of Aesthetic Experience." His final recourse to experience endorses the very term expressly abjured by Heidegger in "The Origin of the Work of Art." But the term itself is differently construed by the two thinkers. Rather than aesthetic experience being a form of passive containment within a merely receptive representational subject, as Heidegger had charged, it is for Dufrenne the very point of active access to the world of the work in its full nuance and annunciatory truth.

This leaves us with at least two major questions: What is finally the place of "experience" in art? What are its ultimate "objects"?

- (1) Concerning *objects*: not only are the objects of art not to be confined to represented objects, but they are also not to be construed as perceptual objects alone, as in Merleau-Ponty, or as such objects in their affective and expressive aspects, as Dufrenne proposes. These latter expansions of earlier senses of the aesthetic object take us in the right direction, but they do not go far enough. We should

replace the notion of "object" with other more capacious terms such as "place," "region," and "landscape." Aesthetic objects are never wholly isolable, but exist only in relation to these more generous parameters, which furnish the appropriate and effective settings for artworks. JEAN-PAUL SARTRE tended in this direction with his idea of "situation" in *L'être et le néant* [1943], where this idea is accorded primary significance; it is also explored in his early essays on art, especially as published in *Situations* (Sartre 1947–1965).

- (2) For art to work on us, to take effect there (and not merely through the pristine pleasure or displeasure underscored by Kant), our own appreciative stance as spectators needs to be rethought. This means that aesthetic experience itself is to be construed differently from the models inherited from Kant, Husserl, Ingarden, and Dufrenne.

Several non-phenomenological aestheticians—Otto Baensch, R. G. Collingwood, and Susanne Langer—are of assistance here. Each of these authors singles out the role of *feeling* in the experience of art. Like Dufrenne, each points to the larger dimensions of feeling; they suggest its diverse place in the experience of art not only as underlying the affective a priori, as Dufrenne holds, but also as making possible the idea of the spectator as co-performer (Collingwood, 1938) and as deeply allied with form in art (Langer, 1953). In particular, Baensch suggests that feeling inheres not just in human subjects, but in the larger world to which they belong: "feelings, like all qualities, are built into the structure of the world as dependent parts or characteristics of objects" (Baensch, 1958: 22). They are also built into artworks, "definitely embodied there" and "molded in conformity with the works that contain them" (ibid.: 23). This is to locate feeling not just in human subjects and their creative or appreciative processes, but *outside* them, in the very situations in which artist and audience alike are emplaced from the beginning—i.e., in the very particular places, regions, landscapes, and worlds to which they belong, collectively as well as individually. When we begin to think in this direction, the very idea of experience is transformed. It is now understood in terms of the various ways in which we inhabit these place-worlds, whether as incorporated into artworks as their inherent "world," as stressed by Heidegger and Dufrenne, or as displayed in the open texture of everyday dealings in the human life-world. "Experience" is not anything purely

psychic, much less psychological, nor is it sheerly “intentional” in Husserl’s and Ingarden’s strict sense; it is “operative,” as EUGEN FINK might put it, exhibiting an active intentionality that is at once affective and corporeal, meaningful and expressive.

One consequence of this approach is that the place-worlds at stake in art cannot be held to be heteronomous (i.e., dependent on human consciousness); nor, for that matter, are they autonomous (i.e., self-sufficient). They are the products of a creative collaboration between the places and the people who collude in art-making and art-appreciating, in a veritable *sensus communis* of collaborative activity, a theater of co-performance in which aesthetic experience and its objects exchange positions, with “subjects” located in “objects” regarded as quasi-subjects, and “objects,” reinterpreted as place-worlds, relocated in “subjects” via co-immanent feeling (Casey, 2002, 2005). What Merleau-Ponty says of the body, i.e., that the inside and outside are inextricably intertwined, should be said of aesthetic object and experience: we witness one as “the outside of its inside” and the other as “the inside of its outside” (Merleau-Ponty, 1968: 144). It is a matter of a chiasmic crossover in which the entrenched binaries of modern philosophy—so pervasive in Kant and still evident in Husserl and Ingarden—no longer control aesthetic discourse and theory.

The subject-object schema is not just an innocent gesture or a matter of epistemic convenience. It has held an entire epoch in its thrall, and all the more grippingly for being so closely affiliated with the representationalism characteristic of modernist thought. When it comes to art and its experience, this same bipolar model is all the more tempting, e.g., with respect to the need for objectivity of judgment and agreement with others, and yet it is much too confining for an enterprise like art that prizes freedom at every turn. Early modern aesthetics, most notably that which came to fruition in Kant’s *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, was compelled to privilege this model in its passion for objectivity and consensus. But maintaining such a privilege is no longer called for in the late modern and postmodern era. Already Husserl lessened its stranglehold by maintaining that the noema has several layers, including those of emotion and phantasy, and thus that the corresponding noetic acts of consciousness are differentially structured. Ingarden continued in this expansive vein by demonstrating that the literary

work of art is stratified and thus has an irreducible polyphonic structure.

But shadows of mentalism and representationalism persist in Husserl and Ingarden, and it is only when we move to Dufrenne and Merleau-Ponty that these vanish definitively. The exorcism happens mainly through an emphasis on the concrete complexity of perception that takes us out of our minds and into the environing place-world whose analogue is the world of the artwork: a world that is no mere assemblage of things but a poignant actuality that bristles with imaginative possibilities.

Heidegger draws us still farther out—out into the Open, where the event of Being occurs. However, this ontological liberation comes with a price: the complete elimination of experience as indissociable from art. I have suggested that this is too high a price to pay, and that we can retain a valid role for aesthetic experience and its objects if we can reimagine these basic terms in a less polarizing way. We accomplish this by opening up the aesthetic object to the ingressions of place-worlds while reconceiving aesthetic experience as a form of feeling that not only ties subject to object but melts down their very difference. Then the diremptive bipolarity inherent in representationalism gives way to a more ample vision of what art and its experience can mean in expressive artworks.

Bibliography

- Baensch, Otto. “Kunst und Gefühl.” In *Logos* 12, 1923–1924, 1–28; “Art and Feeling.” Trans. In *Reflections on Art: A Source Book of Writings by Artists, Critics, and Philosophers*. Ed. Susanne K. Langer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958, 3–36.
- Casey, Edward S. *Representing Place: Landscape Painting and Maps*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Casey, Edward S. *Earth-Mapping: Artists Reshaping Landscape*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Collingwood, R. G. *Principles of Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La vérité en peinture*. Paris: Flammarion, 1978. *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l’expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. [1953]. 2nd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann,

- 1950, 7–68; “The Origin of the Work of Art.” In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie*. [1913]. Ed. Karl Schuhmann. *Husserliana* 3/1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk. Eine Untersuchung an den Grenzen der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931; *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973a.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks*. [1937]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1968; *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973b.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilskraft*. [1790]; *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Ed. Paul Guyer. Trans. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Langer, Susanne K. *Feeling and Form. A Theory of Art*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. “Le doute de Cézanne.” In his *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Nagel, 1948; “Cézanne’s Doubt.” *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Patricia A. Dreyfus. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 9–25.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. “Le langage indirect et les voix du silence.” In his *Signes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1960, 49–104; “Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence.” Trans. Richard C. McCleary. In his *Signs*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 39–83.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L’œil et l’esprit*. [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; “Eye and Mind.” Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 159–90.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l’invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L’être et le néant: Essai d’ontologie phénoménologique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1943; *Being and Nothingness: A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Situations*. 6 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1947–1965; *Situations*. Trans. Benita Eisler. New York: Braziller, 1965.

Aisthesis

Jagna Brudzińska

The Greek concept of *aisthēsis* refers both to phenomena of sensuous perception that relate to the five senses and to sensuousness in general. This ambiguity reflects the complexity of the concept. Early modern empiricist theory of knowledge considered *aisthēsis* primarily from the point of view of the epistemological function of *sensation*. As such, it also became established as a theme for sensuously oriented psychology. Phenomenology refers back to these different significations. From the starting point of a concept of sensation (*Empfindung*) with an empiricist coloring, sensuousness reaches a position of very high importance in phenomenological theory as the region of original experience. It is not least through the acknowledgment of phantasmatic and kinaesthetic sensation that an implicit broadening and differentiation of *aisthēsis* is brought about. This is important for the understanding of experience in general and of aesthetic experience and aesthetic subjectivity in particular. It is the phenomenology of EDMUND HUSSERL that introduces this broadening and differentiation and thus lays the foundation for a modern phenomenological theory of *sensuousness*.

There are four perspectives on sensuousness in Husserl's phenomenology. First, in the context of the analysis of intentional experience in the *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901), sensation is analyzed with respect to its function in the structure of intentional acts. Secondly, there is the perspective of object-constitution, where the “apprehension-content” model comes into question and a systematic differentiation

between the concepts of sensation and phantasma is introduced. This perspective is of particular importance for aesthetic experience. Third, there is the viewpoint of the constitution of inner time-consciousness or the transcendental theory of primal constitution and temporalization. In this perspective, sensation is termed *primal impression* and acquires a transcendental function. Fourth, we have the phenomenology of the *body* that was strongly echoed in second-generation phenomenology and has been taken further—most recently, in the phenomenology of *material* or instinctive-affective genesis.

Husserl begins the critical discussion of the concept of sensation in the Fifth Logical Investigation. He distinguishes between real content (*reeller Inhalt*) and intentional content. The intentional content is to be understood as that which appears in the experience (e.g., a brown table), and the real content as that of which the experience is composed (e.g., sensible qualities such as the table's color). The latter functions as something that lacks independence and needs an objectifying or animating *interpretation* or *apprehension* (*Auffassung*). Sensations are indeed experienced in the intentional acts, but do not themselves exhibit intentional characteristics. “*Sensations*, and the acts ‘interpreting’ them or apperceiving them, are alike experienced, *but they do not appear as objects*: they are not seen, heard, or *perceived* with any sense. *Objects*, on the other hand, appear and are perceived, but they are not *experienced*” (Husserl 1984: 399).

This distinction is made with the initial intention of correcting the psychologistic confusion in the concept of experience that takes both concepts as referring to actual occurrences in the world. In opposition to this assumption, Husserl makes it clear that the intentional content of an experience is not an actual occurrence

J. Brudzińska (✉)

Universität zu Köln, Köln, Germany

Translated by Matthew Boss, University of Sydney

in the world, but an intuitively given structure of sense belonging to the appearances; this is always based upon the activity of an *objectifying* or *animating apprehension*. The same sensations can be given an interpretation that objectifies them in a variety of ways: the same material sign can be interpreted as a word, as a sign-figure, or as a sign in an unknown script. But these various possibilities of interpretation are not to be attributed to changes in the sensuous material. This means that apperception always represents a *surplus* in comparison with mere sensations. This discovery translates to the problematic of object-constitution, which is understood in the *Logische Untersuchungen* as an intentional process of objectification in virtue of which apperception always goes beyond the content of the mere sensations when it objectifies this content.

In the *Logische Untersuchungen*, this thesis is developed into the first model of constitution: the so-called apprehension-content model (*Auffassung-Auffassungsinhalt-Modell*) (Husserl, 1984: Part 1, B 392; Part 2, B 91ff.). This conception is deepened and further differentiated in Husserl's study of intuitive representations (*anschauliche Vergegenwärtigungen*). At issue to begin with is the analysis of various interpretive activities that exhibit different structures in the various kinds of experience (simple perception, picture-consciousness, recollection, phantasy) and are in part founded in one another. Thus, for instance, the re-presenting (*vergegenwärtigende*) apprehension of recollection is based upon a presenting (*gegenwärtigende*) perceptual interpretation. And picture-consciousness, in the case of a physical image, exhibits a *threefold* structure of apprehension involving (1) the *physical image* (e.g., a picture of a landscape hanging on the wall); (2) the *mental picture* awakened by the image, or the *picture-object*, as the objectivity that in fact appears (a vividly given representation of the landscape); and (3) the actual *picture-thing* that the picture represents—that which is intended, i.e., the *sujet* (the landscape) (Husserl 1980: 29).

Hence we are dealing here with three objectivities or object-apprehensions, but at the same time only one appearance. Through the fact that the sensuous material is only sufficient to present one objective meaning, Husserl explains the circumstance that in spite of the presence of several object-apprehensions constructed upon one another, only one appearance comes to light in the representation (*Vorstellung*) of an image (ibid.). He also insists that there is only

one sensuous foundation to the lived experience. This foundation is conceived as having an originally perceptual nature—which expresses the precedence of sensation over phantasma. The phantasmatic, which functions as the content of an apprehension and so as a source of intuitions for re-presenting experiences, *Vergegenwärtigungen*, is, however, conceived at first as a mere modification of sensation (the source of intuitions for presentations, *Gegenwärtigungen*—ibid.: 96f.).

It is only the difficulty of distinguishing between simple perception and simple phantasy that makes it necessary to deepen the inquiry into the difference between the contents of these apprehension, since the difference between the two kinds of experience cannot be attributed to a difference in their interpretive structures—they both exhibit the same interpretive structure. Hallucinations, visions, or even dreams count for Husserl as examples of simple phantasy. It is from here that insight into the original distinction between the sources of intuition, i.e., into the original heterogeneity of *aisthēsis* as either sensation or phantasma, is gradually obtained.

Hence two different ways to understand sensuousness emerge in the *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung* lectures of 1904/1905 (Husserl, 1980). They allow us to speak of an original *heteronomy* in the concept of *aisthēsis* as sensation and phantasma. This heteronomy is to be interpreted from three different points of view: (1) *descriptive-functional*, (2) *structural*, and (3) *genetic*.

From the *descriptive-functional* viewpoint, sensation, as *the actual* (the *belief-moment*) in the course of perception, is assigned the task of *accreditation* or “certification”; phantasma, in contrast, that of *discrediting* the actuality in experience. Hence the contents of sensation enter into the constitution of *reality*; the phantasmatic contents, in contrast, yield *non-reality* (non-itself-giving) or *quasi-reality*. To sensations there essentially belongs perceptual apprehension. To phantasma there belong imaginative apprehensions (remembering, picture-consciousness, phantasy), which are understood to begin with as modifications of the perceptual consciousness that is founded in sensation (i.e., as *sensation-phantasma*).

With this understanding of the invalidating function of phantasma as that which is non-itself-giving, what is grasped, however, is a merely negative moment of this function. How it is to be determined positively

remains open. Around 1917, Husserl discovers such a determination when he reveals the phantasmatic as the mode of sensuousness of the *experience of the possible*, and phantasy as the *originally giving consciousness of the possible*—as a neutral consciousness, i.e., a consciousness in the mode of the *as if*, as opposed to positional consciousness (for instance perception—Husserl, 1987: 170). The phantasmatic is thus acknowledged as an *original* source of intuition.

The descriptive-functional perspective received attention particularly within phenomenological aesthetics. Here the work of MORITZ GEIGER and FRITZ KAUFMANN, above all, deserve consideration. Kaufmann in particular succeeds in deepening the descriptive-functional understanding of aesthetic experience. He takes Husserl's analyses of picture-consciousness as his starting point and investigates the various *effects* of original sensuousness. Treating the pictorial artwork as an aesthetic phenomenon, he interprets the meaning of this phenomenon's sensuous component—from the viewpoint of the apprehension-content model—as the *materially mediated effects of impressions*. In this conception the sensual contents do not function as merely passive moments of the objectifying process.

Kaufmann shows to what degree the issue is, on the one hand, the subjective *receptivity for the impression*, and on the other hand, the way the impression itself exerts an influence and has its effect in the objectifying processes. He thus combines the effect-moments of form with the originally hyletic modes of effectiveness that are expressed in aesthetic experience as the medium of aesthetic form (Kaufmann, 1960: 11ff.). Hence the interpretive activity cannot be made comprehensible independently of the modes of effectiveness belonging to the sensuous. Rather, a specific reciprocity between content and apprehension has been made plain: through being interpreted, the contents exert their influence, and thus play their part in determining the dynamics of the interpretive process.

This *functional* differentiation is accompanied by a *structural* differentiation. Here sensation turns out to be *that which is bound to the bodily self* of perception—and so determines the structure of itself-giving. What is taken from phantasma, in contrast, is rather a *medial* or *transitive* structure. Already in the 1904/1905 Lectures Husserl holds that phantasma can only function *representatively* (*repräsentativ*), while sensations always exhibit a structure that is

presentative (*präsentativ*) (Husserl 1987a: 107). This phantasmatic moment permits one to speak of a structural *permeability* of experience that always mediates something that is *other* than the bodily pregivenness of sensation. The dynamic structure of the affectivity of phantasmatic sensuousness consists in the *releasing of the bodily self* of sensation and its *opening of itself to the other or the foreign*.

Through the phantasma of empathetic representation, qualities of *another's* experiences and states of being are given (e.g., the anger of another, which I can understand immediately without being angry myself); in phantasmatic formations of symbolic consciousness, the individual structure of significance of the implicitly intended, given associatively as the *other* of what is explicitly represented, appears (e.g., the raising of the national flag at sporting events evokes patriotic feelings). But above all, the *other* manifests itself in the corporeal body as instinct or drive in phantasmatically given strivings, willings, and tendencies. Thus, the corporeal drive is expressed as the immediate sensible givenness of what is wanted or desired. This makes it immediately experienced as an original consciousness of representations (*Repräsentationsbewusstsein*). Its influence reaches to the processes of self-affecting of original temporalization in the genesis of subjectivity. In the case of re-presentations of another's states of being, what makes the mediating structure of the phantasmatic possible is an *imaginative* (reproductive and imitative) activity. In the case of original representative consciousness (*ursprüngliches Repräsentationsbewusstsein*) such as that of the drive, on the other hand, it is a phantasmatic *imaginary* activity (Brudzinska, 2004: 86ff.).

At the end of the 1920s, the mediating function of *imaginative* consciousness was treated in the context of a first phenomenological theory of media by a Polish phenomenologist: LEOPOLD BLAUSTEIN. His research lies on the boundary between psychology and aesthetics and deals with the phenomenology of cinema, theater, and art. Following Husserl's analyses of re-presentative consciousness, Blaustein distinguishes between original *perceptual* and *imaginative* sense data, and describes a specific kind of *imaginative intuition* that is accompanied by the *imaginative attitude*. The change from the perceptual attitude into the imaginative has a role in determining aesthetic experience (Blaustein, 1930: 5ff.).

In spite of a precisely differentiated understanding of sensuous experience along with careful descriptive and structural distinctions within the realm of *aisthēsis*, the apprehension-content model could not successfully clarify the question of the difference between perception and phantasy. It became apparent that the division between the content and the apperceptive interpretation from which the content is not independent, a division the model presupposes, lacks a foundation in intuition when it comes to simple sensuous experiences. Moreover, the characterization of a sensuous experience, e.g., the presentative or re-presentative experience of a color, has its basis in an activity of original sensuousness, not the activity of an interpretation. A fundamental deepening in the understanding of the structure of experience and the function of the sensuous was therefore introduced, leading to a new interpretation of the significance of the sources of intuition as sensation and phantasma, and bringing with it a further genetic differentiation in the concept of (self-) experience, of (self-) constitution. The contents of sensation and phantasma, once conceived as non-independent, as merely “picturing” and needing objectifying interpretation, were found to have an original function as an immediate intentional consciousness. On this point Husserl states in 1909: “‘Consciousness’ consists of consciousness through and through, and even sensation is ‘consciousness’ as is phantasma.” (1980: 265) Hence when it comes to both sensation and phantasma, we are dealing with original modes of constitutive experiencing that have no need to be first awakened to *subjective* life through animating acts, but in fact function as the first manifestations of this life.

Besides the previously understood *duality* of perception-consciousness and phantasy-consciousness, an *equality of level* of sensation and perception, or—in parallel to this—of phantasma and phantasy, has been discovered. This *equality* must not be understood as an *identity of kind*; rather, what is emphasized is the originally intentional character of both forms of experience (perception and sensation, or phantasy and phantasma). In the *intentional structure* of these forms a fundamental difference stands out. In the case of perception, what is at stake is the re-presenting, intending, or doxic intentional activity of presenting consciousness, which is marked by a reflective character. But in the case of sensation, as active consciousness, with the structure

of the *non-or pre-reflective* (self-) consciousness as an immediate manifestation: the (self-) experience of the flowing stream of consciousness precedes all reflection.

The phenomenology of the pre-reflective form of consciousness is the theme of Husserl’s study of *inner time-consciousness*. This reveals a new—transcendental—perspective on sensuousness. In these analyses the aesthetic is thematic initially as the primal impression and its retentive modifications. *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins* (1905) sheds new light on the question of the content of sensation, although at first only the perceptual-impressional contents are treated and the distinction between sensation and phantasma seems blurred. At issue here are not only the (constituted) experiences, but also the primordial constituting functions of consciousness and the stream of inner time-consciousness itself. Husserl addresses the question of the way a present act (an act of perception), which itself exhibits a temporal duration, is able to grasp a temporal object, i.e., a temporal extension.

This question is worked out in a critical discussion with certain theorists of psychological experience (Johann Friedrich Herbart, Franz Brentano, and Hermann Lotze), who, as Husserl shows, want to understand the intuition of an enduring object or process as restricted to an isolated perceived “now.” Against this view Husserl argues, in harmony with other psychological authors (above all William Stern, Carl Stumpf, William James), that intuition itself has a temporal structure. The analysis of perception shows that the now is not to be identified with the current present and cannot be understood as an isolated point in experience whose actuality is exhausted in this punctuality; rather, the now functions as the ideal reference point of the experience of the present (Husserl, 1966a: §16).

From a *formal* point of view, the now is interpreted as a structural moment of the complex occurrence of the present it is understood as a limit, an approximation, an ungraspable boundary in experience; considered from the dynamic point of view—as the “eternally retreating boundary-point between past and future” (ibid.: 162). To be sure, the primal impression of *hyletic* givenness retains a privileged position. Husserl acknowledges that this moment of the primal impression (sense impression) has considerable significance, since it anchors experience in the common

spatiotemporal world. Nevertheless, in spite of this privileged position of the now in terms of content—i.e., as the moment of the primal impression, hence the hyletic moment that has the primordially establishing (*urstiftende*) function in the constitution of the flowing present—he interprets it as a structural moment of experience that is not independent and continually remains in a relationship of mediation with the not-now: that is to say, the now is borne by the retentive-protentive structure of the present past (retention) and the present future (protention). Thus the first transcendental function of sensation in the constitution of the consciousness of enduring objects is brought to light.

The primal-impressional structure of immediate sensation is to be distinguished from this and functions on the level of the constitution of immanent time-consciousness as the *primal consciousness* (*Urbewusstsein*) of the *stream of primal impressions*, a consciousness that must be understood as a pre-objective manifestation of the flow of life itself (ibid.: 119). This expresses the original transcendental function of sensuousness as activity, characterized by a pre-reflective implicit moment of the *itself-giving* of transcendental subjectivity or self-affection as a field of primal experience or primal consciousness. Unlike the retentive-protentive constitution of the objectifying consciousness that is fundamentally borne by the structure of *transverse-intentionality* (*Querintentionalität*), immediately pre-reflective primal consciousness turns out to be characterized by the activity structure of *horizontal-intentionality* (*Längsintentionalität*—ibid.: 379f.; Husserl, 2001: 15ff.).

The immediacy of self-experience likewise became a theme for the phenomenology of the body and of genesis, providing a further perspective for the aisthetic. Husserl increasingly made sensuous experience a theme from the viewpoint of *sensuous bodiliness*. It is the discovery of kinaesthetic sensuousness that in 1907 makes the understanding of thing- and space-constitution accessible as a subjective occurrence. Here the concept of *kinaesthetic sensation* is formulated as the moment of perception that makes presentation (*Darstellung*) possible without presenting itself (Husserl, 1973: 159ff.). It refers to that which is self-moving, not to a moved thing. In *Ideen II*, the aisthetic is confirmed as a subjective factor in thing-constitution, and the aisthetic body is established as a

theme for egological phenomenology (Husserl, 1952: 55ff.).

The aisthetic body proves to be doubly given, from without and from within, as something corporeal in space and as a sensing body. As a spatial thing, it is subject to the laws of Euclidean geometry and distinguished by qualities and conditions linked together causally. As a sensing body, it is always experienced in relations and expressive qualities. It situates sensuous subjectivity spatially as the *zero-point of all orientation* (ibid: 158). As a self-moving body, it functions not only aisthetically, but also kinaesthetically. In the *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie*, Husserl wrote, “The kinaestheses are different from the movements of the body which exhibit themselves corporeally, yet are somehow one with them and belong to one’s own body in this two-sided way [inner kinaestheses—outer corporeal actual movements]” (Husserl, 1954: 164). Hence the kinaestheses are interpreted not as noematic, but as noetic moments of experience belonging to the *I*. Later in the 1930s, Husserl addresses kinaesthetic sensuousness in the context of instinctive-affective genesis and drive-intentionality.

In the 1930s, the connection between sensing and self-moving was also deepened by the German psychiatrist and phenomenologist Erwin Straus. Through a criticism of atomistic and behavioristic psychologies, whose highpoint he saw in Ivan Pavlov’s theory of the conditioned reflex, he recognized sensing as a self-movement realized *synaesthetically* and as fundamental to communication between world and self, although it is not an objectifiable element of knowledge of the world (Cf. Straus, 1935: 149). His favored field of intuition is the experience of rhythm, music, and dance.

Straus’s results were taken up by Husserl’s assistant Ludwig Landgrebe, for whom *kinaesthetic sensuousness* is decisive. Landgrebe understood kinaestheses as the significant moment of the being conscious of one’s own self that makes all sensing into a self-sensing. In this he follows MARTIN HEIDEGGER’s conception of *Befindlichkeit*. Following Husserl, he shows, with regard to the intentional structure of consciousness, that sensuousness as a kinaesthetic sensing of one’s own self functions not as mere receptivity, mere suffering or being affected, but as an elementary form of *activity* within *passivity* (Husserl, 1972: §17). Tactile experience makes clear that the

having of sense impressions cannot be explained as a *receptive accepting of data*. It functions as the experience “of an activity [Aktivität], be it latent [‘not chosen’], or patent, as the activity of ‘I move myself.’ It is the experience of a self-moving which, in accordance with the intention of perception, is directed towards the optimum of what can be sensed” (Landgrebe, 1963: 117). Thus although the concept of *aisthēsis* taking shape in Landgrebe’s reflections does not consider the difference in content between impression and phantasma, it leads to a concept of sensuousness as the subjective mode of being-in-the-world.

MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY also takes sensing (*le sentir*) as a *living communication with the world* (Merleau-Ponty, 1945: 64). Sensing precedes the cleavage of subject and object. The communicative moment of sensing is realized *synaesthetically* (ibid.: 260ff.) and reveals a peculiar kind of intentionality—one that must be understood as pre-reflective. He speaks of an intentional *complex* or an intentional *arc*. The example of *sexuality* or *erotic understanding* makes the structure of sensing particularly clear. It exhibits a mode of perception different from objective perception. Erotic perception is not to be understood in terms of *cogitatio* and *cogitatum*, but is the direct intending by one body of another body (ibid.: 183). His special achievement is the description of the specific *incorporation* of consciousness that constitutes the bodiliness of *aisthēsis* and the *immersion* of self-consciousness in sensuousness.

This trail is followed today in Germany by the phenomenology of the body of Bernard Waldenfels, who interprets sensuousness through the experience of the foreign, with Husserl as his starting point, but also taking into consideration a wide spectrum of recent work. Here the sensuous moment functions as *heteroesthesia*, whose *chiasmatic* structure demonstrates that there can be no coinciding of *kinēsis* and *aisthēsis* (Waldenfels, 1999: 69f.).

In France, it is above all the radical phenomenology of the body of MICHEL HENRY that turns an understanding of immediate sensing, as affective emanation and its reincarnation, into the foundation of a critique of culture (Henry, 2000: § 22). Starting with a bodily-hyletic understanding of *aisthēsis*, Henry and his German interpreter Rolf Kühn reveal a dimension of *material genesis*. Kühn speaks of a *radical self-affection of life* as temporal flow and refers back to

Husserl’s results on affective genesis and drive (Kühn, 1998: 92).

Drive and sensuous experience as affectively determined by it are the great themes of psychoanalysis. Since its foundation by Sigmund Freud, it has accorded particular importance to sensuous experiencing, and can be understood as an implicit theory of the aesthetic of the sexual that consists in the discovery of sexuality as the basic dimension of psychic experience; the conception of libido as a psychic energy of sexual origin, and the analysis of the basic forms and phenomena of psycho-corporeal expression in infantile sexuality, as well as the analyses of the biographically conditioned destinies of the drives, which first make the individual forms of human sensibility and its modes of effectiveness comprehensible. What Freud perceives here are fundamental spheres of sensuous unconscious experience. These can be understood phenomenologically in the context of phantasmatic-imaginary experience as the spheres of an *eruptive genesis*, or as the phantasmatically founded consciousness of *original representation* (Brudzińska, 2004: 223ff.).

In his late work, Freud developed a theory of culture in which aesthetics, as an activity occurring within culture, is treated in terms of its genesis in the drives. Here aesthetic comportment is understood as the result of a tendency that is kept in check or modified (Freud, 1942b: 140f.). Its most prominent mechanism is *sublimation*, which functions as the destiny of a drive when the object and the goal of the drive are exchanged, “so that the originally sexual drive now finds gratification in an activity no longer sexual and more highly valued socially or ethically” (Freud, 1942a: 231).

The preferred field for research into the activity of sublimation is the motivation for artistic creation. The transference of bodily sexual energies to nonsexualized or desexualized fields can be interpreted as lawful transformations in the aesthetic; seen from a psychoanalytic viewpoint, these are unconscious structures of affectivity. This perspective is deepened in the *morphological* theory of aesthetics of the German psychologist and cultural theorist Wilhelm Salber, who is somewhat influenced by both psychoanalysis and Gestalt psychology. Salber (1986) takes sensuousness as the affect-moments and expressive qualities involved in the processes of the formation and transformation of psychic structures. Hence morphology establishes a concept of *aisthēsis* that is to be understood in terms of the dynamic of form.

Bibliography

- Barck, Karlheinz, Gente, Peter, Paris, Heidi and Richter, Stefan (eds.). *Aisthēsis. Wahrnehmung heute oder Perspektiven einer anderen Ästhetik*. Leipzig: Reclam, 2002.
- Becker, Oskar. "Von der Hinfälligkeit des Schönen und der Abenteuerlichkeit des Künstlers. Eine ontologische Untersuchung im ästhetischen Phänomenbereich." In *Festschrift Edmund Husserl zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1929, rpt. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1974, 27–52.
- Blaustein, Leopold. *Przedstawienia imaginatywne. Studium z pogranicza psychologii i estetyki*. L'vov: PTF, 1930.
- Brudzińska, Jagna. *Assoziation, Imaginäres, Trieb. Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Subjektivitätsgenese bei Husserl und Freud*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Köln, 2004.
- Freud, Sigmund. "'Psychoanalyse' und 'Libidotheorie'" (1923). In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 13, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1942a, 211–30.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie" (1905). In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 5. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1942b, 29–145; *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. Trans. and ed. James Strachey. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci" (1910). In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 8. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer 1942c, 128–211; "Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood." The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 11. Ed. James Strachey et al. London: The Hogart Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1957, 59–137.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–685.
- Henry, Michel. *Incarnation. Une philosophie de la chair*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2000.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch*. Ed. Marly Biemel. *Husserliana* 4. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1952; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Second Book. Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie*. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 6. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954; *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins (1893–1917)*. Ed. Rudolf Boehm. *Husserliana* 10. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966a; *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*. Trans. John Barnett Brough. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis. Aus Vorlesungs- und Forschungsmanuskripten 1918–1926*. Ed. Margot Fleischer. *Husserliana* 11. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966b; *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis: Lectures on Transcendental Logic*. Trans. Anthony J. Steinbock. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ding und Raum. Vorlesungen 1907*. Ed. Ulrich Claesges. *Husserliana* 16. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973; *Thing and space: Lectures of 1907*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band. Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*. Ed. Ursula Panzer. *Husserliana* 19/1, 19/2. The Hague: Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, 1984; *Logical Investigations*. 2 vols. Trans. J. N. Findlay. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1911–1921)*. Ed. Thomas Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp. *Husserliana* 25. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1987.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Die Bernauer Manuskripte über das Zeitbewusstsein (1917/18)*. Ed. Rudolf Bernet and Dieter Lohmar. *Husserliana* 33. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Erfahrung und Urteil. Untersuchung zur Genealogie der Logik*. Ed. Ludwig Landgrebe. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1972; *Experience and Judgment: Investigations in a Genealogy of Logic*. Trans. James S. Churchill and Karl Ameriks. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. *Das Reich des Schönen. Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Kühn, Rolf. *Husserls Begriff der Passivität. Zur Kritik der passiven Synthesis in der Genetischen Phänomenologie*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1998.
- Landgrebe, Ludwig. *Der Weg der Phänomenologie*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Salber, Wilhelm. *Kunst—Psychologie—Behandlung*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1986.
- Sokolowski, Robert. *The Formation of Husserl's Concept of Constitution*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964.
- Straus, Erwin. *Vom Sinn der Sinne. Ein Beitrag zur Grundlegung der Psychologie*. Berlin: Springer, 1935, 2nd ed. 1956; *The Primary World of the Senses: A Vindication of Sensory Experience*. Trans. Jacob Needleman. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Tengelyi, Laszlo. "Zeit und Empfindung (E. Husserl, E. Lévinas, M. Henry)." In *Recherches Husserliennes* 4, 1995, 53–76.
- Waldenfels, Bernhard. *Sinnesschwellen. Studien zur Phänomenologie des Fremden* 3. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1999.

Appearance

TANI Toru

What are the essences of “appearance,” “fiction,” and “illusion” as they apply to the field of aesthetics? The task of this entry is to shed light on this problem from the standpoint of phenomenology. This position already specifies our task. For example, a mirage is a kind of illusion, but it is not necessarily an aesthetic phenomenon. It belongs, no matter how beautiful it may be, to the field of “physical phenomena” in the sense of Franz Brentano. In contrast to this, aesthetics is concerned only with “psychic phenomena,” or better, “intentional phenomena,” which is the field that concerns phenomenology.

MAX SCHELER clearly distinguishes these two types of phenomena and says that “illusions” (*Täuschungen*) occur when physical phenomena are drawn into the sphere of the psychic, whereas the two should properly be kept separate. Phenomenological analysis should confine itself to psychic phenomena, and even illusions must and can be analyzed only within that sphere if their essence is to be made clear. Although a historical approach—such as Jonathan Crary’s, who suggests that the “science of illusions” contributed to the formation of the “subject” by setting it apart from the world in the capacity of an “observer”—is also interesting, such an approach is excluded here so that the essence of the illusion itself can be addressed.

From the phenomenological point of view, Scheler points out that illusions occur in the field of intuition (direct cognition), and he distinguishes them from “errors” (*Irrtum*), which arise from indirect cognition or inference. The aesthetic phenomenon clearly

belongs to the field of intuition rather than that of inference, he says. In this sense, Scheler provides a useful model for the phenomenological analysis of aesthetic phenomena, although he himself is speaking mainly of theoretical and ethical judgments in his reference to illusions.

For the problematic of this essay, however, EDMUND HUSSERL, the founder of phenomenology, is more important than Scheler. A student of Brentano, he conducts a more pure and radical analysis of psychic phenomena. Some may think that the effective range of his analysis is theoretical or logical, with little relevance for aesthetics. But for Husserl, “reason allows for no differentiation into ‘theoretical,’ ‘practical,’ ‘aesthetic,’ or whatever” (Husserl, 1976b: 275). There is no isolated aesthetic world. It is part of the phenomenologist’s intention *to analyze aesthetic phenomena in close relation to theoretical or logical phenomena*.

With regard to psychic or intentional phenomena, Husserl analyzes the correlation of “appearances” (*Erscheinungen*) and “that which appears” (*Erscheinendes*). This analysis will be extended in this entry to visual art—specifically, Renaissance painting, impressionism, and cubism. He also analyzes the notions of “sense” (*Sinn*) and “absurdity” (*Widersinn*) in the dimension of logic. In perhaps an unprecedented attempt, this entry will apply this logical analysis (together with the notions of appearances and that which appears) to the work of surrealists such as René Magritte and of illusion artists such as Maurice Escher. This will lead to a specific description of the essences of appearance, fiction, and illusion.

Already in his very early years, i.e., in 1882–1983, Husserl discovered the correlation between “that which appears” (or object) and its “appearances,” if

TANI T. (✉)
Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan

only in perception (although he later universalized this correlation). He says: "The representation of the identity of the object [is] mediated. I have a sensation of unequal angles, yet judge them as equal. The square must 'appear' with unequal angles [in such and such relations], when it should have equal angles. The parallelogram is the appearance of the square, and represents the square to me" (Husserl, 1983: 282). The square here corresponds to "that which appears" (object), while the parallelogram is its "appearance." We see the former "mediated by" or "through" the latter. That is to say, "mediated by" or "through" the sensation-parallelogram, we perceive the object-square. This "mediatedness" or "throughness" is an essential determination of "intentionality." The sensation-parallelogram and the perceived object-square are inseparably linked, yet the two are not the same.

This, however, does not mean that the object is already there, independent of its appearances. (For how could we confirm it, even if it were there, since we see everything mediated by or through its appearances?) There is no object outside of its mediatedness. The object is constituted for the first time in this mediation-relationship, in correlation with its appearances. In this sense, intentionality, as a relationship of mediation, precedes the experience of the object and is the condition for its possibility. Here we see that this notion of "appearance" does not fundamentally mean a "mere appearance" unrelated to the thing itself. "Mere appearance" will be treated later in the consideration of fiction (which is neutral in being) and illusion (which is negated in being). We must first clarify the aesthetic relevance of the "appearance."

In his early years Husserl went on to say that each appearance is not given in itself, but that such appearances are linked to each other to form a temporal series. "To the intuitively given are connected a series of intuitions, which confer the various moments of the non-proper representations of the object ..." (Husserl, 1983: 283). The "series of intuitions" is later elaborated as the series "retention," "impression," and "protention." Thus to be more precise, we can say that we perceive an object intentionally mediated by or through the series of retention, impression, and protention. This temporal constitution of the object is also referred to as the "synthesis of transition" (*Übergangssynthese*)—(Husserl, 1985: 242, 267).

Now is it possible to extract a pure impression in itself, separated from its link to the temporal series? Husserl says: "In the ideal sense, perception (impression) would then be the phase of consciousness that constitutes the pure Now But this is only an ideal limit, something abstract, that can be nothing in itself" (Husserl, 1966: 40). That is, an instantaneous impression is no more than an abstraction, even though it is necessary for the description.

Regarding the relationship between appearances and that which appears, Descartes said in his *Optics* that to follow the rules of perspective, we should properly use an oval figure to express a circle and a rhombus for a square. If we replace Descartes's rhombus with a parallelogram, it is easy to see the connection between his idea and Husserl's. This is the central problem of perspective, and it takes us back to the paintings of the Renaissance.

Leonardo da Vinci drew a picture of the artist viewing an object in perspective through a hole in a board and then a sheet of glass some distance away. He writes in explanation that perspective is like looking through a piece of glass, then copying all the things that lie beyond the glass onto its surface. The objects beyond the glass are seen as if through a pyramid, with the eye positioned at the top (in this case, the hole in the board) and the sheet of glass at the bottom (da Vinci, 1970: Ms. A/IV).

What we see on the glass surface is a parallelogram, "appearance," which is essentially the appearance of a "form." What Leonardo did by means of this perspective apparatus was to thematize the form-appearance, which is usually not thematic in itself, but which mediates that which we thematically perceive. Inasmuch as Renaissance painting concentrates on expressing the appearances on the glass surface, it can be understood as a stepping away from the thing itself, and in this sense, as an abstract style of art, despite its normally being regarded as supremely concrete.

Husserl developed the concept of appearance further into that of "adumbration" (*Abschattung*) and he went on in *Ideen I* (1913) to distinguish between "adumbrations of form" (*Gestaltabschattungen*) and "adumbrations of color" (*Farbenabschattungen*)—(Husserl, 1976a: 85). Where the perspectivism of the Renaissance focuses primarily on adumbrations of form, the impressionists gradually pushed form into the background in favor of highlighting the impression of color. While this can be understood as bringing

forth an aspect of the object neglected in Renaissance perspectivism, these paintings still failed to attain the perception of the object in the phenomenological sense, inasmuch as they represented only the adumbration of color. Furthermore, the visual impressions of the impressionists were instantaneous and point-like in the temporal sense, whereas from the phenomenological point of view, we perceive the object through a temporal series of intuitions. Thus impressionism was just as abstract as Renaissance art in its stepping away from our actual perception of that which appears. They both represent (mere) appearances. (Cézanne is an exception. MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY says: “Cézanne knew already what cubism will say again” [Merleau-Ponty, 1964: 65; cf. 1948: 22ff., 1969: 210f.])

Let us now follow the notion of “abstract” to the cubist paintings of Pablo Picasso, who was a generation younger than Husserl, but whose life overlapped with much of the latter’s. Let us consider what a phenomenological interpretation brings to cubism.

It is well known that cubism was presented as a challenge to impressionism. Phenomenologically, cubism can be regarded as a challenge to the limitations of the adumbration of color. Furthermore, it can be seen as an attempt to portray the cube itself (the “that which appears”), and as an attempt to break through the limits not only of color-appearance, but also of form-appearance. Cubism clearly made a distinction between appearances and that which appears, although not as theoretically as Husserl. For him, this distinction is part of the universal structure of experience, but it is typically clear in the case of the perception of a cube. He often cites the example of a die, which is a typical cube. Mediated by or through appearances, our intentionality intends an object such as a “cube” (Husserl, 1983: 283). In normal perception, this “intention” is harmoniously “fulfilled” by new appearances (for example, the other sides of the cube), so that the object is constituted more adequately, although perfect adequation to the physical thing itself is impossible.

Here we must clearly distinguish between perception and lived experience. The former includes something more than the latter. In contrast to mere lived experience, Husserl characterized perception in his early writings as an “intellectual synthesis” (*gedankliche Synthesis*—*ibid.*).

Hans Rainer Sepp, quoting Picasso, says that the cubists attempted to paint “not such subjective-psychic, instantaneous lived experiences [*Erlebnisse*] as in the case of the work of the impressionists, but an ‘a priori,’ ‘mental’ insight” (Sepp, 1995: 301). These words gain new meaning through phenomenological analysis. That is, the theme is not an instantaneous impression or lived experience, but a “mental” insight that is also “a priori.”

For example, Picasso’s *Girl Before a Mirror* (1932) presents at least two appearances (the side and front profile of the face) that are synthesized and that burst out (*durchbrechen*) into a cubistic object—the “that which appears.” That is, it shows us lived experiences being synthesized and bursting into perception. This perception is not a mere lived experience, but rather something “mental” (in a similar context, Descartes wrote in his *Optics* that “what sees, is not the eye but the soul”; we can discern the same implication here)—although, phenomenologically speaking, the word “mental” should be replaced by “intentional,” just as Husserl’s own word “intellectual” should be so replaced. Lived experience and perception are correlated through this synthesis and bursting-out, which always and already occur through intentionality itself, and which are therefore “essential” and “a priori,” meaning that such a structure is not merely contingent.

Picasso did not theorize about his own work in this way, but his artistic “intuition” may have led him to a parallel nontheoretical version of Husserl’s thinking. Sepp reports that Picasso recognized himself as a realist. If “realism” is taken to mean fidelity to the “things themselves,” this statement is easily understood. Picasso was not abstract. It was rather the Renaissance painters and the impressionists who were abstract. Husserl, incidentally, characterized the aesthetic as an “interest in appearance” that is also linked to an emotional orientation that takes “pleasure in the appearance” (Husserl, 1980: 145)—a characterization that is applicable to both Renaissance and impressionist art. Taking this characterization further, we can say that the cubistic tendency goes on to take interest and pleasure in that which appears.

The surrealist movement was founded in the 1920s as an attempt to go beyond realism, and drew heavily, especially in literature, on Sigmund Freud’s theory of free association. The following will subject the movement to a phenomenological interpretation in order

to clarify the concept of “absurdity.” This interpretation will lead, further, to a discussion of the work of Maurice Escher.

Husserl conceives his phenomenology as having two stages. The first stage is the foundation of an a priori “pure logic” on which all other (a posteriori) sciences are based. The second stage of phenomenology is the grounding of the first stage itself. This is “transcendental phenomenology” in its proper sense, and includes the theory of the constitution of being as a condition for truth. Now how can such a rigorously scientific, logical conception be useful in the understanding of aesthetic phenomena? The nature of the latter seems very far removed from the idea of a rigorous science, and hence it is easy to overlook the important implications that phenomenology can have for aesthetics.

Let us return to the manuscript of 1882–1883. There Husserl writes of the need to distinguish between (1) the intuition initially given in perception and phantasy and (2) the various series of intuitions that are able to link themselves to that intuition by means of certain “signs” (“*Zeichen*”) to be found in earlier series of intuitions (Husserl, 1983: 283). These “signs,” which Husserl himself sets off with quotation marks, refer to “appearances.” That is, “appearances” are “signs” that point to “that which appears.” Whereas linguistic or logical signs are totally different in nature from what they refer to, intuitive “signs” are similar to their referents and form a unity with them, although they are not identical with them. Again, when Husserl speaks of a “so-to-speak sign for itself” in *Ideen I* (Husserl, 1976a: 113), he is using the term “so-to-speak” (*gewissermaßen*) in almost the same way that he used quotation marks in the earlier example. In such a sign relation, he says, “intuitions and thoughts are . . . most intimately connected” (1983: 283).

Husserl analyzes the semantic structure of the sign from the logical viewpoint in his *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901). As is well known, he distinguishes two types of signs: the “indication” (*Anzeichen*) and the “expression” (*Ausdruck*). An indication has no “sense” or “signification” in itself, while an expression does. (To reduce the possibility of confusion, the sense of an expression will hereafter be called, following *Ideen I*, §124, “signification” [*Bedeutung*]). For example, branding is the indication of a bond servant. Almost all words are expressions. However, “abracadabra” and “green is or” have no signification,

and are therefore not expressions. “The morning star” has a signification. Mediated by or through this signification, an object is intended—it has an object that it intentionally refers to. This intention is fulfilled by the perception of the fulfilling object that we call “Venus” (“that which appears”). This is also the case with the “the evening star,” fulfilled by what we know now to be the same “Venus.” “Golden mountain” is also an expression possessed of a signification. Like “the morning star,” it refers to an object, mediated by or through this sense—there is an object intentionally referred to. But in this case, it does not in fact have a real existing object (a perceptual “that which appears”) to fulfill it. The intention can be fulfilled only by phantasy, as a fiction, with a phantasy object.

We should understand the semantic or logical relation between signification and object as a variation of the intuitive relationship between appearance and that which appears. Later, when Husserl develops the notion of (intuitive) noema, he says that “the noema in general is nothing more than the generalization of the idea of signification [*Bedeutung*] to the overall sphere of the act” (1971: 89). More precisely, we should say that after the 1890s, Husserl grasps both semantic and intuitive relationships in term of “a universal a priori of correlation” (1976b: 169 n.). They have the same structure.

More interesting is the case of “a round square.” It has a signification—an object is intentionally referred to. But this intention can never be fulfilled, neither by perception, nor even by phantasy or as a fiction. It is a priori unfulfillable. It has no fulfilling object. This is a case of “the ideal impossibility of sense fulfilling” or “the a priori impossibility of a fulfilling sense” (Husserl, 1984: 61) and is called an “absurdity” (*Widersinn*), despite its having a sense and belonging to the category of expressions.

With regard to image-phenomena such as paintings and statues, Husserl distinguished three aspects: the “physical image” (*physisches Bild*), the “image-object” (*Bildobjekt*), and the “image-subject” (*Bildsujet*). Furthermore, with regard to the being-character of such phenomena, he speaks of “neutrality modification,” which is a modification of the being-character of the perceived object and which is applicable to both phantasy and image consciousness.

Generally speaking, something which has a being-character of neutrality is not related to existence and

truth (cf. 1976a: §109f., 254 n.; Husserl, 1950: 93). ROMAN INGARDEN also focused on this matter from the aesthetic position in *Erlebnis, Kunstwerk und Werk* (1969). But Husserl said: “The novel, the theater piece, has an intersubjective ‘existence’ Thus the descriptive statements, the judgments about the characters and about their probable development and so on, have also a kind of objective truth, even if they relate to the fictive” (Husserl, 1980: 520). This new understanding enables the distinction between the “image-fiction” (*Bildfiktum*), which has a kind of truth, and the illusory, which is discarded in its truth because of the contradiction of positing it with external reality. Husserl says, “The image-object is fictive, but not illusory, because it is not, as in the case of illusion, an in-itself-harmonious [appearance] that is contradicted by the surrounding actuality [or in the positing, where the harmonious contradicts with the harmonious].” (ibid.: 490) In other words, because the illusory “requires the double-positing of that which appears as a whole” (ibid.: 491), a contradiction arises between positive and negative positing, and therefore its positing is discarded and its truth is negated.

The “physical image”—in the case, for example, of the relief of Husserl that graces the town square of Prostějov, his birthplace—is a metal plate. Without a physical image, image-consciousness is not possible, whereas phantasy is especially free in this regard. However, image-consciousness is not synonymous with the perception of the physical image. The former is based upon the latter, but goes on to grasp an image that is not simply metal, but emerges from the physical image. This second image is called the “image-object” (for example, the image of a person). But the image-object points further, to something else—in this case, to Husserl himself.

Here we find the perceptual relationship between appearances and that which appears extended once again. It is thus possible to extend the structure of perception to that of image-consciousness, since the image-object is a kind of appearance (of the subject) in the widest sense. But according to Husserl, it is a “theoretical fiction” to understand perception from the starting point of image-consciousness (Husserl, 1979: 305). For while we can see the image-subject separately outside of the image-object, we cannot see that which appears separately outside of the appearances in the perception.

We may say that, mediated by or through the image-object, we “intend” the image-subject, although in this case, the image-object is neither ideal nor real. On the other hand, the subject itself lies outside of the image-object, so we can fulfill this intention either by perceiving the subject itself, or by pure phantasy.

In the case of Husserl’s relief, the subject (Husserl) has the being-character “real.” And it (he) also has the time-character of “past.” It (he) has a place in “objective time.” But to cite another example, the image-subject of *The Little Mermaid* in Copenhagen does not have a similar place in objective time. Accordingly, neither does it (she) have the being-character “real.” More precisely, it (she) has a time-character of a kind; however, the time is not objective time, but quasi-time, which does not belong to the one objective time. It is not incorporated into objective time; therefore it is floating. But it (the mermaid) is at least fixed in a place in quasi-time. This fixedness corresponds to the being-character “neutral,” and if the quasi-time is constituted intersubjectively, as in the case of a theater piece, it makes possible a kind of truth. This leads us to an understanding of “neutrality modification.”

The physical image has its place in objective time. For example, Husserl’s relief has a place in time that begins in November 2000. Correspondingly, it has the being-character of “real.” But the image-object does not, and the image-subject need not, have such a place in objective time or the being-character of “real.” In essence they are “neutral,” whereas the perceived object must always be “real.”

But this does not mean that the image-object and image-subject are simply ideal or a priori. “Ideal” and “a priori” are synonymous with having no place either in objective time or quasi-time. Precisely because of this, the ideal or a priori can always and everywhere appear as the same. It is “everywhere” and “nowhere” (Husserl, 1985: 313).

The being-characters (“real,” “ideal,” and “neutral”) are attributed to each object through an operation of consciousness. Since being is transcendent, this operation is said to be “transcendental.” And because Husserl recognized that the constitution of being (in this sense) is the most fundamental condition for the possibility of experience and for the cognition of truth, his usage of the word “transcendental” partly overlaps with that of Kant.

Let us digress somewhat and consider the problem of phantasy. A phantasy-object itself is not ideal

or a priori. It is neutral and belongs to quasi-time. Nevertheless, it can relate to the “essence” of an object. (To be more precise, we should actually distinguish between *formal* and *material essences*. Here we mean only the latter.) In order to recognize an essence, we must first perceive various individuals possessing that essence and then extract what is common to them. But perceptions are (numerically) finite. In phantasy, on the other hand, we are free to vary the object in infinite ways. We can extract the indispensable moment from infinitely varied objects, omitting what is unnecessary, in an operation somewhat similar to finding the “greatest common factor.” By means of this operation, which depends on the fiction of phantasy, we can also discover the indispensable, “essential” moment where, if the phantasy is taken further, the common factor is lost. This operation is called an “eidetic reduction.” Concerning this reduction, Husserl says: “So we can say in all truth that if one loves paradoxical speech, or if one understands ambiguous meanings, then ‘fiction’ is the vital element of phenomenology as of all eidetic science, and fiction is the fountain from which the cognition of the ‘eternal truth’ draws its nourishment” (1976a:148).

Now let us return to the matter of “neutral” image-subjects such as that of the mermaid in Copenhagen. In the painting of another *Mermaid* by surrealist René Magritte, the creature is reversed and has a fishlike upper body and human legs. Although not a “normal” mermaid at all, we can grasp the image-object and moreover fulfill its “intention” by phantasizing its image subject. This is similar to the case of the “golden mountain.” Magritte’s painting creates the image-object of a fictive image-subject. In other words, he has freely expanded the relationship of the appearance and that which appears, and given us the pleasure of a new fiction.

But there is another type of work that is (purely) illusory, rather than fictive. In the normal illusion, its being is discarded because of its inconsistency with the “real” being of things in the surrounding world. It is given a negated being, but the negation, i.e., “not-being,” is still a kind of positional being. It belongs to “positionality,” not to “neutrality.” In the case of fiction (even Magritte’s), the image-object is inconsistent with the actuality of the outside world, but is nevertheless not discarded. It has the character of an “image-fiction” (*Bildfiktum*), as a kind of “neutrality.” More precisely speaking, although the image-object has in itself a

conflict in two senses—that with the physical image and that with the image-subject (Husserl, 1980:51)—itself, as an image-fiction, is not discarded. Many of Escher’s works are, as images, image-fictions, just like Magritte’s. They are posited in contradiction to external reality, yet are acceptable as fictions. But they are also more than simply fictive, because they also contain so to speak internal contradictions within themselves.

For example, in *Ascending/descending*, four staircases encircle a castle parapet, and people ascend in the clockwise direction and descend in the counterclockwise direction, both endlessly. We can “see” it as a physical image, and also “view” it as an image-object. It is acceptable as an image-fiction, which is independent of inconsistencies with reality. Nevertheless, we cannot fulfill the “intention” of the image. We cannot arrive at the image-subject, even by free phantasy. Our mental gaze, which has a tendency to transcend toward the subject, loses its way and finally collapses on itself. This drawing corresponds to the idea of a “round square.” Although it has a meaning-intention, the intention is unfulfillable a priori, either by perception or by phantasy. In this sense we can characterize the work of Escher as an “absurd image.” It is illusory in its very essence, because it is contradictory in itself, not in relation to an external reality. As an image-object in itself, it is a self-contradictory, purely illusory appearance. But just because it blocks the transcending tendency of our gaze, it shows (intuitively) limits of our experience that we are normally unaware of, or rather, we encounter (visually) the conditions for the impossibility of experience. (Some psychiatric cases demonstrate such conditions to us in another way. I believe that the investigation of such conditions is a new task for transcendental phenomenology.)

The work of surrealism shows us how free our phantasy can be. It expands the range of our constitutive ability, which is often limited by our everyday habits of thinking, by using the method of “free” association. But the work of Escher shows us further that our constitutive ability is limited by a priori and ideal conditions, and that we cannot go beyond those limits. He is not a surrealist who attempts to surmount realism by his freedom; on the contrary, he is a paradoxical transcendentalist who attempts to point out the limits of the possibility of our experience. Consciously or not, he has achieved a new type of transcendental reduction and acquaints us with the pleasure of illusion.

In conclusion, Husserl acknowledges no differentiation of reason. Correspondingly, our world is not separated into various realms, but is a single, united world. Philosophy and art and every activity are expressions of this world. Therefore the essences of appearance, fiction, and illusion in the arts should be clarified from the universal structure of our world experience. In light of this structure, we find that the “aesthetic” relates not only to “*aisthēsis*” (intuitive sensation), but also to “*logos*” (logic). This viewpoint demonstrates in a renewed way the infinite horizon of phenomenological research. The present essay is a mere suggestion of this infinity.

Bibliography

- Crary, Jonathan. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990.
- Da Vinci, Leonardo. *The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci*. Ed. J. P. Richter. New York: The Granger Collection, 1970.
- Descartes, René. *Discourse on Method and Related Writings*. Trans. Desmond M. Clarke. London: Penguin Books, 1999.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge*. Ed. Stephen Strasser. *Husserliana* 1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950; *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*. Trans. Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins (1893–1917)*. Ed. Rudolf Boehm. *Husserliana* 10. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966; *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*. Trans. John Barnett Brough. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Drittes Buch. Die Phänomenologie und die Fundamente der Wissenschaften*. Ed. Marly Biemel. *Husserliana* 5. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1952, rpt. 1971; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Third Book. Phenomenology and the Foundations of the Sciences*. Trans. Ted E. Klein and William Pohl. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie*. Ed. Karl Schuhmann. *Husserliana* 3/1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976a; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie* [1936]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 6. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954, rpt. 1976b; *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Aufsätze und Rezensionen (1890–1910)*. Ed. Bernhard Rang. *Husserliana* 22. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1979; *Early Writings in the Philosophy of Logic and Mathematics*. Trans. Dallas Willard. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewußtsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1908–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. Dordrecht, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Studien zur Arithmetik und Geometrie. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1886–1901)*. Ed. Ingeborg Strohmeier. *Husserliana* 21. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band. Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*. Ed. Ursula Panzer. 1. Teile. *Husserliana* 19/1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984; *Logical Investigations*. Trans. J. N. Findlay. 2 vols. New York: Humanities Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Erfahrung und Urteil. Untersuchungen zur Genealogie der Logik*. Ed. Ludwig Landgrebe. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1985; *Experience and Judgment: Investigations in a Genealogy of Logic*. Trans. James S. Churchill and Karl Ameriks. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Erlebnis, Kunstwerk und Wert*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1969.
- Merleau-Ponty, 1964: 65; cf. 1948: 22ff., 1969: 210f.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Nagel, 1948; *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Patricia A. Dreyfus. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'oeil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; “Eye and Mind.” Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 159–90.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *La prose du monde*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1969; *The Prose of the World*. Trans. John O'Neill, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Scheler, Max. *Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 3., Bern: Francke, 1977.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. “Der Kubismus als phänomenologisches Problem.” In *Facetten der Wahrheit*. Ed. Ernesto Garzón Valdés and Ruth Zimmerling. Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1995, 295–321.

Architecture

Timothy K. Casey

It is an astonishing historical fact that the divorce of art from life that first appeared in the nineteenth century extended even into the realm of architecture. After all, unlike the so-called “useless” arts, buildings must be lived in, regardless of whether they actually meet basic human requirements. Many have lamented this divorce. But phenomenology is arguably better equipped than, say, orthodox Marxism or American pragmatism to provide the kind of theoretical framework necessary for reconciling the aggrieved parties and so for making art and architecture central to our understanding of the world and our place in it once again.

According to Karsten Harries (1997), the historical failure of “art for art’s sake” to rescue us from the dreariness of modern life suggests that in the end art cannot exclusively serve the demands of beauty. Harries’ full-frontal attack on architectural aestheticism in particular clearly owes a debt to MARTIN HEIDEGGER’s understanding of building as a special mode of dwelling that intensifies and deepens our being-in-the-world by means of material, formal, and spatial interpretations of lived concerns. Harries, like others in the phenomenological tradition, is anxious to remind us that art’s traditional role was never strictly aesthetic, and that its primary purpose was never to excite pleasure in a detached viewer or listener. Rather, artworks always served functional needs ranging from the religious and festive to the social and political. Nor, on the other hand, were craft technology’s concerns purely functional. Attention to appearance and beauty has always been integral to handicraft, a tradition whose influence

is still apparent in such modern industrial works as the Brooklyn Bridge and the great railway stations of Paris.

With these considerations in mind, Harries argues for a renewed historical sensibility that would not simply repeat the architectural forms of the past, but would instead learn from them as exemplars of the integration of form and function. By redirecting our attention toward the wholeness of buildings and landscapes, Harries brings into view what he calls the ethical function of architecture. Here “ethos” is understood not as a set of rules or unchanging moral principles, but as a way of life that inspires architectural styles such as the Gothic or baroque. By style Harries means an ornamentation that, in contrast to the arbitrary decoration of nineteenth century eclecticism and twentieth century postmodernism, is nothing less than a microcosm of the work as a whole, and hence the artistic representation of a world.

On this rendering, architecture goes beyond the mere provision of shelter. Buildings are both disclosive and normative in nature: that is, they incorporate and promote quite specific ways of perceiving and valuing the world. The social function of ornament—far from being the “crime” alleged by functionalists who follow Adolph Loos—is in fact to interpret the cultural, social, and natural significance of our lives. How it accomplishes this task is what the phenomenology of architecture attempts to describe and account for.

Given the economic and technological threat to the planet endemic in our own time, Robert Mugerauer (1994) believes it especially important for architecture today to address ways in which we can re-establish a closeness to the natural that would ignite a collective ecological conscience. Mugerauer understands that ecology is not separate from the built world. He

T.K. Casey (✉)
University of Scranton, Scranton, PA, USA

thus enlists the environmental dimension of building as the organizing idea of his rich phenomenological descriptions of contemporary architecture. Taking his clue from EDMUND HUSSERL, he posits a lifeworld that encompasses modern science but is not reducible to it, a move that in turn enables him to locate our current difficulties in the modern technological concealment, if not denial, of a *physis* that is self-emergent and hence outside human control.

But in searching for a “fitting placement” that can re-constitute an “attunement” between humans and “natural patterns,” Mugerauer suggests we work *with* modern technology, not against it, by turning its tendency toward concealment to nature’s advantage. Echoing Heidegger’s tool analysis in *Sein und Zeit* (1927), Mugerauer proposes we look to the strategies of *camouflage* and *display*—imaginatively utilized in green architecture—because of their responsiveness to the particularities of place and region. Examples include such mundane but instructive structures as parking garages in Zürich that are set back into hill-sides, quite literally camouflaged by trees, grass, and shrubbery. For Mugerauer, a skillful application of these ontological maneuvers ultimately must work in tandem with an eye to human scale and a commitment to dwelling within nature and its perennial patterns.

In my view, the problem of aestheticism and its compartmentalization of art and life can be traced to an even more vexed issue: the modern inversion of the traditional priority of use over production. This inversion, so apparent in the productionist metaphysics of Marxism and capitalism, helps to explain our indifference to dwelling as the inevitable consequence of reducing technology to questions of mere technique and efficiency. Le Corbusier’s well-known and influential definition of houses as “machines for living” typifies this approach. It is certainly noteworthy from a phenomenological perspective that the mass production spirit initiated by Corbusier in the 1920s heralded an aesthetic formalism alarmingly ignorant of the human lifeworld—in effect atomizing form and function, and leaving architects with the unhappy choice between an irrelevant aestheticism and a soulless technicism.

To affirm with HANS-GEORG GADAMER (2004) that “[a] building is never only a work of art” is not, however, to surrender to a strict functionalism. Regardless of the intentions of builders, an

aesthetically neutral architecture is in reality a practical impossibility. Even modernist boxes speak to us of our technological prowess and faith in scientific objectivism. The real question here is whether the machine aesthetic captures the depth and rich diversity of lived experience. And the answer to this question depends on resolving the larger query of how form and function are actually integrated in the built world.

The architect is first and foremost devoted to solving functional problems. This means, of course, that form does follow function in some sense, but only when function is understood in more than a bare utilitarian way. What is more, such an understanding presupposes an intimate familiarity with the lifeworld as a background of meaning against which the architect idealizes individual forms that both mirror and *enhance* the various uses or functions to which buildings such as schools and churches can be put. (Note, for instance, the way in which the vaulted ceiling of a medieval cathedral orients one’s gaze heavenward, or what the campus of an Oxford or Princeton University says about the place of history and tradition in higher education.)

It is hardly surprising, then, that architects such as Louis Kahn see themselves not just as builders, but as *poets* and *philosophers* as well (Lobell, 1985). In the right hands, architectural design begins with what Kahn calls a “strong idea” about the functional task (e.g., education or worship) the building is to house. It is this conception—evidently philosophical in nature—that inspires the creation of an architectural form envisioned on the basis of a broad knowledge of traditional architectural styles. To be sure, form here is no eternal, Platonic idea. Rather, it is historically arrived at and, even more important, is tested and reconsidered in light of the spatial, cultural, and natural context into which it will be inserted. To be effective, architectural form must always be “de-formed” by subjecting it to a hermeneutical violence that brings it down to earth and makes it relevant for builders and dwellers alike. Still, form does not literally follow function but instead, in the suggestive language of Paolo Portoghesi (1982), “satisfies” it by artistically developing and adding to its commonly understood meaning and importance in human life. Good architecture is simply a question of the degree to which this satisfaction is achieved.

Clearly, this approach requires an expanded notion of function that includes those cultural, historical, and

natural forces that constitute a world. The ability artistically to express human moods and aspirations within the limits inscribed by these forces goes to the heart of the architectural task of creating a sense of history and pride of place that links us in everyday ways to each other and to the institutions that make up our public life together. It is in this sense that beauty is integral to the solution of specific building problems. Beautiful architectural forms can thus be said to embody human functions by making visible their various meanings and values.

Since Immanuel Kant and the Enlightenment, the tendency has nonetheless been to construe art as useless and architecture as a puzzling anomaly that presents an irresolvable contradiction between aesthetic disinterestedness and involvement in the practical. This is a way of thinking that has been historically reinforced by the removal of artworks from their functional contexts to museums whose main purpose, it seems, is to pose as islands of culture in a sea of crass utility and economic hegemony. But perhaps the *tension* between form and function, beauty and use, can be seen in a more positive light. Perhaps it is precisely by means of this tautness that architecture evokes in its perceptive users a *participatory disinterestedness* that binds us to the world, but not so tightly that we lose sight of what makes it significant and livable for us. Experienced in this way, architecture becomes unique among other technologies in that through its artistic element, it illuminates the lifeworld as a space of intelligibility that largely goes unnoticed in our habitual, day-to-day manipulation and use of equipment.

One finds a similar defense of architectural beauty—and of ornament specifically—in the work of the critical theorist Theodor W. Adorno (1997). Adorno, however, attacks the problem from the standpoint of the inadequacy of a pure functionalism. Though Marxist in orientation, he rails against the impractical character of the “mercilessly practical,” since even the most prosaic of objects are symbolic and capable of speaking to human needs and concerns. In architectural terms, this means that buildings are necessarily ornamental, no matter how “functionalist” they may appear. Indeed, from this perspective even the Loosian absence of style turns out to be just another style.

Architects are artists by necessity, though not in the pure sense as Le Corbusier claimed. Potentially, all works of art have a role to play in the social and

political life of humanity. And yet, as Adorno emphasizes, this role can easily be misunderstood, since no aesthetic form can be “exhaustively determined” by its social or political utility. Art in its own way is philosophical critique, and so always retains a utopian element opposed to the status quo. This goes to the heart of Adorno’s rejection of functionalism in modern architecture, for he sees it as the natural complement to a bourgeois “culture industry” that, in confusing art with mass culture, mistakes escapism for authentic transcendence.

Like Harries and Alberto Perez-Gomez (1985), Adorno links the alienation of art from life to the “rational objectification” of existence disseminated through modern science and technology. In turning this objectification into an absolute, instrumental reason works to suppress a natural “mimetic impulse” that seeks a human resonance in the objects around us. The neutralization of this impulse, Adorno claims, has led to a disenchanted, uninhabitable world emptied of beauty and moral worth. Consequently, he looks to the artistic imagination to revive the power of *mimēsis* as an aesthetic antidote to an increasingly “administered” environment. That architectural beauty should perform this kind of civic function implies neither submission to ideology nor surrender to stark utility. Quite the contrary, it would signal the production of pre-geometrical, pre-Newtonian spaces that could once again give voice to a just and more humane social order, as well as to human possibilities yet unseen.

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor. “Functionalism today.” In *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. Ed. Neil Leach. New York: Routledge, 1997, 6–19.
- Adorno, Theodor. *The Culture Industry*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Casey, Edward S. *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer Philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1975; *Truth and Method*. New York: Continuum, 2004, 150.
- Harries, Karsten. *The Ethical Function of Architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1927; *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

- Heidegger, Martin. "Bauen Wohnen Denken." In his *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1954, 145–62; "Building Dwelling Thinking." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 143–61.
- Lobell, John. *Between Silence and Light: Spirit in the Architecture of Louis I. Kahn*. Boston: Shambala, 1985, 4.
- Mugerauer, Robert. *Interpretations on Behalf of Place: Environmental Displacements and Alternative Responses*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Norberg-Schulz, Christian. *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli, 1985.
- Perez-Gomez, Alberto. *Architecture and the Crisis of Modern Science*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985.
- Portoghesi, Paolo. *After Modern Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli, 1982.
- Seamon, David, ed. *Dwelling, Seeing, and Designing: Toward A Phenomenological Ecology*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985.

Antonio Banfi

Gabriele Scaramuzza

Antonio Banfi (1886–1957). Banfi's aesthetics begins with an unprejudiced opening toward aesthetic and artistic experience in all its vitality and complexity, and with the assertion that this experience is compromised by current ways of theorizing (especially by theories influenced by the neo-idealistic philosophical tradition where Italy is concerned). The remedy to this situation is not connected, in Banfi's reflections with some intuitive form of abandoning oneself to lived immediacy, but rather with an investigation exploring worlds of knowledge presented by history.

From this activity the necessity of a philosophical aesthetics emerges as the demand for an *idea* that can collect the results of inquiries around a coherent point, and hence not in a merely empiricist way. Pre-philosophical forms of reflection on aesthetic and artistic reality—sometimes characterized pragmatically (evaluatively and normatively), sometimes analytically and descriptively—not only run the risk of inflexibility, but operate with unclarified assumptions and call for a uniting principle in which it is possible to find a constant ground for aesthetic and artistic experience. This principle, this “*idea di esteticità*” (the transcendental idea of aesthetics), characterizes the differences between the aesthetic sphere and the other spheres of culture and makes it recognizable. It has a methodical value by itself, it does not constitute the goal, but rather the beginning of inquiry. It expresses its worth in order to be an effective way of orienting the description of the aesthetic sphere, and it works only to this goal.

Since it does not characterize the aesthetic experience in a univocal way, this idea in particular has an

antinomic structure (Banfi's aesthetics differs deeply from any form of essentialism) and is marked by a specific mode of encounter (that is, with an independent and immediate intuitiveness) between the opposite spheres of subject and object. In this form it opens up to the real phenomenology of the aesthetic world through which the need for things to speak for themselves can be fulfilled without prejudice and without evaluative or moralistic frameworks that obstruct its life. But how is this specifically phenomenological sphere characterized?

The categorial web that sustains this sphere is the result of an interlacement of some variably relevant constants in everchanging reciprocal relations. Briefly, the “phenomenological” is not an independent knowledge that subordinates the other spheres of knowledge, perhaps hierarchizing them. Once satisfied, the “necessity of philosophy” that emerges from those spheres of knowledge does not produce a sphere of knowledge *sui generis* that replaces them. Instead, it collects and valorizes them, in their limits of validity and meaning within a specific space that is the space of the connection between different spheres of knowledge relative to the various problems that experience offers. Phenomenological description is also “open” because it makes different points of views confront and react to one another: the spheres of knowledge become relative by mutual comparison, and the process that Banfi calls “de-dogmatization” properly goes on. In this way the vitality of experience is preserved and its complexity and variety obtain adequate recognition.

The spheres of knowledge that are considered are those connected to the traditional components of aesthetic experience, those that gradually prove to be its substantial concepts: aesthetic subjectivity (creative and contemplative) and objectivity (forms and

G. Scaramuzza (✉)

Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

structures), the aesthetic and the artistic; intuition and expression; materials and techniques; inspiration and work, distinctions between arts (fine and minor arts) and genres; beauty and other aesthetic categories; autonomy and heteronomy; relations with other cultural dimensions; historicity and supertemporality, etc. Historical contextualization is certainly one of these spheres of knowledge; nevertheless, it is not the only one, nor the most relevant. To “understand” a cultural event also means—and not secondarily—to reconnect it to the historical perspective in which it has been produced; relativization is also a historiographical enterprise (the phenomenological and the historical spheres are not contrasted in this respect). Nevertheless, historicization does not exhaust the tasks defined by phenomenology: historicity is only one of the many dimensions of events, and it does not cancel out other dimensions. The sphere of phenomenological knowledge also resolves, in Banfi’s opinion, the ontological-structural concerns, and it does not cancel other questions concerning meaning and value that cannot be satisfied exclusively by the sphere of the historical knowledge. Aesthetics cannot exhaust itself in historiography or in other forms of reflection on art.

Moreover, the phenomenological opening to which the idea points works on past experiences and studies; nevertheless it is generally oriented (in its tendency systematically to question its own results) toward a future “never-ending task,” yet this is not its only future-oriented task. It also envisages possible “utopian” meanings of experience, and it becomes the project of an “endless” work of constructing reality.

The last phase of Banfi’s reflection, coinciding with the most politically engaged period of his life, emphasizes aspects of aesthetic experience (also considered in its aspects of diffused aesthetic character and of lesser or functional artistic character) that—even outside any perspective of *engagement*—that can deeply influence social life and help raise its value, thus becoming an exhortation to a fuller life for everyone.

Where the connections to other contemporary traditions of aesthetics are concerned, it is necessary to point out that Banfi’s aesthetics was first presented in a cultural climate dominated, in Italy, by the neo-idealistic aesthetics of Croce and Gentile (the former especially) and that he polemicized against them. If Croce’s aesthetics is ruled by an essentialistic and evaluative attitude—oriented toward a univocal definition in which an independent essence of art is expressed,

but in which a value-judgment concerning works of art can also be found—Banfi’s thought shows, on the contrary, the phenomenological commitment to describe reality in the complexity of its aspects, without oversimplifying it and without evaluative frameworks or normative presumptions that repress or consume its very life.

Nevertheless, his aesthetics is rooted in a sound knowledge of European culture, to which he always compared his own positions; his philosophy is incomprehensible without considering this. His remote influences are Kantian and Hegelian; a crucial year in his formation was 1910–1911, when he studied in Berlin, came into contact with the ideas of Heinrich Wölfflin and Ernst Cassirer, and—most importantly in the development of his aesthetics—met Georg Simmel and Max Dessoir (who introduced him to *allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* and then to the study of Konrad Fiedler and Emil Utiz). Other remarkable influences came from Wilhelm Dilthey; from the philosophers of the Marburg school (in particular Hermann Cohen and *Ästhetik des reinen Gefühls*), from *Wertphilosophie* and from the philosophy (and theology) of the crisis, the philosophies of life and so-called “irrationalism,” from Friedrich Nietzsche to Ludwig Klages, from Stefen George to August Strindberg, from Lucian Blaga to existentialism (which he criticized). Finally, his dialogue with Anglo-American thought (from Francis Herbert Bradley to George Santayana, from Alfred North Whitehead to John Dewey) and with contemporary French thought (from Charles Renouvier to Henri Bergson) were rich in consequences.

In phenomenology, Banfi began to reflect on EDMUND HUSSERL early in the 1920s, and was the first to appreciate MORITZ GEIGER’s studies of delight and aesthetic experience and WALDEMAR CONRAD’s inquiries into the aesthetic object (only many years later were these philosophers and ROMAN INGARDEN’s aesthetic work rediscovered in Italy, thanks to Elisa Oberti). Banfi definitely follows the objectivistic attitude (antinaturalistic and antipsychologistic) shared by the *allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* and the first studies in phenomenological aesthetics (against which he claims to develop the topic of the idea significantly). His aesthetics can certainly be included to some extent among the first attempts to point out the influences of phenomenology on aesthetics. Yet it can also be concluded that his work is born from an original

combination of phenomenological influences and topics derived from neo-Kantian transcendentalism.

Banfi's aesthetics was not received favorably in Italy, especially by the neo-Idealistic and the neo-Scholastic traditions, against which he polemicized throughout the course of his philosophical reflections. Yet his thought was also received rather coldly by the very left-wing tradition that he supported, since it was remarkably different from the current orthodox Marxist (even Lukásian) tradition. On the contrary, his thought was welcomed favorably, as well as significantly developed, by his students, and also influenced the thinkers indirectly connected to them and the cultural movements close to journals such as *Corrente* and *Il Politecnico*. It contributed to a reconsideration of issues (such as technique and genres, the autonomy of art and its relations with the historical and social reality) that the Crocean culture had largely ignored.

In the field of the philosophy of art, Dino Formaggio (1914–) draws the most fertile consequences from some of Banfi's ideas, whether from the general methodical formulation of aesthetic language, or from the valorization and the deeper analysis of particular topics. Thus he rediscovers the value of the technical side of artistic production, confirming the dichotomy between art and aesthetics (and between aesthetics as the theory of perceptible phenomena and aesthetics as the theory of art) that Banfi had hinted at, but had partly neglected if compared to some of Max Dessoir's most radical conclusions. Formaggio developed the topic of artistic production in conjunction with some themes in Husserl, MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY, and MIKEL DUFRENNE concerning reflection on the project-oriented and communicative praxis of the body, which acts as the fundamental constitutive principle for the reality of art.

Beginning in 1936 and with reference to the notion of pure poetry, Luciano Anceschi (1911–1995) verifies the inextricable complexity of the autonomy and heteronomy of artistic reality that Banfi had already theorized. His intention is to characterize the nucleus that marks the artistic reality and the web of relations that connects it to various experiences. He confirms, moreover, the aspects by which Banfi's aesthetics participates in pragmatic reflection, in inquiries directed to the revaluation of literary theory, such as reflections on the artist and his/her art, as well as the question of the fundamental starting point for the reconstruction of

the entire web of institutions, structures, and questions that mark the particular sphere of literature.

The relationship between autonomy and heteronomy (seen in its more problematic aspects, which connect it to the disturbing topic of deformation) is extremely significant in the original and restless inquiries of Miro Martini (1908–1951). Other philosophers connected to Banfi's thought who were engaged in aesthetic reflection can also be mentioned including Fulvio Papi (1992), who offers a genuinely philosophical interpretation of art, (and of poetry and literature in particular), and Guido D. Neri (1935–2001) who investigates the visual arts in his essay on Erwin Panofsky and in his reflections on Caravaggio. Further aesthetic insights can be discovered even in the work of those philosophers who were engaged in altogether different theoretical questions, such as Giulio Preti (1911–1972), although they play a central role in the work of his student Ermanno Migliorini (1924–1999), who combines phenomenological and analytic motifs in his often remarkable inquiries into important phases and authors of contemporary art, such as Marcel Duchamp and conceptual art.

Nevertheless, the centrality given in Banfi's thought to the topic of crisis produces extremely significant results not only in the reflections on art of a notable number of his followers, but also in the activity of several artists: in the poetry of Antonia Pozzi (1912–1938) and Vittorio Sereni (1913–1983), and in the novels of Guido Morselli (1912–1973). Faithful to his teacher, Formaggio interprets the so-called "death of art" as an artistic renewal, and consistently uses it as a way of understanding various works of contemporary art (especially visual art). The topic of crisis is also deeply significant for other followers who use it for reinterpreting literary or artistic events, even far from Banfi's preferences. In this way, Luciano Anceschi's inquiries examine almost exclusively the symptomatic phases of the "crisis," from decadentism to the avant-gardes, to literary neo-avant-gardism. Remo Cantoni (1914–1978) reconsiders Dostoevsky in a problematic way and is among the first to bring the name of Franz Kafka to the attention of Italian culture. Enzo Paci (1911–1976) focuses his studies on the cultural affinities between Thomas Mann and Marcel Proust, Rainer Maria Rilke and Paul Valéry, T. S. Eliot, and contemporary architecture. Luigi Rognoni (1913–1986) strengthens Banfi's open ideas and phenomenological suggestions in his musical studies, in particular about

the school of Vienna, but also in his essays on cinema. Giovanni Maria Bertin (1912–) shows great sensitivity toward the culture of the crisis from a pedagogical point of view. Finally, Giosue Bonfanti (1915–2000) also chiefly focuses on the literary world.

Bibliography

- Banfi, Antonio. *Vita dell'arte: Scritti di estetica e filosofia dell'arte*. E. Mattioli and Gabriele Scaramuzza with Luciano Anceschi and Dino Formaggio. Reggio nell'Emilia: Istituto Antonio Banfi, 1988.
- Anceschi, Luciano. *Autonomia ed eteronomia dell'arte. Sviluppo e teoria di un problema estetico*. Florence: Sansoni, 1936.
- Anceschi, Luciano. *Progetto di una sistematica dell'arte*. Milan: Mursia, 1962.
- Bertin, Giovanni Maria. *Disordine esistenziale e istanza della ragione: Tragico e comico. Violenza ed eros*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1981.
- Bonfanti, Giosue. *Approdi letterari*. 2 vols. Lecce: Manni, 2000–2001.
- Cantoni, Remo. *Crisi dell'uomo: Il pensiero di Dostoevskij*. Milan: Mondadori, 1948.
- Cantoni, Remo. *Franz Kafka e il disagio dell'uomo contemporaneo*. Milan: Unicopli, 2000.
- Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand. Eine phänomenologische Studie." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3, 1908, 71–118, 469–511; 4, 1909 400–55.
- Formaggio, Dino. *Fenomenologia della tecnica artistica*. Milan: Nuvoletti, 1953.
- Formaggio, Dino. *L'idea di artisticità*. Milan: Ceschina, 1962.
- Formaggio, Dino. *Arte*. Milan: Isedi, 1973.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, 1, 1913, 567–684.
- Geiger, Moritz. *Zugänge zur Ästhetik*. Leipzig: Der Neue Geist, 1928.
- Martini, Miro. *La deformazione estetica*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1955.
- Migliorini, Ermanno. *Critica oggetto e logica*. Florence: Il Fiorino, 1968.
- Neri, Guido. *Il sensibile, la storia, l'arte. Scritti 1957–2001*. Verona: Ombre Corte, 2003.
- Paci, Enzo. *Relazioni e significati*. Vol. 3. *Critica e dialettica*. Milan: Lampugnani Nigri, 1966.
- Papi, Fulvio. *La parola incantata e altri saggi di filosofia dell'arte* [1930]. Milan: Guerini, 1992.
- Preti, Giulio. *Umanesimo e strutturalismo: Scritti di estetica e di letteratura*. E. Migliorini. Padua: Liviana, 1973.
- Rognoni, Luigi. *Espressionismo e dodecafonìa*. Turin: Einaudi, 1954.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele. *Crisi come rinnovamento: Scritti sull'estetica della scuola di Milano*. Milan: Unicopli, 2000.

Beauty

Simone Neuber

Traditionally, philosophy has been concerned with logic, the *epistēmē* of the *true*; ethics, the *epistēmē* of the *good*; and aesthetics, the *epistēmē* of the *beautiful*. So we can say that the beautiful is what aesthetics is about. This definition, however, does not get us very far as we do not yet know what aesthetics is, much less which specific flavor phenomenology can add; and complicating the issue, contemporary aesthetics explicitly questions that it is dealing with the beautiful at all. In the twentieth century aesthetics may well proceed without even touching on the question of beauty. But what exactly is the beautiful so that it can become a questionable object of our perception of the sensible world (*aisthēsis*) and the rather new field in philosophy called aesthetics?

To come to a more “substantial” definition of the beautiful that cannot be arrived at acontextually on purely phenomenological terms, it is useful to survey the emergence of aesthetics as being about sense-related beauty in Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten’s *Aesthetica* (1750–1758). With his definition—“aesthetices autem est finis est perfectio cognitionis sensitivae, qua talis. Haec autem est *pulchritudo*” (the aim of aesthetics in the perfection of our sensual cognition as such. This, however, is beauty—Baumgarten—1750–58: §14, emphasis added)—he relates the beautiful to our *sensuous* (non-conceptual) understanding, and divorces it for subsequent generations from the good and the true to which for Plato *to kalon* still inseparably belonged. From a Platonic point of view, *to kalon* as *to ekphanestaton* is more than a pleasing physical entity. The *eros* of beauty corresponds to the *eros* of truth whereby beauty closes

the gap between the apparently existing “two” Platonic “worlds,” the real and the ideal. Knowing the ideal of beauty is knowing the true.

Immanuel Kant is far from Plato when in his *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790) he turns the beautiful into the object of an aesthetic judgment that, as *Reflexionsurteil*, is to be separated from an *Erkenntnisurteil* and thus from the logical realm. The beautiful is that which perceptually pleases according to its form. In spite of its formedness, however, the beautiful is not conceptualizable by theoretical reason. Instead, it leads to the latter’s free play with the imagination resulting in *Lust*, pleasure, or *Wohlgefallen*. The term *interesseloses Wohlgefallen* (disinterested pleasure) is the condensed formula of what happens in approaching the beautiful that pleases in itself without feeding the subject’s greed, be it cognitive (the judgment is not conceptual) or material (it is not interested). Since judging the beautiful requires *Geschmack* (taste) and since even the creating genius cannot produce anything durable and acknowledgeable unless it is tasteful (ibid.: §50)—and furthermore, since *Geschmack* can be considered a form of “*sensus communis*” (ibid.: §40)—then the beautiful, in spite of its non-conceptuality, is “subjectively universal”; it transcends the subjective realm (something that will become crucial for HANS-GEORG GADAMER and will be criticized by Jean-François Lyotard). Formed, distinct, measured, and interactive with theoretical reason, the beautiful has its other in the unformed, unmeasured *sublime* that is linked to practical reason and undergoes a renaissance in contemporary aesthetics.

Little has been added to those pivotal benchmarks from the phenomenological side. We can assume two major reasons. A first is contextual: phenomenology is a rather new “method” emerging contemporaneously

S. Neuber (✉)
Eberhard Karls-Universität Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

with art's explicit refusal to be beautiful. If its is true that, as Felix Guattari and Gilles Deleuze observe, "*la phénoménologie a besoin de l'art*" (phenomenology needs art—1967: 54), then phenomenology confronts artistic movements such as cubism, expressionism, and surrealism that start to question the classic "ideal" of the *Kunstschöne* (beauty in art); contemporary art does not offer a soil where beauty-flourishes either. And the second reason, which we will meet in relation to French phenomenology, is inherent to the phenomenological approach: phenomenology has to ask itself whether "the stuff that beauty is made of" is also the "stuff" that phenomenology deals with.

Turning from the godfather of aesthetics, Kant, to the godfather of phenomenology, EDMUND HUSSERL, we see that "aesthetics" for him has nothing to do with an aesthetic judgment, but with the sensible world as such of which the beautiful is only a small aspect. Husserl rarely considers it at all. Many if not most of his allusions can be found in the posthumously published *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung* (1980). Unsurprisingly, whenever he comes to speak about the beautiful, he takes a thoroughly Kantian stance. A footnote to a *Beilage* dating from approximately 1906 is only symptomatic: "see text and Kant's lessons" (Husserl, 1980: 145). Although the beautiful keeps its Kantian definition, Husserl's project is completely different. For Kant, the *Urteilkraft* is to form the essential bridge from *Verstand* to *Vernunft*, but Husserl is not interested in this relation. Rather, he touches on the beautiful in his inquiry into the modifications that the originally given undergoes when being reproduced in imagination, memory, etc. He asks for the difference between dealing with an immediately given object (its appearance) and dealing with its *sujet* perceived in an aesthetic experience. The latter experience is distinct from, e.g., the theoretical approach, since it abstains from positing the "object" (*Seinssetzung*)—a "disinterestedness" certainly echoing Kant.

The focus of a *Beilage* dating from 1926 asks for the transcendental conditions or guarantee of the objectivity of the beautiful: why is the beautiful not a merely singular experience, something fading away once we have experienced a thing to be beautiful? Why do we continue to experience the thing to be like that over and over again? Husserl assumes that the beautiful must be a more or less "perfect *idea*," an "identical fictum." "Identical" qua "ideal," it is given a sensuous body (*Verleiblichung*) by the artist and thereby

becomes intersubjectively accessible. It forms a realm oscillating between the real and the phantasmal that we as perceivers can "live into."

It is unfortunate that Husserl does not consider the potential that beauty might have had for his struggle with affectivity in *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis* (1918–1926), where he describes different ways in which objects call for our attention. The affective power of a beautiful *Anmutung* (enticement) remains unthematized until MIKEL DUFRENNE comes to deal with it forty years later. Husserl leaves us with a skeleton or a bundle of ideas that certainly deserves further investigation, be it beauty as the bridge between the phantasmal and the experiential world, the specific experience of "living into," or the unique character of "as-iffness."

Other than Husserl, his pupil DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND explicitly poses the *ti esti* question about beauty in the first volume of his *Ästhetik*. Less inspired by Kant, although acknowledging his achievements (above all "disinterested pleasure,") von Hildebrand draws his inspiration from Augustine, adopting the latter's conception of the deep metaphysical roots of beauty: it is a spiritual experience. For von Hildebrand, then, the beautiful in its *objective* being is not merely a being among other beings, but the very reflection of God's glory: as an extraordinary value it brings us *in conspectu Dei*. Von Hildebrand takes it to be the only source of human happiness and finds it irreplaceable for practical-philosophical purposes; today's "depoetization" of the world becomes a great danger. An antidote can only be found in the contemplation of beauty.

Von Hildebrand does not consider beauty to be monovalently identical but rather differentiates three kinds: *metaphysical beauty*, which is the byproduct of other values (e.g., the glory accompanying truthfulness); *primitive or first-order beauty*, which merely affects on a sensuous level; and, finally, *second-order beauty*. It is the latter that is the focus for von Hildebrand. Other than Kantian beauty, which finds its antipode in the sublime, von Hildebrand's second-order beauty seems itself to be of a sublime quality: it is the sublime beauty "beyond" beautiful objects. In that very respect it resembles metaphysical beauty, but is distinct in that it is not an *Abglanz*, a spinoff-shining of other values, but a higher beauty that opens up if we genuinely perceive things of first-order beauty. In this ontological "beyondness" it creates the bridge to

the transcendent. It is “speaking of” a higher truth and forms the realm in which all other values “inhere.”

Concerning the potential “bearers” of beauty, von Hildebrand distinguishes *values*, which have their own “aroma” of metaphysical beauty, and *thematic* and *nonthematic* beautiful things: Examples of the former are artworks and all things that explicitly exhibit beauty; the latter are beautiful things that, like architecture and nature, also have other potential *teloi*. Regarding the beauty of nature, it is noteworthy that unlike what is suggested both by artworks and by the claim of disinterestedness, abstaining from positing existence does not hold in this case, and neither does openness of interpretation: von Hildebrand makes sure that nature may not “betray” us, but really has to *be* what it purports to be. A beautiful mountain loses its beauty if we find out that the object is in fact a cloud. Moreover, once we have discovered our mistake, the cloud cannot even turn into a beautiful one. Beauty cannot change its bearer in the same way that a squirrel can change a tree. The reason for this lies in von Hildebrand’s assumption that different objects embody different “degrees” of second-order beauty, so that a mountain having “much” second-order beauty has to undergo a digression if we find out that it is in fact only a sublime cloud. Its beauty degenerates and disappoints us.

The evanescence and rarity of beauty implicit in von Hildebrand’s hierarchy of second-order beauty is emphasized by another phenomenologist in Husserl’s circle, OSKAR BECKER. He focuses on the “fragility” of the beautiful that he regards as a being on the edge. Like an asymptote, it is not only the rarer the nearer it gets to the vertical axis, but also increasingly endangered the steeper the slope. He uses the English adjective “thrilling” to express the immense affective power and the essentially *agonal* character of the beautiful. Bringing the brutality of the real into a silenced and tamed form, it is as fragile for its relative rarity as it is for the struggle within: it is formed *chōra* always about to implode. With “thrillingness,” Becker distances himself from a Schopenhauerian misunderstanding of Kant’s “disinterested pleasure” and extrapolates the attention-demanding character of the beautiful.

Another student of Husserl offers a less theological, but more alethological interpretation of beauty. In his “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” (1935–36), MARTIN HEIDEGGER arrives at an unsurprisingly Platonic defi-

nition of the beautiful: “Das ins Werk gefügte Scheinen ist das Schöne. *Schönheit ist eine Weise, wie Wahrheit als Unverborgenheit west*” (The shining set into the artwork is the beautiful. *Beauty in a way truth presences as unconcealment*—1950: 44). Beauty is disclosure echoing *ton ekphanestaton*, the shining forth of the truth of being (*a-lētheia*) that gains presence in and through the beauty of the artwork. Its superlative status can be explicated with Heidegger’s reference to Kant and Nietzsche in his lecture on the latter. With Kant’s “pleasure without [further] interest” beauty comes to have its means in itself. To paraphrase JEAN-PAUL SARTRE, beauty leads to a “*néanisation de l’autre*” (nullification of the other) so that there is nothing left that could compete with its shining forth. It is not dis-traction, but rather con-centration.

The second superlative trait is much more characteristic of Heidegger and is developed out of a rather one-sided interpretation of Nietzsche that overemphasizes the latter’s Apollo-Dionysos pathos. Its remodulation by Heidegger is often contextualized within the situation of Nazi Germany, a situation from which he never managed to distance himself completely. Beauty is not just what shines forth most fully, but also the climax of the possible in a certain era. It is a harmony under the surface of which there is a power play between the actual and the possible. It is the same agonal structure exhibited by the strife of earth and world in his artwork essay. The beautiful is no longer a *pleasing* answer. It is the answer to our most profound and least bearable expectation: Beauty is the least that humans can still stand (*aushalten*) and in that respect becomes a measure: it is our ultimate *Zumutung*, spanning our very possibility. It is evident that beauty in this understanding is not atemporal, but changing in response to present-day demands, which made this conception susceptible to allusions to Nazi ideology.

Later in his career, and especially in his reflections on technology, Heidegger disendows beauty of those “superhuman” traits and instead regards art (especially poetry) as the “saving power” answering the challenges of calculative thinking and enframement (*Gestell*). This shift affects his notion of beauty: The etymological proximity of *das Schöne* and *das Schonen* (sparing) gains prominence. Beauty moves towards the *Ereignis* mirroring Heidegger’s rather meditative late thinking. It is not to be willed, but *freie Gunst*, the free giving that can only be awaited and prepared for thoughtfully. It is crucial that Heidegger

never situated his notion of the beautiful within aesthetic theory, which he wished to overcome due to its metaphysical heritage. The beautiful is not a “thing” or an “object” opposing a “subject,” but is the happening of truth; as such, it is not an “other,” but the appearing of the grounding of all.

What for Heidegger becomes an intellectual striving for the revealing and especially the saving character of the artwork, which he will later conceptualize as the arrival (*Anblick*) of the Göttliche, is made fruitful for and applicable to aesthetics by his student Hans-Georg Gadamer, who disburdens beauty of its aletheological and terminological heaviness, but without rendering it less “Greek.” Unlike Lyotard, for whom present art has outlived the beautiful, Gadamer is convinced by its “*Aktualität*,” its *relevance*, or rather its up-to-dateness. Seeking the common feature of all artworks no matter what their origin, Gadamer develops his tripartite structure of *Spiel*, *Symbol*, and *Fest*, (play, symbol, and festival), stressing not only the universal character of the beautiful, its “standing in good standing” (Gadamer, 1977: 140), but also the fact that it is *anthropologically* rooted in the play of human beings, and therefore cannot be outdated.

As *symbol*, going back to Aristophanes’ speech in the *Symposium*, beauty has a mnemosynic function: it is humanity’s other that is nevertheless a part of humanity, sought for and immediately recognized. Experiencing beauty means undergoing a reunification, a healing (*Heilen*). As *symbol*, the beautiful does not “signify” a universal, it does not “represent” a meaning (like an *allegory*) that could have other means to appear, but it *is* what it “points at.” Furthermore, it not only *is* but is always *more*: It is its own expansion of being. The symbolic unification of the particular with its lost other is accompanied by the gathering dimensions of *Spiel* and *Fest* that echo Kant’s *sensus communis*. Yet Gadamer takes this universality even further: It is not just that we witness the beautiful thing and all agree on its beauty, but that we *join* it and relate to it. We become players in the play of the artwork and in that very activity we experience a unity that is “other” than our ordinary, fractured being-in-the-world. This otherness goes along with an otherness of time: ordinary time makes a place for the arrival of a sacred temporality, the time of *festivity*. Experiencing beauty becomes a celebration of unity, of belongingness, and of a *kosmos*, in which we have our place not as singled-out beings, but as parts of a whole. Beauty

is accordingly an “aesthetic non-differentiation” (ibid.: 118) celebrating the holy/whole.

If the German tradition builds on the metaphysical importance of the beautiful—be it aletheological, the *Freude* (or enjoyment) in the presence of God, or the gathering of festivity—the French phenomenologists almost ignore beauty. They merely practice, as Mikel Dufrenne puts it, a “*digression sur le beau*” (digression on the beautiful) (1967: 18). Either the beautiful is not thematized at all, as in MAURICE MEREAU-PONTY’s oeuvre, or it is addressed merely tangentially (Dufrenne), or its contemporary validity is negated altogether and the beautiful is replaced by something apparently more appropriate to the time; i.e., the sublime (Lyotard).

The middle route between ignoring beauty and replacing it is chosen by Mikel Dufrenne, whose *Phénoménologie de l’expérience esthétique* (1967) certainly offers one of the most important contributions to phenomenological aesthetics. Bringing his conception into dialogue with Jean-Paul Sartre, we see that the “place” of beauty is not self-evident at all. Does beauty have its “seat” in the *object* (artwork) or in the *aesthetic object*? And more urgently, is it an object for phenomenology? Dufrenne differs from Jean-Paul Sartre, for whom “*le réel n’est jamais beau*” (the real is never beautiful—Sartre, 1940: 245), leading him to banish the beautiful to the imaginary. Dufrenne certainly agrees that the beautiful cannot be *objectively defined*: “*le beau n’est pas un critère objectivement définissable et universellement valable*” (the beautiful is not a criterion which can be defined objectively and which has universal value—Dufrenne, 1967: 32). Yet this may not lead us to conclude that it is in no way *objective*. In fact, it is only due to its objectivity that the beautiful can become an aesthetic object “*sous notre regard*” (in our eye). Aesthetization does not happen out of the blue, but “*il faut que l’objet se prête à cette esthétique*” (it is necessary that the artwork lends itself to that aestheticization—ibid.: 20).

Dufrenne joins the choir with Heidegger and Gadamer in opposing the formal definition of beauty that he harshly criticizes as “*un dogmatisme arbitraire et stérilisante*” (an arbitrary and sterile dogmatism—ibid.: 19). He escapes from that standardization by reducing beauty to authenticity. Once we regard an object as being what it purports to be, we can say that it is *authentic*—and then that it is beautiful: “*son essence lui est une norme*” (its essence posits its

norm—*ibid.*: 22), or as we can certainly add, its only norm. Even if beauty is reduced to authenticity, they are not the same, but differ in their respective givenness: “*le beau désigne la vérité de l’objet lorsque cette vérité est immédiatement sensible et reconnue*” (the beautiful signifies the truth of the object whenever that truth is immediately perceivable and recognized—*ibid.*: 20). The root of beauty is nothing but a thing’s *energeia*. Beauty comes to be truth rendered sensible, or truth *in actu*. Dufrenne calls his theory a “*une théorie qui reconnaît la beauté sans faire une théorie de la beauté*” (a theory which recognizes beauty without giving a theory of beauty). Indeed, he does not have to deal with the beautiful *expressis verbis*, since only authentic, i.e., beautiful things can become aesthetic objects. And it is crucially the latter and not the former that aesthetics is about for him.

Inspired by what he takes to be Husserl’s point, Sartre claims that the beautiful results in “*une néantisation du monde*” (a negation of the world—1940: 245), concluding that there can no longer be an object that could host beauty and that therefore beauty has its realm in the imaginary. Lyotard, however, comes to the conclusion that there is no place in the world for the beautiful for another reason. It is not because the beautiful negates reality that it cannot be an “object,” but because reality has rendered the beautiful obsolete. With this diagnosis, Lyotard answers an urgent question of (post)modernity that came up at the latest after World War II: Is there a place for beauty in art after Auschwitz? In contrast to what Kant thinks, does not art have to undermine mere pleasingness? Does it not have to be inherently critical, critical of its age and society? If the experiential character of an aesthetic object is potentially ambivalent—does that not oblige art to actively evoke this ambivalence, thereby preventing the subject from merely usurping the object? If beauty results in *Lust*, does not the sublime then satisfy the essentially critical function proper to current art precisely to the extent that it results in the mixed emotional state of *Lust* and *Unlust*? More recent voices deemphasize political usurpation in favor of the leveling-down of beauty in its omnipresence: Regarding the aesthetization of the world in which more and more is “design,” and beautiful things—and above all, *kitsch*—are all around, must not art then remain the reflexive other? Does it not have to be incommensurate to have a place in society at all?

In his profound reflections on the sublime, Lyotard finds the answer to modernity in the Kantian *Widerstreit*. Concluding with Barnett Newman that “The Sublime is Now,” he modifies both Newman and Kant. He stresses the first moment of the Kantian sublime, the “disaster suffered by the imagination” (1988a: 136), and sees no aspect of reconciliation. “Now, that is the sublime”—the thatness of the always-arriving new, the never-ending *il y a*, is the sublime that confronts “intelligence” with its radical inability to synthesize. As a micrology inscribing the occurrence of a thought into metaphysical thinking, the sublime shows that there is always a remainder of the to-be-thought. This act of inscribing is the achievement of avant-garde art: “The artist attempts combinations allowing the event [i.e., the *il y a*]” (*ibid.*: 101) even though s/he knows that the now is the to-be-expressed inexpressible. The aesthetics of the sublime is negative. What it is dealing with is “a negative sign of the immense power of ideas” (*ibid.*: 98).

Kant’s universalizing dimension of “taste,” or the apparent “*sensus communis*,” becomes the target of Lyotard’s critique. If the experiencing subject only *apprehends* and *reproduces*—without, however, *subsuming* the beautiful under a conceptual category—then its presumed immediate quasi-objectivity, Kant’s “subjective universality,” is a mere illusion. There is no consensus; instead, as Lyotard puts it, there is “a cloud of community” (Lyotard, 1988b: 38). Since modernity does not provide a metanarration that would legitimize any pretended universality, and since the beautiful in its very structure is incapable of achieving by itself any “aesthetic progress” toward a “republic of taste,” an aesthetics corresponding to that non-synthesizability can only be provided by the sublime’s constant striving, its *differing*. The sublime “traces the way for thinking to get in touch with clouds of thoughts” (*ibid.*: 40) or ideas. This way is no longer immediate, but rather mediated by practical reason. The *artistic progress* called forth by the sublime—“The arts, whatever their materials, pressed forward by the aesthetics of the sublime in search of intense effects, can and must give up the imitation of models that are merely beautiful, and try out surprising, strange, and shocking combinations” (1988a: 100)—has a political dimension paralleling the moral development of society. The sublime and practical reason proceed hand in hand. When ready-to-hand forms that “have already been thought” and “calculated” (1988b: 42), are all around

us, art—unlike the technology of which Heidegger is so skeptical—is free to develop new *technai* capable of getting in touch with (moral) ideas. Sublime art no longer pretends to achieve a *sensus communis*, “allusive and elusive” (ibid.: 38), but triggers off a “dissensus” (ibid.: 44), a differing of differences in which the poliformity of a changing society is not negated, but affirmed.

This postmodern version inspired by a phenomenology filtered through Kant does not have the last word, but is itself criticized by recent phenomenologists trying to revive metaphysical beauty. Damir Barbaric points out that even if the omni-beautification via design and kitsch leads to a leveling-down of beauty, this only affects *aesthetic* and not *metaphysical* beauty. So does the apparent opposition by the Kantian sublime: the overwhelming, non-consumable beauty only opposes and replaces a beauty that does not exhibit those traits itself, whereas metaphysical beauty seems to be a still valid—or even especially valid—“measure.” After all, not only Dietrich von Hildebrand but also Oscar Becker and Martin Heidegger have endowed beauty with traits of the sublime. Barbaric (2002) concludes that beauty is not only the measured, but that it is a measure itself (Heidegger), or a corrective of the misunderstood aestheticizations and beautifications of our contemporary lifeworld. The other and inherently critical dimension, then, does not have to be sought in the sublime, but is provided by the achievements of *metaphysical* beauty.

The beautiful that was to reconcile so much in its history has become a problem itself. Part of the problematicity lies in the fact that John Cage, Barnett Newman, Jackson Pollock, video-installations, or ready-mades certainly have other aims than merely to arouse pleasure. But are they sublime? Or does their sublimity make them beautiful in a metaphysical sense? If art is to seek refuge in the sublime by preventing capitalistic or political abuse, as Christine Pries (1988) among others suggests, does this refuge in its apparently “critical dimension” not eclipse the problem that it is a preliminary art of a sublime character that is especially susceptible to heroic propaganda? And is the sublime “now,” or is it not also “outlived” by the now? Is not our age not only one of omni-aestheticization but also one of omni-shock and omni-sublimization? Can we still be rendered speechless by something sublime, or has the sublime itself undergone a leveling-down? Is Barbaric perhaps right when he

points out that beauty may well remain a corrective even if our definitions of beauty undergo a change in time? As attractive as his suggestion might be to save a refuge for beauty, this raises the objection of whether Heidegger, who nurtures his notion of “beauty as measure,” would agree with a “metaphysical” beauty if his aim was to overcome metaphysics.

Is there a metaphysical beauty in a postmetaphysical era? And do we need that? If we consider the metaphysical function in the reconciliation of the real with the ideal, has not history caught up with art (Barbaric, 2002: 173)? Can information technology not turn being into mere appearing and appearing into being, so that all those simulacra, whether pretty or ugly, no longer need any reunion at all—be it “metaphysical,” or in this case rather meta-virtual—since they are already de-dichotomized? As much as those questions may affect all approaches to aesthetic theory, one question is especially virulent for the phenomenological method: It has to ask itself if beauty is its potential object at all. Is there any beauty left after a Husserlian epochē? If we understand phenomenology as rigid constitutive phenomenology concentrating on aesthetic objects, is beauty then not left out of that set of possible objects, merely functioning as an “aesthetic-object-maker”—a point that Husserl fails to make and that Dufrenne practices in a “guidebook-like” way? Aesthetics following a Husserlian method and having a rather narrow sense of phenomenology and not the broader one including, e.g., hermeneutical ontology, certainly travels safely if it regards itself as “*une théorie qui reconnaît la beauté sans faire une théorie de la beauté*” (a theory that recognizes beauty without making a theory of beauty).

Bibliography

- Barbaric, Damir. “Schönheit und Maß.” In *Im Spannungsfeld zweier Kulturen*. Ed Karen Gloy. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2002, 93–117.
- Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb. *Aesthetica*. Frankfurt an der Oder: Johannes Christian Kleyb, 1750–1758.
- Becker, Oskar. “Von der Hinfälligkeit des Schönen und der Abenteuerlichkeit des Künstlers.” In his *Dasein und Dawesen. Gesammelte philosophische Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1963, 11–40.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix, Guattari. *Esthétique et philosophie*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1967.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. [1953]. 2nd ed. Presses Universitaires de France, 1967;

- The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Die Aktualität des Schönen. Kunst als Spiel, Symbol und Fest*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1977; *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays*. Ed. Robert Bernasconi. Trans. Nicholas Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; "The Origin of the Work of Art." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Nietzsche I. Der Wille zur Macht als Kunst*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985; *Nietzsche*. Vol. 1. *The Will to Power as Art*. Trans. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Ästhetik, 1. Teil: Nachgelassenes Werk. Gesammelte Werke V*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis. Aus Vorlesungs- und Forschungsmanuskripten 1918–1926*. Edited by Margot Fleischer. *Husserliana* 2. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966; *Analyses concerning Passive and Active Synthesis: Lectures on Transcendental Logic*. Trans. Anthony J. Steinbock. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigung. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *L'Inhumain: Causeries sur le temps*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1988a; *The Inhuman: Reflections on Time*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *Peregrinations: Law, Form, Event*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988b. Pries, Christine, ed. *Das Erhabene*. Köln: Dumont, 1988.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'imaginaire: Psychologie phénoménologique de l'imagination*, Paris: Gallimard, 1940; *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. Trans. Jonathan Webber. London: Routledge, 2003.

Simone de Beauvoir

Sara Heinämaa

Simone de Beauvoir (1908–1986). Beauvoir is not a systematic or academic writer and she does not present any theory of art or any doctrine of aesthetic experience. She is, however, a philosophical thinker, and her works include original reflections on the task of the artist and the novelist. These she develops not only in her existential-phenomenological essays, but also in her great novels, *L'invitée* (1943) and *Les mandarins* (1954). Even her multivolume autobiography (1958–1972) includes philosophical discussions of the nature of fiction and literature. Thus Beauvoir trains our thinking on art and literature both by her scholarly texts and by her fictional works.

The usual notion is that Beauvoir chose art and left philosophical reflections to JEAN-PAUL SARTRE. This is a misconception based on superficial readings. In truth Beauvoir did not think that such a choice was necessary, but struggled to combine critical thinking with fictional and poetic forms. She believed that philosophical reflections and artistic constructions are not in opposition, but serve the same end: the expression of the metaphysical truth about the human condition. Beauvoir abandons what she calls “systematic philosophy” ([1946] 1948: 103–4; [1985] 1999: 93). By this she means the attempt to build a conceptual system that would cover the totality of life, knowledge, and being. This is part of philosophy but not all of philosophy; there are other alternatives open for those who wish to serve reason in its self-inspection. Instead of constructing a theory or a doctrine, the philosopher can “experiment” with experience and study its variations and limits. Moreover, philosophical thinking and literary constructions can merge to form a “metaphysical

novel.” The paradigmatic example of such hybrid forms is the Platonic dialogue, but Beauvoir also refers us to the works of Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855), Fyodor Dostoevsky (1821–1881), and Franz Kafka (1883–1924) (Beauvoir [1946] 1948: 117–8).

Beauvoir’s view of the relation between literature and philosophy is indebted to her close contemporaries, Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980) and MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY (1908–1961), but more fundamentally to Kierkegaard’s philosophical-literary work. Kierkegaard’s concept of existence is the source of Beauvoir’s basic view of human life as an ambiguous movement between two poles: eternity and finitude, particularity and ideality, solitude and sociality, subjective and objective (Beauvoir, 1947: 119). She explicates her existential approach in *Pour une morale de l’ambiguïté* (1947). In “Littérature et métaphysique” (1946), she argues that philosophy and literature both aim at understanding the paradoxical condition of human existence in their own peculiar ways. A purely philosophical work aims at capturing the essential structures of human life, and a purely fictional work discloses individual lives and alternative perspectives “in their complete, singular, and temporal truth” (Beauvoir [1946] 1948, 119). However, the greatest works in the traditions of philosophy and literature serve both ends: they succeed in grasping “the essence at the heart of existence.”

Moreover, the philosopher who pursues essences depends on the work of the novelist. Philosophical theorists need fiction to widen their view of what can be experienced and how. The theorist begins his/her reflections by using the results of his/her own imagination, but in the attempt to discover unfamiliar forms of experience, she soon runs to the limits of his/her own capacities. Beauvoir argues that personal

S. Heinämaa (✉)
University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

memories, dreams, and observations are weak and limited resources when compared to the power of literature. It is only written fiction that opens to us fields of experience that overcome what we can see and remember (Beauvoir [1946] 1948: 107–9; 1955: 195). In this way, Kafka's novels and Lewis Carroll's storybooks as well as the Marquis de Sade's pornography all serve philosophical ends (Beauvoir [1946] 1948: 115, 123; 1955, 64). Novels and other fictional works help us to overcome the limits of actual experience, memories, perceptions, and dreams.

Beauvoir also argues that the work of the novelist is itself an experimental enterprise. The writer does not know or determine in advance what will happen in the novel. The story is a result of experimentation with language, reasoning, and imagination. The novelist sets up the stage and outlines the characters, but rather than inventing their lives, the writer lives with them, discusses with them, takes sides, and runs risks. Thus as the work proceeds, the novelist sees new truths appear and new questions unfold (Beauvoir [1946] 1948: 112–3).

The main difference between the writer and the theorizing philosopher is in relation to language. The theorist forms abstract concepts by defining and limiting the meanings of ordinary language and thus aims at capturing the essential structures of all experience. The novelist, on the other hand, accepts ordinary language expressions in their full richness and ambiguity and uses all their resources to communicate the complexity of particular lives, as well as their mutual separation and dependence. The aim is not to idealize any particular life or experience, but to communicate the unavoidable singularity of life itself.

Literature and philosophy also relate to the essential forms of experience differently. Whereas the theorizing philosopher uses fiction to train him/herself to intuit the essential structural features of experience, the novelist uses fiction, reality, and language to present lives as singular wholes, as “singular universals,” to use Beauvoir's existential terminology (Beauvoir 1972: 163, cf. Sartre, 1947). This does not mean that the novel merely describes an internal reality or a closed world of a solipsistic subject. On the contrary, the world and others are implied in any individual life, however solitary, private, or self-centered it may be. Even the life of Gregor Samsa, the main character of Kafka's *Die Verwandlung* (1915), is a life with others—a life in their disdain and rejection.

In “Le roman et la métaphysique” (1945), Merleau-Ponty argues that Beauvoir's *L'invitée* is a paradigmatic example of the metaphysical novel: it reaches the fundamental structures of intersubjectivity by bringing together the lives of three individuals, Françoise, Pierre, and Xavière. The book is not just a story of a triangle or of two rivals; it is composed of three incompatible but simultaneous couples, Françoise and Pierre, Françoise and Xavière, and Pierre and Xavière. Moreover, each couple is presented from two separate perspectives. The experiences of love, jealousy, and deception are not framed for any psychological ends, but in the interest of understanding the dependence that we all have upon other persons. Merleau-Ponty argues that Beauvoir's novel discloses the tension between the couple having a shared universe and full intersubjectivity having the world as its environment. Beauvoir's work shows that the problem of the other is merely a particular case of the problem of others—in the plural (Merleau-Ponty, 1964: 113).

In Beauvoir's account, the intersubjective relation is always also a relation between sexed bodies—men and women. In *Le deuxième sexe* (1949a), she develops an existential-phenomenological analysis of the relation and hierarchy between the sexes. The main argument is that philosophy and literature—as well as science and religion—neglect women's experiences, and thus offer falsely universal and falsely objective accounts of the human condition. The task of a feminist thinker is then to attend to women's expressions and experiences.

For Beauvoir, women's literature is largely underdeveloped. There is no alternative literary or scholarly tradition of women (Beauvoir, 1949b: 241). This view was later challenged by Beauvoir's followers in America and on the Continent. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, for example, traced out a “female literary tradition” in their extensive work, *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (1979). On the Continent, Beauvoir's reflections on sexual difference and literature were developed further by Luce Irigaray (1930–), Hélène Cixous (1937–), and Julia Kristeva (1941–). In contrast with the Americans, the French feminists connected the Beauvoirian heritage to HEIDEGGER's idea of destruction, and argued that the task is not so much to discover or establish a feminine tradition, but rather to destroy or deconstruct the concepts as they are handed down to us by the androcentric tradition. Thus, feminist scholars should

study genealogies of women writers rather than try to establish an alternative tradition. In this vein, French feminists sought a way of writing, *l'écriture féminine* (feminine writing), that was based on the rhythmic and stylistic forms of the feminine body and that challenged the androcentric dogma and the forms of traditional philosophy.

The early texts of Cixous, Irigaray, and Kristeva function as instances of feminine writing, but also reflect on the nature and genesis of this stylistic form. The best known of these texts are Irigaray's "Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un" and "Quand nos lèvres se parlent" (1977). Cixous' well-known essay, "Le rire de la méduse" (1975), was originally written for a special issue of the journal *L'arc* dedicated to Beauvoir. Cixous starts her reflections on feminine writing by stating: "Woman must write herself: must write about women and bring women to writing, from which they have been driven away as violently as from their bodies—for the same reasons, by the same law, with the same fatal goal. Woman must put herself into the text—as into the world and into history—by her own movement" (Cixous, 1975: 39).

Bibliography

- Les écrits de Simone de Beauvoir: La vie—L'écriture. Avec en appendice textes inédits ou retrouvés.* Ed. Claude Francis and Fernande Gontier. Paris: Gallimard, 1979.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *L'invitée*. Paris: Gallimard, 1943; *She Came to Stay*. Trans. Yvonne Moyse and Roger Senhouse. London: Flamingo, 1984.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Pyrrhus et Cinéas*. Paris: Gallimard, 1944; "Pyrrhus and Cineas." Trans. Marybeth Timmermann. In Beauvoir's *Philosophical Writings*. Ed. Margaret A. Simons with Marybeth Timmermann and Mary Beth Mader. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004, 89–149.
- Beauvoir, Simone. "Littérature et métaphysique." In *Les Temps Modernes* 1, 1946, 1153–63; rpt. in her *Existentialisme et la sagesse des Nations*. Paris: Nagel, 1948; "Literature and metaphysics." Trans. Veronique Zaytzeff. In Beauvoir's *Philosophical Writings*. Ed. Margaret A. Simons with Marybeth Timmermann and Mary Beth Mader. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004, 269–77.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947; *The Ethics of Ambiguity*. Trans. Bernard Frechtman. New York: Carol Publishing Group Editions, 1994.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Le deuxième sexe I: Les faits et les mythes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1949a; *The Second Sex*. [shortened version]. Ed. and trans. H. M. Parshley. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1953; rpt. 1987.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Le deuxième sexe II: L'expérience vécue*. Paris: Gallimard, 1949b; *The Second Sex*. [shortened version]. Ed. and trans. H. M. Parshley. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1953; rpt. 1987.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Les mandarins*. Paris: Gallimard, 1954; *The Mandarins*. Trans. Leonard M. Friedman. London: Flamingo, 1984.
- Beauvoir, Simone. "Faut-il brûler Sade?" In *Les Temps Modernes* 74, 75, 1955, 1002–33, 1197–230; in her *Privilèges*. Paris: Gallimard, 1955, "Must we burn Sade?" In *The Marquis de Sade: The 120 Days of Sodom and Other Writings*. Trans. Annette Michaelson. London: Arrow Books, 1990.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Mémoires d'une jeune fille rangée* [1958]. 2nd ed. Paris: Gallimard, 1997; *Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter*. Trans. James Kirkup, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981.
- Beauvoir, Simone. "Que peut la littérature?" In *Le Monde* 249, 1965, 73–92.
- Beauvoir, Simone. "Mon expérience d'écrivain (September 1966)." In *Les écrits de Simone de Beauvoir*. Eds. Claude Francis and Fernande Gontier. Paris: Gallimard, 1979, 438–57.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Tout compte fait*. Paris: Gallimard, 1972; *All Said and Done*. Trans. Patrick O'Brian. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Philosophical Writings*. Ed. Margaret A. Simons, Marybeth Timmermann and Mary Beth Mader. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Beauvoir, Simone. "Beauvoir interview (1985)." In Margaret Simons, *Beauvoir and The Second Sex: Feminism, Race, and the Origins of Existentialism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999, 93–100.
- Bergoffen, Debra B. "Out from under: Beauvoir's philosophy of the erotic." In *Feminist Interpretations of Simone de Beauvoir*. Ed. Margaret Simons. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, 179–92.
- Bergoffen, Debra B. *The Philosophy of Simone de Beauvoir: Gendered Phenomenologies, Erotic Generosities*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Björk, Ulrika. *Poetics of Subjectivity: The Meaning and Function of Literature in Simone de Beauvoir's Philosophy of Existence*. Finland: University of Helsinki, 2008.
- Cixous, Hélène. "Le rire de la méduse." In *L'arc* [special issue on "Simone de Beauvoir et la lutte des femmes"] 61, 1975, 39–54; "The Laugh of the Medusa." *Signs*. Trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen. rpt. in *New French Feminism: An Anthology*. Ed. Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron. New York: Schocken Books, 1980, 245–64.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan, Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Heinämaa, Sara. *Toward a Phenomenology of Sexual Difference: Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Beauvoir*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.
- Heinämaa, Sara. Cixous, Kristeva and Le Dœuff – Three "French Feminists." In *History of Continental Philosophy, Volume 6*. Ed. Alan Schrif. Acumen.
- Holveck, Eleanore. "Can a woman be a philosopher? Reflections of a Beauvoirian Housemaid." In *Feminist Interpretations of*

- Simone de Beauvoir*. Ed. Margaret Simons. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003, 67–78.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un*. Paris: Gallimard, 1977; *This Sex Which is Not One*. Trans. Catherine Porter with Carolyn Burke. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Klaw, Barbara. "Sexuality in Beauvoir's *Les mandarins*." In *Feminist Interpretations of Simone de Beauvoir*. Ed. Margaret Simons. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, 193–221.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. "Le roman et la métaphysique" [1945]. In his *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Nagel, 1948, 34–52; "Metaphysics and the Novel." In his *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Patricia Allen Dreyfus. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 26–40; rpt. in *Critical Essays on Simone de Beauvoir*. Ed. Elaine Marks. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1987, 31–44.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Linguis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1975.
- Pilardi, Jo-Ann. "Female eroticism in the works of Simone de Beauvoir." In *The Thinking Muse: Feminism and Modern French Thinking*. Ed. Jeffner Allen and Iris Marion Young. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989, 18–34.
- Pilardi, Jo-Ann. *Simone de Beauvoir: Writing the Self: Philosophy Becomes Autobiography*. Westpoint, CT: Praeger, 1999.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. "L'universel singulier." In his *Situations philosophiques*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947; "Kierkegaard: The singular universal." In *Existentialism and Marxism: Sartre on Philosophy, Politics, Psychology and the Arts*. Trans. John Matthews. London: New Left, 1974.
- Sirridge, Mary. "Philosophy in Beauvoir's Fiction." In *The Cambridge Companion to Simone de Beauvoir*. Ed. Claudia Card. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 129–48.

Oskar Becker

Markus Ophälders

Oskar Becker (1889–1964). It is not necessary that the foundation of all being be a unique origin; it could be constituted by an antagonistic duality. These are the terms in which Otto Pöggeler has recently characterized the problematic that lies at the base of Oskar Becker's reflections on aesthetics (Pöggeler, 1996: 29; cf. Sepp, 1998). This conception, however, which Becker anchors mainly in Schelling's philosophy of nature, does not simply put phenomenology aside, but rather pushes it to its extreme consequences. Interesting in this approach is not simply the fact that the *rhizōmata panton*, which in "Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft" (1911) EDMUND HUSSERL indicated as the essential object of philosophical research, might constitute in reality a duality. Interesting above all is the attribute "antagonistic," because it puts a different accent on the problematic of foundation, which became more and more important for phenomenology in the 1920s. In this connection, Pöggeler focuses on the point where Husserl, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, and Becker meet; it is the same point, however, from which the two favorites will subsequently leave their master.

Oskar Becker proceeds from the hypothesis that *Sein* (being) and *Wesen* (essence) are opposed to one another as ultimate principles defined as "*Da-sein*" and "*Da-wesen*" (Becker, 1994: 39). He explains, furthermore, that the historical, self-conscious, and self-reflective *Da-sein* is opposed either to the lowest stratum of natural instincts (defined as subhistorical) or the highest stratum of the absolute spirit (defined as suprahistorical). The third stratum in between those

extremes does not constitute mediation (ibid.: 41). On the contrary, in opposition to *Da-sein*, the suprahistorical spirit and the subhistorical nature find themselves in a reciprocal relation of paradoxical nearness. Exactly this paradox finds its best expression in the work of art. As a momentary unity intimately split within itself the artwork stretches like a bridge over the abyss that separates *Da-sein* and *Da-wesen*, history and nature. The two extremes do not lie one beneath the other, but interpenetrate (Ibid.: 50).

It is exactly the movement of their meeting each other and its representation in the work of art that constitutes for Becker the field of aesthetic phenomena. In the arts, history should be considered as nature and nature as history (cf. Adorno, 1973: 354f.). The paradoxical, reciprocal penetration of nature and history in art would turn once again on itself and create, as Becker says, a "system of ontological-'hyperontological' tensions" (1994: 20). If the work of art is the highest expression not only of the ontological difference, but also of what Becker defines as the "parantological indifference," it seems a highly paradoxical phenomenon: split in itself, instantaneous, precarious (*vergänglich*), and fragile.

To characterize this central aspect of the artistic phenomenon, Becker draws not only on Immanuel Kant, but mainly on F. W. J. Schelling's philosophy of nature and Karl W. F. Solger's theory of irony. In the first respect, he refers to the statements that emphasize the intimate contradictoriness and divided character of the artwork. For Schelling, the artwork represents the identity of conscious and unconscious activity and is basically an unconscious infinity, a synthesis of nature and freedom (Schelling, 1985: 687). Thus infinity is represented in a finite way (ibid.: 688). But Schelling does not resolve the problem that he so

M. Ophälders (✉)
Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

lucidly formulates and Becker therefore affirms that it is only a part of the solution to the problem of the aesthetic phenomenon, although an essential part (1994: 19f.). What he misses in Schelling is the existential analytic and the point of view of “that being [*Seiendes*], in which the possibility of a comprehension of being [*Seinsverständnis*] essentially lies”; an “analysis of aesthetic existence [*Dasein*]” (1994: 20) is needed, with an analysis of its temporality to open up a presence in which infinity receives a natural and finite body.

“The historical man dies as a historical one in every moment of his existence” (ibid.: 23), and humans must always project themselves anew into the dark future; only the “‘instant’ indicates the unity of the ‘transports’ [*Entrückungen*] in the ‘thrown projection’ of a ‘future that has already been’ [*geworfenen Entwurf der ‘gewesen(d)en Zukunft’*]. In this instant the creative act of the spirit happens” (ibid.: 25). In the person of the artist, thrownness (*Geworfenheit*) which means historical reality, and the project, which opens up the sphere of possibility, reach a limit (*Grenze*) in the intervention of natural destiny. This means that historical being, natural being, and the spirit meet each other in the creative instant. Thus Becker alludes to Kant and consequently redefines genius: the genius knows how to proceed in the creation of an artwork, but if nature, which is equally required for the success (*Gelingen*) of the work of art, does not intervene, this will never be sufficient. The temporal structure of the artwork is thus that of the instant. We are concerned with a phenomenon in the true sense of the word: it appears in a mere instant and right afterwards is gone irrevocably irretrievably. The “parontological indifference” realizes itself in this fugacious appearance, which means a phenomenon in which “essence is similar to being [*Wesen gleicht Wesendem*]” (ibid.: 39).

The aesthetic experience is only momentary: either it is or it has always just been. It is in this sense that Becker refers to the young György Lukács’s idea of the Heraclitean structure of aesthetics: every artistic figuration represents a monad that knows nothing about other monads, which is a positive peculiarity rather than a metaphysical limit established from outside (Lukács, 1917–1918: 38). Described in more detail, the temporality of aesthetic existence is “‘eternal presence,’ which exists only for itself: it is perfect and self-sufficient. The characteristic of this ‘eternal presence’ is its imperturbability, its not being menaced

by other ‘figures of time.’ The ‘eternal presence’ is *without relation* to the future and the past: it does not have any horizons, it is ‘cosmically’ closed up in itself. It is not standing still, but is ‘circulating’” (Becker, 1994: 29). At the end of this analysis of aesthetic *Da-sein*, all these characteristics combine in the paraexistential of *Getragenheit* (being carried and sustained). Nevertheless, *Getragenheit* does not exhaust the *Da-sein* of the artist, who remains within historicity and self-consciousness. This duality of the perfect reciprocal penetration of the natural and the historical-spiritual now makes it necessary to introduce another concept: irony, which Becker follows Solger in conceiving.

Becker reflects on the temporality of irony, the temporality of that “view that is suspended above everything and destroys everything” (Solger, 1971: 387), which is alert, sober, and reflective, but at the same time suspended and dreaming. “The paradox is that this futile and transitory ‘*Jetzt*’ [Now] shall be eternal,” and “the moment of artistic irony suspended in this way has cosmic, eternal presence” (Becker, 1994: 31). But we have to ask ourselves if the analysis of the aesthetic *Da-sein* and its results synthesized in the concepts of *Getragenheit* and irony have really maintained the breadth of the aesthetic problematic exposed in the beginning with the Heraclitean structure, the relation between nature and history, and caducity.

Becker already uses one of Solger’s fundamental concepts—the caducity or fragility (*Hinfälligkeit*) of beauty—in the title of an essay originally published in 1929 (“Von der Hinfälligkeit des Schönen und der Abentenerlichkeit des Kunstlers”). If there is anything true, it has to find itself in what is most inferior, fugacious, futile, and transitory, but on the other hand, even the sublime height, the idea itself has to show itself, in all its caducity and voidness (Solger, 1980: 216). If the body of the idea is really what a body is, it is not only mortal, but is mortality itself, because the idea is everything it is entirely and completely (Solger, 1971: 366). Insofar as the idea becomes an appearance and gains a living body (*Leib*) in the form of an artwork, nothing remains outside: the suprahistorical becomes entirely reality in the complete reciprocal penetration with the subhistorical. The result of this is the system of ontological–“hyperontological” tensions, in which, as mentioned, *Wesen gleicht Wesendem*.

This “parontological indifference” is, however, extremely thrilled and agitated in itself, so that it

vanishes into nothingness in the same instant in which it becomes an appearance: the unity of idea and appearance in the appearance—as Solger puts it—means implosion of the transcendent and the immanent in the immanent. This instant of extreme caducity, where an entire world always vanishes anew into nothingness, is defined by Solger as the ironic moment, the most fruitful and creative, yet the most terrible and tragic moment of all human existence. And it is exactly the concept of caducity that allows him to conceive a perfect reciprocal penetration of the historical and the natural, i.e., to think both historical being as nature and natural being as history: in the moment of the highest tension, the one turns into the other, and thus art destroys itself in the same moment it comes into being (Solger, 1971: 366).

The aesthetic experience is thus constituted by a fragile constellation of tensions between the natural and the historical-spiritual. Because of the antagonistic duality of the foundation, it can take place only in the temporal dimension of instant punctuality. If we radicalize the concept of caducity down to its ultimate consequences, it involves both *Da-sein* and *Da-wesen*. And in the ironic instant the reciprocal penetration becomes total, which does not allow us to reach a dimension of *Getragenheit* suspended above everything—at least not for Solger, who has defined exactly this kind of irony as a cruel mockery, which has nothing to do with tragic irony (Solger, 1973: 514; cf. Walser, 1996). Through the analysis of the temporality of the aesthetic *Da-sein*, Becker recovers at the end an “ontological difference” of a second degree out of the “parontological indifference,” and the *rhizōmata panton* remain separated (*chorís*) from the phenomenon.

The Heraclitean structure of the aesthetic and of any possible experience of it does not tolerate metaphysical limits beyond the phenomenon itself. In the words of Schelling, if beauty is the infinite represented in a finite way, this has to be perceivable concretely in the phenomenon itself and is the genesis of romantic irony, which contains important elements for a similar approach. Like Novalis and Friedrich Schlegel, Solger proceeds from Fichte’s concept of reflection, because it recovers the immediacy of the object. Since this is only possible in the paradoxical form of reflection on reflection, reflection is virtually infinite. For the romantics, however, this infinite is not linear, but forms an infinity of connections and complexities within the form

itself. Schlegel has defined this reflexive infinity with the term “*cyklische Methode*” (Schlegel, 1988: 180; cf. Strohshneider-Kohrs, 1977: 41f.), and for Solger, the complexity of reflection is realized within the work of art in the form of an infinite constellation of allegorical references (cf. Benjamin, 1980: 26).

The incessant allegorical references continue, however, up to the point where they create a totality. This is the moment of irony; here the infinite represents itself in a finite way: the allegorical constellation completes itself in its being in this and no other way, and this is the way it reaches its interior limit. Irony is constituted by the extreme passage of the infinite through the finite and of the finite through the infinite; for an instant, this passage annihilates the infinite reflection and recovers the immediacy of the particular phenomenon. The spiritual becomes completely natural, immediately aesthetic, and the natural becomes perfectly spiritual in a constellation that gives nature its missing words and arrests the incessant development (*Werden*) of the spirit. However, irony is tragic, because in the perfect relation between the natural and the spiritual an entire world is annihilated. Art as *promesse de bonheur* realizes itself through death; only such extreme mediation can recover the immediate, and—just as for the Hölderlinian Empedocles—life ignites into flame at the moment of death. The temporality of aesthetic *Da-sein* cannot remain self-sufficient and calm, circulating within itself eternally, but exists only for an instant; immediately afterward it explodes again, and the cosmic time bursts into an irrelative temporality of monads without windows. The aesthetic phenomena constitute a “continuous revelation” (Solger), which disseminates its traces into the real world. Yet in a truly Heraclitean manner it neither signifies nor hides, it just intimates. It is for this reason that only irony can be fundamental, because “*nemo contra deum nisi deus ipse*.”

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Die Idee der Naturgeschichte. Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 1. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973.
- Becker, Oskar. *Von der Abenteuerlichkeit des Künstlers und der vorsichtigen Verwegenheit des Philosophen*. Ed. H. Stünke. Berlin: Alexander Verlag, 1994.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Der Begriff der Kunstkritik in der deutschen Romantik. Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 1/1. Ed. Rolf

- Tiedemann and Herman Schweppenhäuser. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1980.
- Lukács, György. "Die Subjekt-Objekt-Beziehung in der Ästhetik." In *Logos* 7, 1917–1918; rpt. in his *Frühe Schriften zur Ästhetik (1912–1918)*. Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1971, –.
- Pöggeler, Otto. "Eine Epoche gewaltigen Werdens." In *Die Freiburger Phänomenologie*. Ed. Ernst W. Orth. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1996.
- Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph *System des transzendentalen Idealismus* [1800]. *Ausgewählte Schriften*. Vol. 1. Ed. M. Frank. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. *Kritische Schriften und Fragmente (1794–1818)*. Vol. 5. Ed. Ernst Behler and Hans Eichner. Zürich: Schöningh, 1988.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. "The Aesthetics of Oskar Becker." In *Axiomathes* 1–2, 1998, 105–16.
- Solger, Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand *Erwin. Vier Gespräche über das Schöne und die Kunst*. Ed. Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971.
- Solger, K.W.F. *Nachgelassene Schriften und Briefwechsel*. Ed. Ludwig Tieck and Friedrich von Raumer. Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1973.
- Solger, K.W.F. *Vorlesungen über Ästhetik*. Ed. Karl W. L. Heyse. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.
- Strohschneider-Kohrs, Ingrid. *Die romantische Ironie in Theorie und Gestaltung*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1977.
- Walser, Martin. *Ironie und Selbstbewußtsein*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996.

Chinese Aesthetics

CHEN Zhiyuan

In the strict and original sense, phenomenology and aesthetics are not inherent parts of traditional Chinese thought. Hence this entry surveys their introduction and dissemination in China (including the development of professional studies and expanded applications), as well as the emergence of comparative studies and cultural interaction between these areas and Chinese thought.

The first comprehensive and accurate introduction to EDMUND HUSSERL's phenomenology in China appeared in 1929. But the political disturbance of several decades thereafter shattered any hope of continuing translation and research. The only exception occurred in 1965 in Hong Kong when XU Fuguan published his famous book *The Spirit of Chinese Art*, where he contended that CHUANG-TZU's heart in the "fasting of the heart" (Xin Zhai) was analogous to Husserl's pure consciousness after the epochēs and was therefore the "subject of the spirit of art." This began phenomenological aesthetics in China. In 1980, LI Youzheng's introduction to ROMAN INGARDEN revived research in this area. Through the efforts of many scholars, including NI Liangkang and SUN Zhouxing, both leading researchers and reliable translators, some basic writings of Husserl, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY, Roman Ingarden and MIKEL DUFRENNE have been translated since then. In only 20 years, phenomenology has replaced classic German philosophy and gaining a prestigious status and invoking much enthusiasm and high expectations among literary theorists,

many of whom have become its main upholders and practitioners.

Chinese scholars give different answers to the question: "what is phenomenological aesthetics?" For most, it means, first, the eradication of the subject-object dichotomy in aesthetic epistemology or ontology; second, the method of aesthetic intuition in contrast to the pursuit of essences in metaphysics; and finally, the use of reduction in different ways. As with the ambiguity of the concept of phenomenology itself the diversity of views among Chinese scholars is the outcome of different phenomenological resources or distinctive perspectives.

XUE Hua pioneered the investigation of Husserl's aesthetics in his book *Hegel and the Puzzle of Art* (1986), which relies on *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung* (1980). He attempts to solve the problem of the origin of art and beauty by basing aesthetic judgment on imagination. ZHANG Zailing, a scholar in comparative philosophy, holds that the later Husserl's work on intersubjectivity makes interaction between Western and Chinese aesthetics possible because the latter was already accustomed to viewing beauty as quasi-intersubjective. ZHU Liyuan, an influential theorist in literary and art circles who favors the ideas of the lifeworld and intersubjectivity, has also played an important role. However, the transcendence of the subject in Husserl's theory was purposefully overlooked not only in ZHANG Zailin's interpretation, but also in ZHU Liyuan's reading. The translation of *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins* (1966) into Chinese in 2000 gave a new impetus to the further development of the already popular phenomenology of music. At the same time NI Liangkang's "The phenomenology of image consciousness" (2001), which was a new investigation

CHEN Z. (✉)

Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China; Chinese Academy of Social Science, Beijing, China

into *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung*, attracted such widespread attention that some authors have come to regard the analysis of image-consciousness as one of Husserl's distinctive achievements in the phenomenology of art.

When Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* (1927), *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (1959), and *Poetry, Language, Thought* (1971) were translated into Chinese, he began to enjoy a high reputation in China. But in phenomenologically based studies in aesthetics which were in fact carried out mainly in literary and artistic circles, he was unfairly neglected, despite the success of his works. His name was rarely mentioned, and even omitted in the official narrative history of phenomenological aesthetics. In contrast, Heidegger's thoughts have had a significant impact in studies that were not carried out under the name of phenomenological aesthetics. ZHANG Shiyong, an eminent scholar of German philosophy, has argued that Heidegger's concept of being-in-the-world opens a road to understanding "the unity of heaven and human" in traditional poetry from the land of poetry. Another example is YE Xiushan's famous work *Thought, History, and Poetry: An Investigation of Phenomenology and Existentialism* (1998). This book begins with an investigation into the characteristics of phenomenology and ends with a Heideggerian aesthetic conclusion.

The relationship between phenomenological aesthetics and the aesthetics of "Chan" also gives rise to some discussions. When the realm of Chan is interpreted as a horizon of meaning, interpreters often resort to Husserl's conception of intentionality. When it is interpreted as an original horizon of experience before the split between subject and object, Heidegger's theory of being-in-the-world is often adduced as the ground of it. It is said that the realm of Chan is an unutterable realm of poetry, so Heidegger's thinking about art and poetry can once again afford access to the cultural dialogue between East and West. Doubts often arise in this context concerning Husserl's view that the value judgments are founded on objective judgments. The sudden enlightenment of Chan is seen either as Husserl's eidetic intuition, which immediately changes the Buddha nature into the human essence, or as a return to hermeneutical understanding as the fundamental mode of being-in-the-world, which often leads to the simple conclusion that Heidegger's Being is to be equated with the Buddha nature. When it comes to the free Buddhist mind, some people insist on the

comparative study between this mind and the transcendental subject of Husserl, while others are inclined to integrate it with Heidegger's concept of existence. Both are fashionable topics in China.

The priority of traditional Chinese poetry over sculpture, theater, and music, which were previously seen only as the skill of people of lower social status, lay in the fact that composing poems was not only the mark of a really cultured person, but the way to build one's spiritual home. Drawing inspiration from Heidegger, ZHANG Shiyong analyzes the poems of TAO Yuanming (365–421), the father of Chinese pastoral literature, and points out that TAO's desire for authenticity and his hopes for transcending experiences of failure was based upon his understanding of death. YE Weilian also holds that the highest level of Chinese landscape poetry is (or Tao, as in Taoism, allowing the landscape full of the spirit of Dao "to show itself"—namely, *aletheia* or *physis* in Heidegger's sense. And when he calls the landscape "noema," in spite of the parallelism between *noesis* and *noema*, he distinguishes the latter from the former, which for him is merely a lower cognitive function of understanding. The most successful phenomenological analysis of Chinese landscape poetry has been carried out by WANG Jianyuan. In his view, landscape poetry expresses spatial experiences in situations, and the spatial processes of those experiences are manifestations of temporalization. Since synthesis of spatial perception is in fact synthesis of time-consciousness, the universal characteristic of Chinese landscape poetry is to temporalize spatiality, and this is the source of its life.

The interpretation and application of Roman Ingarden's theory has occupied the core position in phenomenological aesthetics in China. In 1988, an essay by YU Yunyang entitled "Roman Ingarden's music philosophy of phenomenology: Introduction and commentary" caused such a sensation throughout the world of musical theorists that musical phenomenology soon became an influential school. Its influence can be seen everywhere, not only in the general theory of music, but also in comparative music study and in music education. Ingarden's thorough analysis of the structure and layers of the literary work also immediately captivated the theorists of literature. He was often regarded as the first theorist who afforded an outstanding analysis of the internal structure of the literary work. Chinese theorists could learn much more about

how phenomenological theories can be directly applied to practices from him than from anyone else. For example, in JIANG Yongji's reflections on reading theory, Ingarden's thought plays a structurally instructive role, though he also refers to Husserl and Heidegger. WANG Yuechuan has constructed a new system in his *Art Ontology* (2005), where we can find the influence of Ingarden's theses as well. And this is also the case in ZHU Liyuan's classification of the layers of the literary work.

In China, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE was always labeled as an existentialist aesthetician, but not a phenomenological one. The consequence of such an inflexible distinction was the disappearance of his influential phenomenological aesthetics. Nobody has provided a serious analysis of Sartre's theory of imagination, which was in fact the basis of his theory of art. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, a phenomenologist deserving more attention in aesthetics, is typically always mentioned in conjunction with introductions to Mikel Dufrenne's thought. But aestheticians in China have raised their voices for theory reformation in aesthetics. The phenomenology of perception and of the body would have been a useful method to end the domination of speculative philosophy in so-called practical aesthetics in China. It is regrettable that few writers have thought highly of it.

Mikel Dufrenne's works were introduced into China almost at the same time as Ingarden's works. The Chinese editions of his *Esthétique et philosophie* (1967, 1976, 1981), *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique* (1953), and some other works have been published. Although his *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique* has often been acclaimed as the climax of modern phenomenological aesthetics, Dufrenne's influence has primarily come from his critical theory. If it is an exaggeration to say that interest coming from the history of philosophy but not from philosophy itself dominates contemporary phenomenological aesthetics in China, it is also unfair to assert that the problem may lie in the latent Western horizon in Dufrenne's analysis of an occidental aesthetic experience that is alien to the Chinese lifeworld.

The aesthetics of MORITZ GEIGER has been regarded only as an early and immature phase in the development of phenomenological aesthetics. His limited influence began around 2000, when his book *Die Bedeutung der Kunst. Zugänge zu einer materialen Wertästhetik* (1986) was translated into Chinese. More

interest has been focused on the Geneva school, especially on George Poulet's criticism of consciousness, but still without noticeable achievements.

The publication of a series of doctoral dissertations since 2003 has marked a new stage of development in Chinese phenomenological aesthetics. ZHANG Xushu's *Investigations of the Phenomenological Aesthetics of Ingarden* (2003) is a thorough investigation of the internal structure of Ingarden's theory. A new book about the phenomenology of music has been written by HAN Zhong'en; in her *Metaphysical Manifestation of the Meaning of Music and a Study on the Possibility of Intentional Being* (2004), where she argued that the meaning of music was an intentional Being. An abundance of material is characteristic of LIU Shuguang's *Heidegger and Aesthetics* (2004), which discusses this subject in more detail than ever. The most macroscopic and comprehensive thinking has been offered by TANG Yonghua in *The Limit of Western Phenomenological Aesthetics* (2005). WANG Ziming's *Phenomenology and Reflections on Aesthetics* (2005) is an effort to unearth the subliminal aesthetic meaning of Husserl's phenomenology, his many reflections drawing heavily on the conclusions of Dufrenne and the Geneva school.

The Society for Phenomenology in China and the Chinese Academy of Arts held an international conference on phenomenology and art in 2002. Through dialogue with foreign artists and domestic phenomenologists, the artists and painters who attended became aware of the value of phenomenology for the ideas guiding their artistic and literary creations. Since then, the phenomenology of painting has been a widely received theoretical term in the world of art. It seems that the phenomenology of photography also benefited from this conference. A visiting photographer has become its major advocate and supporter. The appearance of the phenomenology of film was surprising, but its rapid achievements have been even more surprising. This is attested by the book *Film Phenomenology* of ZHOU Yueliang and HAN Junwei. The success of this work lies in the phenomenological analysis of the basic elements of film, especially in the analysis of artistic symbols.

Phenomenological aesthetics, as well as phenomenology, is a newly born discipline in China. There is still a long way to go for its maturity. But after a rocky start, both the scope and the depth of phenomenological aesthetics have been greatly expanded.

Bibliography

- CHEN Houcheng and WANG Lin, eds. *Modern Western Critical Theory in China*. Tianjin: Baihua Literature and Art, 2000.
- HAN Zhong'en. *Metaphysical Manifestation of the Meaning of Music and a Study on the Possibility of Intentional Being*. Shanghai: Shanghai Conservatory of Music, 2004.
- JIANG Yongji. *The Reading Theory of Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University, 2001.
- LI Youzheng. *Roman Ingarden's Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Shanghai: Shanghai Literature and Art, 1980.
- LIU Shuguang. *Heidegger and Aesthetics*. Shanghai: Sanlian Publishing House, 2004.
- NI Liangkang "The Phenomenology of Image Consciousness." In *Journal of Nanjing University* 1, 2001, 32–44.
- TANG Yonghua. *The Limit of Western Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Ha'erbing: Heilongjiang Renmin, 2005.
- WANG Jianyuan (Wong Kin Yuen). "Temporalization of Spatial Experience in Classical Chinese Landscape Poetry." In *Essays in Commemoration of the 30th Anniversary of the United College*. Ed. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1989, 99–114.
- WANG Luxiang, ed. *Modern Western Aesthetics in the Eyes of Western Scholars*. Beijing: Peking University, 1987.
- WANG Yuechuan. *Art Ontology*. Beijing: Chinese Social Sciences, 2005.
- WANG Ziming. *Phenomenology and Reflections on Aesthetics*. Jinan: Qilu Publishing House, 2005.
- XU Fuguan. *The Spirit of Chinese Art*. Shanghai: Huadong Normal University, 2001.
- XUE Hua. *Hegel and the Puzzle of Art*. Beijing: Chinese Social Sciences, 1986.
- YE Weilian. *The Works of Ye Weilian*. Vol. 2. Hefei: Anhui Education, 2004.
- YE Xiushan. *Thought, History, and Poetry: An Investigation of Phenomenology and Existentialism*. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1989.
- YI Ren. "A Glimpse of Phenomenology Studies of Overseas Chinese Scholars." In *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art* 1, 1989, 36–42.
- YU Yunyang. "Roman Ingarden's Music Philosophy of Phenomenology: Introduction and Commentary." In *Journal of the Central Conservatory* 1, 1988, 3–14.
- ZHANG Shiying. *Between Heaven and Man: Perplexities and Alternatives of Chinese and Western Philosophy*. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995.
- ZHANG Xushu. *Investigations of the Phenomenological Aesthetics of Ingarden*. Hefei: Huangshan Publishing House, 2003.
- ZHANG Yunpeng and HU Yishan. *Phenomenological Method and Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang University, 2007.
- ZHANG Zailing. *A Comparative Study of Chinese and Western Philosophy*. Xi'an: Northwest University, 1997.
- ZHOU Yueliang and Han Junwei. *Film Phenomenology*. Beijing: Beijing Broadcasting Institute, 2003.
- ZHU Liyuan. "Transcending the Thinking Method of Dualism: A Thought About the Breakthrough Way of Literature Theory and Aesthetics in the New Century." In *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art* 2, 2002, 2–9.

Waldemar Conrad (1878–1915)

Daniela Angelucci

Conrad's analysis in *Der ästhetische Gegenstand* (1908–9) is the first description of the aesthetic object according to the method elaborated in the *Logische Untersuchungen* of his teacher EDMUND HUSSERL. Against subjectivism, his intention was to develop the realistic aspect of phenomenology. Husserl's later transcendental-idealistic development was understood by his first disciples as a departure from the original tendency towards the "things themselves." Conrad's thought has been underappreciated because it was considered merely a mechanical application of Husserl's method. But the importance of this text lies not only in its pioneering perspective, but also in the clear methodological indications that guide his reflections. Aiming at the specification of the differences between the natural and the aesthetic object, the analysis also defines the latter as "*ideal*" which may be surprising for a realistic philosophical attitude. Plainly, his thought implies a very productive complexity.

Conrad's assumptions are the descriptive nature of aesthetics and the intention to understand the peculiar interaction between the work of art and the subject who enjoys it. However, in order to allow the descriptive method to be employed in the artistic sphere, it is necessary to consider the system of everyday life as well as the scientific causal laws that govern nature. Hence the accent is always put on the peculiar relation between subject and artistic object, based on the ontological attributes of the object. In order to understand the nature of this relation, a phenomenological analysis is necessary that uses the terminology and the elaboration of Husserl: the aesthetic evaluating act *means*,

intends the work of art, is directed to it, while in its turn the work guides the act.

Intentionality marks not only the act of evaluation, but also the modalities of behavior fundamental to judging the work of art, i.e., vision, understanding, and enjoyment. In the same way, for Conrad the reference to the object of intentional consciousness also characterizes the subjective side of the aesthetic production: the activity of the artist, which, in realizing his/her creation, imagines it "as an object" . . . , fixing it as identical while he transfers to reality its parts one after the other" (Conrad, 1908: 74). Once the intentionality of the aesthetic relation between artist, or enjoyer, and object is affirmed, he can clarify how this qualification—perceived with all the nuances attributed to it by Husserl—is the element allowing a "perfecting" of the descriptive method, i.e., the passage to phenomenology. Only in this way is it possible "to bring the object near." Only the gradual fulfillment of the intention allows the description of the artistic object's essence, which is the principal task of aesthetics. Conrad indicates the following steps to reach an adequate comprehension of the object.

In the first place, "it is necessary to approach the description without any presupposition" (ibid.: 75). Therefore, since the meaning of phenomenology is to avoid every transcendence and to grasp the immanence of phenomena, it is unacceptable to admit the existence of the world. In the second place "the objects that we have to describe in a phenomenological way cannot be 'things,' individual objects, *concreta* . . . , but only ideal objects, of which we can affirm essential qualities" (ibid.: 76). The intended objectivity (*gemeinter Gegenstand*) is not the singular realization, *hic et nunc*, but the essence of the object that is intuited in phenomenological seeing. In front of a natural thing the

D. Angelucci (✉)
Università di Roma Tre, Rome, Italy

question is “What is there?”—but in front of an ideal objectivity, the question is instead “What is present here at my perception . . . like this?” Finally, “it is necessary to limit oneself to one’s own observations” (ibid.: 76), leaving every communicative aspect out of consideration.

As material of investigation, Conrad took individual works of art, the human attitude toward them, and the similar attitudes toward objects of other kinds. However, it is evident that for artistic realizations intended as natural things, as well as psychic behavior in front of them, a reflection confined to probable judgment is sufficient. To go beyond materiality and execution does not mean to dissolve the work of art proper, but rather to address the idea that is realized in it, as well as its essential properties—i.e., everything that constitutes the object intended by the subject.

There are then three attitudes, different from our usual perception, that can be assumed in front of the work of art. The first represents the work of art as really existing and as provided with qualities that move and fascinate the spectator. This “psychomotor” object, which operates in time and space, is called by Conrad the *wirkende Kunstwerk*. According to the second attitude, the object represented in the work of art represents, in its turn, the ideal object. Finally, the third possible behavior is the one where what appears represents, immediately and with evidence, the intended ideal object. Only the latter interests an authentic phenomenological investigation.

The artistic genre belongs to the series of ideal aesthetic objects, e.g., there is not only a particular symphony, but also the specifically musical aesthetic object, “symphony,” and even the essence of art in general. To this series, which is called objective, there is added a psychic or subjective one that includes the correlative behavior of vision and evaluation. Nevertheless, here the inquiry is limited to the objective series, or rather Conrad wants “to study the essence of the musical object, of the pictorial one, etc., . . . in order to establish the essence of the ‘aesthetic object in general’ as the immediately higher genus” (ibid.: 80).

Hence the central part of the essay is dedicated to the particular artistic genres (music, poetry, painting, and sculpture) using the same methodological steps: after the preliminary consideration of a single sound, word, or sign comes a general analysis of a certain aesthetic object, and finally a more detailed analysis of

it. This detailed research allows recognition of a sort of stratification inside the work of art, so its results are composed from various elements. To the specification of these essentially inalienable elements there is added, necessarily, the question of the complexity and the richness of the aesthetic object. In fact, Conrad is then obliged to inquire into the limits of the variations in the aesthetic object’s perception—the limits allowing recognition of the same objective identity, beyond which there is a disintegration of its structure. There is a dimension, proper to the aesthetic sphere, subject to alteration, but not compromising the objective identity: the *Irrelevanzsphäre*.

Especially interested in the method, Conrad insists on the distinction between three modes of apprehension (*Auffassung*): the *naïve*, the natural (*natürliche*), and the natural scientific (*naturwissenschaftliche Geisteshaltung*). The first grasps the object and its emotional components in an immediate way, without the intervention of any kind of reflection. This kind of spiritual attitude has a constant tendency to change into the natural mode, which is a particular moment of a more general causal conception based on the separation between appearance (*Schein*) and reality, as well as between the effects produced by the object—considered here as a psychic phenomena—and the objective reality of the work of art. Finally, there is the perspective of the natural sciences. However, a material conception of the world consisting only of pragmatic and natural realities inevitably leads to a psychologistic aesthetics, one focusing on mental events that are not included in that material, limited vision of the world.

The identification of a different modality referring to the aesthetic object’s existence, which is irreducible to the merely natural reality and also to the status of a pure concept, legitimates an autonomous field of investigation. Following the above, Conrad reaches the definition of the aesthetic object in itself: its “an ideal one, for which it is essential to be realizable” (Conrad, 1909: 453). Its realization, its “concretization” in space and time—and consequently its “sensuous vividness,” which makes it different from an abstract geometrical object—does not mean that it is part *tout court* of the real world. On the other hand, the aspect of the work of art that can be defined as “material” is an inalienable structural aspect of it. Like the natural object, the aesthetic object is a whole composed of several properties, but unlike the natural objects

it is not offered to the totality of the senses (*allsinnig*): here only one aspect is intended. The majority of interpreters concentrate on this attribution of the characteristic of “ideality” to the work of art. Some of them think that it does not at all mean relegating it to the world of eternal ideas and pure thought. Using the words of MIKEL DUFRENNE (1953), “*idéal*” does not at all mean “*idéique*.” Gabriele Scaramuzza, (1972) also affirms that Conrad does not underestimate the sensuous value of the aesthetic fact, but does want to separate the object’s own unity from its numerous concretizations. On this question Elisa Oberti (1962) suggests that there is an unjustified metaphysical jump over the sensuous dimension, which is where Conrad wanted to start.

I think that an attempt to rebalance the question should be made. In the first place, and with reference to the concept of it proper to phenomenology, the object is in no case mere materiality. It should be recalled that according to Conrad, although the analysis of actual data cannot be set aside, to grasp the phenomenon in its authenticity means to understand its structure in its essence, and not to stop at particular artistic realizations. In other words, the object is not identified with the *res*. Second, in assuming the hard work of an essential definition, there is a difficulty that cannot be avoided—namely, that this type of reflection needs to maintain a balance between two aims that sometimes appear to be in conflict: the declared descriptive intention directed toward the *reality*, and the explicit will to grasp the object’s *essential* nucleus. In reaffirming both the importance of Conrad’s methodological indications and his brave attempt to define a double object as ambiguous as the artistic one, the presence of some elements able to agitate the water of phenomenological realism also needs to be recognized. In my opinion, these elements include not only the use of the term “ideal,” but above all the reference to the function of the subject.

Ultimately, Conrad himself feels the necessity to refer to the correlative and indispensable investigation into the subjective act. In taking into account that the object here is not intended simply as *res*, but as an intentional object, the position “to be in front of,” the subjective act, plays a decisive role. In order to present aesthetic value, a peculiar behavior of the subject is necessary—the subjective act does not influence, for example, the perception of the geometrical object in the same intensive way. On the other

hand, to make a problem of a firmly realistic position may, in some cases, appear naive, but this seems to constitute a richness, a vivifying outcome resulting from the meeting between speculative thought and art.

In 1915 Conrad’s posthumous essay on the aesthetic attitude of the subject was published, showing a radical change of course in his thought.

The effort to consider the aspect of enjoyment, which might have led to a phenomenological conception, is traditional and thus problematic and even dissonant. The results are reached not through a phenomenological conception, but through an evaluative one that does not consider the importance of the structural “invariants” of the work of art. The posthumous essay does not seem to add any new elements, precisely because it is developed in a completely different way.

Bibliography

- Angelucci, Daniela. *L'oggetto poetico: Conrad, Ingarden, Hartmann*. Macerata: Quodlibet, 2004.
- De Caro, Eugenio. *Note sulla fenomenologia dell'estetico*. Milan: ISU-Università Cattolica, 1996.
- Conrad, Waldemar. “Der ästhetische Gegenstand, Eine phänomenologische Studie.” In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3, 1908, 71–118, 469–511; and 4, 1909, 400–455.
- Conrad, Waldemar. “Die wissenschaftliche und die ästhetische Geisteshaltung und die Rolle der Fiktion und Illusion in derselben.” In *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*. 158, 1915, 129–167; 159, 1916, 1–61.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris: 1953; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Honecker, Martin. [Review of] Waldemar Conrad, “Der ästhetische Gegenstand.” In *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 20, 1911.
- Krenzlin, Nicolas. “Il modo d'essere dell'opera d'arte letteraria.” In *Annali dell'Istituto Antonio Banfi*. Ed. Roberto Poli and Gabriele Scaramuzza. Florence: Alinea, 1998.
- Matteucci, Giovanni. “La relazione tra espressione e significato come problema di una estetica fenomenologica.” In *Annali dell'Istituto Antonio Banfi*. Ed. Roberto Poli and Gabrielle Scaramuzza. Florence: Alinea, 1998.
- Mazzoni, Augusto. *La musica nell'estetica fenomenologica*. Milan: Mimesis, 2004.
- Moos, Peter von. *Die deutsche Ästhetik der Gegenwart*. Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1931.

- Oberti, Elisa. *Estetica. Teoria dell'oggetto artistico come presenza evidenziata*. Milan: Marzorati, 1962; 2nd ed. Celuc, 1974.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele. "Introduzione." In Waldemar Conrad, *L'oggetto estetico*. Padua: Liviana, 1972.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele. *Le origini dell'estetica fenomenologica*. Padua: Antenore, 1976.
- Volkelt, Johannes. "Objektive Ästhetik." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*. 122, 1917.

Creativity

Mario Teodoro Ramírez

In this entry we propose a definition of art as a “creation of reality.” First of all, we present a critique of the classic theory that conceives art as “representation.” We will try to show how it is possible to recover the philosophical value in the idea of representation, a sort of rational core: the problem of the relations of art to reality, and of the relation of artistic activity to the real. The theory of art as an activity of creation is superior because it solves the problem that the theory of representation acknowledges but is incapable of solving properly.

Confronted with the problems that the theory of representation presents, the theory of creation reformulates the theory of art as *creation of reality*, i.e., as a production that is representative neither of reality nor of unreality. Representationalism is not truly opposed by creation except through a new concept of creation, a radical and consistent idea of creation. Art is a creation of reality, what art does is *create*, and what it creates is something *real*. We are not idealistically proposing that art creates *reality*; we are saying that what it creates is real as opposed to unreal. Only through this act of creation can our thought and action reach and comprehend reality itself; only by creating reality do we get to know reality. As affirmed with philosophical audacity by MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY: “Being is *what requires creation of us* for us to experience it” (Merleau-Ponty, 1968: 197).

In its simplest meaning, the theory of representation conceives of art as a *mimēsis*, as a mere copy or reproduction of a previous reality. In principle the debatable

thing about this theory is not so much its conception of the artistic procedure—the function of representing, reflecting, or reproducing something—but the supposition that there actually is a previous reality that we know and value in anticipation of the artistic procedure or the work of art itself. But is this truly the situation? The theory of representation is naive because it fails to realize that the valuation that it makes of the real at the expense of art is generated by art itself. There is a retroactive and sacrificial effect: the work of art submits itself to what it proposes in a way that makes us believe in it as if it had always already existed independently of the artistic act that brings it out. But the truth is that the representation is first in relation to what is represented. In any case, what the representation “represents” is not outside the work of art, but inside of it. It is only possible to define it through this work itself. HANS-GEORG Gadamer (1991, 96) says that in the representation that is a work of art, it is not that the work of art represents something that it is not; the work of art is by no means an allegory, i.e., it does not say something leading us to think of something else, but can find what it has to say only in itself.

The reality to which we return from art has thus been opened and defined by the work of art itself. By this manner, as Eugenio Trías indicates, it is constituted “on a determined universal norm after which it is possible a posteriori, to determine an entirety of concrete situations that acquire signification from the norm” (Trías, 1983: 135–36). The theory of representation, adds Trías, wrongly supposes as granted all that has been revealed by the work of art. “In fact, Quixote is frequently conceived as an allegory of that very thing that he himself has revealed with explosive strength” (Trías, 1983, 136). In fact it is only since the work of Cervantes that we have found the *quixotic* in the world,

M.T. Ramírez (✉)

Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, Morelia, México

Trans. Ilbel Ramírez Gómez

just as *magic realism* is what turns the Latin American landscape magical and just as *Impressionist* painters created the bright fields or the foggy cities.

The theory of representation is the naive attempt to explain the work of art by the very thing from which it helped to raise the veil. Thus as Heidegger has masterfully pointed out, “the road toward the determination of the thingly reality of the work leads not from thing to work but from work to thing” (Heidegger, 1971: p. 39). It is not from the being of the object (of the “thing” as it is perceived, utilized, or scientifically determined) that we are able to comprehend the being of the “work of art”; on the contrary: *it is from the being of the work of art that we “understand” the being of the thing*. According to Heidegger, none of the manners in which Western philosophy has attempted to think the being of the thing—as a carrier of its properties, as a connection of sensations, as the unity of matter and form (the tool)—are adequate to capture it without overtaking and destroying it, to guard its being and authentic truth. Only art is capable of respecting the silent reticence and the dignity of the things, only art “gives” us the being of the thing as such.

Any other human behavior distinct from art—everyday perception, work, knowledge, moral action—takes from the thing only the “part” that responds to the “interest” that constitutes it and forgoes everything else, turning it into an ominous silence. On the other hand, the work of art prevents matter from being consumed or remaining immersed in itself. It is only in the work of art, says Heidegger, that “the rock comes to bear and rest and so first becomes rock; metals come to glitter and shimmer, colors to glow, tones to sing, the world to speak” (Heidegger, 1971: 46). It is in art that the matter of the things *speaks* and one can see the proper and originary *figure* of the world. In sum, Heidegger holds that “in the art work, the truth of what is has set itself to work” (Heidegger, 1971: 39). In van Gogh’s picture one can accordingly see what “a pair of peasant’s shoes” is.

Art represents neither an exterior reality nor an interior reality; it does not represent a signification or an accomplished thought, a given historical, cultural, or social reality. Art *creates* all this. It neither represents nor denies reality: it creates a new reality. The Italian phenomenologist Luigi Pareyson has put it still better: “Art does not supervene on an existent reality, it creates a new reality; art does not reflect an already shaped spirit, but shows us a new form of humanity; art

does not express a finished world, but discovers a new world. And this is because art installs itself in the very heart of the reality in motion, and because the work of art is already a reality, a spirit, a world: its own reality, its own spirit and its own world” (Pareyson, 1987: 57–8). Art must be thought, evaluated, and desired for what it gives us, and not for anything else (previous knowledge, existent reality, already established human or social needs, etc.): whether it accomplishes its aim or not, what it gives us is its claim, its invitation, its order, to *be* once more in its own terms.

Nevertheless, we still can consider art as “representation,” on the condition that we do not understand it as representing *something real*, but instead as representing the *reality of something*, as being a representation of “reality” itself. Art goes to the essence of *the* real. Artistic “imitation” does not, says MIKEL DUFRENNE, “imitate the real, but imitates, from the real, the movement through which it reveals itself” (Dufrenne, 1976: 62). And Gadamer (1996: 88) says that what becomes visible in imitation is precisely the thing’s ownmost essence. Probably this was the sense of “*mimesis*” from the beginning: not the imitation of something real but the imitation of what makes a thing real—the reinstatement of the source, of the process of the real, of that through which the entity is an entity, i.e., the being of the real thing (cf. Bozal, 1987).

Now if art represents reality itself, if it is *creation of reality*, how does it do it? How does reality evolve? In the last instance, what is the real? In principle, the mode of being of reality is paradoxical, since it is what is “given” to us as something that is “beyond” us. The real is what *resists* us, what *surpasses* us; “the thing ignores us,” says Merleau-Ponty. It subsists as a strange being, complete and mysterious. We cannot say it is meaningless; rather, its meaning is indistinguishable and inseparable from its being, and this is uncompromising and indefinable. “The very significance of the thing is built up before our eyes, a significance which no verbal analysis can exhaust, and which merges with the exhibiting of the thing in its self-evidence” (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 323). It is a question of an incarnate sense that is inseparable from the most ephemeral shades of color and of the most microscopic variations of the object.

According to Merleau-Ponty, Cézanne reached his maturity as a painter—and achieved what he wanted—when he was able, in Emile Bernard’s words to “contain the atmosphere, the light, the object, the relief, the

character, the outline and the style” in every touch of color (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 323)—that is to say, when he was able to create something like the thing, something to be seen rather than defined, when he produced a being irremediably sensible, insuperably visible. In our perceptive experience of things, the sensuous qualities (colors, sizes, shapes) are not presented as isolated forms, but as ingredients in a complete totality. From this, in agreement with Merleau-Ponty, a real thing becomes indistinguishable from the total appearance of the thing and gets confused with its being itself.

The signification of a vase perceived (when “perceived” is contrasted with imagined, thought, etc.) is dispersed all over it, shining forth in it. The freshness, the liveliness, the cheerfulness of a vase is not located in a part of it, nor in any of its components, but in the peculiar way in which the whole of it offers itself to our perceptual experience. For the vase, having a signification is nothing more than existing as it exists. In general, for the real having sense is nothing more than being as it is, since the real is what is irreducible, interminable, and inexhaustible. Conversely, to produce sense in art is nothing more than to *create something inexhaustible and irreplaceable, just like the real*, an open being that never ends, and that, like the *symbol* of PAUL RICOEUR, always surprises what there is to see, what to say, and what there is to think.

In this perspective, we can understand the reason and specificity of the praxis of art and therefore avoid confusing it with a technical or cognitive activity. Under the assumption of a prior reality to which they refer, knowledge and technical work extract and confine information, aspects, or results—but the concrete essence remains unreachable because in one way or another, the difference, the indomitable and irreducible singularity of the real is continually denied. Only art apprehends the essence of the real, precisely because it alone does not claim to transmit a certain meaning, information, or concept “about” reality. Art offers us *the real as it is*, it is a gift of reality, provided that the real is what is “given,” what is offered to be seen, lived, sensed, or thought. The reduction of this gift of reality, of its being-given, to a mere representation winds up denying the reality of the real, denying its very being and its original feature to which is precisely *the impossibility of representation*. “Here something disturbing manifests itself. That which in the sciences is not at any time to be gotten around—nature, man, history, language—is, *as* that which is

not to be gotten around [*unumgänglich*], intractable and inaccessible [*unzugänglich*] for the sciences and through the sciences” (Heidegger, 1977: 177).

Art can only effectively accede to the real when it becomes creation, i.e., when it brings to appearance something singular and unrepeatable, that—like the real—cannot be represented; when it finds its place in the genesis of the real and is therefore capable of creating something, not *similar* to the real, but *dissimilar* like the real; and ultimately, when it is capable of creating a problematic sense: something that is unquestionably lived, yet escapes from any ultimate definition, something inexhaustible and indomitable, real forever and never.

This was the latent question in the theory of representation—namely, that art is related to reality, that art works with the real, and that it intends to offer it to us. But the problem that was valid in the beginning got lost very quickly when the attempt was made to solve it in the elemental terms of the theory of representation. It can only be that art has something to do with the real, but in a totally different way: as an urge to be real, i.e., to create reality. And this is a principle of aesthetics: anything that is art has to be realized, to be personified, to materialize. In a complementary way, anything that we think about a work of art must be thought immanently from its own reality—from its most singular sensuous components, from its most evident materiality. Therefore, this thought does not come from outside; it comes from the work of art itself as never before thought, and as what is only thought out of its own unrepeatable singularity.

From this point of view, and in accord with Clement Rosset, the ideal of art cannot be other than *music*, because only music is “creation of reality in the wild state, with neither commentary nor contradiction, and it is the only artistic object that represents a being as it is” (Rosset, 1979, 63). Like any other form of human expression, music possesses the ability to catch the spectator, enfolding us in a completely autonomous world. The listener is literally alienated, fascinated, captivated, and delivered to this purely sonorous world, where everything is a sound and nothing more than sound.

The musician, explains Rosset, is the true demiurge, the true creator, for “he does not proposes an image of the real, but imposes a flesh and blood reality, furnished with its own matter and form. Music is not a rival of the real but its emulation, its ‘model’:

‘imitating’ the real effectively means imitating the act of becoming real, not imitating something that has already become real” (Rosset, 1979, 65).

Music is in this sense the *ideal art*, the non-representational art *par excellence*, and has always been the art most clearly opposing artistic practice itself against the theory of representation. But one could also consider architecture and the arabesque. It is recognized that architecture is non-representational. In a more concrete sense, it creates surroundings, an atmosphere, a space that does not refer to anything but to itself—a reality that is more than liveable or perceptible, habitable. After all, what is more real than the place where you live, your house? The architectural work is not the result or representation of a story or a space, but a *basis* for a story and a world. Since ancient times, says Dieter Jähnig, “the buildings, town squares, steles and furnishings were not the image or expression of something preestablished, of something factually or ideally preexisting. They were the scenery of the formation of the course of time, the scenery of the story. Or according to the modern mentality: they were the foundation of history” (Jähnig, 1982: 14).

Certainly, the arts considered traditionally as representational (painting, literature, cinema) require a reinterpretation of their procedures to show how even they—and even their stylistically representational manifestations (realism, naturalism, etc.)—remain as effects of a creative activity. The aim of *painting* for example, is not—as it has long been thought—to “reproduce the visible,” nor does it “abandon the visible,” as a certain interpretation of contemporary art has made us believe. According to Paul Klee’s unsurpassable formula, it “turns visible,” “makes visible the invisible.” What painters do and have always done is to copy not the visible things, but the *visible being* of the things; they create *visibility*. Painting gathers, displays, and exalts to the maximum degree the powers and captivations of the visible thing, its luminous magic. The painter does not copy a visible landscape, but generates—with purely plastic means—a new landscape, a new and enriched visibility, i.e., a being where any quality or characteristic—tactile or sonorous values, remoteness, distances or routes, happy moments or worries, nostalgias, ideas or utopias—must be translated into visual terms, must be “seen.” The painter—Renoir—does not copy a locomotive arriving at the station, he “makes you see” the haze, the languor, and the dark clarity of modern times.

The same is true for literature. A good novelist creates characters that surpass their creator, that impose their story, vicissitudes, and character on the writer, who does not know until then where they will wind up. The writer creates his/her own *world*, the order of which is not arbitrary: its logic is imposed on the writer in such a way that ignoring it leads to failure as a creator. My tale, says a novelist, “seemed to arm itself. Surprised, I saw it get integrated, dictate its own laws and respect them, create its own plots and subplots, its hidden relations. It seemed to me like hearing the voice of the protagonists, detect their specific timbres. I functioned as an amanuensis who took dictation” (Pitol, 1996: 126).

The novelist neither reproduces nor represents reality, history, or life. S/he creates a new reality, a story, a different life that is more intense, more focused, and deeper. It is something to be lived and relived, imagined and reimagined, thought and rethought—something to be again. The poem is equally an artifact of magic and enchantment that does not talk about the night and the stars, but rather creates, with words and rhythms, a starry landscape. The poet does not explain or describe, but gives, creates:

La noche se abre / Granada desgranada / Hay estrellas
arriba y abajo / Unas son peces dormidos en el río / Otras
cantan en el extremo del cielo, (Paz, 1968: 133)

The night opens / Pomegranate seed scattered / Stars
up and down / Some are fishes sleeping in the river /
Others sing in the corner of the sky

Art is representation, but what it represents is reality itself; it is a creation, but also creates a new reality. And what art creates is *real* because, like every other reality, it is something that always surpasses us, that resists us, and that demands that we apprehend and comprehend it in thoughtful surrender, in active thought, in *re-creation*.

In the end, artistic creation is not the creation of a thing, an entity, or an image (this is mere fabrication, fetishism). Creation is essentially predicated of a *world*, a world of spectators, of a historicity of sense, and of a corporeal, personal, and collective existence. That is *the content, the idea, or the sense* of a work of art including everything it motivates, permits, and promotes; the reality proper to its what is said about it, and what only supervenes from it: ideas, but also sensations, emotions, acts, encounters, worlds, etc. As Heidegger says, “The work belongs, as work, uniquely, within the real that is opened up by itself. For the

work-being of the work is present in, and only in, such opening up" (Heidegger, 1971: 41). This means that the social and historical being of the work of art is something intrinsic, immanent. It is not an exterior and posterior fact. The work of art is an operator of collective encounters and historicity. It is a creator of history and not a mere historical product; it shows us another reality and another sense of social life and of the historical process of development.

The internal structure of the work of art is the *opening* of a common and historical world. Unlike the explicit, univocal and direct significances of other cultural products, aesthetic significances, while incarnate and inseparable from sensuous materiality, are constituted as implicit, open, equivocal senses and manifolds, as necessarily exposed and open to interpretation, to re-creation. The work of art does not exist without the public, intersubjective, and communal process that it unleashes. And the true reality of the work of art is only to be found in this process, because the artwork itself cannot be realized without its own *work* as creation or institution. There is thus a circular and internal relation: the historical community consecrates the work of art, but the work of art also *shapes* the community; it is its *transcendental* origin.

Beginning from the definition of art as a paradigmatic form of human creative activity, we have sought to defend, explain, and found the concept of creation understood as creation of reality (rather than reduction or representation of reality or creation of unreality). This definition of the creative process finds its ultimate telos in the concept of human *auto-creation*. *There cannot be creation or recreation without auto-creation*. What really matters in every act of creation is the "being" of the human being (as an individual and as a species). Unlike non-artistic reality, artistic reality possesses a destiny of freedom and a dash of flexibility, an incomparable lightness suitable for performing an experiment that seemed impossible: the "ontological experiment," which it is necessary for a being who cares for him/herself and wants to obtain a "nature" to perform. Who cares for him/herself, who wants to obtain a nature, a reality? The one who wants this must be an artist, which is to say, an explorer, a constructor of sensations, a creator of reality. Art is the means whereby it is possible to carry out that ontological

experiment, that reckoning of possibilities of being, that practical speculation that can prepare us for the realization of the task we *are* . . .

On a small scale, the human being is always practically a creator—in every "job," every consideration, every choice of a purpose and attempt to reach it. But what is at stake here is being a creator on a grand scale: one of creating historically for the distant future, one of the great risk in which the human being wagers itself—and can lose. In this struggle to create, in the auto-creation of the human being, the revelation of the artist plays its certain and irreplaceable role. (Hartmann, 1977: 549)

Bibliography

- Bozal, Valeriano. *Mimesis: las imágenes y las cosas*. Madrid: Visor, 1987.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. "L'esthétique de la représentation." In his *Esthétique et philosophie II*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1976.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Die Aktualität des Schönen. Kunst als Spiel, Symbol und Fest*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1977; *La actualidad de lo bello*. Barcelona: Paidós, 1991.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "Kunst und Nachahmung." In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 8. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 25–36; *Estética y hermenéutica*. Madrid: Tecnos, 1996.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953; *Estética*. México City: UNAM, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Trans. William Lovitt. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1977.
- Jähnig, Dieter. *Welt-Geschichte: Kunst-Geschichte. Zum Verhältnis von Vergangenheitserkenntnis und Veränderung*. Colonia: Verlag M. DuMont Schauberg, 1975; *Historia del mundo: historia del arte*. México City: FCE, 1982.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et invisible*. Ed Calude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1968; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Pareyson, Luigi. *Conversazioni di Estetica*. Milan: V. Mursia, 1965; *Conversaciones de estética*. Madrid: Visor, 1987.
- Paz, Octavio. *Libertad bajo palabra*. 2nd ed. Mexico City: FCE, 1968.
- Pitol, Sergio. *El arte de la fuga*. Mexico City: Era, 1996.
- Rosset, Clément. *L'objet singulier*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1979; *Joyful Cruelty*. Odeon, 1993.
- Trías, Eugenio. *Filosofía del futuro*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1983.

Cubism

Andrea Pinotti

It is one of the paradoxes in the history of ideas that cubism, which so greatly inspired philosophical approaches among the twentieth century avant-garde, was characterized by its representatives as an atheoretical or even antitheoretical movement. Pablo Picasso himself was aware that cubism had been explained through mathematics, trigonometry, chemistry, psychoanalysis, music, and who knows what else. All this was to him nothing but literature or nonsense, which resulted in blinding people with theories (interview with Marius de Zayas, 26 May 26, 1923, in Fry 1966: 168). What is the use of saying what we do—this is Picasso's position—if anybody can see it? Georges Braque maintained that the only thing that matters in art is that which you cannot explain. And Juan Gris was no less lapidary: “... *mieux encore, n'en pas parler du tout*” (... better yet, do not say anything).

Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, the famous gallerist and theoretician so close to the cubists, whose text *Der Weg zum Kubismus* (1920) offered one of the first theoretical readings of the movement, confirmed that no other enterprise was less theoretical than cubism. In spite of the cubists' intentions, the history of ideas nevertheless records that during the twentieth century, cubism was linked to certain philosophies as their pictorial *analogon*. The young Kahnweiler and later Arnold Gehlen (1960) linked cubism to neo-Kantianism (*contra* see Gadamer 1967). Henri Bergson and William James were also evoked. And phenomenology.

Is there a reason why atheoretical or antitheoretical cubism could be considered the incarnation of such diverse philosophical doctrines as the ones just

mentioned, doctrines that cannot be superimposed and reduced to a common core? Moreover—a complementary question—what is the feature that makes the phenomenological interpretation distinctive if compared to the other philosophical readings of cubism? (See the synthesis by Bayerová and Vlček 1991). Last but not least, a question within phenomenology itself: what is shared, and what on the contrary specifically marks the relation between phenomenology and cubism, in comparison with the connections instituted with other moments of contemporary art (Klein 1963; Sepp 1988; Escoubas 1991), e.g., expressionism (Fellman 1982) or abstract art (Henry 1988)?

One might answer the first question as follows: the impatience expressed by Picasso and Braque toward the attempted *explanations* of cubism with *theories* always went hand in hand with the *description* of the perceptive *practices* (visual, but also tactile, and even olfactory, i.e., synaesthetic) of figural representation of the space-time relations. Such a circumstance might have represented a background of interest common to certain neo-Kantians and phenomenologists (as well as to some Gestalt psychologists who so irritated Picasso). Such a background could be defined aesthetically—not in the sense of aesthetics as a philosophical doctrine of art, but rather in the sense of “transcendental aesthetics,” of aesthesiology and perceptology. Thanks to its revolutionary approach to the representation of space-time structures, cubism would represent a pictorial response to Kant's question regarding the conditions of possibility of our sensible experience, a question fundamental to Gestalt theory, neo-Kantianism, and phenomenology.

The second and third questions might perhaps be addressed through a preliminary consideration of the history of phenomenological approaches to

A. Pinotti (✉)
Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

cubism. “One day people will certainly try to discover the connections between cubism and a philosophy *contemporary* to it. It seems to me probable that EDMUND HUSSERL will be taken into consideration, since his phenomenology remains a transcendental idealism” (Kahnweiler 1946: 267). But the first reference to cubism and phenomenology occurred much earlier and in an extra-phenomenological context. The art historian Fritz Burger quoted passages from Husserl’s “Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft” (1911) regarding the nature of the “vision of essences” (*Wesensschau*) and its independence from matters of fact, maintaining that “Picasso gave to such question an artistic answer” (Burger 1913: I, 138). The independence of essences from empirically existing objects, stated by Husserl, induces Burger to point out an analogy with the autonomy of what is given in Picasso’s paintings as opposed to the traditional objects of experience: what is seen would not be the object, but rather the knowledge of the object, the representational acts. In its natural identity the object would become a “mystery,” and here Picasso (and Husserl too!) would finally be a meeting point between Kant and mysticism. Burger’s suggestion was neglected by the successive phenomenological readings of cubism, but he quite precociously hints both at a general aesthe-siological and at a particular phenomenological aspect. First, one sees in Picasso’s paintings not so much the object as the modalities of representation. Picasso’s art is the representation of a representation—a metarepresentation. Second, because it is set free from the appearance of the empirically existing object, what is painted by Picasso would correspond somehow to the essence described by Husserl.

Not less surprising than Burger’s mystic perspective of such *Wesen* is the Platonic-Schopenhauerian version of it given many years later by Guy Habasque (1949), in what is usually but erroneously considered as the first attempt to establish an analogy between cubism and phenomenology. Habasque first emphasizes their common interest in the essence as opposed to the appearances, in the universal against the particular, in the necessary rather than the contingent. The cubists’ goal was in the end nothing less than “the Platonic Idea, Husserl’s *Eidos*,” thus corresponding to Schopenhauer’s statement that the task of art is to represent the eternal ideas. But the equation *idea-eidos*—an improper equation rejected by Husserl (see how he reacts against the charge of Platonic realism in the §22

of *Ideen I*)—would not be the only phenomenological element in cubism.

Criticizing as insufficient its analytic phase, whose application of the principle of multiperspectivity as a way to provide information concerning the mere concept of a thing, Habasque primarily emphasizes the synthetic phase, which he proposes to rename “eidetic cubism,” whose pictorial method would correspond to Husserl’s eidetic reduction. Here what is exalted is what Burger had stigmatized, i.e., the autonomy of the ideal object with regard to the existence of the empirical object. Thanks to such independence, Habasque can conclude that cubism introduces in painting a new modality of knowledge that is *a priori*. Still, the correlates of such *a priori* knowledge are not—and this seems to be his authentic phenomenological issue—the exact essences of the world of pure mathematics and geometry, but rather the inexact essences typical of the world of our concrete bodily experience, the same ones that *Ideen I* (§§71–75) had explicitly vindicated. Hence the *deforming* operations so characteristic of the cubist style are related to its non-exactness and only approximate definition.

The history of the rapprochement between cubism and phenomenology is therefore inaugurated, with Habasque and even earlier with Burger, at the crossroad of a series of misunderstandings that nevertheless hold some insights that hit the mark. Since such early attempts, it is clear that the real point does not consist in a phenomenological interpretation of cubism, that could accompany other readings (hermeneutical, formalist, iconological, etc., all equally legitimate), but rather in the hypothesis that cubism does *the same* as phenomenology, that it performs *a parte imaginis* the same operation that phenomenology performs *a parte philosophiae*. Cubist painting is thus not an object of phenomenology among other objects, but is in itself phenomenological. Precisely this multiperspectivity (the simultaneous representation of the object in its various aspects that would be offered to perception only successively, gained through a rotation of the object or of the subject around the object, as described by Albert Gleizes and Jean Metzinger in *Du Cubisme* of 1912), something that Habasque considered an insufficient method of analytic cubism, would be underscored in the 1960s by Ksawery Piwocki (1962) and above all by Walter Biemel (1966; reviewed in Patočka 1999) as the pictorial *analogon* of Husserl’s doctrine of perceptual adumbration (*Abschattung*) and

of the kinaesthesia—a perspective judged by HANS GEORG GADAMER (1962) as an “absurd idea.” Walter Biemel nevertheless observes that if the progressive seizing of one aspect after the other in Husserl’s kinaesthesia is constitutively necessary to our experience of the identity of the thing as what remains stable under the variations of its appearing, the multiperspective method, especially in the analytic phase of cubism, runs the risk of breaking the object into a thousand pieces and thus promoting its unrecognizability. And it is not by chance that Biemel characterizes such fragmentation in terms of violence against the object, and ends up by reading cubism through Nietzsche’s *Wille zur Macht*.

Remaining closer to Husserl’s doctrines, the most recent studies of phenomenology and cubism (Escoubas 1991, Sepp 1995) emphasize not so much the question of essences or of the kinaesthetic adumbrations, but rather the issue of the *epochē* (we are talking here of emphases, since such concepts are strictly interconnected). Thanks to the complicity of the dates—Husserl introduces the concept of *epochē* in *Die Idee der Phänomenologie* (1907), the same year that Picasso paints *Demoiselles d’Avignon*, considered to be the beginning of the cubist movement—a parallel can be drawn between the cubist procedure of progressively suppressing the reference to the object, all to the advantage of the pure figural autonomy of the image, on the one hand, and on the other, the suspension of belief in any form of transcendence (both of the object and of the subject) required by the phenomenological reduction. As a practice of pictorial *epochē*, cubism would thus realize at the highest level the affinity between the aesthetic and the phenomenological domain, an affinity that Husserl’s famous 1907 letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal had outlined in terms of a suspension of any positing of existence. At the same time, bracketing the object meant as *motif* or *sujet*, cubism would practice the *epochē* of painting itself and its whole history.

Wesen, *Abschattung*, and *epochē*: these are the three fundamental concepts around which the game between cubism and phenomenology has been played up to now, a game that has still not been exhausted or definitively understood. Their relation, very precisely examined with regard to form, might deserve further scrutiny as regards color. The cubist palette, in its suppression of the chromatic richness of impressionism to the advantage of neutral browns and greys, neutralizes

the colors of the world, exactly as our familiarity with life does, transforming the vividness of a thousand nuances into an obvious dullness. Yet at the same time, this enables us to see our daily neutralization, makes us aware of it, enabling us to once again be surprised by mundane colors. From obviousness to surprise, to *thaumazein*; losing the world in order to regain it: in such a path we find the philosophical core of cubism, which—like phenomenology—is an occasion to learn to *see*.

Bibliography

- Bayerová, Marie and Tomáš Vlček. “Kubismus und Philosophie—Parallelen und Affinitäten.” In *1909–1926 Kubismus in Prag. Malerei, Skulptur, Kunstgewerbe, Architektur*. Ed. Jiri Svestka and Tomáš Vlček. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1991, 44–53.
- Biemel, Walter. “Zur Deutung der Polyperspektivität bei Picasso.” In *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Goerresgesellschaft* 74, 1966, 154–168; rpt. as “Zu Picasso—Versuch einer Deutung der Polyperspektivität.” In his *Philosophische Analysen zur Kunst der Gegenwart*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968, 236–263; rpt. in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 2. *Schriften zur Kunst*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1996, 29–65.
- Burger, Fritz. *Cézanne und Hodler. Einführung in die Probleme der Malerei der Gegenwart*. 2 vols. Munich: Delphin, 1913.
- Escoubas, Elaine. “L’épochē picturale: Braque et Picasso.” In *La Part de L’Œil* 7 (*Art et phénoménologie*, ed. Eliane Escoubas, 1991), 189–203.
- Fellman, Ferdinand. *Phänomenologie und Expressionismus*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1982.
- Fortunescu, Irina, ed. *Braque: Anthology of Texts*. London: Abbey Library, 1977.
- Fry, Edward F., ed. *Cubism*. New York: Harper & Co., 1966.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. “Begriffene Malerei?” In his *Kleine Schriften II*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1967, 218–226.
- Gehlen, Arnold. *Zeit-Bilder. Zur Soziologie und Ästhetik der modernen Malerei* [1960]. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1986.
- Glizeis, Albert, and Jean Metzinger. *Du cubisme*, Paris: Figuière, 1912; *Cubism*. Trans. London: T. F. Unwin, 1913.
- Habasque, Guy. “Cubisme et Phénoménologie.” In *Revue d’Esthétique* 2, 1949, 151–161.
- Henry, Michel. *Voir l’invisible: Sur Kandinsky*. Paris: François Bourin, 1988.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Die Idee der Phänomenologie. Fünf Vorlesungen* [1907]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 2. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950; *The Idea of Phenomenology*. Trans. Lee Hardy. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
- Husserl, Edmund. “Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft” [1911]. In *Aufsätze und Vorträge* (1911–1921). Ed. Thomas Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp. *Husserliana* 25. Dordrecht:

- Martinus Nijhoff, 1987, 3–62; “Philosophy as Rigorous Science.” In his *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*. Trans. Quentin Laurer. New York: Harper & Row, 1965, 71–147.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie* [1913]. Ed. Karl Schuhmann. *Husserliana 3/1*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book. General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Kahnweiler, Daniel-Henry. *Der Weg zum Kubismus* [1920]. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatie, 1958.
- Kahnweiler, Daniel-Henry. *Juan Gris: Sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits*. Paris: Gallimard, 1946; *Juan Gris: His Life and Work*. Trans. D. Cooper. New York: H. N. Abrams, 1969.
- Klein, Robert. “Peinture moderne et phénoménologie” [1963]. In *La forme et l’intelligible*. Paris: Gallimard, 1970, 411–429; “Modern Painting and Phenomenology”. In *Form and Meaning*. Trans. M. Jay and L. Wieseltier. New York: Viking Press, 1979.
- Patočka, Jan. [Review of Biemel 1966]. In *Texte Dokumente Bibliographie*. Ed. Ludger Hagedorn and Hans Rainer Sepp. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1999, 441–448.
- Picasso, Pablo. *Collected Writings*. Ed. Marie-Louise Bernalac and Charles Piot. Trans. C. Volk and A. Besoussan. New York: Abbeville Press, 1989.
- Pinotti, Andrea, ed. *Pittura e idea: Ricerche fenomenologiche sul cubismo*. Florence: Alinea, 1998.
- Piwocki, Ksawery. “Husserl and Picasso” [1962]. In *Aesthetics in Twentieth-Century Poland*. Ed. Jean G. Harrel and Alina Wierzbianska. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1973, 143–163.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. “Der Kubismus als phänomenologisches Problem.” In *Facetten der Wahrheit. Festschrift für Meinolf Wewel*. Ed. Ernesto Garzón Valdés and Ruth Zimmerling. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1995, 295–321.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. “Annäherungen an die Wirklichkeit. Phänomenologie und Malerei nach 1900.” In *Edmund Husserl und die phänomenologische Bewegung. Zeugnisse in Text und Bild*. Ed. Hans Rainer Sepp. Freiburg: Karl Alber: 1988, 77–93.

Dance

Gediminas Karoblis

The founding phenomenologists mentioned dance only casually as an example of bodily skill or entertainment, and made no efforts at phenomenological understanding or description of it. In comparison with other art forms, dance was therefore included in phenomenological aesthetics relatively late. Moreover, the initiative was taken and supported mainly by dance practitioners themselves. It may be noticed that there are authors who use the term “phenomenology” in dance research while understanding it quite fluidly. Nevertheless, it should be stated that a tradition of phenomenology of dance is emerging, albeit thus far maintained by individual attempts.

Phenomenology was systematically introduced into the field of dance research in the 1960s. In *The Phenomenology of Dance* (1966), Maxine Sheets-Johnstone presents a descriptive analysis of a symbolic dance as a “form-in-the-making.” She draws upon the phenomenology of JEAN-PAUL SARTRE and upon previous work on the theory of art as symbolic form by Susanne K. Langer, although the basic source of the work was her experience of the choreographer and the dancer. In the introduction to the second edition of the book (1979), she notes that subsequent study of texts by MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY had made her critical of the dualism of Sartre and helped her concentrate on an animate bodily form as the basic subject of dance.

In the 1970s, David Michael Levin published his first essays on dance, and these attracted the attention of philosophers to the phenomenological approach in the aesthetics of dance (Levin 1983). He presents phenomenology as the first necessary step toward

descriptive analysis of theatrical dance, the exemplary form of dance criticism and aesthetics. In his later works, he combines phenomenology with ideas of social critique in dance, looking for the possibilities of emancipation, decolonization, and democratization.

It was also in the 1970s that Sondra Horton Fraleigh opened her scholarly path of existential phenomenology in dance research, combining the phenomenological approach, somatic therapy, and her impressive experience with studies of outstanding founders of modern dance, such as Mary Wigman, Hanya Holm, Alwin Nikolais, Martha Graham, Merce Cunningham, and others. She published her first book in 1987, presenting it as an exploration of the existential context of modern dance and a descriptive aesthetics of dance based on the concept of the “lived body.” Continuing her interest in East-West cultural interfaces, she explores the philosophy of nothingness in butoh dances (1999), discusses methodological issues (1999), and, in the spirit of many other phenomenologists, often includes autobiographical notes. Algis Mickunas (1974), who had studied with EUGEN FINK and Ludwig Landgrebe, criticizes dualistic ontologies of dance that interpret it as “superfluous” (Nietzsche, Valéry) or as a revelation of “Being” different from our “common” world (HANS-GEORG GADAMER). He claims that the dancer is the dance, constituted not as a being within the world, but as a world in a spatiotemporal formation and deformation.

In the French tradition, contemporary phenomenology of dance is impossible without reference to the works of Paul Valéry and MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY. It has often been observed that the term “chiasm” brought into usage by these thinkers is extremely useful for understanding dance. Michel Bernard (1993) has developed this for the aesthetics of dance. He

G. Karoblis (✉)

Vytautas Magnus University and Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania

distinguishes three different chiasms: the intra-sensory (between active and passive sides of sensation), the inter-sensory (between different modalities of sensation), and the para-sensory (between expression and perception).

The coming of new technologies created the possibility of experimentation with virtual environments integrating the virtual and the physical (as in “ghost-catching”). In recent decades, Susan Kozel integrates new technologies with phenomenology, describing and analyzing her performances in interactive installations (Kozel 1998). There is a group of Scandinavian authors (and already a few doctoral dissertations in Finland) who address cognitive and ethical issues and the transformative power of dance in the lifeworld of a dancer (Parviainen 1998; Rouhiainen 2003). The path of the hermeneutical phenomenology of dance is being developed by Joanne McNamara (1999).

Why and how is phenomenology relevant for the aesthetics of dance? Let us concentrate on three fundamental issues concerning dance: *appreciation and evaluation* (in “balletomania,” dance criticism, etc.); *education and performance* (in dance classes, performing environments, dance therapy, etc.); and *creation and exploration* (in choreography, dance research, etc.). The heart of the phenomenological method is the phenomenology of judgment, and this has consequences for aesthetic judgment. The phenomenology of dance explores the question of the adequacy of judgments about a dance in the spirit of the “return to the things themselves,” to use EDMUND HUSSERL’s celebrated formulation. To claim truthfulness, a judgment about a dance should be based upon the immediate experience of perceiving, performing, or creating dance.

Phenomenology asserts that this requires bracketing any preconceptions that may be put in terms of “I believe that...” (e.g., I believe that this is ballet and that is modern dance, I believe that the choreographer has style, I believe that the tango expresses jealousy, etc.). According to the rules elucidated in contemporary pragmatic phenomenology (Depraz et al. 2003), the whole procedure should consist of suspending belief about dance; redirecting attention to dance as it is experienced here and now or represented in memory as the experienced event; and letting the dance reveal itself.

The phenomenology of dance includes the project of the adequate verbalization or notation (Labanotation, or any other type of notation of dance, similar to notation in music) of kinaesthetic awareness,

not just movement of body parts. Besides the attempt to translate kinaesthetic differences into linguistic differences in dance criticism (open cycle), it also aims at a translation of these differences from one kinaesthetic subject to another. Thus the “I can . . .” of a dance teacher becomes the “I can . . .” of a dance student (closed cycle), until non-reflective ease of movement is achieved. Quite often copying, repetition, and the method of trial and error have no effect without understanding. Therefore, in their practice, choreographers or teachers of dance often encounter the necessity to verbalize or notate (Hutchinson 2004) some delicate aspects of movement based on the lived experience of bodily kinaesthesia available only from the first-person perspective (whether verbalizing or notating is better remains a question).

This requires the deep understanding of the chiasm between the body schema and the body image, as well as practical knowledge about how the body schema should be re-formed in order to re-form the whole picture most effectively. Dance leaders often warn their followers: “If you want to follow me, do not copy my body image; listen to what I say, and reform your own body schema.” It is important that a choreographer cannot ask a human being “to turn one degree to the left,” because this has no sense for the body schematically.

Eventually, the deep understanding of this chiasm between the body schema and the body image teaches us that in dance the most important thing is not a detailed phenomenological analysis, but a holistic phenomenology. Quite often a delicate analysis creates the situation in which, so to speak, we “do not notice the forest for the trees,” i.e., we do not feel the dance among the movements. Then a simple phenomenological remark about “what is it like to dance like this . . .” makes sense. For example, “The waltz is like waltzing” (always turning in a couple) sounds trivial, but has deep sense in dance classes.

Mickunas has pointed that a schema of the total dance is present in each movement. Phenomenology encourages a methodical exploration of the “I can” and “I cannot” of the body from the epistemological point of view. But this is exactly the practice of a choreographer—exploring the body through his/her creative inventiveness. The dance keeps its tradition alive through the process of deformation/formation. As George Steiner expressed it in his ideas about the utopian city, where art criticism would be prohibited, a dancer in his/her dance interprets a dance

choreography or a dance tradition (Steiner 1991), thus becoming “the last interpreter” (Mickunas 2004).

Is it possible to formulate a phenomenological definition of dance? There is more than one anthropological definition of dance. The definitions of dance as mimesis or symbolic expression are in conflict with the lived experience of abstract dances, which deliberately do not imitate or express anything. The definition of dance as play is persuasive enough, but conflicts with the phenomena of sacred dance, and needs a phenomenological clarification. It is also obvious that the oft-repeated formal definition of dance as a “patterned, rhythmic movement in space and time” suffers from metaphysical biases that were strongly criticized in phenomenology. The concept of “movement in space and time” presupposes the Cartesian epistemology. But the dance very clearly shows the shortcomings of that: the dance itself constitutes the continuum of force-time-space and is constituted through kinaesthetic awareness. The zombie cannot dance, because it has no consciousness. Therefore, as Mickunas concludes, the dance is the kinaesthetic consciousness of the dancer. On the other hand, the dancer is the dance. After these phenomenological clarifications, it is possible to summarize that the dance is kinaesthetic consciousness, which depends on the structure of intentionality and which differs in dance as play, show, competition, therapy, and magic.

How does the phenomenology of dance relate to other contemporary trends in the aesthetics of dance? For analytic philosopher Julie van Camp, the thematization of dance in the systematic works of Monroe C. Beardsley, Nelson Goodman, Joseph Margolis, and Francis Sparshott seems tardy: “More philosophically-inclined dance theorists, critics, and historians have been especially preoccupied with phenomenology and the work of Susanne K. Langer, while philosophers have tended to simply include dance as an afterthought in more comprehensive theories” (van Camp 1981, online). The discourse of analytic philosophers reoriented in the recent decade from the efforts of setting the linguistic framework and solving the traditional questions—e.g., what does it mean to judge about the beauty, identity, and authenticity of dance—to addressing dance as it is practiced, which had always been the main impulse in the phenomenological discourse. Action theory, which emerged in this tradition, was first introduced into the field of dance by Beardsley. The problem of intentionality as central in this theory

is also an important issue for the phenomenology of dance.

In Continental philosophy, structural methods and the semiotics of dance were discussed in the seminars organized under the leadership of Algirdas Julien Greimas, who was influenced by Merleau-Ponty. Susan Leigh Foster, postmodern analyst of dance, applied the semiotic square of Greimas in the feminist analysis of the ballerina (Foster 1996). The debates about postmodernism entered dance aesthetics in the 1970s (Banes 1987). Postmodern discourse is often related to the techniques of deconstruction (which has the roots in phenomenology, but differs from it). In dance aesthetics the deconstructive shift of attention occurred as the critical rereading and the “change of places” on the axes of gender, ethnicity, and even the movement itself.

Women are leading figures in the philosophical discourse on dance, often supporting feminist theories and disclosing the feminine dancer as “to be-looked-at” for the man’s gaze, couple dances as the establishment of the paternal family, etc. The other binary opposition of “classic (global) vs. characteristic (local),” elaborated in dance by Russian ballet analysts, was also reinterpreted when Kealiinohomoku asserted that “ballet is a form of ethnic dance” (1970). Postmodern choreographers often reverse an expected movement in dance to a non-movement, etc. And thematizing of the body in a way that relates the issues of phenomenology to the studies of Michel Foucault has encouraged readings of dance as the means and the medium of body politics.

Evolutionary aesthetics and neuroaesthetics consider cultural questions with reference to natural ones. In her recent publications, Sheets-Johnstone integrates her previous research with the evolutionary approach (1999). Choreographer Ivar Hagendoorn (2002) has systematically integrated the neuroscientific framework into the dance research during the last few years, and the possible application of phenomenological method on this track is still to be explored.

Bibliography

- Banes, Sally. *Terpsichore in Sneakers: Post-Modern Dance*. 2nd ed. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1987.
- Bernard, Michel. “Sens et fiction ou les effets étranges de trois chiasmes sensoriels.” In *Nouvelles de danse* 17, 1993, 56–64.

- van Camp, Julie Charlotte. "Philosophical Problems of Dance Criticism." (PhD dissertation: Temple University, 1981) <http://www.csulb.edu/~jvancamp/diss1.html> (02-01-05).
- Depraz, Natalie, Francisco J. Varela and Pierre Vermersch. *On Becoming Aware: A Pragmatics of Experiencing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003.
- Foster, Susan Leigh, ed. *Corporealities*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Fraleigh, Sondra. *Dance and the Lived Body*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987.
- Hagendoorn, Ivar. "Einige Hypothesen über das Wesen und die Praxis des Tanzes." In Gabriele Klein and Christa Zipprich, eds. *Tanz. Theorie. Text. Jahrbuch Tanzforschung*, Vol. 12. Hamburg: 2002, 429–444.
- Hutchinson, Ann. *Labanotation: The System of Analyzing and Recording Movement*. 4th ed. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Kealiinohomoku, Joann. "An Anthropologist Looks at Ballet as a Form of Ethnic Dance." Marian Van Tuyl, ed. *Impulse 1969–1970*. San Francisco: Impulse Publications. 1970, 24–33.
- Kozel, Susan. "Spacemaking: Experiences of a Virtual Body." Alexandra Carter, ed. *The Routledge Dance Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1998, 81–88.
- Langer, Susanne K. *Feeling and Form*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.
- Levin, David Michael. "Philosophers and the Dance." Roger Copeland and Marshall Cohen, eds. *What is Dance? Readings in Theory and Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983, 85–94.
- McNamara, Joann. "Dance in the Hermeneutic Circle." Sondra Fraleigh and Penelope Hanstein, eds. *Researching Dance*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999, 162–187.
- Mickunas, Algis. "The Primacy of Movement." In *Main Currents in Modern Thought* 31, 1974, 8–12.
- Mickunas, Algis. "The Problem of the Last Interpreter." (Lima 2004), http://www.pucp.edu.pe/eventos/congresos/filosofia/programa_general/jeuves/sesion.
- Parviainen, Jaana. *Bodies Moving and Moved: A Phenomenological Analysis of the Dancing Subject and the Cognitive and Ethical Values of Dance Art*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 1998.
- Rouhiainen, Leena. *Living Transformative Lives: Finnish Freedance Dance Artists Brought into Dialogue with Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology*. Helsinki: Theatre Academy, 2003.
- Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. *The Phenomenology of Dance*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.
- Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. *The Primacy of Movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999.
- Sparshott, Francis. *A Measured Pace: Toward a Philosophical Understanding of the Arts of Dance*. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1995.
- Steiner, George. *Real Presences*. London: Faber & Faber, 1991.

Jacques Derrida (1930–2004)

Terri J. Hennings

Of all the philosophers of the late twentieth century, Derrida is probably the most influential and the most widely misunderstood. His impact on the direction literary criticism has taken has been enormous; the reception of his work was to produce what has become known as “deconstruction” and set the stage for the debate between modernism and postmodernism. His works have had a wide and diverse influence on many disciplines, including fields as different as architecture, art, feminism, filmmaking and film criticism, legal scholarship, music, psychoanalysis, and theology.

It is especially in the United States, however, that Derrida’s reception and influence has had the most obvious effects on how philosophy is to be practiced. It also split literature departments there into those who “do” and those who “don’t” do deconstruction. This rift would only widen with time as Derrida wrestled with the problematic borderline between literature and philosophy, a problem he broaches in his work on EDMUND HUSSERL, *La voix et le phénomène* (1967), where he seems to suggest that thinking must in some sense choose between the pursuit of pure, univocal concepts and unlimited semiotic free play. With the publication of *Glas* (1974), which is in the form of a Joycean intertextual commentary on Hegel and Genet, many accused him of having lost interest in “serious” philosophical work and misunderstood him to have chosen the path of free play. As we shall see, however, this is an unjust accusation. Although Derrida’s interests, if viewed in a strict sense, can perhaps be seen as “marginal,” he was a rigorous thinker when he challenged deeply ingrained notions regarding language,

writing, and experience in his relentless rereading of canonical writers in the Western philosophical, literary, and artistic tradition.

Derrida begins his more than 40-year-long inquiry into our Western intellectual and cultural tradition with a close and intensive reading of Edmund Husserl in which he points to what he sees as several problems in the phenomenological method. These “problems” have to do with writing and the “metaphysics of presence” that subjugates writing to speech. He argues against the possibility of a pure consciousness as Husserl understands it, and thus against the existence of the fundamentals of consciousness. His target is Husserl’s preference for the universal at the expense of the particular or contingent. When we focus on the particular and the contingent, we can no longer simply assume universal structures of consciousness. Husserl’s faith in a transcendental consciousness is marred by the presuppositions of a metaphysics of presence. One of those presuppositions is about language, which according to Derrida, Husserl reduces to only those aspects that can be accommodated to pure consciousness: forms, sounds, marks are all bracketed out. Meaning is the interior product of solitary mental life.

The selection of a starting point for a history of deconstruction is inevitably arbitrary, but the year 1966 has much to recommend it. For those interested in critical theory, that was the year when Roland Barthes’s *Critique et vérité*, Michel Foucault’s *Les mots et les choses*, and Jacques Lacan’s *Écrits*, among others appeared. But for our purposes the most striking event in 1966 was a symposium held at Johns Hopkins University where a paper entitled “Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Cultural sciences” was presented by an unknown speaker named Jacques

T.J. Hennings (✉)

Department of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies,
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Derrida. In this paper he makes explicit his critique of structuralism. Whereas structuralism had pointed out that the problems of literary form, language, consciousness, and intentionality dissolved when analyzed through a structuralist method, Derrida countered that this structuralist redistribution of categories was not blind, but was itself susceptible to be questioned and dismantled. Or rather, Derrida leaves us with a choice between two ways of thinking: nostalgia for an absolute foundation for truth, or an assent to a radical dissemination at the heart of what thinking itself is. This critique, and the choice it entails, marked the emergence of what was to become known as deconstruction.

The word first appeared in the published version of Derrida's lecture at Johns Hopkins whereby Derrida takes the term from MARTIN HEIDEGGER who carries out an *Abbau* (dismantling) or *Destruktion* (destruction) of metaphysics. Downplaying the strong connotations of *Destruktion*, Derrida understands by deconstruction a dismantling, the purpose of which is not to eliminate, but to unveil how something like a text works. It is thus neither negative—like a destruction—nor positive—as in a simple rearrangement. The deconstructed text remains as it was before, although the economy of its meaning has been unveiled, so that it cannot function as before with the authority it enjoyed, the meaning it was granted, or the place in the canon it had received. Derrida's choice of deconstruction thus designates a double move: both disarranging and rearranging.

Derrida was never satisfied with the term “deconstruction,” which became the preferred designator for his re-marking of philosophical concepts, and he often expressed dismay at how this word had become singled out—a word that was never intended to stand on its own but rather was initially proposed as a link in a chain of other words such as trace, difference, and arche-writing. Exactly how and why the term deconstruction was seized upon to describe his project is not known. One theory that has been proposed is that the word achieved such popularity because of “its resonance with *structure* which was, in the 1960s, the reigning word of structuralism” (Kamuf 1991: vii). “Deconstruction,” Derrida said, “. . . is a word I have never liked and one whose fortune has disagreeably surprised me” (Derrida in Montefiore 1983: 44). Indeed, this “fortune” has been tied more to literary criticism than to philosophy, resulting in the refusal by

many in the Anglo-American philosophical tradition to take Derrida seriously.

Yet it is precisely Derrida's emphasis on writing that led him to question the founding assumptions of philosophical discourse. As he stated during his thesis defense in 1980: “For I have to remind you, somewhat bluntly and simply, that my most constant interest, coming before even my philosophical interest I should say, if this is possible, has been directed towards literature, towards that writing which is called literary” (Ibid.: 37). Derrida opens, so to speak, literature and philosophy to a sort of “contamination.” He displaces and destabilizes the boundaries between them, questioning the categories of genres or discourse and showing how language counteracts the unity a representation strives for. This does not mean, however, that we are simply to collapse the boundaries between literature and philosophy just because they are both writing.

In the metaphysical tradition, the philosophical search for truth has claimed precedence over literature's concern with style. Derrida did not simply want to invert the hierarchical claims of philosophy over literature, but rather to show the instability of their boundaries. For him there is no assured essence of “literature” or of “philosophy.” Both are unstable categories with no guarantees, and if they seem secure and natural, it is only because they are governed by a powerful consensus, premised on “foundational thinking.” This “foundational thinking” is the “metaphysics of presence”—the assumed priority of speech over writing that goes hand in hand with the idea of a pure, self-authenticating knowledge.

Derrida's offensive against metaphysical thinking was worked out across two currents of contemporary French thought: phenomenology and structuralism. For him, what is common to these apparently incompatible methods is their reliance on the metaphysics of presence. His writings on phenomenology and structuralism, announcing his assault on metaphysical thinking were published in 1967: *La voix et le phénomène*, *De la grammatologie*, and *L'écriture et la différence*. *De la grammatologie's* enormous impact on American academics, however, would come almost ten years later with the publication of Gayatri Spivak's translation. Up until this point his influence was more or less confined to either departments of French or Comparative Literature, since most of his works had not yet been translated into English. With Derrida's

thought now accessible to an Anglophone audience, what started as a small tremor would increase to a great quake—the aftershocks of deconstruction would be felt for years to come.

One of the most formidable effects of Derrida's thought was the growth of critical theory in North America, especially as practiced by those who became known as the Yale Critics. This group of critics who taught at Yale University—Harold Bloom, Geoffrey Hartman, Paul de Man, and J. Hillis Miller—all worked in relation to the deconstructive philosophy practiced by Jacques Derrida. Literary deconstruction sought to seek out the aporias, the blind spots (hence the title of de Man's seminal 1971 work, *Blindness and Insight*), the moments of self-contradiction where a text unknowingly betrays the tension between rhetoric and logic. However, the form deconstruction took as it was applied to literary criticism—an institution with its own specific needs and requirements—resulted in a “domestication of Derrida,” a deconstruction often at odds with his own interests and concerns.

Since our concern is with aesthetics, let us now briefly turn to Derrida's meditations on art, mediated by readings of Kant, Hegel, Heidegger, and Benjamin. He posits that aesthetic theory has been structured by a persistent demand—that of framing. For Derrida, “this permanent demand—to distinguish between the internal or proper meaning and the circumstances of the object in question—organizes every philosophical discourse on art, the meaning of art, and meaning itself, from Plato to Hegel, Husserl, and Heidegger. It presupposes a discourse on the boundary between the inside and the outside of the art object, in this case, a discourse on the frame” (Derrida 1978/87: 12).

Derrida locates this discourse in Kant's *Kritik der Urteilkraft* (1790). In his reading of Kant, he points out that Kant's notion of the aesthetic object is based upon the opposition inside/outside—upon the notion of boundaries, of framing. According to Kant, what is essential in judgments of taste (the beautiful) is what gratifies by its form. Kant goes on to state that “*Selbst was man Zieraten (parerga) nennt, d.i. dasjenige, was nicht in die ganze Vorstellung des Gegenstandes als Bestandteil innerlich, sondern nur äusserlich als Zutat gehört und das Wohlgefallen des Geschmacks vergrössert, tut dieses doch auch nur durch seine Form: wie Einfassungen der Gemälde...*” (even what is called ornamentation [paragon], i.e., what is only

an adjunct, and not intrinsic in the complete representation of an object, in augmenting the delight of taste does so solely by means of its form—Kant 1974: 142) Kant's aesthetic object must have intrinsic beauty, value, and meaning, which are to be distinguished from everything extrinsic such as its monetary value, location, circumstances of production, etc. And he must insist on a frame, enclosing an inside.

But in *La vérité en peinture* (1978), Derrida points out, these frames, that these “parerga have a thickness, a surface, which separates them not only, as Kant would have it, from the inside, from the body of the ergon itself, but also from the outside, from the wall on which the painting is hung . . .” (Derrida 1978: 71). Although the frame encloses the work, focuses attention on it, and plays a constitutive role, at the same time it undermines this role by its definition as a subsidiary ornament. The frame or the logic of the frame is very much like the logic of the supplement in which the marginal becomes central by virtue of its marginality. The paragon cannot be defined—it is undecidable: does it belong to the transcendental values, to the art work, or to the exterior contingent world? Derrida shows that in spite of Kant's efforts, there can be no assured limits to the aesthetic object. And if there is no assurance as to the limits of the aesthetic object, categories such as aesthetic judgment or aesthetic experience cannot be definitively ascertained.

One of Derrida's main interests has been the nature of discourse about art, which he further explores in his *Les mémoires d'aveugles*, a work commissioned by the Louvre for an exhibition of the same name in 1990. In it Derrida continues the “logic of the paragon” by treating images as the permeable borders of his writing, and at the same time addressing the traditional figure of the artist as seeing and making visible.

Although Derrida's thinking is most widely known for its influence on the form and function of literature and philosophy, it has also had an impact on other art forms. Artists, art critics, and art historians have also applied Derrida's thinking to the visual arts. Examples would be Sart Maharaj's work on pop art (1992) and Fred Orten's work on Jasper Johns (1994), as well as Jasper Johns himself (1996). Deconstruction shows how every structure that organizes our experience (be it literary, economic, social, political, religious, artistic, or psychological) is constituted and sustained through acts of exclusion that can become repressive. In a move reminiscent of Freud, Derrida asserts that what is

repressed does not just disappear, but always returns to haunt and possibly unsettle every construction—often with disastrous consequences. These repressive structures grew out of our Western intellectual and cultural tradition that divides the world into binary oppositions: right or left, good or bad, inside or outside. Derrida struggled to find ways to overcome patterns that avoided these diametrical opposites, and worked to preserve difference and acceptance for the other. In this respect, Derrida's project was not, as many have charged, apolitical, but rather is ethical to the core.

Bibliography

- Barthes, Roland. *Critique de vérité*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La voix et le phénomène*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967a; *Speech and Phenomena*. Trans. David Allison. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Derrida, Jacques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1967b; *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Derrida, Jacques. *L'écriture et la différence*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1967c; *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Glas*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1974; *Glas*. Trans. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La vérité en peinture*. Paris: Flammarion; *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Ian Macleod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Les mémoires d'aveugles*. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1990; *Memoirs of the Blind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Foucault, Michel. *Les mots et les choses*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966; *The Order of Things*. Trans. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.
- Hartmann, Geoffrey. *Saving the Text: Literature/Derrida/Philosophy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Johns, Jasper. *Jasper Johns: Writings, Sketchbook Notes, Interviews*. Ed. Kirk Varnedoe. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996.
- Kamuf, Peggy, ed. *A Derrida Reader. Between the Blinds*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974; *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966; partially trans. as *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. London: Tavistock, 1977.
- Maharaj, Sart. "Pop art's pharmacies." *Art History* 15, 1992.
- Man, Paul de. *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- Miller, J. Hillis. *Fiction and Repetition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Montefiore, Alan, ed. *Philosophy in France Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Orten, Fred. *Figuring Jasper Johns*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Dream

Hans Rainer Sepp

Looking for attempts in the phenomenological tradition to analyze what happens in dreaming, one can find many traces above all beginning in the late 1920s. We will try to interpret these traces and then answer a two-fold question: do phenomenological findings concerning dreaming have a systematic coherence, and if so, can they be applied to forms of art, surrealism in particular?

Sometime after 1930, Jean Héring, a student of EDMUND HUSSERL at Göttingen, wrote to his teacher about a dream. He was walking together with friends; eventually he realized that “they” were all dreaming and he tried to convince them of this. Then it occurred to him that it was nonsense to argue this point, since there is no intersubjectivity in dreams. Next he tried to prove to them that they did not exist, but the friends said: “We are as convinced of the fact that we exist as you are that you do.” He replied: “But I know for sure that I am dreaming, whereas you do not even know that you are being dreamt.” His efforts to convince the others being unsuccessful, he proposed a bet: “Nobody, except me, can remember this dream the next day because there is no identity between the subject being dreamt and the awakened subject.” When one of the friends retorted that in this case the bet would be stupid, Héring played his last trump: “I am tired and will—wake up.” And he disappeared—much to their astonishment—to wake up in his own bed as usual. “Were my friends convinced? It is awkward, but I will never get an answer. Or perhaps I will in the next dream?” And he added: “Dear Master, next time you absolutely must take part!” (Husserl 1993: 118).

Perhaps it is not a coincidence that from the start, the phenomenology of dreaming is connected to the problems of intersubjectivity and idealism (and of course, this connection is well known within the Cartesian tradition).

Héring’s obviously fictional dream story may be merely a pretext meant to provoke Husserl to show how his phenomenological idealism differs from solipsism. At any rate, Husserl took Héring at his word and provided an answer (cf. *ibid.*: 119f.). He insists on the differentiation between the dreaming I and the I being dreamt by the former I who dreams. The latter I appears, like the others being dreamt, only in the dream. My awareness of the fact that I have been dreaming is already connected with waking up from dreaming. Thus Héring’s dreamt I is not able to prove that his fellows do not exist because neither he nor his friends are involved in the living sphere of the dreaming I. As ALFRED SCHUTZ later writes in his analysis of dreams, “We cannot dream together and the *alter ego* remains always an object of my dreams, incapable of sharing them” (Schutz 1996: 43).

Certainly, the dreaming I and the I being dreamt are both modes of consciousness, yet they differ in what they accomplish: the dreaming I imagines the dream-world, but the I being imagined is not imagining, s/he lives in a state of awakesness. “The I of the dream world does not dream, it perceives” (*ibid.*: 120). However, it is contradictory to say—as Husserl does—that the I of the dream world is a “pseudo-I” in a pseudo-world and within a pseudo-intersubjectivity, and then simultaneously to say that it perceives. How it is possible that a perceiving I is at the same time only a pseudo-I? This question remains unanswered in Husserl’s work. In an unpublished manuscript he notes that the dreaming I produces a world, the pseudo-world of the dream; this

H.R. Sepp (✉)
Charles University Prague, Prague, Czech Republic

I does not have a ground taken for being real but a “quasi-ground” (Ms. E III 6).

In trying to analyze dreaming phenomenologists at first got stuck in the futile alternative of whether dreams are *either* the product of imagination *or* the product of perception. Dorion Cairns reported a conversation in September 1931 with Eugen Fink, Husserl’s assistant at that time: “After we left Husserl, Fink was speaking of dreams, which he understands as *Vergegenwärtigungen* re-presentations rather than as *Wahrnehmungen* perceptions, as I am inclined to do” (Cairns 1976: 37). Nevertheless, the paradox that the I of the dream world is a “pseudo-I” and that it nevertheless perceives has been productive.

Later phenomenologists have tried to solve this paradox by examining the relation between the waking and the dreaming I against the backdrop of the questions concerning continuity and time-consciousness. In his doctoral thesis of 1929, Fink took the view that the worldlessness—the quasi-worldliness—of the dreaming I is in fact a certain mode of being-in-the-world, a “worldly being in the mode of engrossedness” (*Welthabe im Modus der Versunkenheit*—Fink 1966: 64). If the dreaming I produces the quasi-world of the dream, as Husserl said, then it follows from Fink’s point of view that this quasi-world can only be established because the normal structure of being-in-the-world continues in the mode of dreaming, even though modified.

In an article written in 1942, JAN PATOČKA pointed out that this connection between the awake and the dreaming consciousness must not be understood as a continuous relation (Patočka 1991). If worldliness is continued, in the strict sense, within the quasi-worldliness of the dream, then there is no means for determining what is actually real. There has been a tendency in the philosophical tradition to suppose that our waking state could in fact be a dream. For Patočka, the fragmentary and fleeting structure of the dream is an indication that the dream-world is built up of material from the real world. Thus the experiencing within the dream relates to real experience, but not vice versa. Hence there is no strict continuities between the real world and the dream-world.

Herbert Leyendecker, who studied with Alexander Pfänder in Munich as well as with Husserl in Göttingen, had already emphasized in his published dissertation from 1913 that there is no continuity between the waking state and dreaming (cf. 1913:

185f.). He was interested in the phenomenon of dreaming within the scope of his detailed analysis of the different kinds of delusion. This forerunner of a phenomenology of dreaming, though, only asks at the end of his book a double question concerning the relationship of dreaming and delusion: In what ways are we deceived when we are dreaming, and which experiences dissolve the delusion that has been produced by dreaming? He doubts that dream experiences can be disillusioned either within the dream or only by waking up. Anyway, his final answers are unknown: the notes in which he dealt with these questions have been destroyed during the First World War, and he never came back to this topic.

In accordance with these positions, Alfred Schutz, who additionally describes symbols and systems of relevance in the dream world, asserts in “On Multiple Realities” (1946; see Schutz 1962: Chapter 4, and cl. 1996: Chapter 4) that the relation between dream and reality is a relative discontinuity: events in the dream-world are seemingly disconnected from the order of time, but in fact they have no place in objective time, whereas the direction of time consciousness (irreversibility of the course of time) remains in dreaming. “The happenings in dream life are the re-interpretation of past experiences by transforming previously confused experiences into distinctness by explicating their implied horizons” (Schutz 1996: 42). Similarly, the Freiburg phenomenologist Arnold Metzger remarks that the form of the dream world is “below the continuity of remembering and expecting” (Metzger 1972: 246), and MARC RICHIR notes that the sleeping state separates us from the order of time; the temporal mode of the dreaming consciousness is presentive and gives as such rise to senses, to “dream-thoughts,” but it does not correlate with a presence as the flowing source of a regular time structure (Richir 2000).

Like Husserl, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE also remarks in his *L’imaginaire* (1940) that an actual experience of dreaming is only possible when one is awake, but unlike Husserl, he concludes that the dreaming consciousness is not able to perceive, since it is locked into its imagining attitude: everything is an image for it (Sartre 2004: part 4, Chapter 4). As Marc Richir writes, “The Dreamer feels, sees, hears, touches, but he does not perceive, or rather, he does not perceive in the way of perception” (Richir 2000). For Sartre, the character of “pseudo” marking the world of the dream results from a specific belief of the dreamer: the dreaming I

believes that the complex of things it imagines is itself. This leads to the impression that it is impossible to escape from the fictitious dream: "I am caught." For Sartre, this belief has two stages: first the dreaming I imagines a world, and then it relates its imagined products to itself. Thus he can argue that both the dreaming I and the I being dreamt are in fact identical. Only by analyzing the object phenomenologically is it possible to differentiate them.

By only making a distinction between two kinds of "I" that participate in dreaming, but also taking them together, Theodor Conrad, who was also a student of Husserl in Göttingen, collapsed Husserl's and Sartre's ideas into one in order to propose a comprehensive phenomenological theory of dreaming in his later work *Wesenlehre des Lebens und Erlebens* (1968) (Conrad 1968: Chapter 3). He points out that all of the different kinds of representation—memory, prospection, phantasy, and daydream—are marked by the feature of *shifting*, i.e., imagining that the subject is both here and over there in the region of the imagined context. The dreaming subject is totally removed from its real place; it is, so to speak, transplanted into the dream, and the "here" is identified with the "there." The dreaming I gives rise to the imagination of a "there" to such an extent that it is imagined as a real "here." This illusion of this dreamt reality is an "illusion" only for the dreaming I that has produced this world, but is not illusory in its own terms (and correlatively, not for the I being dreamt) because it marks the new actual "here." As a product of the dreaming I, the dream-world is not imagined, but presented. Thus it seems that in dreaming, the imagining subject paradoxically imagines in such a way that it presents.

Conrad calls the subjective mode correlative to the dream-world "dream experiencing" (*Traum-Erleben*) and considers it the core of the phenomenon of dreaming. The world around this dream experiencing is the dreamt of the dreaming, and Conrad insists that the existence of the dream-world imagined by dreaming is feigned, but the dream experiencing is "authentic." In contrast to a daydream, "hard reality prevails in the dream." Thus the real dream experiencing, the producing act of the dreaming, and the dreamt world around the dream experiencing form a "unity." "Dream is an experience of shifting disguised as an experience of non-shifting" (*Der Traum ist: ein als Nichtversetztseins-Erlebnis getarntes Versetztseins-Erlebnis*—ibid. 71).

While dreaming, consciousness hands itself over to reality—in itself and by itself. Building a jail by means of its own imagination, consciousness imprisons itself by the same means that waking consciousness evades the crush of reality. Just as a picture portraying a real subject absorbs the viewer, so s/he experiences the reality imagined in the picture as actually real.

All the theories summarized above are attempts to describe dreaming *as such*. Their main relevance for aesthetics is to show the role of imagination within the phenomenon of dreaming. But there is a further dimension of dreaming that opens up wider horizons for phenomenological research regarding aesthetics. This is the *cultural function* of dreaming, since different cultural contexts contain different possible ways of dealing with dreams.

In some unpublished manuscripts, Dorion Cairns was one of the first within phenomenology to recognize this aspect of the phenomenon. Already in the 1930s he contended that the validity or invalidity of dreams is a question of cultural difference. "Indeed it is perhaps only in Western Society and within the last few centuries that there are many people who, even at the theoretical level, deny objective truth to dream experiences generally." During the 1950s, Wilhelm Schapp, another student of Husserl in Göttingen, postulated in his "philosophy of stories" that there are flexible transitions between dream stories and the stories in which our waking life is involved (Schapp 1985: 152f.). The question of the status of awakeness therefore depends on the definition given by a stage of history (Schapp 1981: 7f.). He does not speak about the structure of the dream itself, but—like Cairns—he points to cultural modes of interpreting that determine the borderline between the dream-world and the world of reality contextually.

On the basis of the reflections on dreaming that have been discussed, one could say that the phenomenological reason why the borderline between the validity of dream experiences and waking experiences is culturally fluid is that the dreaming I produces reality by imaginative means. When the part of the imaginatively produced reality is stronger than the insight into the imaginative process of that producing, there will be a greater tendency for the dream experience to be grasped as valid, even as real. As Cairns notes, "... the primitive finds it easier to go taking dream-experiences at their face value as experience."

Regarding the question of the validity of dreams, one must of course distinguish between the belief that the dream world is real in the same way as the real world itself, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the opinion that dream experiences contain their own modes of truth. While the former is based on an attitude in which the faculty of imagination has not yet been discovered as such, the latter may be the result of an explicit turn to imagination as well as of the discovery that imagination takes root in reality. The opinion that imagination stems from reality is the basis of Freud's psychoanalysis. Cairns's remark that dreaming is "a self-revelation" corresponds with the doctrine of psychoanalysis where dream is the disguised fulfillment of a suppressed desire (cf. Ricoeur 1965, book 2, part 2, Chapter 1).

Thus there are two conditions under which the borderline between the validity and non-validity of dream experiences is fluid: first, imagination and reality are intertwined in dreaming so that imagination produces reality; and second, the contextual determination of the borderline as well as of the kind of validity depends on which part of this whole structure will be emphasized in the state of waking, i.e., will be "reality" (the imagined is actually real), or "not reality" (dream "reality" is only imagined), or "a specific mode of reality" (imagination has its roots in reality).

The described fact that dreaming is the unified as well as complex process of de-realizing and re-realizing by imagination does not merely overcome not only the unsatisfactory alternative whereby dreaming is held to be (more or less) imaginative or perceptive; it also enables *different* possible modes of referring to dreams within different cultural contexts. One extreme position within this difference is the belief that dreams simply present reality, while the other extreme position means that dreams are only illusions. The latter, a concomitant of all "enlightened" eras, is admittedly an impoverishment of human possibilities. Cairns also stresses in his manuscripts that "to buy a consistent common world, even of mere things" is "at the cost of *throwing out* certain presentive experiences as invalid, because they conflict with the bulk of presentive experiences, not only waking illusions but dreams."

All kinds of reaction to the field of that difference are also a matter of dependence and independence: the more dream is seen as presenting reality, the more consciousness will depend on this, and the more dream

is seen as a fruit of imagination, the more consciousness will be free of it. The phenomenological basis of the dependence is twofold: the imaginative force of the dreaming I limits imagination by imagining reality, and it limits its "object," the dreamt I. When the above-mentioned second extreme position considers dreams to be merely illusory, this double dependence has been rescinded and is no longer important.

Arriving at this point, we begin a phenomenological analysis of what happens in surrealism. Briefly explained, surrealism—both as a way of life and as a movement in art—favors greater freedom in contrast to the leveled clarity of a "consistent common world," and advocates for a restoration of the real force of dreaming. Like psychoanalysis, surrealism detects a specific mode of truth in dreams, but it does not identify this truth with rational clarity. What André Breton proposed in his *First Surrealist Manifesto* (1924) is even a reversal: for him, dream advances to the position of being the only basis of reality. Awake states are disparaged as phenomena of interference that interrupt the continuity of dreaming. Like Patočka, Breton stresses the discontinuity of the real world and the dream world, but he anchors consciousness in the latter. The unity of life and world has been determined by the dream state, and the alternation of being awake and dreaming forms a kind of "absolute reality" called "sur-reality."

Insofar as surrealism combines a liberating attitude and an experience of the real chasm of dreaming, it also enters the sphere of difference explained by phenomenology of dreaming. Thus the surrealist attitude tallies with the phenomenological analysis, but with an enlargement: surrealism extends the relation whereby imagination will be bound through its own imagined reality to the relation whereby imagination sees that to be bound by the reality of the dream is the highest degree of liberation, because the basic mode of reality presented in dreaming qualifies the fact of being involved in real social conventions.

An interesting consequence follows from this. Breton claims that for the dreaming I, the "worrying" question about possibility will be brought to a standstill. This means, from the point of view of surrealism, that everything that happens gets a special kind of necessity like that of the facts of reality. Thus the imagination most liberated from all conventions of the logic of daylight gives rise not only to the real power of the dream, but also—by its *unchangeable*

presentations—to a renewed life and world attaining the highest level of necessity, without being at the mercy of reality and at the same time remaining independent of the horizons in which real experiences are embedded. Of course, the horizons in which the dream experience lives are not really “open,” but determined by their origin in the imagining achievement of the dreaming I. The free state of imagination is, however, also unchangeable due to the surrealistic extension that the imagination of self-bounding by imagined reality has been acknowledged to be as such without reducing its product, the reality of the dream. This difference between the imagination achieved (and limited) by the dreaming I and the imaginative force of the surrealistic attitude as a waking relation to the imagination of dreaming is the twofold condition of the possibility of creating surrealistic works of art.

When Ives Tanguy painted his mysterious imaginary landscapes—e.g., his *Palace of the Window Rocks* (1942)—he was artificially recognizing a tableau that shows never-seen, quasi-real imaginary things within a quasi-real imaginary space. The imagination that presents such things is totally free—accompanied by “the feeling of an absolute freedom,” as Tanguy said—whereas the product is a world that not only looks as if it is real, but appears as a coherence of facts established by unshakeable necessity. The imagination is free because it undertakes the ultimate: it creates imaginary products that give the impression of being real. This imagination realizes as the dreaming I does, but in a state of not limiting itself (better put: as an imaginative force that both reveals and confirms the self-limiting imagination); it thereby realizes a kind of world-experiencing with correlative objects that seem to be real (comparable to a *trompe l’oeil*) although they can never have a place within the real world (contrary to a *trompe l’oeil*).

The presentation of a necessity being based on an “absolute” sphere that is neither reality itself nor a representing picture of reality marks a common aim of art and phenomenology at the turn of the last century, and may be a reaction to the same cultural situation in which contact with reality has lost its natural status, its matter-of-factness. While artists search for necessity—e.g., Wassily Kandinsky’s “*innere Notwendigkeit*” (the inner necessity) of pure colors and pure forms (Kandinsky 1952: 48, 75, 78)—phenomenology turns to possibility, to the horizons of experiencing. This possibility nevertheless retains

its relation to the real world and should display (as at least desired in Husserl’s phenomenology) a strong invariable structure, which is a kind of necessity, and this very structure is itself to be detected by imagination. The “dream of phenomenology” (cf. Husserl 1954: 508) is, however, not yet over, since the central question is still unanswered: what is the source of this kind of necessity about *reality* and its possibilities?

Bibliography

- Breton, André. *Manifestes du surréalisme* [1924]. Paris: Flammarion, 1999; *Manifestos of Surrealism*. Trans. Helen R. Lane and Richard Seaver. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972.
- Cairns, Dorion. *Conversations with Husserl and Fink*. Ed. Husserl-Archives. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976.
- Cairns, Dorion. *Nachlass* held in the Archival Repository of the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology, Inc., at the University of Memphis.
- Conrad, Theodor. *Wesenstheorie des Lebens und Erlebens*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.
- Conrad-Martius, Hedwig. “Traum und Schlafwandeln” [1940]. Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Conrad-Martiusiana* A VII 3.
- Fink, Eugen. “Vergegenwärtigung und Bild Beiträge zur Phänomenologie der Unwirklichkeit” [1930]. In his *Studien zur Phänomenologie 1930–1939*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966, 1–78.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung* [1923]. *Gesamtausgabe* 17. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994.
- Héring, Jean. “La représentation et le rêve.” In *Revue d’Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 27, 1947, 193–206.
- Héring, Jean. “Concerning Image, Idea, and Dream.” In *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 8, 1947, 188–205.
- Héring, Jean. “Über Traumerlebnisse” [1956]. Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Conradiana* 378 D.
- Héring, Jean. “Quelque thèmes d’une phénoménologie du rêve.” In *For Roman Ingarden: Nine Essays in Phenomenology*. Ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka. Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959, 75–89.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie*. [1936]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 6. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954; *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Briefwechsel*. Ed. Karl Schuhmann and Elisabeth Schuhmann. Vol.3. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. Iribarne, Julia V. “Contributions to the Phenomenology of Dreams.” In *Essays in Celebration of the Foundation of the Organization of Phenomenological Organizations*. Ed. CHEUNG Chan-Fai, Ivan Chvatík, Ion

- Copoeru, Lester Embree, Julia Iribarne, and Hans Rainer Sepp. Web-published at www.o-p-o.net, 2003.
- Kandinsky, Wassily. *Über das Geistige in der Kunst* [1912]. Bern: Benteli, 1952; *Complete Writings on Art*. Ed. Kenneth C. Lindsay and Peter Vergo. New York: Da Capo Press, 1994.
- Landgrebe, Ludwig. *Der Begriff des Erlebens. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik unseres Selbstverständnisses und zum Problem der seelischen Ganzheit* [1932]. Ed. Karel Novotný. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2009, §46.
- Leyendecker, Herbert. "Anhang: Zusammenfassung mit einem Ausblick auf die Wesensanalyse des Traumes." In his *Zur Phänomenologie der Täuschungen*. Halle: Buchdruckerei des Waisenhauses, 1913, 176–89.
- Metzger, Arnold. *Freiheit und Tod* [1955]. Freiburg: Rombach, 1972.
- Patočka, Jan. "Die Frage des Solipsismus und das Argument des zusammenhängenden Traums" [1942]. In his *Die Bewegung der menschlichen Existenz. Phänomenologische Schriften II*. Ed. Klaus Nellen, Jiří Němec, and Ilja Srubar. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1991, 43–60.
- Richir, Marc. *Phénoménologie en esquisses: Nouvelles fondations*, Grenoble: Millon, 2000.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *De l'interprétation: Essai sur Freud*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1965; *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Trans. Denis Savage. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'imaginaire: Psychologie phénoménologique de l'imagination*. Paris: Gallimard, 1940; *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. Trans. Jonathan Webber. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Schapp, Wilhelm. In *Geschichten verstrickt. Zum Sein von Mensch und Ding* [1953]. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985.
- Schapp, Wilhelm. *Philosophie der Geschichten* [1959]. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1981.
- Schutz, Alfred. "On Multiple Realities" [1946]. In *Collected Papers I*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962, 207–259.
- Schutz, Alfred. *Collected Papers IV*. Ed. Helmut Wagner and George Psathas. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. "Phänomen Traum. Ein innerphänomenologischer Dialog." In *Traum Logik Geld. Freud, Husserl und Simmel zum Denken der Moderne*. Ed. Ulrike Kadi, Brigitta Keintzel, and Helmuth Vetter. Tübingen: edition discord, 2001, 110–124.

Mikel Dufrenne (1910–1995)

Edward S. Casey

The most distinguished philosopher of art in French phenomenology, Dufrenne is faithful to his origins in EDMUND HUSSERL, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE, and MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY. He brought phenomenological aesthetics to a yet to be surpassed level of clarity and originality. His writings were systematic and highly structured, yet fresh and bold in their insights. He confronted classical issues in aesthetics while being open to the new in the art of his time. His students, e.g., Christian Metz, Louis Marin, Olivier Revault D'Allonnes, Daniel Charles, and Jean-Francois Lyotard, have risen to distinction. He founded the department of philosophy at the University of Paris, Nanterre, in the 1960s, inviting EMMANUEL LEVINAS and PAUL RICOEUR to join him there. Editing *La Revue d'Esthétique* and directing the book series entitled *Collection d'Esthétique*, he disseminated a distinctively phenomenological aesthetics throughout the West. At his death, he was the doyen of the philosophy of art in Europe, and widely appreciated elsewhere, including the United States and Quebec, where he taught during his last decades.

Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique (1953) is Dufrenne's masterpiece. Parts I and II are entitled "Phenomenology of the Aesthetic Object" and "Analysis of the Work of Art." The aesthetic object calls for phenomenological treatment, since it is the artwork as it *appears* in perception; it is the work of art "perceived for its own sake" (Dufrenne 1973: 16). Aesthetic object and work of art are intimately intertwined in aesthetic experience: "the aesthetic object

refers to the work and is inseparable from it" and can be considered the work of art that "gets the perception it solicits and deserves" (ibid.: lii; cf. 17). Thanks to their close collaboration, the work is animated and the object is anchored. The result is "the sensuous in its glory" (ibid.: 14; cf. 339: "the apotheosis of the sensuous"). Art consists in the generation of the sensuous (*le sensible*), which is the integral flesh shared between the artwork as experienced and the human subject as the locus of that experience. The aesthetic object is their conjoint creation, and arises whenever humans attend to art, in opera or theater, museums or galleries, on the street, in the park, etc.

Part III of the *Phénoménologie* is entitled "Phenomenology of Aesthetic Perception." Building on Merleau-Ponty's analysis of the primary and secondary layers in perception, Dufrenne traces out three levels in art: sheer bodily presence; representation (preeminently as imagination); and feeling (culminating in expression). Where imagination can be a distraction from the artistic process, feeling is profoundly implicated. Far from being mute or brute, feeling has its own intelligence that serves as a bond between aesthetic subject and aesthetic object. "Feeling is as deeply embedded in the object as it is in the subject" (ibid.: 455). It exceeds mere immediacy by virtue of its alliance with reflection: "feeling is encompassed, at both its poles, by reflection.... Feeling can have a noetic function and value only as a reflective act, in part a victory over former reflection and in part open to a new reflection" (ibid.: 416). At the same time, feeling involves a depth that links the feeling subject and the felt artwork in a "communion" and "reciprocity" (ibid.: 225, 483). Deep within the aesthetic object, an adumbrated world attracts and holds feeling—a world populated by events,

E.S. Casey (✉)
State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY, USA

characters, colors, and distances, but exceeding any simple sum of these particular contents.

In the final part, “Critique of Aesthetic Experience,” Dufrenne explores the transcendental dimension that makes aesthetic experience possible, its *a priori* basis. He finds this in affective qualities that specify the world of the aesthetic object while being based in feelings of the appreciative subject. Much as the sensuous imbricates aesthetic object and subject within lived experience, affective qualities pre-connect these two poles on an *a priori* level. Rather than being experiential, the *a priori* is *constitutive*: stemming from the subject as the condition of any actual experience, it structures the objects of that experience. In the case of aesthetic experience, qualities such as exuberance or tenderness are in the creator and the appreciator not merely as psychological facts, but as states of mind of a certain sort—as well as in the aesthetic object, as “the soul of [its] expressed world” (ibid.: 446), as what gives this world its incomparable character or identity. Thus a quality, acting as an *a priori* condition, endows the aesthetic world with a distinctive *expressiveness* where “expression” is “that which reveals affective quality as total and undifferentiated” (ibid.: 455). The expressive is the display of affective quality in the world of the aesthetic object. As Dufrenne puts it, all parts of an aesthetic object “collaborate in achieving expression and in contributing to the total effect that is encapsulated in the affective quality” (ibid.: 424).

The affective *a priori* indicates a profound kinship between the appreciator of an aesthetic object and its world. What is expressed as a quality in that world is at the same time grasped, pre-reflectively, within the subject and through its feeling. This indicates that the affective *a priori*, rather than being a matter of knowledge alone (as in Kant), is “existential,” i.e., based in human subjectivity at the deep level of feeling. This same *a priori* is simultaneously “cosmological,” i.e., it says something significant about the constitution of non-artistic lifeworlds of perception and history (Ibid.: 454). Both existential and cosmological dimensions of the affective *a priori* are preconceptual, yet they can attain a form of truth peculiar to artworks: through them, we become acquainted with otherwise neglected aspects of ourselves and the surrounding world. The aesthetic object is self-contained and self-sufficient, but it also speaks of what exceeds its experienced limits: its own historical and material conditions, its “environment.” Aesthetic worlds are at

once “true by themselves” (ibid.: 536), i.e., true in their own affective and expressive terms, and yet also true of the historically and culturally real factors they arise from. This means that the artwork has, beyond its phenomenological and transcendental dimensions, an ontological bearing that resituates it in the real with regard to its generation and effects—even as its primary life lies in the experience that animates and sustains it. Ultimately, the aesthetic object is, in terms from Merleau-Ponty, an “in-itself for-us” (ibid.: 556) that, while mainly meaningful in the experience of art, also “reveals an aspect of the real” (ibid.).

Near the end of the *Phénoménologie*, Dufrenne announces that “aesthetic experience itself calls for the notion of the *a priori*” (ibid.: 437). Immediately afterward, he was preparing *La notion de l'a priori* (1959). Building on MAX SCHELER, he set out a systematic theory—a theory supplemented in *L'inventaire des apriori* (1981)—that discusses “the objective *a priori*,” “the subjective *a priori*,” and “man and world.” The objective *a priori* includes formal, material, perceived, and constitutive forms of the *a priori*, while the subjective *a priori* involves the corporeal and social *a priori* as well as “the *a priori* as known *a priori*.” The discussion of these terms is elegant and economic, and sorts out much that was merged in the *Phénoménologie*. The primary thesis is that “the *a priori* is the meaning present and given in both object and subject, and it assures their communication while maintaining their difference” (Dufrenne 1959/1966: 45–6).

The equilibrium and affinity between human and world are also pursued, and in the end, the place of the *a priori* in philosophy and poetry is outlined. “The poetic” is not just an aesthetic category but an expression of the deep-lying accord between humans and nature. It is an *a priori* that belongs to the natural world, e.g., in the case of a beautiful landscape, as well as to the poetry that invokes this world. Much as “feeling is an aspect of the world” and not just a subjective state of mind, so poetry releases feeling from a too narrow attachment to particular objects, thereby “allowing [feeling] to manifest itself according to the measure of a world” (1973: 237). Poetry expresses the natural world in images rather than concepts and in a concrete speech that conveys the living sense of the natural world. Thus poetry gives a vivid sense of what it is like to inhabit the natural world, the world that is also the object of conceptual understanding. Philosophical and scientific truths about nature “must first be sought in

the feeling of nature” (ibid.: 236), and it is poetry that most forcefully expresses this basic feeling.

Dufrenne’s *Le poétique* (1963) inaugurates a second phase of his career. Not only does it provide a detailed examination of poetry as such, with nuanced accounts of reading and recitation, rhythm and harmony, but it also suggests a new model for art. In this model, the role of Nature (now capitalized for emphasis) becomes the predominant moving force, the ultimate source, of aesthetic experience. Nature emerges as an “inexhaustible reality,” “a reserve, an animated source” (Dufrenne 1963: 152, 155) that is the ultimate inspiration of the artist. It “preexists” the artwork and “calls for it” (ibid.: 87). The priority of the aesthetic object that earlier emerged in the close attention to aesthetic experience gives way to a paradigm in which Nature as “the imponderable power of the source” (ibid.: 164) at once provokes and precedes this object. The earlier emphasis on the accord between humans and the natural world—i.e., the basis of the *a priori* in its major forms—shifts to the origin of the accord itself. No longer the human subject but Nature becomes the “*a priori* of the *a priori*” (ibid.: 164; cf. 175, 180).

In this model, the ecumenical attitude so evident in the *Phénoménologie* yields to a stress on the virtues and powers of poetry. In part, this is because poetry treats its medium, language, as a natural given or “matter” (*matière*) with its own necessity, transforming it into poems that present themselves as necessary in their verbal format, as having to assume the form they do: “language becomes Nature by way of poetry” (1963: 175). Further, the primacy of “the poetic” as an aesthetic category since Aristotle reflects how “the poetic state” is experienced not only when reading or hearing, but as part of all aesthetic experience: hence the widespread use of “poetic” as a term of general approbation, not only for art but also regarding the natural world. Dufrenne proposes that the basis for this priority of the poetic lies in the fact that the poetic state in the poet corresponds to the poetic character of Nature: “the poetic state is inspired by [the] poetic being of Nature” (ibid.: 136). This state in the reader is a response to a poem, and the poem is a response to the inherent poetry of Nature, “this poetry before the poem” (ibid.). Not that Nature is already poetry—that would be to misconstrue it as *natura naturata* and to attribute to it a settled form—but as a creative source, as *natura naturans*, it is “poetizable”

(ibid.: 70). Thanks to the poet, Nature precipitates into the “great images” that make up poetry of many kinds: “The poetic designates the expressivity of the images wherein the *poiein* of Nature expresses itself” (ibid.: 180).

A novel view of expression emerges. No longer the culmination of the path from below—from presence to representation to feeling—it is now the first avatar of Nature in a movement from above: “all art is expressive like Nature, but it expresses Nature, while Nature expresses itself” (ibid.: 180). Nature expresses itself not just in certain archetypal images (e.g., “mountain,” “ocean,” “plains”), but more generally in *worlds*, i.e., detotalized totalities of images that are spatiotemporally open-ended. World, already important in the context of aesthetic experience, is now the essential middle term between Nature and the poet. On the one hand, Nature sediments itself into world: “Nature becomes world for human beings” (ibid.: 164)—a world that is the accessible aspect of Nature, inaccessible in itself. Yet it is “the world which the work expresses” (ibid.: 84); the work “says it” (ibid.: 67), and thus brings it into language or another medium. The poetic signifier “enlarges the signified into the dimensions of a world” (ibid.: 72), and the world thereby expressed is the “true subject” of poetry insofar as “the world is itself poetic” (ibid.: 70, 72). In this way, world is the expressive matrix where Nature “crystallizes itself” (ibid.: 175), just as it is the place where poetry—indeed, every artistic endeavor—consolidates itself, where art happens in its most extensive evocative power. Nature “speaks to us” (ibid.) in particular worlds, but we can speak back to Nature by poetizing it from within (and in the terms of) these same worlds.

While we have focused on Dufrenne’s major books in phenomenological aesthetics, he published several other books on art and numerous shorter pieces. The appreciative reader will notice that Dufrenne’s phenomenological approach continues even as he explores contemporary movements in his later writings. His last book, *L’œil et l’oreille* (1987), echoing Merleau-Ponty’s essay “L’œil et l’esprit” (1961), argues that the ear deserves the same attention as the eye; this book contributed significantly to the intense debate concerning oculocentrism in the 1980s. The book is a fitting finale to a remarkably fertile and far-reaching engagement with art, an engagement guided by phenomenology at every critical juncture.

Dufrenne's many accomplishments in aesthetics bespeak the elective affinity between phenomenological method, broadly construed, and the experience and creation of art. It is as if the latter, from within their own diversity and complexity, called for the subtle insightfulness of the former. During his career, Mikel Dufrenne pursued and deepened this affinity in works that bear his own uniquely congenial and immensely creative stamp.

Bibliography

- Allen, David G. "Aesthetic Perception in Mikel Dufrenne's *Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*." In *Philosophy Today*, 27, 1978, 50–64.
- Barilli, Renato. *Per un'estetica mondana*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1964, 271–98, 323–28.
- Beardsley, Monroe C. *Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present*. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- Brisson, Marcelle. "De la perception sauvage à l'utopie." In *Pour une esthétique sans entrave: Mélanges Mikel Dufrenne*. Paris: U.G.E., 1975, 33–50.
- Casey, Edward S. "Translator's Introduction." In Mikel Dufrenne, *The Notion of the A Priori*. Trans. Edward S. Casey. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1966, xviii–xxviii.
- Casey, Edward S. "Translator's Introduction." In *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973, xv–xlii.
- Casey, Edward S. "L'imagination comme intermédiaire." In *Mélanges*, 1975, 93–114.
- Charles, Daniel. "Mikel Dufrenne et l'idée de la nature." In *Mélanges*, 1975, 73–88.
- Clement, Catherine B. "Séminaires." In *Mélanges*, 1975, 61–64.
- Delhomme, Jeanne. "D'un nouvel a priori." In *Mélanges*, 1975, 89–92.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 Vols. [1953]. 2nd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *La notion de l'a priori*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959; *The Notion of the A Priori*. Trans. Edward S. Casey. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1966.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Le poétique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963a.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Language and Philosophy*. Trans. Henry Veatch. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963b.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *In the Presence of the Sensuous: Essays in Aesthetics*. Ed. Mark S. Roberts and Dennis Gallagher. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1987.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Esthétique et philosophie I–III*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1967, 1976, 1981.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Pour l'homme*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1968.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Art et politique*. Paris: Presses de la Cité, 1974.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Subversion, perversion*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Inventaire des a priori: recherche de l'originale*. Paris: Christian Bourgois, 1981.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *L'oeil et l'oreille*. Montreal: Editions de l'Hexagone, 1987.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. ed. *Main Trends in Aesthetics and the Sciences of Art*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1979.
- Dufrenne, Mikel, and Paul Ricoeur. *Karl Jaspers et la philosophie de l'existence*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1947.
- Feezel, Randolph M. "Mikel Dufrenne and the World of the Aesthetic Object." In *Philosophy Today* 29, 1980, 20–32.
- Figurelli, Roberto. "La notion d'a priori chez Mikel Dufrenne." In *Mélanges* 1975, 133–42.
- Formaggio, Dino. "Mikel Dufrenne, la natura et il senso del poetica." In *Fenomenologia e scienze dell'uomo* 2, 1982, 7–18.
- Franzini, Elio. "Natura e poesia. Su un inventario degli a priori di Mikel Dufrenne." In *Fenomenologia e scienze dell'uomo* 2, 1982, 67–90.
- Gilson, Etienne, Thomas Langan, and Armand A. Maurer. *Recent Philosophy: Hegel to the Present*. New York: Random House, 1966, 396–401.
- Kaelin, Eugene F. *An Existentialist Aesthetic*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962, 35–385.
- Kaelin, Eugene F. *Art and Existence: A Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1970.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. "À la place de l'homme, l'expression." In *Esprit* 7, 1960.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *Discours, Figure*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1971, 291–95.
- Magliola, Robert R. *Phenomenology and Literature: An Introduction*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1977, 142–73.
- Morpurgo-Tagliabue, Guido. *Esthétique contemporaine*. Milan: Marzorati, 1960, 460–68.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Philosophie, sentiment et poésie." In *Esprit* 29, 1961, 504–12.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Le poétique." *Esprit*, 1966, 107–116.
- Robert, Mark S., and Dennis Gallagher. "Editors' Introduction." In Mikel Dufrenne, *In the Presence of the Sensuous: Essays in Aesthetics*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanity Press International, 1987, xv–xxiv.
- Sallis, John. "Constitution in Mikel Dufrenne." In *The Modern Schoolman* 42, 1970, 169–75.
- Silverman, Hugh J. [Review of] Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. In *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 1975, 462–64.
- Silverman, Hugh J. "Dufrenne's Phenomenology of Poetry." In *Philosophy Today* 25, 1976, 20–24.
- Spiegelberg, Herbert. *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction* [1960]. 3rd rev. and enl. ed., with the collaboration of Karl Schuhmann. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982, 600–6.
- Taminiaux, Jacques. "Notes sur une phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique." In *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 55, 1957, 93–110.
- Tertulian, Nicholas. "En réalisant la Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique." In *Mélanges* 1975, 115–28.
- Vásquez, Aldolfo Sánchez. *Estética y Marxismo*. 2 Vols. Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1970.

Ecological Aesthetics

Ted Toadvine

The emerging subdiscipline of ecological aesthetics concerns the aesthetic appreciation of the world in its entirety, including both the natural and built environments, and is consequently the broadest category of aesthetics. This area of study emerged as a distinct field in the latter half of the twentieth century, although its historical roots may be traced to eighteenth century British and Scottish theories of natural aesthetics, especially their treatment of the picturesque in landscape painting, which culminated in Kant's analysis of the beautiful and sublime in nature. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, aesthetic theory tended to focus almost exclusively on artworks and other objects of human design. But encouraged by increasing concern with environmental issues among philosophers and the general public, a new interest in the aesthetics of nature and its relationship to the built environment has emerged over the last several decades. Ecological aesthetics today incorporates studies of the aesthetics of nature, including natural objects and larger wholes such as ecosystems, gardens and landscape architecture, environmental and earth art, architecture and urban planning, and the relations between the different modes of aesthetic appreciation appropriate to these different domains. This extension of aesthetic consideration to both natural and built environments has led to a reconsideration of traditional aesthetic categories and of central tenets of aesthetic theory.

Explicitly phenomenological work in ecological aesthetics is still in its infancy, but the insights of many of the major figures in the tradition are applicable to this new field of study. EDMUND HUSSERL's concept

of intentionality and his descriptions of the intuitively given experiential lifeworld, for example, provide a concrete framework for understanding aesthetic experience as a basic and pervasive quality of everyday life.

MARTIN HEIDEGGER's appreciation of the role of earth in the formation of the artwork, his critique of the enframing character of modern technology, and his description of poetic dwelling as an alternative to modern technological civilization suggest parallels with contemporary environmental concerns and a critique of the humanistic limits of modern aesthetic theory. MAX SCHELER proposes the aesthetic value of nature as a paradigmatic example of the nonrelativity of values. MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY's investigations of embodied perception and his later ontology of flesh hold implications for the epistemological and metaphysical foundations of an environmental aesthetics, and many of his writings on art address the relationship between the painter's vision and our perceptual experience of nature. MIKEL DUFRENNE recognizes in pure aesthetic experience an incipient phenomenological reduction that brings to the fore the intentional bond between subject and world, suggesting the particular appropriateness of the phenomenological approach for formulating a general aesthetic theory. His description of aesthetic objects as expressive "quasi-subjects" and of the sensuous as a common act of the sensing and the sensed also pave the way for an elaboration of aesthetics into a philosophy of nature.

Arnold Berleant, a leading figure in the development of a specifically ecological aesthetics, has been the strongest proponent of the phenomenological approach in this field. His "aesthetics of engagement," inspired by Husserlian intentionality and Merleau-Ponty's descriptions of embodied experience,

T. Toadvine (✉)
University of Oregon, Charleston, OR, USA

challenges core assumptions of traditional aesthetics. According to Berleant, the “doctrine of disinterestedness” that pervades aesthetic theory entails the separation of a spectator, conceived as passive and primarily visual, from an aesthetic object lacking any practical connections with the wider natural and cultural context (Berleant 1988: 1992). In contrast, he holds that the human perceiver is embedded in the aesthetic environment and continuously interacts with it in an active, engaged, and multisensory fashion. This “participatory model” of aesthetic experience treats the environment as “a field of forces continuous with the organism, a field in which there is a reciprocal action of organism on environment and environment on organism and in which there is no real demarcation between them” (Berleant 1988: 93). This general model of aesthetic experience is equally applicable, he suggests, to works of art, the built environment, and the natural environment. In fact, given the continuity between the human perceiver and the surrounding world, the cultural and historical formation of the concept of nature, and the extension of our technological influence to every part of the natural world, it follows for him that there is no real distinction between nature and culture: “the natural world is no independent sphere but is itself a cultural artifact” (Berleant 1992: 167). On the basis of this aesthetics of engagement, Berleant develops a theoretical framework for negative aesthetic judgments and suggests a new model for education and aesthetic community that gives central place to continuity, “connectedness within a whole rather than a link between discrete parts” (Berleant 1997).

Although Berleant has been the first to offer a comprehensive phenomenological theory of ecological aesthetics, other themes relevant to the field have also received extensive treatment by phenomenologists in recent years. Investigations of the role of place, for instance, have combined philosophy with cultural geography and environmental design to form a new area of study that David Seamon calls “phenomenological ecology” (Seamon 1993; Seamon and Mugerauer 1985). Edward S. Casey (1993) argues for a renewed appreciation of the role of place in human experience, which he sees as long obscured by our cultural and philosophical privileging of space and time, and he explores the lived body’s role in the formation of place and the distinct characters of built, cultivated, and wild place-worlds. His intellectual history of the hidden role of place from ancient creation myths through

the twentieth century devotes considerable attention to the phenomenological tradition, especially the contributions of Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty (Casey 1997). Starting from the “originate thinking” of Heidegger, Ingrid Leman Stefanovic (2000) grants an ontological primacy to place in her proposal of alternatives to received notions of sustainable development. Gary Backhaus and John Murungi (2002) present phenomenological analyses of the systemic transformations of urban and suburban landscapes through their dialectical interaction with human activities. Eduardo Mendieta (2001) maintains that our very idea of philosophy, including its account of rationality and social agency, is informed by urban spatializing practices, a point that he illustrates by taking JEAN-PAUL SARTRE’s phenomenology as a paradigmatic example.

Other relevant topics of recent phenomenological investigation include the intersection of built and natural environments in gardening and environmental art, as well as the representation of the earth within literature and the fine arts. Collections edited by Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (2001, 2003) address the representation and role of earth in literature and human existence and the phenomenological experience of gardens, especially as figures of infinity and the sublime, across a span of cultural and literary traditions. James Hatley (2003) finds in the Land Art of Andrew Goldsworthy a renewed interrogation of the relation between *technē* and *physis* that, rather than leaving nature untouched, approaches nature “in such a manner that our touching is also touched by what we touch,” suggesting an aesthetics as well as an ethics of wilderness (Hatley 2003: 14).

Central to contemporary ecological aesthetics is the question of the relation between the aesthetic appreciation of artworks and of nature. Berleant, as noted above, stresses a continuity of all forms of aesthetic appreciation that is grounded on the activity of the engaged and participatory human perceiver. In contrast, Allen Carlson (1993, 2000, 2004), emphasizes the difference between these two types of appreciation, holding that common sense or scientific knowledge is necessary for the aesthetic appreciation of nature. According to his “natural environmental model,” nature is “an environment and thus a setting within which we exist and that we normally experience with our complete range of senses as our unobtrusive background” (Carlson 2004: 72). Nature becomes an

aesthetic object when we shift our attention to certain foci within this all-embracing background, which are then experienced as forming an “obtrusive foreground.” Conceptual knowledge of nature is needed to guide our selection of appropriate foci and boundaries for this shift of attention.

Stan Godlovitch (2004), on the other hand, holds that such positions as Berleant’s and Carlson’s arbitrarily adopt the human scale of perception, thereby failing to appreciate nature on its own terms. As an alternative, he proposes an “acentric” aesthetic aloofness, the leveling of all viewpoints to an anonymous uniformity within which the human standpoint holds no particular privilege. Only such an acentric view is capable of grounding moral respect for nature, Godlovitch holds, since it leaves nature “fundamentally inaccessible and ultimately alien” (Godlovitch 2004: 113). Clarification of this debate requires, first, a phenomenological account of aesthetic experience in general, and second, an account of what appreciation of nature “on its own terms” can mean within the context of human experience.

Aesthetic experience always involves a perceptual or sensuous core, which may take as its focus one sense in particular or a combination of senses and corporeal experiences. When viewing a painting or listening to a symphony, for instance, cultural convention teaches us to exclude as irrelevant everything but what the single focal sense conveys. By contrast, a stroll through a stand of old-growth Douglas fir combines sights, smells, sounds, tactile impressions, and the kinaesthetic sense of movement in a single aesthetic experience. (This sensuous core of aesthetic experience may also be supplied by memory or imagination rather than by present perception, e.g., remembering a musical performance or imaginatively anticipating a walk through the forest.)

Because the core of an aesthetic experience is always sensuous, such experience is always relative to the perceiver’s spatial and temporal scale. The range of human spatial and temporal perception is a function of our sensory organization and may differ significantly from the spatial or temporal organization of the *Umwelten* of other sentient creatures. The aesthetic appreciation of works of art generally dictates a certain spatial or temporal context: we look at a painting from a certain distance and listen to a musical performance at a certain tempo. We may alter these contexts at will in some cases, and they may also be

changed by habituation (familiarity with a city changes our spatial context for appreciating the architecture of a certain building) or conceptual knowledge (awareness of geological timescales may alter our aesthetic appreciation of erosion patterns on the rocky Oregon coast). The spatiotemporal limits prescribed by human perceptual organization may also be expanded technologically, e.g., by microscopes and telescopes or by time-lapse photography, which requires the translation or annexation of these broader or narrower spatial and temporal contexts to those that we are able to experience directly. In addition to such spatial and temporal contexts, the sensory aspect of our aesthetic experience essentially involves “framing,” the selection of certain foci as aesthetically relevant against a broader background or horizon. Such selection reflects traits of the perceiver, such as concentration, attention span, expectations, personal history, and habituation, and it may also be guided by cultural norms and conventions.

Framing of artworks is typically guided by convention, as with the literal frame of a painting or the edge of a theatrical stage, and cultural framing conventions are not entirely absent when we look beyond the world of art: directional markers and rain gutters are not the intended objects of appreciation on a nature trail, and signs along the highway mark the appropriate stops for a “scenic overlook” of the landscape. But aesthetic experience often extends beyond objects designed for that purpose or scenes that are culturally endorsed, leaving us with less well-defined guidance in our framing selections. The appreciation of sounds in nature, for instance, involves numerous selections that may be shaped as much by individual as by cultural preferences: how long we should listen, what counts as a foreground or background sound, whether human-produced sounds should be excluded, and even whether we should parse natural sounds into relatively distinct melodies in a serial structure (Fisher 2004). The appreciation of landscape also highlights the importance of such framing, since a landscape exists only as seen from a particular point of view; the landscape scene is a “subjective object” rather than a real part of nature (Crawford 2004b: 257).

The sensuous core of the aesthetic experience is therefore essentially relative to the perceiver. But aesthetic appreciation is not reducible to this sensuous core, since evaluation, at least of a tacit sort, must be involved. Although both Berleant and Carlson restrict aesthetic appreciation to humans, we clearly share with

many animals such sensory pleasures as basking in the sun or enjoying a thirst-quenching drink, which are candidates for rudimentary aesthetic appreciation. In many cases, human aesthetic experience will also include what Ronald Hepburn calls a “thought-component,” which is introduced “as we implicitly compare and contrast *here* with *elsewhere*, *actual* with *possible*, *present* with *past*” (Hepburn 1993: 66–67). This “thought-component” is not limited to conceptual thought and need not involve self-conscious awareness or reflection. Rather, it indicates that the sensuous core is accompanied by a mixture of emotion, imagination, conceptualization, and metaphorization, and may also include elements of what Hepburn terms “metaphysical imagination,” a “seeing as...” that interprets the present perception in terms of its metaphysical relevance for the whole of experience (Hepburn 2004). Watching a frog have its innards sucked out by a giant water bug, as Annie Dillard describes in *Pilgrim at Tinker Creek*, may provoke a grim realization of the “chomp or fast” law of life, extending to a view of the cosmos as essentially conflictual. A swim in the warm and calm waters off the Florida coast, on the other hand, might carry with it a sense of metaphysical immersion and fluid interconnection with all things.

Such metaphysical imagination, and the “thought-component” more generally, cannot be treated as a superficial addition to the aesthetic experience; “it is fused with the sensory components, not a meditation aroused by these” (Hepburn 2004: 128). Despite the terminology, such “components” are not separable parts or layers added on to an unchanged perceptual substratum, but integral aspects of a single, holistic experience from which they are separable only abstractly. Emotions, imagination, and conceptual knowledge may even guide the sensuous framing of experience by directing one’s attention to what may have otherwise escaped attention, so that the sensuous components and the thought-components of an aesthetic experience engage in a mutually informing dialectic.

This account of aesthetic experience incorporates in a limited way both the perceptual engagement described by Berleant and the influence of conceptual information stressed by Carlson. But the emphasis on spatial and temporal scale and the role granted to framing underscores Godlovitch’s concerns: does aesthetic experience so described allow for appreciation

of nature in its own right, or is it merely an anthropocentric projection? Donald Crawford (2004a) distinguishes between three senses of nature: (1) unrestricted nature, a metaphysical view of nature as “unlimited and all-encompassing” dating from the mid-nineteenth century and including humans and cultural creations such as works of art; (2) Aristotelian nature, characterized by having an internal rather than an external source of change and consequently to be contrasted with the artifactual, which would include human natural functions but exclude contingent natural events or “accidents” as parts of nature; and (3) pure nature, defined negatively by the absence of any human influence whatsoever, which would exclude our bodies, works of art, and culture, but would include what Aristotle considered to be “accidents.” The claim of Godlovitch that subjecting nature to our human perceptual scale thereby degrades it therefore takes nature in the latter sense as its ideal.

But nature in the pure sense cannot function as a standard for aesthetic appreciation. It is questionable, first, whether any part of the earth remains unaltered by human activity, and the activities that we consider to be aesthetic appreciation of nature are often directed toward objects that bear the mark of human influence (Crawford 2004a). More fundamentally, the emphasis on “pure nature” suggests a questionable metaphysical division between humans and nonhuman nature, as Berleant (1992) has noted. Finally, if respecting “pure nature” excludes any relationship with a perceiver or experiencer, then there would not seem to be any reason to consider this relationship “aesthetic” or even an “experience,” since the aesthetic relation is an intentional one and involves a sensuous aspect. Nevertheless, the notion of “pure nature” does have a foundation in our experience. Our aesthetic experience recognizes a relative distinction between objects of human design and those relatively free from human intervention: an old-growth forest trail will show signs of human intervention, but it remains less designed than an arboretum, and this in turn is relatively more natural than a potted Norwegian spruce. “Pure nature” arises as an ideal extension of the experience of perceived naturalness, much like the examples of metaphysical imagination discussed above. Godlovitch’s characterizations of nature as mysterious and aloof thus remain tacitly indebted to our perceptual experiences of nature.

Furthermore, the relativity of aesthetic experience to a perceiver does not entail that such experience is an anthropocentric projection. The aesthetic significance of a part of nature depends on the elements revealed by the perceiver's perspective and framing, but these elements are still features of nature, not subjective projections. Crawford makes this point concerning the appreciation of natural scenery: "A landscape, as an object of aesthetic appreciation, is in fact an expanse of the surface of the earth...; and although its qualities are those we determine by looking at it from a particular viewpoint, that does not preclude it from being a part of nature" (Crawford 2004b: 257). We may become aware, of course, that our perceptual experiences are framed in an inappropriate way by limited or inaccurate conceptual knowledge, or by the imposition of personal or cultural expectations that fail to accord with what nature actually presents. For example, our appreciation of English ivy in a Northwestern forest may alter when we learn that it is an invasive species crowding out native trilliums, and we may listen to birdsongs differently after becoming aware of the Western tendency to privilege narrative musical structures. But this ability to revise our concepts and framings relies on an expansion of experience, not on the rejection of experience altogether in favor of aloof mystery. Even our awareness of the limitations of human spatial and temporal scale takes our perceptual experience as its starting point, varying this imaginatively as we conceive of other possible scales and perspectives. There is no contradiction, then, between holding that all aesthetic appreciation is experiential, i.e., relative to a perceiver, and that it may engage with nature on its own terms. Each particular aesthetic experience is open to evaluation concerning its success in taking nature on its own terms, and our judgments along these lines will always be open to revision in light of further experience.

Among non-phenomenological contributions to ecological aesthetics, the dominant line of development has been the cognitive approach espoused by Carlson, according to which scientific knowledge is central to aesthetic appreciation of nature. He argues that twentieth century philosophy of art downplayed formal qualities to emphasize the role that art history and criticism play in art appreciation, so our appreciation of nature should be guided predominantly by natural-historical and scientific knowledge

(Carlson 1993, 2001). This emphasis on natural-historical knowledge follows in the tradition of John Muir, Henry David Thoreau, and Aldo Leopold, who tied the aesthetic value of nature to its ecological harmony and integrity, a position that has been refined in Baird Callicott's "land aesthetic" (Carlson 2004, Callicott 1987). Because of its prioritization of scientific knowledge, the cognitive approach has drawn criticism for underestimating the importance of non-conceptual factors in our aesthetic appreciation of nature, such as emotions (Carroll 2004), imagination (Brady 2004, Hepburn 2004), and the ambient dimension of experience (Foster 2004). Debate has also centered on what forms of knowledge may be appropriate for aesthetic guidance, with suggestions that scientific knowledge be complemented by Indigenous traditions, folklore, and myths (Saito 2004), as well as by literary treatments of nature (Sepänmaa 1993). Carlson has refined his position in light of these suggestions and proposes that the cognitive approach be extended beyond consideration of natural aesthetics to provide a model for aesthetic appreciation of the world at large (Carlson 2000, 2001).

Carlson criticizes Berleant's "aesthetics of engagement" for focusing primarily on sensory and formal qualities, thereby making aesthetic appreciation of nature trivial and subjective and potentially isolating the appreciation of art from that of the larger world, since contemporary art appreciation clearly involves conceptual knowledge and understanding that goes beyond the merely sensuous and formal qualities of the object (Carlson 2001: 429). The phenomenological approach to aesthetic experience sketched above avoids these criticisms while incorporating the best features of both Berleant's and Carlson's positions. Since all aesthetic experience is founded on a sensuous core, Berleant's descriptions of our continuous perceptual engagement with an aesthetically charged surrounding world are appropriate. But Berleant overlooks the phenomenologically valid distinction between objects of human design and those relatively free of human intervention. This distinction suggests that aesthetic appreciation of these different objects, and of the cases that range between them, may be informed by conceptual knowledge, and even that such conceptual knowledge may direct our perceptual scale and framing of these objects. Contra Carlson, the phenomenological view does not prioritize conceptual

knowledge over the many other aspects of our complete aesthetic experience, including emotional, imaginative, ambient, and metaphysical aspects, and does not exclude other sources for conceptual knowledge apart from the scientific, such as traditional knowledge or literature.

While for Carlson, "Science is the paradigm of that which reveals objects for what they are and with the properties they have" (Carlson 1993: 219), phenomenology sees natural science as an abstraction from lifeworldly experience oriented toward certain theoretical and practical pursuits. The most fundamental disclosure of objects as what they are is as they are experienced pre-theoretically within the lifeworld, although this experience may be informed by the conceptualizations and sedimentations of the natural sciences. The contributions of the cognitive approach to ecological aesthetics are therefore not at odds with phenomenological insights, starting from a basic description of aesthetic experience that would be applicable both to art and nature. The two accounts may be fruitfully combined for a richer understanding of our holistic aesthetic engagement with the world.

Bibliography

- Backhaus, Gary, and John Murungi, eds. *Transformations of Urban and Suburban Landscapes: Perspectives from Philosophy, Geography, and Architecture*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002.
- Berleant, Arnold. "Aesthetic Perception in Environmental Design." In *Environmental Aesthetics: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Ed. Jack L. Nasar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 84–97.
- Berleant, Arnold. *Art and Engagement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.
- Berleant, Arnold. *The Aesthetics of Environment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.
- Berleant, Arnold. *Living in the Landscape: Toward an Aesthetics of Environment*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997.
- Brady, Emily. "Imagination and the Aesthetic Appreciation of Nature" In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004, 156–69.
- Callicott, J. Baird. "The Land Aesthetic." In *Companion to A Sand County Almanac: Interpretive and Critical Essays*. Ed. J. Baird Callicott. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987, 157–71.
- Carlson, Allen. "Appreciating Art and Appreciating Nature." In *Landscape, Natural Beauty and The Arts*. Ed. Salim Kemal and Ivan Gaskell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 199–227.
- Carlson, Allen. *Aesthetics and the Environment: The Appreciation of Nature, Art and Architecture*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Carlson, Allen. "Environmental Aesthetics." In *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. Ed. Berys Gaut and Dominic McIver Lopes. London: Routledge, 2001, 423–36.
- Carlson, Allen. "Appreciation and the Natural Environment." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004a, 63–75.
- Carlson, Allen, and Arnold Berleant, eds. *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004b.
- Carroll, Noël. "On Being Moved by Nature: Between Religion and Natural History." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004, 89–107.
- Casey, Edward S. *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Casey, Edward S. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Crawford, Donald. "The Aesthetics of Nature and the Environment." In *The Blackwell Guide to Aesthetics*. Ed. Peter Kivy. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004a, 306–24.
- Crawford, Donald. "Scenery and the Aesthetics of Nature." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004b, 253–68.
- Fisher, John A. "Environmental Aesthetics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics*. Ed. Jerrold Levinson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, 667–78.
- Fisher, John A. "What the Hills are Alive With: In Defense of the Sounds of Nature." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004, 232–52.
- Foster, Cheryl. "The Narrative and the Ambient in Environmental Aesthetics." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004, 197–213.
- Godlovitch, Stan. "Icebreakers: Environmentalism and Natural Aesthetics." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004, 108–26.
- Hatley, James. "Technē and Physis: Wilderness and the Aesthetics of the Trace in Andrew Goldsworthy" (2003). International Association for Environmental Philosophy Website (<http://www.environmentalphilosophy.org/>).
- Hepburn, Ronald. "Trivial and Serious in Aesthetic Appreciation of Nature." In *Landscape, Natural Beauty, and the Arts*. Ed. Salim Kemal and Ivan Gaskell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 65–80.
- Hepburn, Ronald. "Landscape and the Metaphysical Imagination." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004, 127–40.
- Kemal, Salim, and Ivan Gaskell, eds. *Landscape, Natural Beauty, and the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Mendieta, Eduardo. "The City and the Philosopher: On the Urbanism of Phenomenology." In *Philosophy & Geography* 4, 2001, 203–218.

- Saito, Yuriko. "Appreciating Nature on its own Terms." In *The Aesthetics of Natural Environments*. Ed. Allen Carlson and Arnold Berleant. Ontario: Broadview, 2004, 141–55.
- Seamon, David, ed. *Dwelling, Seeing, and Designing: Toward a Phenomenological Ecology*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Seamon, David, and Robert Mugerauer, eds. *Dwelling, Place, and Environment: Towards a Phenomenology of Person and World*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Sepänmaa, Yrjö. *The Beauty of Environment: A General Model for Environmental Aesthetics*. 2nd ed. Denton, TX: Environmental Ethics Books, 1993.
- Stefanovic, Ingrid Leman. *Safeguarding our Common Future: Rethinking Sustainable Development*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.
- Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa, ed. *Passions of the Earth in Human Existence, Creativity, and Literature*. *Analecta Husserliana* 71. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa, ed. *Gardens and the Passion for the Infinite*. *Analecta Husserliana* 78. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

Empathy

Andrea Pinotti

There is no one empathy theory, but rather an archipelago of authors and concepts organized around a center that seems to escape a rigorous definition, but has nonetheless inspired many conceptions in the humanities (in metaphysics and aesthetics, religion and ethics, psychology and psychoanalysis, sociology and anthropology), as well as in biology and zoology. Under the entry *empathēia* in Liddell-Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* we read: physical affection, passion. Its etymology is a compound of *én* (in) and a derived form of *pathos* (affection). The German term *Einfühlung* repeats the Greek compound: *Ein* is a prefix meaning "in" and a movement of penetration, immersion, or introduction from the outside to the inside (*hinein*)—although it can also allude to "one," unity, unification, or fusion of two in one—and *Fühlung*, from *fühlen*, to feel, means feeling.

The first occurrences of *Einfühlung* and the corresponding verbal form *sich einfühlen* (to empathize) are to be found in romantic authors such as Johann Gottfried Herder and Novalis, who are recognized by the subsequent theorists as the godfathers of empathy theory (for a critical discussion of this derivation, see Perpeet 1966). In his *Plastik* (1778: Chapter 4), Herder writes that beauty is human life and health palpitating through the perceived body, and thanks to an interior sympathy (*innere Sympathie*), we perform a transposition (*Versetzung*) of ourself into the figure we are contemplating. In the same year he published *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden der menschlichen Seele*, where we find the theme of *hinein fühlen*: in consenting sympathy we have access both to the other

(*Mitgefühl*) and to ourselves (*Selbstgefühl*), because we can only feel ourselves inside others (*hineinfühlen*). In his nature novel *Die Lehrlinge zu Sais* (1798), Novalis conceives sensation as a medium between the self and the other thanks to *Sympathie* and *Mitgefühl* and states that the human being understands nature only if s/he empathizes in it (*sich hineinfühlt*)—a location that departs from customary English (empathizes "with" it), but emphasizes the movement from outside to inside.

Thus in both cases—*empathēia* and *Einfühlung*—we have (1) the movement from the subject towards the other (the other subject—the stranger, the foreign human being—or the object, living or nonliving), according to a dual, bipolar structure, and (2) the process of the cancellation of such alterity, dualism, or polarity: the becoming one of two, exactly thanks to such a movement of identification. Such cancellation of duality is emphasized by the French translation of *Einfühlung* proposed by Victor Basch (1896): *sympathie symbolique*, an option in debt to two Greek concepts very close to empathy (*symbolon*, from *sym-ballō*, putting together, and *sympatheia*, from *sym-pathein*, feeling together). In contrast, the first English occurrence, in Edward Titchener's *Experimental Psychology of the Thought Processes* (1909; see Wispé 1987: 18), goes back directly to the Greek: "empathy."

The history of empathy in Western culture covers a large spectrum whose extremes are marked by ancient Greek thought and contemporary science fiction. The former is a perspective based on the cosmological intuition of the affinity of all beings (e.g., Anaxagoras's statement that "everything is in everything" [Diels-Kranz 59 B4]). In his *Poetics* (6, 1449b, 24–28), Aristotle describes the spectators' ability to

A. Pinotti (✉)
Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

identify themselves with the tragic events represented on stage: fear, which—together with compassion—forms the affective basis of catharsis, is possible thanks to a virtual projection into the actions and passions performed by the actors. He is perfectly aware of the empathic process when he writes: “For those who feel emotion are most convincing through natural sympathy with the characters they represent; and one who is agitated storms, one who is angry rages, with the most lifelike reality” (17, 1455a, 30–36). And in Philip Dick’s *Blade Runner* (1968), the Voigt-Kampff test used by the bounty hunter of androids in order to distinguish a human from a cybernetic organism (the deadly Nexus-6 that must be “withdrawn”) is based on the hypothesis that androids are not able to experience empathy toward other beings. More recently, a specialist in artificial intelligence, Roger C. Shank (1984) has pronounced empathic understanding the ideal aim of computer engineering.

From Aristotle to Philip Dick a complex evolution of terms and concepts has developed. The phenomenological approach in its various declinations was and still is fundamental to such an evolution. It stems directly from analyses in eighteenth century British thought and late nineteenth century German psychology. David Hume is a key figure in the former respect. In his *Treatise on Human Nature* (1739), he drew attention to the sympathetic relation, adumbrating some constitutive elements that were to be found in the more detailed nineteenth and twentieth centuries empathy theories: hedonism, the doctrine of passions based on the couple pleasure/pain, inference from the perception of the other’s body; and the conception of sympathy as a fundamental and mighty principle of human nature founding both our taste for beauty and our moral sense. To characterize empathy he suggests a musical metaphor: “The minds of all men are similar in their feelings and operations; nor can any one be actuated by any affection, of which all others are not, in some degree, susceptible. As in strings equally wound up, the motion of one communicates itself to the rest; so all the affections readily pass from one person to another, and beget correspondent movements in every human creature” (book 3, part 3, Section 1). The musical metaphor is completed by a medical image of contagion: “The passions are so contagious, that they pass with the greatest facility from one person to another, and produce correspondent movements in all human breasts” (Section 3).

The translator of Hume’s *Treatise* into German was the psychologist Theodor Lipps, who sought a rigorous reduction of philosophy (1903a) and aesthetics to psychology (1903–1906). He elaborated influential empathy doctrines, especially in the aesthetic and artistic field. Together with authors of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—including such German psychologists as Friedrich Theodor Vischer, Robert Vischer, Heinrich Wölfflin, Adolf von Hildebrand, Johannes Volkelt, Karl Groos, Wilhelm Worringer, and others—Lipps represents the golden age of empathy, especially through his aesthetic doctrine whereby aesthetic enjoyment is objectivated self-enjoyment. Together with projection, transfer, association, expression, animation, personification, anthropomorphization, vivification, imitation, fusion, identification, compassion, reliving and reviving, consenting, and sympathizing processes, objectivation is the most frequent psychological characterization of empathy. Its constitutive elements founding the empathic experience are, schematically speaking, subject and object and the relation instituted between them, moving from the sensible knowledge of the object by the subject.

For orientation within this archipelago of empathy theories the map offered by a pupil of Theodor Lipps and EDMUND HUSSERL, MORITZ GEIGER (1911), is still very useful today from both a historical and a theoretical point of view. The first fundamental distinction is the one between empathy toward human beings and empathy toward nonhuman entities. Perceiving its object, the subject has first of all in front of itself a body. If the object is another subject and the human being perceives another human being, the body will appear to him/her as expressing a soul, a character, a personality: the “outside” will appear as expressive of an “inside.” The question here will be: how can I understand the other’s inside on the basis of the outside, which is all I have? If the object is a mere object, it appears nevertheless to the subject as if it were expressive of a soul, a character, or a personality, of its own life. The question here will be: how can a mere object present itself as if it were a subject?

The second basic distinction is between empathy of activities (*Tätigkeitseinfühlung*) and empathy of moods (*Stimmungseinfühlung*): the former refers to an experience in which the subject feels a movement or an energy in static objects (e.g., a flight of stairs or a raising column) and the latter to an experience in which the

subject realizes an affective atmosphere as if the object had a proper personality (e.g., a melancholy or cheerful landscape.) For the specific case of artistic mood, see FRITZ KAUFMANN's dissertation on the *künstlerische Stimmung* (1929).

Comparing various empathy theories, Geiger notices that some authors maintain the principle of *actuality* (*Aktualität*: when empathizing, I actually and really feel the other's feelings as my feelings), while others support the principle of *representation* (*Vorstellung*: the other's feelings are not actually lived, but are simply represented by the empathizing subject). Moreover, theorists like Lipps interpret empathy as a mainly *spiritual* and *psychological* experience and tend to reduce at least the bodily sensations to a secondary role. Other thinkers (such as Robert Vischer or Adolf von Hildebrand) incline, on the contrary, to understand empathy as chiefly a *bodily* and *physiological* performance.

Such categorial couples are introduced by Geiger in order to organize the extremely rich landscape of empathy theories according to a phenomenological method interested in describing the different layers of sense implied by the empathic experience without feeling tempted to reduce them to a single conception. In conclusion, he ascertains a simple, incontrovertible fact: the phenomenon of empathy has to be accepted and described as an experience that cannot be reduced to other, simpler components.

Phenomenology reserves a special position for empathy. In Husserl, *Einfühlung*—released from Lipps's psychologism and reassigned to the intentional correlation—plays a central role in the foundation of intersubjectivity. Especially in *Ideen II* and in the Fifth Cartesian Meditation (see also Husserl 1973a, b, c), empathy becomes the condition of the possibility of understanding the other that Husserl genetically reconstructs as the experience of otherness and its different layers of sense, starting from the heuristic fiction of the *solus ipse*. Such a theoretical reconstruction of intersubjectivity only reaches it at the end of a sequence of layers. But in itself intersubjectivity comes first as transcendental intersubjectivity, since our experience of ourselves, of others, and of the world as a shared object is from the very beginning an intersubjective experience.

The other phenomenologists who reflected deeply on empathy are MAX SCHELER and Edith Stein. The latter devotes *Zum Problem der Einfühlung* (1917)

to the basis of empathy rooted in the lived body (*Leib*) and demonstrates its fundamental role in understanding the spiritual person. In *Zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Sympathiegefühle und von Liebe und Haß* (1913)—and subsequently in the amplified 1923 edition, *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie*—the former criticizes psychological empathy theories for not distinguishing the different layers of sense in non-homogeneous experiences—such as the apprehension of extraneous actions and passions, comprehension, identification, and sympathy *sensu stricto*—and employs sympathy as an originary emotional foundation for a general theory of the ethical sphere.

Moritz Geiger was the one phenomenologist who showed a particular interest in the *aesthetic* implications of empathy (Husserl did know Lipps's aesthetic empathy theory, but did not develop it—see Scaramuzza and Schuhmann 1990). In his approach we can find a radical criticism of a model supported both by the “corporealist” Vischer and the “spiritualist” Lipps and shared by most empathy theorists: *Einfühlung* as *Einfüllung* or *Erfüllung* (empathy as fulfillment). According to such a subjectivist and “hydraulic” model, the object is neutral, a void container. Through projection and transposition of his/her own feelings and vital energies, the subject fills it up like an empty vase, introducing into it the sense and the feelings that subsequently s/he will perceive as if they belonged to the object (i.e., the object is dead, but the subject infuses it with life). The sense (the feeling, the *pathos*) is on the side of the subject, and during the empathic process it is transferred to an object that was hitherto empty of it.

Against such a strong subjectivism, Geiger observes that the object must always be taken into consideration: not every landscape is empathizable in a melancholy way, not every line is empathizable in an anxious way, not every color is empathizable as “happy” or “sad.” The object must be structured in a specific way in order to be empathized in a certain way, in order to receive my projection. Lipps himself oscillated on this point, admitting that the object “claims” a certain *Einfühlung* from me or has the “right” to it. An object tends to move toward a certain direction: I can feel such tendency in it (*fühle in ihm*) or empathize it into the object (*fühle in ihn ein*) (Lipps 1908: 359). The difference between an accusative case (*in ihn*) and a dative case (*in ihm*) determines the distinction between a radical subjectivism on the one hand and respect for the

object's rights on the other. I empathize an object, I empathize myself in it, only if the object is structured in a certain way.

The pathemic activity originating from the subject and directed to the object (*in ihm*) is reflected in the passivity of the subject, which accepts from the object the motivation of its feeling as already present in the object itself (*in ihm*). The pathemic movement derives from the subject, but it must find a correspondence in the object, in its essential features, to be verified as a refilling of the object itself. Nevertheless, Lipps immediately repeats that the ground of the aesthetic valuation does not consist in the sensible qualities of the object, but rather in my life empathized in it: the feeling that comes from the object "appears" to be connected to the aesthetic object, but it is actually my feeling. He synthesizes this conception in the famous definition: *Aller ästhetischer Genuß ist Genuß des objektivierten eigenen ... Ichs* (every aesthetic enjoyment is enjoyment of the objectivated self—*ibid.*: 371).

Against such a hydraulic model, Geiger resolutely insists on an *analogical* realm of sense (neither subjective nor objective, or both subjective and objective) in which the sense itself is determined in the intentional correlation set up between subject and object. In his 1911 essay on *Stimmungseinfühlung* (mood empathy), he remarks that a serene color does not depend on my subjective mood, but "is" serene. Nonetheless, there must be something in common between mood and objective quality to justify the use of the same name: the objective character of the color shows an essential affinity (*wesensverwandt*) with my mood. It is a *qualitative affinity* instituted between subject and object, producing a mutual exchange between the objective pathemic character and the subjective mood. The analogical relation is established not only between mood and landscape, but also between colors and temperatures (warm and cold colors), between sounds and dimensions (wide or high sounds), so that on the basis of analogy, the sphere of qualitative characters represents a bridge between the different sensory fields.

As Geiger states in his 1933 essay devoted to Alexander Pfänder's method, such an analogical subject-object correlation founds the possibility of any transposition and projection: if we characterize a person as "leathery," transposing upon him/her the nature of leather, there must be a common quality shared by the appearance of that person and leather and, just

as with empathy, we can discuss the justification of each analogy—but we cannot contest the fact that analogy is an unavoidable instrument of all true description (*Über die Berechtigung der einzelnen Analogien ... ist eine Diskussion möglich; nicht aber darüber, daß die Analogie ein unentbehrliches Werkzeug aller wahrhaften Deskription ist*—Geiger 1933: 10–11).

A similar inclination toward an antisubjectivistic understanding of empathy is to be found in the French reception of *Einfühlungstheorie*, chiefly in MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY and MIKEL DUFRENNE. The former moves from the phenomenological description of the experience of the other (1945: Part 2, Chapter 4) to an ontological interpretation that joins the concept of chiasm as an exchange between self and the other and self and world with the concept of flesh as the correspondence between *Leib* and nature (1964).

In Dufrenne, the concept of empathy again finds the aesthetic ground on which it was originally raised: reinterpreting Victor Basch's conception of symbolic sympathy in a phenomenological key, Dufrenne characterizes the work of art in terms of a "quasi-subject" with whom the subject institutes an empathic relation analogous to an interpersonal relationship. In its quasi-subjectivity the aesthetic object reveals itself as an object capable of autonomous expression, a physical body deploying its own interiority and addressing the subject on the level of feelings and emotions. In such a process of deploying an affective inside in a sensible outside, the aesthetic object, like an alter ego, displays its endless infinity. Inclining to ontology and cosmology in the evolution of his works, Dufrenne (1953, 1981) develops the empathic issue in terms of a *natura naturans* (close to Schelling and Romanticism), seen as an originary unity of nature and spirit, body and soul, human being and world. So empathy returns to a romantic core of *Einfühlung* that is still far from being exhausted today.

Bibliography

- Basch, Victor. *Essai critique sur l'esthétique de Kant*. Paris: Alcan, 1896.
- Bites-Palevitch, Milda. *Essai sur les tendances critiques et scientifiques de l'esthétique allemande contemporaine*. Paris: Alcan, 1926.
- Croce, Benedetto. "L'estetica della 'Einfühlung'" [1934]. In his *Storia dell'estetica per saggi*. Bari: Laterza, 1967, 239–246.

- Dick, Philip K. *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968.
- Döring, August. "Über Einfühlung." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 7, 1912, 568–577.
- Drüe, Hermann. "Die psychologische Ästhetik im Deutschen Kaiserreich." In *Ideengeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft. Philosophie und bildende Kunst im Kaiserreich*. Ed. Ekkehard Mai, Stephan Waetzoldt, and Gerd Wolandt. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1983, 71–98.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Le poétique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *L'inventaire des a priori*. Paris: Christian Bourgois, 1981.
- Eisenberg, Nancy, and Janet Strayer, eds. *Empathy and Its Development*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Fidalgo, António. "Edith Stein, Th. Lipps und die Einfühlungsproblematik." In *Studien zur Philosophie von Edith Stein. Internationales Edith-Stein Symposium, Eichstätt 1991*. Ed. Reto Luzius Fetz, Matthias Rath, and Peter Schulz. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1993, 90–106.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Über das Wesen und die Bedeutung der Einfühlung." In *Bericht über den vierten Kongreß für experimentelle Psychologie in Innsbruck vom 19. bis 22. April 1910*. Leipzig: Barth, 1911, 29–73.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Zum Problem der Stimmungseinfühlung." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 6, 1911, 1–42; rpt. in his *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976, 18–59.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Zur Erinnerung an Th. Lipps." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 10, 1915, 68–73; rpt. in his *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 73–78.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Alexander Pfänders methodische Stellung." In *Neue Münchener Abhandlungen (Pfänder-Festschrift)*. Ed. E. Heller and F. Löw. Leipzig: Barth, 1933, 1–16.
- Geiger, Moritz. *Die Bedeutung der Kunst. Zugänge zu einer materialen Wertästhetik*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976; *The Significance of Art: A Phenomenological Approach to Aesthetics*. Trans. Klaus Berger. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1986.
- Groos, Karl. "Das ästhetische Miterleben und die Empfindungen aus dem Körperinnern." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 4, 1909, 161–182.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Plastik* [1778]. Ed. Lambert A. Schneider. Köln: Hegner, 1969; *Sculpture: Some Observations on Shape and Form from Pygmalion's Creative Dream*. Trans. Jason Gaiger. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden der menschlichen Seele* [1778]. *Werke* Ed. Wolfgang Proß. Vol. 2. Munich: Hanser, 1987.
- Hildebrand, Adolf von. *Das Problem der Form in der bildenden Kunst*. Strasbourg: Heitz & Mündel, 1893; "The Problem of Form in the Fine Arts." In *Empathy, Form and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics 1873–1893*. Ed. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonou. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994, 227–279.
- Hume, David. *Treatise on Human Nature* [1739]. Eds. Lewis A. Selby-Bigge and Peter H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Méditations cartésiennes*. Trans. Emmanuel Lévinas and Gabrielle Pfeiffer. Paris: Colin, 1931; *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge*. Ed. Stephan Strasser. *Husserliana* 1. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1950; *Cartesian Meditations*. Trans. Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch. Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Konstitution*. Ed. Marly Biemel. *Husserliana* 4. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1952; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Second Book: Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität. Texte aus dem Nachlass. Erster Teil: 1905–1920*. *Husserliana* 13. Ed. Iso Kern. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität. Texte aus dem Nachlass. Zweiter Teil: 1921–1928*. *Husserliana* 14. Ed. Iso Kern. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität. Texte aus dem Nachlass. Dritter Teil: 1929–1935*. *Husserliana* 15. Ed. Iso Kern. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. "Die Bedeutung der künstlerischen Stimmung." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung. Ergänzungsband, Festschrift Edmund Husserl zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1929, 192–223; rpt. in his *Das Reich des Schönen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960, 96–125.
- Lange, Klaus Peter. *Zum Begriff der Einfühlung (Th. Lipps und J. Volkelt)*. In *Beiträge zur Theorie der Künste im 19. Jahrhundert*. Ed. Helmut Koopmann and J. Adolf Schmoll. Vol. 1. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 113–28.
- Lipps, Theodor. "Ästhetische Einfühlung." In *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* 22, 1899, 415–440.
- Lipps, Theodor. *Leitfaden der Psychologie*. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1903a.
- Lipps, Theodor. "Einfühlung, innere Nachahmung und Organempfindungen." In *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 1, 1903b, 185–204.
- Lipps, Theodor. *Ästhetik. Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst*. 2 vols. Hamburg: L. Voss, 1903–1906.
- Lipps, Theodor. "Weiteres zur Einfühlung." In *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 4, 1905, 465–519.
- Lipps, Theodor. "Einfühlung und ästhetischer Genuß." In *Die Zukunft* 54, 1906, 100–114, abridged in Emil Utitz, ed. *Ästhetik. Quellenhandbücher der Philosophie*. Berlin: Pan-Verlag, R. Heise, 1923, 152–167.

- Lipps, Theodor. "Ästhetik." In *Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Systematische Philosophie*. Ed.. Berlin: Teubner, 1908, 351–390.
- Lipps, Theodor. *Zur Einfühlung*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1913.
- Lipps, Theodor. *David Hume's Traktat über die menschliche Natur (Treatise on human nature). Ein Versuch, die Methode der Erfahrung in die Geisteswissenschaft einzuführen*. Leipzig: L. Voss, 1923.
- Mallgrave, Harry Francis, and Eleftherios Ikonou, eds. *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics 1873–1893*. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994.
- Matzker, Reiner. *Einfühlung. Edith Stein und die Phänomenologie*. Bern: Lang, 1991.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan, 1962.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Ed. by Claude Lefort, Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Meyer, Theodor A. "Kritik der Einfühlungstheorie." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 7, 1912, 529–567.
- Moos, Paul. *Die deutsche Ästhetik der Gegenwart. Versuch einer kritischen Darstellung*. Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1920–1931.
- Morrison, Karl F. *I am You: The Hermeneutics of Empathy in Western Literature, Theology, and Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Novalis. *Die Lehrlinge zu Sais* [1798]. *Werke, Tagebücher und Briefe*. Vol. 1. Ed. Hans-Joachim Mähl and Richard Samuel. Munich: Hanser 1978; *The Novices of Sais*. Trans. Ralph Manheim. New York: C. Valentin, 1949.
- Perpeet, Wilhelm. "Historisches und Systematisches zur Einfühlungsästhetik." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 11, 1966, 193–216.
- Prandtl, Antonin. *Die Einfühlung*, Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1910.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele, and Karl Schuhmann. "Ein Husserlmanuskript über Ästhetik." In *Husserl Studies* 7, 1990, 165–177.
- Shank, Roger C, and Peter G. Childers. *The Cognitive Computer: On Language, Learning, and Artificial Intelligence*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1984.
- Scheler, Max. *Zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Sympathiegefühle und von Liebe und Haß. Mit einem Anhang über den Grund zur Annahme der Existenz des fremden Ich*, Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1913.
- Scheler, Max. *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie*, Bonn: F. Cohen, 1923; *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 7. Bern: Francke, 1973; *The Nature of Sympathy*. Trans. Peter Heath. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1970.
- Siebeck, Hermann. *Über musikalische Einfühlung*, Leipzig: R. Voigtländers Verlag, 1906.
- Smid, Reinhold N. "Ähnlichkeit als Thema der Münchener Lipps-Schule." In *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 37, 1983, 606–616.
- Stein, Edith. *Zum Problem der Einfühlung*. Halle: Buchdruckerei des Waisenhauses, 1917; *On the Problem of Empathy* Trans. Waltraut Stein. Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 1989.
- Stern, Paul. *Einfühlung und Assoziation in der neueren Aesthetik. Ein Beitrag zur psychologischen Analyse der ästhetischen Anschauung*. Hamburg: L. Voss, 1897.
- Titchener, Edward Bradford. *Experimental Psychology of the Thought Processes*. New York: Macmillan, 1909.
- Vischer, Friedrich Theodor. *Das Symbol* [1887]. Rpt. in *Philosophische Aufsätze Eduard Zeller zu seinem fünfzigjährigen Doktorjubiläum gewidmet*. Leipzig: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1962, 151–193.
- Vischer, Robert. *Über das optische Formgefühl. Ein Beitrag zur Ästhetik*. Leipzig: Credner, 1872; rpt. in *Drei Schriften zum ästhetischen Formproblem*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1927, 1–44; *On the Optical Sense of Form: A Contribution to Aesthetics*. In *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics 1873–1893*. Ed. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonou. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994, 89–123.
- Volkelt, Johannes. *Der Symbol-Begriff in der neuesten Ästhetik*. Jena: H. Dufft, 1876.
- Volkelt, Johannes. "Die Bedeutung der niederen Sinne für die Einfühlung." In *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* 32, 1903, 1–37.
- Volkelt, Johannes. *System der Ästhetik*. 3 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1905, 1910, 1914; 2nd ed. 1927, 1925, 1915.
- Volkelt, Johannes. "Pädagogische Einfühlung." In *Vierteljahrsschrift für philosophische Pädagogik* 1, 1917, 36–42.
- Wernaer, Robert M. "Die Einfühlung und das Symbol." In *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* 126, 1906, 29–44.
- Wispé, Lauren. "The distinction between sympathy and empathy: to call forth a concept a word is needed." In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50, 1986, 314–321.
- Wispé, Lauren. "History of the concept of empathy." In *Empathy and Its Development*. Ed. Nancy Eisenberg and Janet Strayer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987, 17–37.
- Witasek, Stephan. "Zur psychologischen Analyse der ästhetischen Einfühlung." In *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* 25, 1901, 1–49.
- Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Prolegomena zu einer Psychologie der Architektur*. Munich: Dr. C. Wolf & Sohn, 1886; *Prolegomena to a Psychology of Architecture*. Trans. In *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics 1873–1893*. Ed. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonou. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994, 149–190.
- Worringer, Wilhelm. *Abstraktion und Einfühlung*. Munich: Piper, 1907; *Abstraction and Empathy: A Contribution to the Psychology of Style*. Trans. by M. Bullock. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1997.
- Ziegler, Theobald. "Zur Genesis eines ästhetischen Begriffs (Einfühlung)." In *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte* 7, 1894, 113–120.

Enjoyment

Mădălina Diaconu

The concept of enjoyment and its approximate equivalents (sentiment, emotion, pleasure, *Genuss*, *Wohlgefallen*, etc.) play a central role in eighteenth century philosophy of art and beauty, and afterward in the psychological aesthetics of the late eighteenth century. Phenomenological aesthetics never denies this hedonistic component of aesthetic experience, and relates it mainly to the perceiver's experience rather than to artistic creation. However, the specifically phenomenological reaction against psychologism led, particularly in Germany during the 1920s and 1930s, to a critique of psychological aesthetics and of all theories that considered enjoyment the culmination of aesthetic experience (Theodor Lipps, Emile Utitz, etc.). Phenomenological aesthetics emphasizes instead the constitution of the aesthetic object through the subject's acts; the structure of the aesthetic object; and the issue of artistic truth. In addition, artistic developments in the past decades (particularly the fact that contemporary art distances itself from the aim of producing enjoyment and suspects the enjoyable to be mere kitsch) has increasingly weakened the interest of phenomenology in the topic of enjoyment.

Phenomenological aesthetics puts a special emphasis on the aesthetic attitude that neutralizes reality, and asks how something imaginary can be enjoyed and even influence "real" life (MIKEL DUFRENNE). Common for the phenomenological approach is also the belief that aesthetic enjoyment is produced by harmonious forms and secluded units, that is by the "world" of the object (OSKAR BECKER, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, ROMAN INGARDEN),

or by aesthetic configurations that correspond to the human being's "natural" psychic structures (Ernest Ansermet). Phenomenological aesthetics thus seems to be "classical" and conservative compared with art theories of the avant-garde.

A rather weak point of the phenomenological analysis of (aesthetic) enjoyment, from the contemporary perspective, consists in its considering the perceiver as an isolated individual, engaged in a tête-à-tête with his/her object; the social and communicative functions of art are, with some authors, noticeably absent. Consequently, the entire problematic of the media risks being rejected *a principio* from the position of a certain (initially even openly declared) elitism.

MORITZ GEIGER is the first to oppose an objective "aesthetics of value" (*Wertästhetik*) to a subjective "aesthetics of effect" (*Wirkungsästhetik*). The latter reduces the work of art to an instrument to produce pleasant feelings; *Wertästhetik*, on the other hand, intends to save the autonomy of the work and to set free the immanent values of the object. For Geiger, a phenomenological aesthetics that aims to become a rigorous science should include both dimensions, but with a focus on aesthetic objects. In order to resolve the dispute between intellectualistic art theory (Conrad Fiedler) and psychological aesthetics (Theodor Lipps), Geiger defines aesthetic experience as an apprehension (*Erfassen*) in feeling of aesthetic values.

And although he holds that the access to (phenomenological) aesthetics goes through psychology, Geiger criticizes psychological aesthetics for making no distinction between aesthetic and common enjoyment. His "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses" (1913) claims that pure delight (*Genuss*) is self-sufficient, and that it builds an island in the middle of the flow of feelings (*Erlebnis-Enklave*)

M. Diaconu (✉)

Institute of Philosophy, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

due to the intensity of its moments. In contrast with delight (*Genuss*) and pleasure (*Lust*), the satisfaction produced by art and play breaks off this splendid isolation and transcends its object. Moreover, delight is essentially passive; it is only when the subject takes up an attitude toward the object that we are dealing with aesthetic delight or enjoyment (*Wohlgefallen*). However, they are alike in that both common and aesthetic delight are able to maintain a certain inward distance from their object.

Later on, in *Zugänge zur Ästhetik* (1928), Geiger distinguishes between superficial and profound effects (*Oberflächen- und Tiefenwirkungen*) of works of art. Both are forms of enjoyment, but the first type implies amusement and entertainment, pleasure (*Lust*) sought for its own sake, and is caught inside the vital sphere; on the other side, the profound effect of art consists in filling the perceiver with joy (*Beglückung*) and moving his/her soul (*Erschütterung*). Pleasure remains particular and vital; only joy affects the fundamentals of the person. These two categories of effects are not opposed, but interact and modify one another, building a psychological synthesis. The ideal work of art produces both superficial and profound effects, joining “profundity of the soul” (*seelische Tiefe*) and “intensity of feeling” (*Fülle des Erlebens*), and thus addresses human being in its integrity, as the classical humanistic aesthetics (Kant, Schiller) demanded. The balance between superficial and profound effects in a work of art varies with the style, form, and the Dionysian or Apollonian character of the art. Finally, from a genetic perspective, profound effects emerge later than superficial pleasures and build on these as a sort of superstructure.

Geiger mentions two sources of aesthetic enjoyment: immediate excitation in the attitude of “internal concentration” (*Innenkonzentration*), and the qualities of the object in the “external concentration” (*Außenkonzentration*). At a time when art was the battlefield between avant-garde and neo-romantic and expressionist excesses of subjectivity, Geiger also draws attention to two forms of perverted aesthetic experience (“dilettantism”). The first characterizes mainly uncultivated persons who miss the aesthetic object because they focus only on the content of art (e.g., the “patriot” or the “moralist”). The second form of dilettantism (*Innenkonzentration*) refers to the sentimentalism of persons who turn to art only as a means of awakening pleasant feelings; hence in seemingly

enjoying art, they are actually enjoying their own feelings.

Typical for such an attitude of sentimentalism (*Gefühlsschwelgen*) is music: Geiger recalls Eduard Hanslick’s diatribe against sentimentalism, particularly in Richard Wagner, yet criticizes Hanslick for having fallen into the other extreme: formalism. The internal concentration is not caused by ignorance or by a lack of artistic culture, states Geiger; on the contrary, it was legitimated philosophically by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and early romanticism, which conceived the world as an arbitrary creation of the subject and as a playful manipulation of the object, and it is still promoted in the *Wirkungsästhetik* and in other irrational currents of contemporary philosophy. *Innenkonzentration* also has a manifold psychological and cultural origin; for example, it is characteristic of the epoch of late romanticism, when the bourgeoisie ascribed to art the function of relaxation and accordingly cultivated melodramas. In addition, immature and egocentric persons are predisposed to such an attitude, as well as “feminine” natures and “self-aesthetic” (narcissistic) individuals. Internal concentration takes into consideration only the passive moments of art perception, neglecting its active reflection. The correct aesthetic attitude—accorded by Geiger only to a small minority—pays attention to the object for its own sake and derives aesthetic values from its intrinsic qualities.

Geiger’s critique of perverted aesthetic feelings has found echos in Oscar Becker, Roman Ingarden, and Ludwig Giesz; the latter even considers Geiger’s considerations to be “doubtless the most complete analysis of the aesthetic pleasure until today” (*die bis heute wohl gründlichste Analyse des ästhetischen Genusses*—Giesz 1994: 32). As for Becker, he distrusts pseudo-aesthetic configurations (*ästhetoides Gebilde*) that stir up, incite, and grip the audience by all sort of stimuli, from the erotic and horrible up to the sublime emotion of mystical religiosity. These art forms contain what he calls a “thrill,” an empathic element that provokes vivid emotions and excitement (*Erregung*). Conversely, Becker admires the miracle by which art achieves the conversion of the brutality of real life into the serenity of classical beauty, as ancient Greek art did. For that, art must somehow “paralyze” the intensity of the affective effect (the thrill) by “catching” it in a cathartic form; form and style enable contemplation and an inward distance from the object. Geiger relates the psychological synthesis

of thrill and catharsis to the fragility of beauty, and grounds it in a dualistic ontology of being (*Dasein*) and nature (*Wesen, Dawesen, Para-Existenz*). The concept of *Getragenheit* may also be mentioned as an interesting contribution of Becker to the theory of aesthetic enjoyment; by that he means the artist's life, its unstable equilibrium between the happy moments of creation, when the artist lets him/herself be carried away by inspiration like a natural being, beyond death, conscience, and guilt, and the moments when s/he falls back again into the flow of history and vulnerability.

In his elaborate investigation of the aesthetic experience, Roman Ingarden criticizes its usual reduction to a momentary feeling of liking and disliking associated with sensory perception. On the contrary, aesthetic experience is for him a complex process extended in time, having various phases and containing heterogeneous elements, such as emotions (aesthetic excitement), active perceptual and categorial forming (the construction of an aesthetic object), passive perception of qualities, etc. The aesthetic process starts when—against the background of a real object—a peculiar, striking quality is perceived that focuses attention and induces in the observer a special state of excitement. This preliminary vague emotion (*Ursprungsemotion*) is akin to astonishment and becomes a sort of desire (“eros”) to gain possession of this quality, to increase to satiation the delight produced by it, and to consolidate this intuitive possession. In other words, this primary feeling sets the subject in motion and inaugurates the process of aesthetic perception. Moreover, it leads to a “check of the course of daily life” (Ingarden 1985: 116), which implies important changes: the practical interest in the real world is removed or temporarily extinguished; the field of consciousness is narrowed to the perceived object, while the surrounding world loses its importance and vividness and seems to be forgotten. In case the preliminary emotion is not strong enough to maintain the interest in the object, the subject returns to the affairs of daily life; if, on the contrary, it lasts, it determines a change of attitude, specifically the transition from a natural (practical or investigative) attitude to an aesthetic one. The aesthetic attitude “neutralizes” reality (EDMUND HUSSERL), in the sense that it is no longer interested in facts, but in a pure intuitive intercourse with qualitative essences.

Emotions are present also in a second phase, when the subject builds up the subjective aesthetic object around the objective work of art. Enjoyment now

acquires the meaning of being pleased with, of rejoicing and luxuriating in the presence of the quality; the perceiver lets him/herself be charmed and even intoxicated with it. Conversely, if the object presents qualitative defects or deficiencies in the uniform harmonization of its qualities, if, in other words, the perceived object does not correspond to the imagined aesthetic object, then a negative emotional reaction of displeasure and deception occurs, and the work of art is declared “ugly.”

Following Ingarden, there are two forms of emotional response of the subject to the aesthetic object formed. One is the sentiment by which the subject manifests empathy (with Lipps: *Einfühlung*) with the objects represented and projects psychic properties onto the objects; this empathy is an act of communal emotional experience. The other form is the building of a qualitative structure of harmony, in which the coexisting qualities modify one another within a coherent whole. Only the second type is an aesthetic emotion *sensu stricto*, according to Ingarden. Moreover, for him, to attain a uniform harmony of qualities is the final aim of the whole aesthetic process.

In the last phase of the aesthetic experience, the previous efforts, the sometimes “painful proceeding” (ibid.: 125) to form the object and the general searching disquietude, give way to satisfaction and contemplation of the entire object. This final emotion contains intentional feelings (with MAX SCHELER: *intentionales Fühlen*) and involves an acknowledgment of the value of the formed aesthetic object, even the proper response to the value (DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND: *Wertantwort*). In other words, every evaluation of a work of art has to be grounded, according to Ingarden, in the subject's emotional reaction to the work, and every judgment should try to express this vivid emotional response as accurately as possible. In its positive culmination, enjoyment manifests itself as being pleased with, as admiration, rapture, and enthusiasm; the negative response to value may take the form of rejection, aversion, abomination, indignation, or simply boredom. Despite this detailed analysis of aesthetic pleasure, Ingarden warns that enjoyment is only a derivative phenomenon of aesthetic experience, not its main moment, and condemns those who seek only empathic delight in art, but are not capable of the specific aesthetic feelings.

Martin Heidegger's critical position towards feeling (*Erleben*) and aesthetic enjoyment has to be

understood in the context of his “destruction” of aesthetics and contemporary art theory. He rejects, for example, the formalist science of art (*Kunstwissenschaft*) as well as the art establishment (*Kunstbetrieb*); none of these has access to the “work” of art as such. But above all he denounces aesthetics for being a subjectivistic theory, like the whole of modern philosophy within which it was founded as an autonomous discipline. As a matter of fact, aesthetics already begins, according to Heidegger, with Plato, after the end of “great art,” once beauty is no longer conceived as the unveiling of being, but as what carries us away and beguiles (*entrückend-berückend*)—which means that beauty, as such, is linked to the human being’s subjective shape. Aesthetic theory generally deals with momentary feeling (*Gefühlszustand*) in its relation to beauty and with the beauty of art in its relation to the feelings of producing (*hervorbringend*) and enjoying (*genießenden*). Aesthetics is a form of *epistēmē* (knowledge), specifically the knowledge of the human being’s “sensorial and affective comportment” (*sinnliches, empfindungs- und gefühlsmäßiges Verhalten*) and of its object—the beautiful (Heidegger 1961: 92). Aesthetics puts the subject-object relation front and center, but reduces it to an affective (*fühlende*) relation, i.e., to *Erlebnis*.

In the 1930s, Heidegger reacts critically to an alleged contemporary omnipresence of sentiments (*Erlebnis*) in the “aesthetic” society of the masses, in which events (*Veranstaltungen*) replace authentic life (*Leben*) through collective feelings (*Erleben*—ibid.: 450). He sobers his audience by recalling the Hegelian thesis about the death of art: *Doch vielleicht ist das Erlebnis das Element, in dem die Kunst stirbt* (but feeling may be the element in which art dies—ibid.: 66). Delight cannot determine the value of art (ibid.: 505); moreover, mere feeling degrades art to an exciting stimulus. What Heidegger seeks is to regain for art the high position it had in romanticism, and for that he emphasizes the cognitive function of art in its relation to truth, although he never denies the presence of feelings in art. To a hyperintellectual approach (*Zerdenken*), for example, which insists on “explaining” poetry, he objects that it misses the specific emotion (*Rührung*) that poetry provokes and destroys its object (1959: 173). But it was Heidegger’s conception in *Sein und Zeit* (1927, §29) of affective dispositions (*Stimmungen, Befindlichkeit*), which opens a world as a whole, that has been especially productive

in phenomenological aesthetics (FRITZ KAUFMANN, Mikel Dufrenne, Ludwig Giesz, etc.).

No later than two years after Heidegger published *Sein und Zeit*, Rudolf Odebrecht published his *Gefühl und schöpferische Gestaltung. Leitgedanken zu einer Philosophie der Kunst* (1929), in which he places “mood” (*Stimmung*) at the core of the aesthetic impression. Fritz Kaufmann then took over the concept of mood and applied it to art. Mood means for him neither the principle of a vague sentimentalism (*Gefühlsseligkeit*), nor the aestheticism of delight (*Geschmäcklertum*), but a manifestation of humankind’s essence. Concretely, affective dispositions express or open the world and help us understand it. Kaufmann also suggests that the difference between common and artistic moods is simply gradual, consisting in the higher specificity of artistic moods. And this specificity is precisely what makes possible a committed art that becomes aware of the latent discontent of daily life.

At a time when German art was dominated by expressionism, Kaufmann regards the work of art as an objectified disposition, and even anticipates the Heideggerian conception of art as “the truth setting (itself) to work” (*das (Sich-)Ins-Werk-Setzen der Wahrheit*) when he describes the artistic “realization” (in Cézanne’s sense) as “the mood setting to work” (*ins Werk setzen der Stimmung*—Kaufmann 1960: 108). However, creation transgresses the artist’s particular subjectivity, so that the work seems to speak for itself. As for the perceiver, his/her experience relies on empathy (*Transposition*) with the artist and requires openness to the work instead of narcissism. In this way, the experience of art produces a consonance in moods (*Einstimmigkeit*) between artist and audience and has beneficial effects on everyday life in general, particularly in its harmonizing social function. In contrast to Heidegger, who condemns the (collective) audience for its inauthentic art experience, Kaufmann praises the unity of the interpersonal accord, the community of affective disposition, and the profound communication enabled by art.

Before assuming the role of the engaged intellectual, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE outlined a phenomenological psychology of emotions in *Esquisse d’une théorie des émotions* (1939), in which he describes emotions as magical transformations of the world, though without special reference to art. Later he distances himself from this conception and refutes it as an individual

escapism. Nevertheless, this does not hinder Ernest Ansermet from relying on Sartre's interpretation of phenomenology (especially Husserl's) in his music theory.

Musical aesthetics, including its phenomenological variants (ALFRED SCHUTZ, Ernest Ansermet), regards music as a purely psychic phenomenon, feeling as its "content," and enjoyment as the natural reaction to it. However, specific to the phenomenological theory of music is the emphasis put on the intentional attitude of the listener, that is to say, on his/her activity in forming musical representations, instead of the common thesis about the subject's passive delight and self-oblivion. For instance, Ansermet not only explains the emotional effect of listening to music through the genesis of music from the composer's sentiments, but also notes that the same listener's feelings confer meaning to a tonal sequence. However, these sentiments (e.g., joy) exist only in certain concrete modalities, like those expressed musically by Ludwig van Beethoven, Gioacchino Rossini, or Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. These ways of feeling are, in turn, individual ethical modalities of the composers. In short, music is an aesthetic expression of ethics, and the experience of music is the activity in which human beings enjoy the imaginary realization of their ethical norms.

To continue, musical consciousness contains three levels: on the first level are perceived sounds; on the second, aesthetic level, musical images are represented; and finally, these images are recognized as the affective modalities of an ethical essence. The different positions of sounds and their relations on the tonal scale produce specific acoustic tensions and thus express various feelings. Moreover, the structures of tonal music—argues Ansermet—are not created arbitrarily nor even artificially, but are given by nature. That is the reason why this music produces pleasure—because it brings human beings into consonance with the world, in contrast to alternative currents in contemporary music (e.g., atonal, dodecaphonic, and concrete music); as mere techniques, these can neither be understood nor enjoyed, and for Ansermet they express the death of God.

Mikel Dufrenne, meanwhile, has worked out an original interpretation of sentiments in art. Like Ingarden and other phenomenologists, Dufrenne considers aesthetic enjoyment as a secondary effect of art, derived from reflection, although no access to art is conceivable without feeling. Furthermore, he

distinguishes between a "reflection that separates and a reflection that adheres" (*une réflexion qui sépare et une réflexion qui adhère*) and a "sympathetic reflection" (*réflexion sympathique*—Dufrenne 1953, vol. 2: 487, 490); the latter is close to feeling and requires a devoted and passionate attention, as well as empathy with the object, in order to reach the inner essence of the work. A successful approach to art is conditioned not only by an adherent reflection, but also by the attitude of letting be and openness to the art-worlds (see also Heidegger and Kaufmann, among others.). The profundity, i.e., the infinity, of the aesthetic object makes reason insufficient to exhaust the object. The profundity of the world and of the perceiver's own existence, with his/her entire past, are disclosed by the (aesthetic) sentiment, which implies the subject's total presence and participatory attitude in the art experience. In addition, aesthetic profundity is grounded in art's capacity to express affective essences; each work of art opens a particular world, whose essence is given by general and a priori affective qualities. These sentiments, experienced in art, may afterward be rediscovered and recognized in daily life, and therefore "illuminate" it.

Like Ingarden, Dufrenne also distinguishes between two kinds of feelings in art: the immediate sentiment only prepares for the encounter with art, whereas the "authentic" sentiment emerges through the whole process of aesthetic experience, as the work of art becomes fully present to the perceiver as an aesthetic object. During this process, the critical and the sentimental attitude alternate and interact in a dialectical progression, in which the comprehension of the object and self-awareness advance in tandem.

Unlike the theoretical attitude, observes Dufrenne, the aesthetic sentiment constantly needs the object's presence and cannot survive if it disappears. As compensation, art moves ("shakes") the subject more deeply than do works of truth. The pleasure and pride caused by the knowledge of the truth consist in possession and require self-oblivion; art delectation, however, does not necessitate the sacrifice of subjectivity, even if it is true that the more the subject dedicates him/herself to the object, the more productive is his/her investigation of the object. Aesthetic admiration is akin to love, insofar as both acknowledge the object's power over the perceiver; still, the aesthetic object remains imaginary, and as such, more or less "in my power," whereas the object of real love enjoys a higher autonomy.

Concepts like enjoyment and aesthetic pleasure also play a significant role in interpretations of aesthetic experience which are related to phenomenology, like those of NICOLAI HARTMANN, Luigi Pareyson, and Hans Robert Jauss. Every perceptual activity has an emotional dimension, asserts Hartmann; this emotion may be then neutralized, transformed, and elevated (*aufgehoben*) to an aesthetic perception. Consequently, the satisfaction (*Wohlgefallen*), ecstasy (*Entrückung*), and fascination (*Hingerissensein*) with art are not reducible to the affects provoked by vital or ethical values, even if these underlie the aesthetic enjoyment, for the latter is still mediated by contemplation and intuition. Hartmann is also aware of the limits of language to express the qualitative richness of aesthetic enjoyment. In his admiration for Kant's and Geiger's considerations on this matter, he binds the aesthetic pleasure to the object as its cause even more closely than they do, and—like Jauss and HERMANN SCHMITZ after him—describes the aesthetic attitude as a simultaneous involvement with the object and distance from it. Authentic aesthetic enjoyment does not mean to become one with the object, not even in music; on the contrary, it is conditioned by a double self-liberation: from the pleasure at the object's practical value, and from the enjoyment of feelings for their own sake.

Pareyson describes art interpretation in its dynamics as a succession of movement and rest, of the disquieted search for meaning and the satisfaction of a filled expectation when the subject lingers in the contemplation of the formed object. At the end of this process, the tensed attention and the investigating efforts are loosened and replaced by feelings like calmness and peacefulness, ecstatic vision and quiet possession—in short, by joy. Aesthetic pleasure consists in wonder, a sentiment composed of surprise and contemplation: (preliminary) surprise puts the subject into motion and so opens the process of interpretation; in contrast, (final) contemplation is somewhat immobile.

If Pareyson “naturally” sets forth the tradition that associates art with beauty and harmony, Jauss's *Rezeptionsästhetik* polemically defends the concept of enjoyment (*Genießen*) against its modernistic denigration, especially in Adorno's aesthetics of negativity. In order to rehabilitate aesthetic enjoyment, Jauss invokes, as hermeneutics traditionally does, a vast philosophical, theological, and humanistic heritage, including phenomenological authors like Geiger,

Sartre, and Giesz. Although he appreciates enjoyment as the aesthetic experience *par excellence*, this is not the same as elementary sensual delectation. Aesthetic enjoyment involves not only communicative identification with the hero (empathy), but also aesthetic distance, both disinterested contemplation and interested participation. More specifically, each of the three components of the aesthetic experience—*poiēsis* (creation), *aisthēsis* (sensation), and *katharsis* (purification)—provides enjoyment: the artist enjoys his/her own productivity and work, as well as the knowledge acquired through them (*poiēsis*); the perceiver enjoys art's regeneration of his/her image of reality and of him/herself (*aisthēsis*); and finally, the perceiver also enjoys art's rich offering of models of identity and communication with others (*katharsis*). Jauss captures the nature of aesthetic enjoyment in the formula: “self enjoyment in the enjoyment of the other” (*Selbstgenuss im Fremdgenuss*).

Given the cultural developments in the past few decades, phenomenological aesthetics also discusses the issue of aesthetic enjoyment in the context of sentimental kitsch and its opposite, disgusting art. Ludwig Giesz relies in his analysis of the “pleasure of kitsch” (*Kitschgenuss*) on Heidegger, Sartre, and Helmut Plessner, but especially on Geiger's “Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses,” and contrasts the aesthetic distance in art with the sentimental self-enjoyment (*Selbstgenuss*) in experiencing kitsch. The kitsch amateur chiefly enjoys him/herself while consuming the object, and is moved by the very fact of being moved by the object (*rührselig*); therefore Giesz considers this pleasure (*Genüsslichkeit*) to be inauthentic and quasi-aesthetic. In other words, the reaction produced by kitsch is a specific hesitation between “pure” (i.e., common) and aesthetic delight; its perceiver enjoys precisely this vague in-between. It is often said that kitsch is cheap; this means that delight can be easily achieved and remains superficial. The sentimental kitsch attitude is idyllic and finds delight even in desperate situations (*Grenzsituationen*—cf. Karl Jaspers) by playing down their negativity or by converting them into sensational and melodramatic experiences. The kitsch lover represses the “real” moods that strike one suddenly and in an uncontrollable manner; instead of them, s/he expects kitsch to provide him with surrogate moods and “diminutive moods” (*diminutive Stimmungen*). Nevertheless,

as Giesz sees it, behind such a person's exclusive openness for the pleasant sides of life, s/he suspects the fragility of happiness.

The analysis of kitsch has shown that an excess of pleasantness causes disgust. Other aestheticians more closely inspect the disgusting as such and its aesthetic potential. Carole Talon-Hugon, for example, works out a phenomenological investigation of disgust (*dégoût*) and notes differences between this and the negative emotions (e.g., the tragic) that are accepted in art. She concludes that disgust is a primary, involuntary emotion and that it is therefore basically impossible to plead for its admission into art.

Bibliography

- Ansermet, Ernest. *Les fondements de la musique dans la conscience humaine*. Neuchâtel: Éditions de la Baconnière, 1961.
- Becker, Oskar. "Von der Hinfälligkeit des Schönen und der Abenteuerlichkeit des Künstlers." In his *Dasein und Dawesen. Gesammelte philosophische Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1963, 11–40.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. Vol. 1. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–684.
- Geiger, Moritz. *Zugänge zur Ästhetik*. Leipzig: Neuer-Geist-Verlag, 1928.
- Giesz, Ludwig. *Phänomenologie des Kitsches*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971; 1st complete ed. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1994.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit* [1927]. Ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. *Gesamtausgabe* 2. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977a; *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. *Gesamtausgabe* 5. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977, 1–74; "The Origin of the Work of Art." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Zur Überwindung der Aesthetik. Zu 'Ursprung des Kunstwerks.'" In *Heidegger Studies* 6, 1990, 5–7.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Unterwegs zur Sprache*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1959; *On the Way to Language*. Trans. Peter D. Hertz. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)*. Ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. *Gesamtausgabe* 65. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1989.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Nietzsche I*. Pfullingen: Günther Neske, 1961; *Nietzsche*. Vol. 1. *The Will to Power as Art*. Trans. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerkes* [1937]. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 13. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1997; *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Ingarden, Roman. "Aesthetic Experience and Aesthetic Object." In his *Selected Papers in Aesthetics*. Ed. Peter J. McCormick. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1985, 107–132.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Ästhetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1977.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. "Das Bildwerk als ästhetisches Phänomen" [1924]; "Die Bedeutung der künstlerischen Stimmung" [1929]. In his *Das Reich des Schönen. Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Stuttgart: Wilhelm Kohlhammer, 1960, 11–125.
- Odebrecht, Rudolf. *Gefühl und schöpferische Gestaltung. Leitgedanken zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1929.
- Pareyson, Luigi. *Eстетica: Teoria della formatività*. Florence: Sansoni, 1954.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Esquisse d'une théorie des émotions*. Paris: Hermann, 1939; *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*. Trans. Philip Mairet. London: Methuen, 1962.
- Schmitz, Hermann. *Der Leib, der Raum und die Gefühle*. Ostfildern vor Stuttgart: Tertium, 1998.
- Schutz, Alfred. "Fragments Toward a Phenomenology of Music" [1944]. In his *Collected Papers IV*. Ed. Helmut Wagner and George Psathas with Fred Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996, 243–75.
- Talon-Hugon, Carole. *Goût et dégoût: L'art peut-il tout montrer?* Nîmes: Jacqueline Chambon, 2003.

Fashion

César Moreno Márquez

Unlike many themes in phenomenological aesthetics, that of fashion has not been abundantly investigated. The brief essay by Georg Simmel (1905), already a classic though in many ways still quite relevant, or the study by Eugen Fink (1969), published nine years after his *Nietzsches Philosophie und Spiel als Weltsymbol*, these are not specifically phenomenological. Fashion has chiefly been studied by structuralists, semioticians, and sociologists. Indisputable classics are the studies by Roland Barthes (1967), which addresses the theme in an indirect manner through study of fashion magazines, and Gilles Lipovetsky (1987), which is quite sociological in style and passionately vindicates the contribution of fashion to postmodern democratic individualism. In addition, the contribution made by Jean Baudrillard (1976) asserts the *semiurgy* of fashion. It would not be easy, however, to speak of hermeneutical currents that express sufficiently clear opinions on this theme.

Perhaps the most irreducible truth concerning fashion is the inability of *our presence in the world, understood as that of bodies rendered meaningful* in public or private everyday life and in various contexts, *to allow our nakedness to suffice*. And yet this does not convey enough. The phenomenon of “fashion” does not depend, as does mere *clothing*, upon our *need* to cover our nakedness. Rather, it depends on the fact that, having been able to remain naked, human beings did not do so. Perhaps this is because our nakedness was impregnated with a sort of *a significance* (Hegel) and

left a lot to be desired in the realms of our multidimensional possibilities for *expression*. Or because this basic fact of our nakedness, of this excessive and raw truth, was not at the level of *playfulness*, of *luxury*, and of *transcendence*, to which our culture has destined us. Nor does fashion depend upon our very circumstantial and oscillating sense of shame. Rather it depends on the fact that, having the possibility of being radically shameless, the human being freely opts to play with nudity, beyond its sexual significance, by refusing it in order to immediately and gradually *unveil* it. Thus although we could resort to physical protection and to shame as explanations for clothing, fashion surpasses the weak explanations of it as a playful and imaginative solution to the problem of our presence.

Perhaps we could better approximate the phenomenon of fashion if we consider the degree to which human beings have always been preoccupied with their *appearance-for-Others* in all of its richness and complexity, so that within the horizon of sociality and culture, *appearing-as-clothed* (rather than *being-clothed*) has been transformed into a decisive vector of our presence. Beyond any rigorous *requirement* within the natural, moral, or aesthetic orders, this preoccupation is encountered in the foundational moment of *being-in-fashion*, for although fashion is tied to certain notions of “good taste” or aesthetic sensibility, it cannot properly be reduced to the requirements of “beauty.” On another note, in order for the phenomenon of “fashion” to become more essentially evident, it has been necessary to go *against nature*, even if only slightly (remember, for instance, the discomfort of certain fashions). This is evident in the excessive luxury of certain styles of dress (in *haute couture* and in the paraphernalia, eccentricity, and theatricality of the *runways*). It is also true that when we overcome any pretension that

C. Moreno Márquez (✉)

University of Sevilla, Seville, Spain

Translated by Marina P. Banchetti-Robino Florida Atlantic University

fashion “contributes more truth” to our presence, we see that fashion is beyond any truth or falsity. None of this means that the phenomenon of fashion negates the concept of protection (against the “weather”), of moral and aesthetic sensibility, of expressive authenticity, or of beauty. However, these do not constitute the irreducible core of this phenomenon.

The phenomenon of *being-in-fashion* presents itself, above all, as a sort of assembly in which *corporeal presence*, *intersubjectivity*, and *semiosis* are almost perfectly conflated, as if fashion were in some sense—and because of our corporeal presence—the indispensable complement to the *expressivity of our (naked) face*. Fashion confirms, through its possibilities, that it is not merely with cloth that our nakedness or presence is *adorned* (rather than merely covered), but with a vestment of the signs of culture: colors, forms, folds, openings, décolletage, cloths, ornaments, etc. This protects our presence not only from the changing climatic phenomena or from nudity, but also, more profoundly, from its own *a significance*.

And without doubt, it is completely necessary at least to understand that fashion assembles many diverse meanings and worlds. It could also be said that fashion “expresses” meanings and worlds (both to spectators and to the “subject” who “wears it”), but only if this notion does not imply a prior referential truth (*a quo*) acting as a support for the authenticity of the expressive exteriority of fashion. What fashion evokes is not so much an “interior” (subjective) reality as limits and worlds, doing so through multiple codes—and always as an agreed-upon game. This assembly is “artificial,” an expression of a “possible world.” And this is not because fashion cannot express a truth or a subjective or social reality (e.g., a state of mind or membership in a social class). Rather, it is because in affirming that fashion expresses a *possible* meaning or world, we are situating it in a prior and more essential terrain. This is why fashion can approximate farce (simulacrum, masquerade, disguise) when it evokes a possible world in which the “actor” is not necessarily me-as-I-am, but rather the possible-I that I become or into whom I am transformed.

The decisive aim of expression in fashion is not to tell the truth about a real interiority, although in other contexts this is the decisive aim of expression. Rather, the aim is to *provoke impressions*, to arouse *horizons of expectations* in accordance with semiotic codes. If fashion could express a truth, this

truth would be that of cultural codes. This is why one of the ultimate meanings of *being-in-fashion* is that of *pretending-to-be* (including *pretending-to-be-oneseelf*). The attention to *appearing or resembling being dressed* potentially requires both continuity and discontinuity between subjectivity and what clothes it (and it is discontinuity that permits disguise). This is why the perfect subject of fashion is not the one who seeks to express him/herself through it (an interpretation that tends to *psychologize* “fashion”), nor is it the one who accepts it as a good consumer by mimicking the majority (an interpretation that tends to *sociologize* “fashion”). Rather, it is a subject who plays with fashion’s resources. For such a subject, being-in-fashion requires a certain circumspect intelligence that asks “What does one wear in this place and at this time?” and “How (who) do I wish to appear (resemble)?” In this sense, the *impulse* to be-in-fashion favors reflexivity, not simply through my *appearing-externally* to an Other (including to that “Other” that I am to myself in the intimacy of my mirror), but also and especially through (the awareness of) my *resembling another* (simulacrally) through the resources of fashion, attention to which consumes my time. Thus it is not strange that as a consequence, fashion incorporates *body-building* and the entire scope of *make-up* and *cosmetics* (including cosmetic surgery).

Yet unlike these “arts” that are contrived against the “defects” emanating from our corporeal engagement with time (erosion, aging), it is not against time but, rather, with it that fashion happily unfolds, as though, in effect, our corporeal presence could leave our “flesh and blood” body behind—almost forgetting it—in order to offer itself to the *becomings* of fashion (the *sex-appeal of the inorganic* of Walter Benjamin and Mario Perniola). Perhaps in no other cultural space does *presentism* in the horizon of the ephemeral (without such ephemerality arousing discomfort) show itself more intensely. In effect, being-in-fashion is a being-in-novelty, as in a being-in-the-future that is nevertheless not a *projecting*, but rather, a leaving-behind, a letting-pass and a letting-arrive, and a “being-in-the-latest-style.” It is not in vain that, unlike fashion in its *structural* dimension, *fashions* are constitutively phenomena “of the surface,” irremediably ephemeral and with self-destructive inclinations, yet occasioning not discomfort, but rather bringing the pleasure and amusement of metamorphosis; we happily sacrifice fashions on the pyre of the ephemeral, ecstasies

arise before the scaffold of the superfluous or of a taste upon which “nothing has been written” (which leaves fashions open to all possible inconstancies).

And it is in that movement of the transitoriness of fashions that *fashion*, with its profound playfulness, becomes a sort of vital celebration of the life-and-death process by virtue of the powerful dynamism that characterizes it, an uninhibited *seduction by the accidental* and an *attraction for the periphery* in the dismissal of “substance,” of “interiority,” or of the “thing-in-itself.” And this is true, perhaps, because fashions bring out the need for a *light and playful, although persistent, contact with contingency* that is all the more intense when the “wearers” have a heightened awareness that they are living *contingently* and *theatrically*. In its own way, fashion responds to the *arationality* of existence, almost opposing the being-ostentatiously-visible to the not-asking-to-be-seen of the rose without reason (*ohne warum*) of Angelus Silesius and Martin Heidegger (we remember that in *Der Satz vom Grund*, the rose of the mystical poem “does not ask if it is seen”—*fragt nicht, ob man sie sieht*). In accomplishing this, fashion is assisted by the many different ways of being-seen (besides “in the street” or “at the party,” etc.): in the catalog, at the parade, behind the display window, on the runway, etc. As an antithesis to everything that gratifies concealment, the characteristic of fashion is exhibition, presentation, “making a scene,” arriving at a sufficient elevation of *perceptive frequency* to overflow the field of vision (and to camouflage differences) or distinguishing itself “by calling attention” (in its extravagance).

This is why its detractors emphasize fashion’s *contagious* vanity and frivolity, whether the banquet of *appearing/resembling in appearances* consumed by fashion involves a “majority,” as in a massive proliferation of a certain kind of appearance in the perceptual field, or an extravagant minority. Certainly, we must underscore fashion’s background of “arationality,” because on many occasions the development of fashion is very “reasonable” and can be easily explained, but we must situate ourselves within the *absence of reason* (or of a reason other than the mere pleasure of being-in-fashion), in order to understand the *autonomy* of this phenomenon. What would be the sufficient reason for the fact that a certain “complement” to our clothing or to our presence becomes fashionable, e.g., the wearing of spectacles, a certain width to the seam of our trousers, a certain combination of colors, or a certain

texture? It would be easier to appreciate what fashion is through its acceptance by the majority (which does not mean that this would help to find a better definition of fashion) than if it were concentrated on the individual and one could infer that biographical reasons, or personal taste, etc., explain the *adoption* of a certain fashion. However, when acceptance (including subconscious acceptance) involves imitation of the majority, the wearer *does not even know* why a particular fashion becomes fashionable. This increases the arationality of fashion and would remain undramatic if one could keep taste-and-playfulness, the mechanisms that are decisive for the always euphoric design-machine.

If we seek to discover the “subject”/wearer of fashion, we must not use the criterion of that subject who uncritically accepts the dictates of fashion. The phenomenon of fashion has experienced such eclosion within the realm of design and within pluralistic democracy that, in order to qualify the comportment of the specific subject of the fashion phenomenon, it would not be sufficient from a specifically sociological perspective to gauge the homogeneity that characterizes massive adoption. We must instead situate ourselves in the *care about presenting myself as appearing-dressed* in a *horizon of sociality* (being-with). Such is the relevance of fashion as much as the stereotypical comportment of the individual who relies upon *him/herself* (Heidegger) as it is to that of the *extravagant* individual. This explains why the subject who is-not-in-fashion is not the one who consciously adopts a fashion against the reigning fashion, but rather the one who is *indifferent* to his/her *appearance-in-society* according to the possibilities offered by this or that garment. The antithesis of such an *outsider* is the *fashion-victim*. And the forefront of the subject of fashion, although s/he can be potentially anyone, is especially represented by—at least in our culture—one of the two modalities of subjectivity that best embody (at the moment) the Western ideals of seduction and futurism: woman and youth.

Whence, however, does the care-for-appearing/resembling emerge? It does not emerge simply from the increasingly acute need to escape *boredom* in the realm of phenomena (especially if this is associated with our personal presence). Rather, and above all, it emerges from the urgency *to-be-recognized* by more than the presence of the face and beyond the insignificance of nakedness. If the escape from boredom

excessively explains the sometimes frenetic changes of fashion and its self-destructive and regenerative powers, the urgency for recognition is interlocked with the human need for acceptance. To adopt/participate in fashion means to feel recognized as integrated (in many senses), and especially as “being with the times,” as “belonging to the present”: *I belong to my time*, fashion carries me and, in the case of my clothes, they demonstrate not my ideas, not my personal tastes, not my beliefs, but my *intercorporeal* presence; by *being-in-fashion*, I am one among many. However, I do not feel devalued by this, but clothed by it, since I feel that I participate in a (“triumphant”) majority. I do not have the impression of feeling *out*: isolated, segregated, “discolored,” “out of time,” “impertinent,” or untimely.

In truth, being-in-fashion through clothing is the easiest way to be-in-fashion. To *be seen* in this way, to *be recognized as integrated* in this or that group, will require waiting for a more circumstantially adequate *communicative fluidity*. The sociological reading becomes an existential interpretation when instead of simply speaking of “integration” and “recognition,” it speaks of the rejection of solitude. This is, however, secondary, since what fashion can offer as a way of combating loneliness is either a gregarious comportment or an individualistic eccentricity that *would dress* what I believe to be my irreducible and “prestigious” individuality with the glances of others—as is frequently the case in *haute couture*. Fashion is as perfectly at home in democratic systems that protect the prestige of minority fashions as it is in totalitarian systems (e.g., the voluntary or the forced *uniform*: in a totalitarian system there could be a Nazi, Fascist, or Maoist uniform, whereas in a democracy there could be an “existentialist,” “postmodern,” “hippie,” or “punk” uniform).

Fashion seems to be a game with a *resolution that is not so much pragmatic as imaginary and playful*, a resolution that presents itself in a horizon of perpetual *intercorporeality*. It is a resolution that is imaginary and playful, rather than properly “real” (for which mere clothing would suffice), since, with fashion, *our diversity comes into play dressed, within time and society*, in the deferred appearance of our unencumbered nakedness as a mere animal truth of the *thereness* of

our presence. It is true that we dress ourselves not only to stop being naked, but also to undress ourselves. However, we know that, by passing through the masquerade (which takes us from “having” and from “being” to “wearing”), we have made a transition from that first (animal) nakedness of the flesh to a nakedness that is no longer simply animal or erotic, but rigorously moral instead. This would indicate that we have crossed back from the footlights and the fireflies into the limelight.

Bibliography

- Barthes, Roland. *Système de la mode*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1967; *The Fashion System*. Trans. Matthew Ward and Richard Howard. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *L'échange symbolique et la mort*. Paris: Gallimard, 1976; *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. Trans. Lain Hamilton Grant. London: Sage Publications, 1993.
- Bell, Quentin. *Mode et société. Essai sur la sociologie du vêtement*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1947.
- Calefato, Patrizia. *El sentido del vestir*. Valencia: Engloba, 2002.
- Craik, Jennifer. *The Face of Fashion: Cultural Studies in Fashion*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Davis, Fred. *Fashion, Culture, and Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Descamps, Marc-Alain. *Le nu et le vêtement*. Paris: Éditions Universitaires, 1972.
- Descamps, Marc-Alain. *Psychosociologie de la mode*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1979.
- Deslandres, Yvonne. *Le costume, image de l'homme*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1976.
- Fink, Eugen. *Mode—ein verführerisches Spiel*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1969.
- Finkelstein, Joanne. *The Fashioned Self*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- Goffman, Erwin. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1956.
- Kiener, Franz Kleidung. *Mode und Mensch*. Munich: Reinhardt, 1956.
- König, René. *Menschheit auf dem Laufsteg (Die Mode im Zivilisationsprozeß)*. Munich: Carl Hanser, 1985.
- Lemoine-Luccioni, Eugénie. *La robe: Essai psychoanalytique sur le vêtement*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983.
- Lipovetsky, Gilles. *L'empire de l'éphémère: La mode et son destin dans les sociétés modernes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1987.
- Simmel, Georg. “Philosophie der Mode” [1905]. In his *Philosophische Kultur*. Leipzig: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1919.
- Squicciarino, Nicola. *Il vestito parla: Considerazioni psicosociologiche*. Rome: Armando, 1986.

Film

Elena del Río

The rigorous and systematized application of phenomenology to the study of film has been a comparatively late development in film studies. Vivian Sobchack's ground breaking book, *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience* (1992), has brought to light the relevance of MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY's existential phenomenology to major aesthetic and theoretical aspects of the film experience. In so doing, her work has also made apparent the reductive and deterministic nature of the prevalent models of film theory used to date, namely, the psychoanalytical and Marxist/ideological approaches. Thinking about film through such phenomenological notions as the lived body (applied to both film and spectator), the embodied and synaesthetic nature of perception, the reversibility of perception and expression, and the material and sensuous operations of the technological film apparatus, *The Address of the Eye* seeks to overcome, on the one hand, the sexual objectification performed by psychoanalytical film theory, and on the other hand, the reifying approach to existence practiced within the Marxist model.

To counter the deterministic bent of the psychoanalytical unconscious and of the social/political relations of a Marxist theory of commodity fetishism, a phenomenology of film experience emphasizes the radical openness and unfinished nature of both the film medium and the spectator. Instead of the subject-object relations that prevail in other theoretical accounts of spectator and film, phenomenology considers both medium and spectator as always already enworlded, always mutually implicated and inclusive of each other.

One of the many radical ways in which *The Address of the Eye* reconfigures our thinking of cinema is its granting of equal perceptive and expressive agency to the viewing subject and to the film itself. The film projected on the screen is not a ready-made and finished object waiting passively to be perceived by the spectator's consciousness, but rather an anonymous, yet present "other" that carries out its own activity of seeing, hearing, and moving. The film is thus not just a *viewed object*, but, just like the spectator, it is also a *viewing subject* in its own right. For Sobchack, the experience of perception and expression is mutually possessed by filmmaker, film, and spectator, insofar as they share "common structures of embodied existence ... [and] similar modes of being-in-the-world" (Sobchack 1992: 5). Distancing its perspective from EDMUND HUSSERL's phenomenology of the transcendental ego, *The Address of the Eye* claims to be informed by the premises of existential, semiotic phenomenology. But while structures of language and meaning are crucial to the analysis of the film experience, these are not, as in the psychoanalytical model, radically at odds with a pre-linguistic or pre-reflective realm (what Merleau-Ponty would call "wild meaning"). Instead, language and meaning are rooted in the perceptive body, continuing or extending its intentions in and toward the world. In other words, while language for psychoanalysis functions "as a substitute for being," a kind of fetishistic representation of presence, existential phenomenology considers language "as an extension of the experience of being-in-the-world" (ibid.: 102).

One of the most valuable and persuasive critiques of contemporary film theory found in Sobchack's book targets the illusory and coercive nature of the film-viewing experience as postulated by the combined

E. del Río (✉)
University of Alberta, Alberta, Canada

accounts of psychoanalytical and Marxist/ideological theories. While these theories describe the cinematic apparatus as a substitutive and illusory orchestration of mirror effects, ultimately providing the spectator with a deceptive experience of reality that has regressive ideological and political consequences, her phenomenological model stresses the expansive and disclosing possibilities of the cinema as an ongoing negotiation between film and spectator's perceptive and expressive acts. The spectator's experience of the film thus alternates between *intentional agreement* and *intentional argument* with the film's own visual and visible experience. As Sobchack puts it, "the spectator's significant relation with the viewed view on the screen is *mediated by, inclusive of, but not dictated by*, the film's viewing view" (ibid.: 278).

Within Marxist/ideological accounts of the cinema such as that of Jean-Louis Baudry and psychoanalytical accounts such as that of Christian Metz, the film is construed as a disembodied, hence transcendental, tyrannizing influence that subjects the spectator to a kind of "paranoid delusion." Vision for these theorists is not situated within specific existential and embodied parameters, for it springs from a kind of mental, incorporeal/invisible locus. By contrast, Sobchack contends that (film) vision can never occur in a state of disembodiment or passive absorption. Our access to the (film) world cannot bypass either embodiment or active engagement, however physically inert or static our bodies may seem during the film-viewing experience. Equally crucial to the reconfiguration of perception carried out by Sobchack's phenomenological model is the idea that perception is not only always attached to corporeality, but is also *synaesthetic* and *synoptic*. That is, perception is not grounded in one single sense (vision) in an isolated fashion, nor are our different sensory modalities fragmented and separated from each other. Instead, they form a system of cooperation and commutability whereby any resulting perception is undoubtedly more than the sum of the different senses participating therein. Merleau-Ponty's statement that "[the] body is a ready-made system of equivalents and transpositions from one sense to another" (Merleau-Ponty 1945: 271) is particularly relevant to the rich sensorial spectrum that emerges in the perceptive encounter between the world of the film and the spectator.

Besides making numerous references to Merleau-Ponty's major works (*Phénoménologie de la*

perception, Le visible et l'invisible, etc.), *The Address of the Eye* also mentions "Le cinéma et la nouvelle psychologie" (1948) as his most explicit and focused meditation on the cinema. In this essay, Merleau-Ponty lays the ground for the correspondence between cinematic technology and cinematic ontology. Simply put, technological instrumentation and mediation generate a certain way of being-in-the-world. As mentioned earlier, a phenomenological description of the cinematic situation considers the film as a lived body. Just as the human lived body forms the basis for intentionality, perception, expression, and action in the world, the film's body—its technological and instrumental dimension—forms the basis for the film's perceptual and expressive engagement with the world. Technology is thus no mere inert and objectified matter, but rather an intentional field that extends and alters the existential projects carried out by humans. Technological methods and processes thus correlate with modalities of thought and consciousness.

Prior to Sobchack's focused attention on the phenomenological correspondence between cinematic technology and ontology, this question had already been a central concern of French film theorist and critic André Bazin. Although Bazin did not characterize his comments on the matter as an explicit phenomenological position, his desire to investigate the specific ontology of the cinema and the precise nature of the film apparatus as a form of perceptual and expressive mediation was certainly driven by an inherently phenomenological impulse. In the four-volume collection of essays written in the 1950s, *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?* Bazin argues, if somewhat idealistically, that cinema possesses a unique capacity for giving us access to the world without the forms of subjective mediation proper to the other arts. In this regard, as Gregory Flaxman argues, Bazin's position is, like Sobchack's, diametrically opposed to such Marxist-informed film theorists as Jean-Louis Baudry and Jean-Luc Comolli "for whom the technology was always already ideologically determined" (Flaxman 2000: 105 n. 8).

Bazin's task of examining the essential properties of the cinema in relation to the other arts was prefigured by the work of the philosopher ROMAN INGARDEN. Ingarden situates the *film play* on the borderline between literature and painting. Unlike the literary work's essential dependence on words, the *film play* must use words only as a supplement to the more

inherently cinematographic visual aspects. And unlike the static nature of painting, the film play consists of a continuously unfolding and changing production of events. One of his most insightful contributions to a theory of film aesthetics is his transposition of musical aspects to the organization of both space and time in the film play. Further, without adopting the negative tone of later psychoanalytical film theory, Ingarden's Husserlian description anticipates several important ideas of theorists such as Christian Metz and Jean-Louis Baudry. Like these theorists, Ingarden refers to people and things presented onscreen as phantoms "that feign to be personally present," and as an illusion that "takes on the character or the phenomenal *habitus* of a reality" (Ingarden 1962: 328). Such statements establish a clear divide between real and reproduced/represented objects, thus paving the path for modern film theory's engagement with film as representation.

At the level of subjectivity (the way in which the film not only constructs the viewing subject, but is also altered and affected by it), the inherent openness espoused by the phenomenological approach has some radical and profound implications that are worth examining. Much has been made in film debates and analyses conducted in recent decades of the cultural and social markers that constrain the body within a specific set of power relations. Psychoanalytical and Marxist-based analyses of film have identified bodies according to preselected binary categories (male/female, white/black, etc.) whose effect is to homogenize bodies, thereby eliding what Sobchack calls the lived body's "excessive, ambiguous, and over-running semiosis" (Sobchack 2004: 144). Let us take the issue of sexual difference as a relevant example. Reacting against the patriarchal domination and repression of the female body prevalent in classical narrative cinema, 1970s feminist film theory unwittingly tended to reinforce and extend such repression by reducing the female body in the cinema to the Freudian concept of fetishism. Thus feminist-informed theorists and critics did not account for the all-important distinction between the female fetishized body resulting from masculinist codes of representation and a specific female lived body that might significantly exceed "the historical and analytic systems available to codify, contain, and even negate [the body]" (ibid.: 147).

Sobchack's attempt to situate film theory within phenomenological, fundamentally philosophical,

parameters and grounds has been followed by more specific studies—undertaken by both Sobchack herself and others—that apply phenomenology to particular cinematic concepts, genres, or modes of filmmaking. Thus, for instance, her essay, "Lounge Time: Postwar Crises and the Chronotope of Film Noir," uses Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope to explore the specific spatiotemporal "thereness" of the *film noir* genre. The idiosyncratic spaces/places and temporal rhythms that ground the *film noir* story emerge in Sobchack's analysis as this particular genre's form of embodiment, its unique being-in-the-world. "Lounge Time" is an excellent example of the multiple ways in which the kind of phenomenological attention to ontological and spatiotemporal description may resonate with, and indeed be inextricable from, the historical and sociopolitical conditions that underpin a particular film or genre. It is this necessary interdependence between the ontological and the epistemological and/or ideological levels that can rescue phenomenology from the kind of charges of idealism or naiveté that have been levelled against former phenomenologically oriented critics such as Bazin, Stanley Cavell, or Jean Mitry.

Jennifer Barker's *The Tactile Eye: Touch and the Cinematic Experience* (2009) makes another important contribution to phenomenological studies of film in its description of the film experience as a tactile interaction between film and viewer. Barker locates tactile behavior in three sites of the spectator and the film bodies: the skin, the musculature, and the viscera. Barker's study is indebted to existential phenomenology's descriptions of perception and subjectivity, as well as to descriptions of the relationship between the senses that have emerged in disciplines such as philosophy, anthropology, and art criticism.

Kevin Fisher's 2004 dissertation, *Intimate Elsewheres: Simulations of Altered States of Consciousness in Post WW II American Cinema*, addresses the phenomenological and cultural-historical significance of films that attempt to orient the spectator within the subjective experiences of characters whose consciousness has been altered by "substances" (from alcohol to LSD), "techniques" (such as brainwashing and hypnosis), and/or "technologies" (such as cybernetics and virtual reality).

Like Barker's and Fisher's, my own work has been decisively and extensively influenced by the phenomenological account of cinema developed in *The*

Address of the Eye. I have found phenomenological theory to be most valuable and illuminating when applied to the areas of technology, performance, and affect.

The questions of cinematic technology and ontology raised by the phenomenological perspective find a suitable match in those films that are self-reflexively inclined to probe into the effects of technology on its user. In “The Body as Foundation of the Screen: Allegories of Technology in Atom Egoyan’s *Speaking Parts*” (1996), I apply the phenomenological premise of embodied perception to the screen-mediated interactions that take place among the characters in Egoyan’s film. *Speaking Parts* insists on the inherent affinity or continuity between the human body and the technological artifact. In considering the body’s extension through/ into the technological, the issue of the user’s engagement, concern, or affect is of the highest priority. As his films make clear, the user may utilize the screen as a way of either exposing or masking his/her vulnerability, dispossession, pain, or loss. Thus *Speaking Parts* showcases the technological as the environment where ontological conditions of embodiment, temporality, and mortality are played out. These time-related aspects of human loss also suggest the relevance of MARTIN HEIDEGGER’s thought to a phenomenological approach to film (Dasein as a being-toward-death), not to mention the applicability of his attention to the ontological effects of modern technology in such essays as “Die Frage nach der Technik” (1954) and “Die Zeit des Weltbildes” (1950).

If, as phenomenology teaches us, embodiment is an inescapable condition of human perception, it must be present in all forms of perception, even in those, such as voyeurism, that allegedly take place in a disembodied state. In “The Body of Voyeurism: Mapping a Discourse of the Senses in Michael Powell’s *Peeping Tom*” (2001), I dispute psychoanalytical film theory’s traditional separation between corporeality and voyeurism by exploring the ways in which this film intertwines a discourse of touch with its acclaimed thematics of voyeuristic vision. In *Peeping Tom*, the spilling over of fetishism from sight to touch supports the idea of the body as a sensual unit or synaesthetic structure. Through its protagonist’s childlike bodily gestures and linguistic incompetence, the film also instantiates the continuity between corporeal semiosis and verbal semiosis. What critics tend to consider as three distinct and alienated spheres in the realm

of voyeurism—vision, the body, and language—thus emerge in *Peeping Tom* as cooperative reinforcers of the same voyeuristic and repressive dynamics.

The interlacing of vision and touch is also one of the grounding concepts in Laura Marks’s analysis of Middle Eastern video works as featured in her book *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (2000). Marks uses the term *haptic visuality* as a comprehensive and alternative approach to the theoretical reduction of the viewing experience to vision and to the corresponding fragmentation of the senses. Marks’s second book, *Touch: Sensuous Theory and Multisensory Media* (2002), pursues a similar line of investigation in its analysis of experimental films and videos.

Sobchack’s most recent book, *Carnal Thoughts: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture* (2004), extends her former phenomenological investigations of film with essays that emphasize the role of bodies “in making sense of today’s image-saturated culture” (<http://www.ucpress.edu/books/pages/10172.html>). This work takes on a more personal and popular stance, showing the relevance of phenomenological philosophy to a broad range of popular media experiences. *Carnal Thoughts* thus shows that the application of phenomenology, and philosophy in general, need not be restricted to those films informed by a certain level of self-consciousness; instead, as she implies in “What My Fingers Knew: The Cinesthetic Subject, or Vision in the Flesh” (2004: 53–84), phenomenology is equipped to account for all kinds of sensual/sensational pleasures of film viewing, those provided by Hollywood film no less than those we encounter in less popular cinematic styles.

Building upon the thoughts on sexual difference provided in *The Address of the Eye* and in the work of other phenomenological feminist scholars, I have also been interested in the ways phenomenology helps us redefine the female body onscreen by expanding its potentialities for self-reinvention and agency. In this sense, the kind of phenomenology practiced by Merleau-Ponty falls short of considering the body in particular gendered ways by simply assuming the white, male body as the universal measure of all bodies. In “Politics and Erotics of Representation: Feminist Phenomenology and Valie Export’s *The Practice of Love*” (2000) and “Rethinking Feminist Film Theory: Counter-Narcissistic Performance in Sally Potter’s *Thriller*” (2004), I try to challenge both

the neglect of gender within traditional phenomenology and its rigid parameters within essentialist feminist theory by examining the ways in which certain women filmmakers have reconfigured the female body onscreen as something other than a fetish serving male interests and desires.

Performance studies is yet another area within film that can benefit from the findings and methods of phenomenology. The theoretical fit between phenomenology and a critical focus on performance hinges largely upon two factors: first, the descriptive emphasis they share; and second, their mutual interest in bodily/ gestural language as both distinguishable from and continuous with the operating modes of verbal language and symbolic systems. In *Falling for You: Essays on Cinema and Performance* (1999), editors Lesley Stern and George Kouvaros adopt an inherently phenomenological stance when they argue that the act of analyzing cinematic performance is closely dependent upon questions of description—questions that have been taken for granted within the critical lexicon and standardized protocols of film scholarship. Thus for both phenomenology as a research procedure and for such performance critics as Stern and Kouvaros, descriptive acts are crucial to the act of bringing to consciousness that “which has been lost to our reflective knowledge through habituation and/or institutionalization” (Sobchack 1992: 28).

Although the descriptive focus advocated by Stern and Kouvaros is radically phenomenological in nature, neither the editors nor the contributors in *Falling for You* adopt an explicitly phenomenological focus. Instead, some of the essays in this anthology make extensive references to Gilles Deleuze, whose ideas on cinema and the body they find rather resonant with the aims of performance analysis. The reliance of these critics on Deleuze’s philosophy is not coincidental, for as I will argue presently, one can find enough areas of overlapping interest between Merleau-Ponty’s existential phenomenology and Deleuze’s philosophy of transcendental empiricism to warrant an approximation.

The phenomenological notion of the lived body as expressive bearer of meaning lays the ground for yet another compelling connection between phenomenology and performance studies. As a complex and multi-layered array of signs, the body’s gestural and kinetic acts make available a crucial, and as yet untapped, resource for the understanding and analysis of film.

The notion of subjective intentionality central to the phenomenological project is closely linked to the lived body’s power of movement. This power lies between the temporal and spatial limitations of embodied consciousness and the body’s capacity to transcend these limitations through an intentional selection, transformation, and concretization of temporal and spatial abstractions. Physical action and movement are thus some of the most powerful tools the body has of inscribing its agency in the world. In this regard, the virtually unexplored field of body performance in film can build upon the research done in other disciplines such as (feminist) philosophy (Iris Marion Young), performance art (Amelia Jones), and dance studies (Susan Leigh Foster). Not coincidentally, some of the most fruitful applications of performance and dance studies to film concern the analysis of the female body. Insofar as objectification has been the prevailing mode of representation assigned to the female body, movement can surely function to counteract it.

As I mentioned earlier, some scholars working on body issues in film seem to favor a Deleuzian over a phenomenological perspective (Jodi Brooks, Laleen Jayamanne, Lisa Trahair [in Stern and Kouvaros 1999]; Marks 2000, Marks 2002). The shift from Merleau-Ponty to Deleuze is based upon solid affinities between their philosophies. Notwithstanding Deleuze’s indictment of phenomenology, his and Merleau-Ponty’s philosophies and their implications for a theory of cinema remain close in many important respects. Both Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of perception and Deleuze’s transcendental empiricism dismantle epistemological systems that are grounded in non-corporeal acts of signification or cognition. The drive to determine a clear dividing line between subject and world, perceiver and perceived, objective reality and subjective experience, is equally suspected and accordingly undermined by both thinkers. In the continuity of human body and world that both these philosophies propose, a sensuous/sensational and affective approximation to the world replaces the purely mental and visual methods of the disembodied cogito.

Both Merleau-Ponty and Deleuze share a view of cinema and art as performing a revelatory function vis-à-vis being. The cinema functions as consciousness does (or in Deleuze’s words, “the brain is the screen”). Merleau-Ponty’s belief in the revelatory function of the gesture is equally at work in Deleuze’s cinema books, where the body figures as the constantly moving and

detritorializing surface that can put us directly in touch with the unthought. Deleuze's attention to the close-up as an instance of the expressive powers of faciality in *L'image-mouvement* (1983) is matched by his concern with the bodily attitudes and postures that form the locus of affection in *L'image-temps* (1985).

But despite the many ideas Merleau-Ponty and Deleuze share, it is also important to acknowledge the difference that separates them—a difference that renders their respective modes of thinking unique and therefore equally necessary. As many commentators have noted, Merleau-Ponty and Deleuze part ways at the juncture where sensation and affect are variously theorized as either belonging to the realm of subjectivity or as operating in a desubjectified field of forces. Thus while for Merleau-Ponty sensation and affect are subjective phenomena arising out of an intentional and individuated rapport with the world, Deleuze regards the sensational and the affective as material flows whose individuation and exchange do not rest upon subjectified intentions, but rather upon the workings of a non-organic, anonymous force or life.

As is apparent from the recent and developing work by film scholars in the field, phenomenological theory has much to contribute to the innovation and expansion of cinema studies, even in those areas such as gender, cultural, media, colonial, and historical studies that were previously deemed off-limits to the purview of a serious philosophical discourse such as phenomenology. This breakdown of disciplinary and institutional boundaries shows, in fact, that there is hardly an area of cultural or human concern that can be bracketed off from the interests of the phenomenologist—the lived body is no doubt here to stay.

Bibliography

- Andrew, J. Dudley. "The Neglected Tradition of Phenomenology in Film Theory." In *Wide Angle* 2:2, 1978, 44–49.
- Banfi, Antonio. "Cinema e socialità." In *La problematicità dell'educazione e il pensiero pedagogico*. Ed. Giovanni Maria Bertin. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1961; rpt. as "L'aspetto sociale del cinema come spettacolo." In Antonio Banfi, *Vita dell'arte: Scritti di estetica e filosofia dell'arte*. Ed. E. Mattioli and Gabriele Scaramuzza. Reggio nell'Emilia: Istituto Antonio Banfi, 1988, 461–72.
- Barker, Jennifer. "Bodily Irruptions: The Corporeal Assault on Ethnographic Narration." In *Cinema Journal* 34:3, 1995, 57–76.
- Barker, Jennifer. *The Tactile Eye: Touch and the Cinematic Experience*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, forthcoming, 2009.
- Bazin, André. *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?* Vols. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958–62; *What Is Cinema?* 2 vols. Trans. Hugh Gray. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967, 1971.
- Casebier, Allan. *Film and Phenomenology: Toward a Realist Theory of Cinematic Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Cavell, Stanley. *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Dagrada, Elena, Raffaele de Berti, and Gabriele Scaramuzza, eds. *Estetica e cinema a Milano*. Milan: Cuem, 2006.
- del Río, Elena. "The Body as Foundation of the Screen: Allegories of Technology in Atom Egoyan's *Speaking Parts*." In *Camera Obscura* 38, 1996, 93–115.
- del Río, Elena. "Politics and Erotics of Representation: Feminist Phenomenology and Valie Export's *The Practice of Love*." In *Discourse* 22:2, 2000, 46–70.
- del Río, Elena. "The Body of Voyeurism: Mapping a Discourse of the Senses in Michael Powell's *Peeping Tom*." In *Camera Obscura* 45, 2001, 115–49.
- del Río, Elena. "Rethinking Feminist Film Theory: Counter-narcissistic Performance in Sally Potter's *Thriller*." In *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 21, 2004, 11–24.
- del Río, Elena. *Deleuze and the Cinemas of Performance: Powers of Affection*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinéma 1: L'image-mouvement*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1983; *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinéma 2: L'image-temps*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1985; *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Fisher, Kevin. "Dasein and the Existential Structure of Cinematic Spectatorship: A Heideggerian Analysis." In *Glimpse: The Journal of the Society for Phenomenology and Media Studies* 1, 1999, 37–45.
- Fisher, Kevin. *Intimate Elsewheres: Simulations of Altered States of Consciousness in Post WW II American Cinema*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California Los Angeles, 2004.
- Flaxman Gregory, ed. *The Brain is the Screen: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Formaggio, Dino. "Estetica e cinematografo." In *Cinestudio*, 9, 1964; rpt. in his *Variazioni su l'idea di artistica: Profili artistici e saggi brevi*. Milan: Nike, 2000, 147–48.
- Foster, Susan Leigh. *Reading Dancing*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Die Zeit des Weltbildes." In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 69–104; "The age of the world picture." In his *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Trans. William Lovitt. New York: Harper & Row, 1977, 115–154.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Die Frage nach der Technik." In his *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1954, 13–44; "The Question Concerning Technology." Trans. William Lovitt. In

- Martin Heidegger: *Basic Writings*. Ed. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1977, 287–317.
- Ingarden, Roman. “Der Film.” In his *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst. Musikwerk–Architektur–Film*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1962, pp. 319–341; “The film.” In his *Ontology of the Work of Art*. Trans. Raymond Meyer and John Goldthwait. Athens: Ohio U. Press, 1989, 317–342.
- Jones, Amelia. *Body Art: Performing the Subject*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Kracauer, Siegfried. *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Marks, Laura. *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Marks, Laura. *Touch: Sensuous Theory and Multisensory Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. “Le cinéma et la nouvelle psychologie.” In his *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Nagel, 1948, 85–106; “The film and the new psychology.” In his *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Patricia A. Dreyfus. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 48–59.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l’invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Mitry, Jean. *Esthétique et psychologie du cinéma*. 2 Vols. Paris: Éditions Universitaires, 1963, 1965.
- Rognoni, Luigi. *Cinema muto: Dalle origini al 1930*. Rome: Edizioni Bianco e Nero, 1952.
- Scalfarotto, Mauro. *Cinema ed estetica nella Scuola di Milano*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Università degli Studi di Milano, 2002–2003.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. “Ingarden’s Ontologie des filmischen Kunstwerks im Kontext klassischer Filmtheorien.” In Adam Węrzeciński ed. *Roman Ingarden. A Filozofia naszego czasu*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne, 1995, 229–44.
- Sobchack, Vivian. *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Sobchack, Vivian. “Lounge Time: Postwar Crises and the Chronotope of Film Noir.” In *Refiguring American Film Genres: Theory and History*. Ed. Nick Browne. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, 129–70.
- Sobchack, Vivian. *Carnal Thoughts: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004; description of *Carnal Thoughts* by anonymous University of California Press editor, <http://ucpress.edu/books/pages/10172.html>.
- Stern, Lesley, and George Kouvaros, eds. *Falling for You: Essays on Cinema and Performance*. Sydney: Power Publications, 1999.
- Young, Iris Marion. *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Eugen Fink (1905–1975)

Hans Rainer Sepp

In EDMUND HUSSERL's later life, Eugen Fink was his most important assistant (see Bruzina 2004; van Kerckhoven 2003), and Fink was influenced by his teachers Husserl and MARTIN HEIDEGGER. But from his early beginnings developed his own concept of phenomenologically inspired philosophy (Böhmer 2006). Although he did not establish a phenomenological aesthetics as such, his work contains many singular analyses relevant for phenomenological research in aesthetics. Two topics in Fink's work are important above all for aesthetics: his theory of image and play, and his attempt to come to terms with the relation of poetry and philosophy. Both topics are located in the field where philosophical anthropology is related to what Fink called "cosmological thinking." Thus his studies of aesthetic themes are not separable from his reflections on the world as such.

The last part of Fink's 1929 dissertation, *Vergegenwärtigung und Bild* (1930; rpt. 1966), is a short phenomenology of the image as a picture in its real surroundings. At the same time, it marks the beginning of Fink's own conception of a philosophy of the world. This concept of "world" is neither a total horizon (Husserl) of worldly experiencing as the form of mundane subjectivity, nor the way in which Dasein is in the world (Heidegger). While for Husserl the givenness of a picture is a result of a neutralization of perception, Fink speaks of a modification not of the act, but of the contents of an act (*Gehaltsmodifikation*). He therefore characterizes "perceiving a picture" (*Bildwahrnehmung*) as a "medial act," i.e., an act whose real medium (e.g., a real piece of paper) contains an unreality (*Unwirklichkeit*), namely, the world

of the image drawn on the paper. When we take up an attitude toward this imaginary world, the real world in which this picture has its real place does not disappear. But the real object (e.g., the piece of paper) is hidden (*verdeckt*), and hidden in a *specific way* because the givenness of the real object is not the same as the indirectly given surroundings co-presented by a perceived object: When we contemplate an image, the real paper of the picture is not given in the mode of a non-thematic horizon. Instead, Fink says the real object is co-present in the mode of "transparency" (*Durchsichtigkeit*) and functions as a medium between the imaginary and the real world (ibid.: 72–78).

This model—namely, that the givenness of a picture is neither a result of two different acts (perception and neutralization), as Husserl thought, nor realized within a homogeneous realm, but is rather a whole that encloses an unbridgeable difference—marks the starting point for how Fink understands the relation of world and inner worldliness. Already in his dissertation he remarks that the perception of a picture is only a sample for medial acts; as another sample he mentions "play."

Thirty years later, in *Spiel als Weltsymbol* (1960), Fink interprets the worldly state of human existence by the model he first developed in his analyses of perceiving a picture. "Play" means the epitome of the style in which existence lives and acts in the world. In this sense, "play" is a so-called "basic phenomenon" (*Grundphänomen*) of human existence and can be analyzed by a phenomenological anthropology (Fink 1979: 352–419). But play is not the only way to describe the "innerworldly" circle of human being-in-the-world, it also stands for the fact that human existence is put into the movement that the world as such "plays" (cf. Sepp 2005a). Analogous to the

H.R. Sepp (✉)
Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

image, play has the ability to function as a *symbol*: whereas the image symbolizes nonpresent parts of the real or parts of a possible world, play as the phenomenon of being-in-the-world is also a symbol of the world itself.

In both cases Fink goes beyond the traditional mode of representation or the relation of a prototype and its reflection because he makes use of “symbol” in the original Greek sense of the word as a *symbolon*, a fragment. A fragment not only reveals itself by visibility, but also manifests its “whole” by invisibility. In the case of human existence, the “whole” of the world itself is present to innerworldly relations, but present in a nonpresent way that can never be taken into presence within the world. To think about this complex relation of human existence and world marks for Fink the responsibility of a “cosmological” philosophy. The cosmological meditation ascertains the so to speak negative givenness of the world as a way in which world phenomenalizes of itself: world lifts human existence to a higher level, since world is shining back (*relucet*) into itself.

One could say (although Fink does not explicitly do so) that here the concept of transparency characterizes the mode of phenomenalization that mediates world and innerworldliness. And one could state (which Fink also did not do) that there is at the same time a second mode of transparency. While in the case of the image the hidden givenness of the real picture functions as a mediating transparency, in the case of the two-fold play of human existence and world the real substrate would be the personal body in its unique real flesh that mediates between being-in-the-world and the world as a *real* world. Here is the starting point not only for a phenomenology of the flesh as rooted in reality, but also for a phenomenology that covers up the relation of the flesh to non-representational symbolizing, especially to the givenness of the image.

Rainer Maria Rilke’s view of the world in his later work is one of the great sources of Fink’s own philosophical standpoint. In the winter semester 1939/1940 he held a course on Rilke’s *Duineser Elegien* at the University of Leuven where he had emigrated, and after the war, in 1947–1948, he gave a series of lectures on Rilke’s *Sonette an Orpheus* within the adult education program in Freiburg. During this time he toyed with the idea of writing a book on Rilke—a plan that he never realized. However, in his *Nachlass* there are

about 150 pages of handwritten notes from this period. One part of these papers contains reflections on the status of poetics, and the other is dedicated to concrete analyses of Rilke’s poems.

For Fink, the goal of poetry is not an embellishing, but rather a “hierophantic” expression. Thus poetry realizes “the transcendence of man toward the superhuman.” Such transcendence reveals not only the finiteness of human existence, but also the divine. Although every interpretation establishes for Fink a non-essential relation to an artwork, he concedes that interpretation is a legitimate procedure, since it is able to decipher the traces that transcending experience leaves behind. In this way, the interpreter should be a witness who testifies as a “mediator” to the work that reveals the condition of human existence. The basis of reflective interpretation is a kind of emotion: “enjoyment” as the ability to repeat the transcending experience enables “the translation of poetics into philosophical reflection.” Transcending within the realm of art means being able to mediate the being-in-between of the not definitively anchored human existence, which—since the human being is neither a nonhuman animal nor a god, but instead is a creature that belongs solely neither to nature nor to freedom—is not definitively anchored. Thus the artist and philosopher have to undertake this transcending anew, i.e., they must mediate between worlds (or between innerworldliness and the world as such) like Orpheus or Hermes.

Fink’s small book *Epiloge zur Dichtung* (1971) contains four studies: on the mask and cothurnus, the two essential stage props of ancient Greek theater; the garden of Epicurus as a specific kind of artificial work within nature; on Franz Grillparzer’s tragedy *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg*; and on Cesare Pavese’s *Dialoghi con Leucò*. Fink calls his attempt at an interpretation of Pavese’s literary work “an experiment” in philosophical interpretation that explains “the poetic interpretation of existence” (*dichterische Existenzdeutung*—Fink 1971: 54). This means an interpretation that asks philosophical questions and tries to formulate them by concepts that have been won from the poetry in question (ibid.: 57). As in his analyses of Rilke’s poetry, Fink is also here particularly interested in the multiple tensions that result from the fact that existence is involved in freedom and nature. Corresponding to this “deconstruction” of traditional antagonisms, in the essay “On Epicurus” he criticizes philosophical dichotomies such as the opposition of

matter and mind and emphasizes that “incarnated existence” (*inkarnierte Existenz*—*ibid.*: 26) precedes such opposites. Accordingly, Epicurus was not voting for a materialistic lifestyle, but trying to found thinking on the sensitive body.

As in his papers on Rilke, Fink also stresses in his essay on Grillparzer’s tragedy that the artist becomes a gateway for superhuman power (*Einfallspforte einer übermenschlichen Macht*—*ibid.*: 37) so that the work will be a place for epiphany. The topic of the feud between brothers gives Fink the opportunity to expose such a conflict as a symbol of the world: the stories of Cain and Abel and of Oedipus’s sons Eteocles and Polyneices, as well as Hegel’s interpretation of the treatment of the latter by Greek tragedy, show that an insight into human being (anthropology) is accompanied by an insight into the world (cosmology), into the *ludus mundi* as a “counter-image of the play of man” (*Gegenbild des Menschspiels*—*ibid.*: 52). These essays are “epilogues” not least because Fink uses poetry to formulate problems of his own thinking. For him poetry can help philosophy “to come into a not yet entered land” (*ibid.*).

A special case of Fink’s interest in aesthetic matters is the book on fashion he wrote on behalf of the Swiss fashion house Spengler in Basel (Fink 1969). There he is also interested in the specific mode of incarnation of human existence, since for him fashion simultaneously covers and reveals the body. When he remarks that fashion creates a sphere of mediating and, with reference to Sandro Botticelli’s *Birth of Venus*, that the nature of clothing is the “transparency of the covered” (*Durchscheinen des Verhüllten*—*ibid.*: 56), he comes close to the realm mentioned above, namely, to analyzing the body in its flesh as the medium between the horizons of understanding and the real world. But he does not actually grasp this thematic field.

The traces of a phenomenological aesthetics that can be found in Fink’s work are not yet a theme of a comprehensive study. Basic elements of Fink’s theory of the image are discussed by Zechner (1999) and Sepp (2005b). Above all, it may be necessary to

deal with the role that Nietzsche plays in the aesthetic outline of Fink’s thinking, as well as to develop the implications of Fink’s work into a phenomenological aesthetics of the relation of flesh and world by disclosing deeper strata and broader connections (cf. Sepp 2010).

Bibliography

- Böhmer, Anselm, ed. *Eugen Fink. Sozialphilosophie—Anthropologie—Kosmologie—Pädagogik—Methodik*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2006.
- Bruzina, Ronald. *Edmund Husserl and Eugen Fink: Beginnings and Ends in Phenomenology 1928–1938*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Fink, Eugen. “Vergegenwärtigung und Bild. Beiträge zur Phänomenologie der Unwirklichkeit” [1930]. In his *Studien zur Phänomenologie 1930–1939*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966, 1–78; “Re-présentation et image: Contributions à la phénoménologie de l’irréalité.” In his *De la phénoménologie*. Trans. Didier Franck. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1974, 15–93.
- Fink, Eugen. *Spiel als Weltsymbol*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Fink, Eugen. *Mode—ein verführerisches Spiel*. Stuttgart: Birkhäuser, 1969.
- Fink, Eugen. *Epiloge zur Dichtung*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1971.
- Fink, Eugen. *Grundphänomene des menschlichen Daseins*. Ed. Egon Schütz and Franz-Anton Schwarz. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1979; 2nd ed. 1995.
- Kerckhoven, Guy van. *Mundanisierung und Individuation bei E. Husserl und E. Fink. Die VI. Cartesianische Meditation und ihr “Einsatz.”* Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2003.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. “Finks Bestimmung des Ideals.” In *Bildung im technischen Zeitalter. Sein, Mensch und Welt nach Eugen Fink*. Ed. Annette Hilt and Cathrin Nielsen. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2005a, 187–202.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. “La medialidad de lo visible. El concepto de imagen de Eugen Fink.” In *Signo, Intencionalidad, Verdad: Estudios de Fenomenología*. Ed. César Moreno Márquez and Alicia Maria de Mingo Rodríguez. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 2005b, 389–403.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. *Bild. Phänomenologie der Epoché I*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2010.
- Zechner, Ingo. “Die Rückgabe des Bild-Körpers und die Unmöglichkeit einer Phänomenologie des Bildes (Fink).” In his *Bild und Ereignis. Fragmente einer Ästhetik*. Wien: Turia & Kant, 1999, 77–82.

Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900–2002)

Mirko Wischke

In one of his central claims in *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960), Gadamer asserts that the “mode of being” of the work of art cannot be captured by its “presence-at-hand” (*Vorhandenheit*). But what is its “mode of being”? Is it not characteristic for artworks to exist in a seemingly timeless present? These questions are justified by the observation of NICOLAI HARTMANN, one of Gadamer’s mentors, that artworks are inexhaustible in that they can always be experienced differently and always beg for new interpretations (Hartmann 1953: 468). But is this not the inexhaustibility of art due to its “presence-at-hand”? Does not the uniqueness of art consist in the fact that it exists in a way that goes beyond the temporal distance between yesterday and today?

Gadamer’s intention is not to reject the seeming atemporality of the artwork even though he regards Hartmann’s account of this phenomenon as insufficient. According to Gadamer, the artwork is always there in its specific presentation (*Darstellung*), e.g., in the performance of a play or an opera or in the reading of a poem, silently or aloud. He derives the essential feature of an artwork from the fact that it is always there, however it may be presented. By being reproduced in a particular presentation, it is always given new life. Gadamer does not simply share Hartmann’s critical reservations about the concept of presentation (*ibid.*: 456), he gives it a new meaning.

The presentation of an artwork is like the image one sees in a mirror; it is inseparable from the present that the image reflects. What is crucial for Gadamer is not

the relation between the image and what is depicted in it, but the various possibilities for being reflected in the image. After all, the performance of a dramatic or musical work does not remain the same from era to era or occasion to occasion. Assumed here is that what belongs to an artwork is a manifold in opposition to which any particular presentation is always “deficient.” The essential feature of this manifold is its possibility of being different. For this reason, any representation of an artwork in a particular presentation is a one-sided bringing-into-being and emergence of what lies hidden in the artwork.

The potentiality for being different is expressed at the phenomenal level for Gadamer in our unique experience of the artwork as contemporaneous with us. It is contemporaneous not because we have learned to understand the artist’s intention, but because we experience the artwork as if there were no temporal distance, i.e., as having an absolute present. That we can experience it in this manner, as if it had no past, leads him to the view that the artwork depends on the repeatability of our experience of it. How should we understand this?

Certainly, the basis of the experience of art for Gadamer is the immediately sensuous encounter with the artwork in the form of witnessing a theater or opera performance or the reading of a poem silently or aloud; the singularity of the artwork comes to fruition in the unmistakable coloring and phrasing of words or sounds. Yet at the same time, the possibility of grasping the totality of the artwork (all of its possible presentations) is precluded. Every experience of the artwork is unstable and amenable to revision. Because it is always presented in a new manner, one and the same artwork can become the source of very different and always new experiences. He grounds the

M. Wischke (✉)
Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Wittenberg,
Germany

Translated by David Weberman

limitlessness of the possibility of presentations not in the performer or the recipient of the work, but in the incompleteness of the artwork itself. For this reason, he regards poetry, theater, and music as art only insofar as they are brought to presentation. An artwork is only an artwork when it is experienced as such. For him a piece of music or theater is only music or theater, rather than a historical document preserved in an archive or museum, when it is performed, just as a poem is a poem rather than a mere text only when it is read.

No explanation has yet been given of the necessary conditions for the capacity of an artwork to be presented in ever new ways. It is not sufficient to say that every presentation—whether a performance or a reading—is always already an interpretation through which, for example, a poem is presented as a poem. What Gadamer describes and places at the center of his thinking is the idea of the “deep mystery” of art (Gadamer 1991: 267), for which there is nothing analogous in science or philosophy. The mystery lies in the fact that artworks are not only inexhaustible and understandable in many ways, but become ever richer in meaning and speak to us more and more compellingly with our growing familiarity with them.

Against other authors such as Hartmann, Gadamer regards the inexhaustibility of the artwork as proof of the fact that the seemingly timeless present of, say, the poetic word is not sufficiently explained if the artwork is taken as present-at-hand or objectifiable. Because art is neither unchangingly present-at-hand nor an independent object into which a subject simply projects his/her concerns, Gadamer cannot accept the idea that art is characterized by its “in-itselfness.” Instead, he speaks of the “mysterious presence” of the artwork that occurs through its presentation by which it is brought into its “true being.” Kant, of course, regards aesthetic pleasure as disinterested. He has two reasons for this. First, the object of taste is neither a matter of usefulness nor of moral goodness; second, human beings do not contribute anything to the artwork. Gadamer finds confirmation in Kant for his own view that the experience of works of art contradicts the notion that art can be set over against the subject as a completely independent object.

While in *Wahrheit und Methode* art is continually present only in its performance, because the individual work of art becomes itself only through its such performances, Gadamer prefers to speak of “execution”

(*Vollzug*) in his essay from 1992, “Wort und Bild—so wahr, so seiend.” Art is art only in its execution, and only in its execution as interpretation does an artwork have its “being.” This formulation brings out more sharply the idea with which Gadamer is concerned: the character of artworks as a kind of execution.

This idea has received little attention in aesthetic theories of recent years. Gadamer’s philosophical hermeneutics has attracted much interest for decades and Gadamer’s Plato interpretations have been intensively studied in Anglo-American circles (James Risser, Brice R. Wachterhauser, Cathrin H. Zuckert, P. Christopher Smith). And in German-speaking countries, Gadamer has received wide attention ever since the publication of his main work in 1960. After some philosophers raised objections to his claim for universality (Karl-Otto Apel, Jürgen Habermas), Gadamer’s difference from “traditional” hermeneutics and his understanding of the Platonic dialogue has become a central concern of his conception of hermeneutics (Hans Kramer, Thomas A. Szlesák, Gunter Scholtz, Frithjof Rodi). Yet his theory of the artwork has not received similar attention, despite certain studies of his concept of play (Jean Grondin, Ruth Sonderegger). There are various reasons for this. His frequent appeals to his teacher MARTIN HEIDEGGER have only led to the blurring rather than the clarification of the differences between their theories of art. The emphasis on the closeness between the two has not necessarily helped the understanding of Gadamer.

One should keep in mind his relationship to Heidegger when addressing the question of his relation to other streams in contemporary non-phenomenological aesthetics. More than Heidegger, Gadamer has been and still is present in the concern with the truth of the artwork in philosophical aesthetics—though often only as a disciple of Heidegger. But that is not the actual reason for Gadamer’s relative absence from aesthetic discussions. New tendencies in aesthetics stress other topics than he does. At the center of attention of new aesthetic work is the wide variety of possibilities in aesthetic experience rather than the putting-to-work of the artwork or its ontology in his “phenomenology of the appropriation of tradition” (Theunissen). Due to the emphasis of the latter on the cataloguing of possibilities of aesthetic experience as opposed to the alleged limitation of theories of modernity, it may be unlikely that Gadamer’s hermeneutical approach to the explanation

of the seemingly timeless present of artworks can be taken up in the contemporary discussion, and it might seem improbable that his observations about the character of execution of artworks will receive particular attention. Nevertheless, Bruce Benson's phenomenology of music (2003) demonstrates that Gadamer's theme of the ever new execution of the work is still a fruitful point of departure today.

Bibliography

- Benson, Bruce Ellis. *The Improvisation of Musical Dialogue: A Phenomenology of Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Dostal, Robert J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Gadamer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Figal, Günter, Jean Grondin, and Dennis J. Schmidt, eds. *Hans-Georg Gadamer zum Hundertsten*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik* [1960]. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990; *Truth and Method*. 2nd rev. ed. by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. Continuum International Publishing Group, 1989.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Unterwegs zur Schrift* [1983]. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 7. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991, 258–269.
- Grondin, Jean. *Hermeneutische Wahrheit? Zum Wahrheitsbegriff Hans-Georg Gadamer* [1982]. Weinheim: Athenäum Verlag, 1994.
- Grondin, Jean. *Hans-Georg Gadamer. Eine Biographie*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999.
- Hahn, Lewis Edwin, ed. *The Philosophy of Hans-Georg Gadamer*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 1997.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953.
- Hofer, Michael. *Nächstenliebe, Freundschaft, Geselligkeit. Verstehen und Anerkennen bei Abel, Gadamer und Schleiermacher*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1998.
- Risser, James. *Hermeneutics and the Voice of the Other: Re-Reading Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics*. SUNY Series in Contemporary Continental Philosophy. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Sonderegger, Ruth. *Für eine Ästhetik des Spiels. Hermeneutik, Dekonstruktion und der Eigensinn der Kunst*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000.
- Wischke, Mirko. *Die Schwäche der Schrift. Zur philosophischen Hermeneutik Hans-Georg Gadamer*. Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2001.
- Wischke, Mirko, and Michael Hofer, eds. *Gadamer verstehen—Understanding Gadamer*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003.
- Zuckert, Catherine H. *Postmodern Platos: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Gadamer, Strauss, Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Moritz Geiger (1880–1937)

Licia Fabiani

Moritz Geiger studied experimental psychology with Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig and then changed to Theodor Lipps in Munich, who introduced Geiger to his refined descriptive psychology. Beginning in 1895, Lipps's students were organized in the "Akademischer Verein für Psychologie." After the publication of EDMUND HUSSERL's *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901), which criticized Lipps's psychologism, Lipps defended his position before his students. The result was just the opposite of what he intended. His students adopted theories and methods from the *Logische Untersuchungen* and formed the circle of *Münchener Phänomenologie*. The Munich Circle intended phenomenology to be an inquiry into the objective and essential structures of the phenomena. Geiger's first theories must be considered in this light. On the one hand, his methodology refers to the *Logische Untersuchungen*, and on the other hand, his interest in psychological analysis and in the problem of aesthetic value derives not only from Lipps, but also from the lively cultural and artistic atmosphere of Munich. He was interested in mathematics as well as aesthetics.

Moritz Geiger qualified for a professorship with his "Methodologische und experimentelle Beiträge zur Quantitätslehre" (1907), a work in experimental psychology inspired by Gustav Fechner's research. This work nevertheless demonstrated the need for a conceptual clarification of what has to be measured. This achieved with an investigation modeled on those of Husserl in the *Logische Untersuchungen*. Moreover, Geiger introduced the distinction between

act and object into the psychology of sensation. The way he confronts this problem goes beyond that of empirical psychologism. Geiger was at Munich from 1908 to 1923, where he became an untenured professor in 1915. During this period he wrote essays that are classic examples of phenomenological research; "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses" (1913) is of particular significance.

In general, Geiger's methods are opposed to those of the naturalistic attitude toward an aesthetic reality that is to be explained as a physical or a psychic event. He contrasts the relativism of *Tatsachenästhetik*—also seen in a critical manner by Husserl—with an aesthetics that highlights the value of the artistic object (*Wertästhetik*). Aesthetics, as he points out in the preface of his unfinished *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*, is marked by an internal antinomy. As science, it can only deal in general concepts, while its subject matter is only accessible through immediate experience. Nevertheless, sensuousness and analytic rigor are not incompatible, and this antinomy can therefore be overcome.

The method by which aesthetics can appropriately express its specificity is phenomenological; it is neither inductive nor deductive, but consists in the intuition of essences. This intuition has the aim of grasping the structure and value of an event. The intuition of essences establishes laws and rules. As Gabriele Scaramuzza remarks, eidetic intuition has its own logic, which is, however, different from that of theoretical demonstration. It has been intimated that Geiger's aesthetics—like the aesthetics of *Münchener Phänomenologie* in general—is object-oriented. Nevertheless, acceding to the object necessarily implies the subject and psychological introspection. Indeed, a great many of Geiger's

L. Fabiani (✉)
Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

investigations—which are mostly fragmentary—are limited to trying to grasp in its purity the way in which aesthetic experience is given.

This particular attention to aesthetic experience is the key to the “Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses,” published the same year as Husserl’s *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie I* (1913). The latter’s turn toward transcendental philosophy was not shared by Geiger. Like others among Husserl’s first students, he adheres in a series of particular investigations to phenomenology as a method. He aims in the “Beiträge” at describing specifically aesthetic enjoyment and at distinguishing it from the merely sentimental effusions of those who use art as a sort of drug, i.e., for temporary emotional gratification. Moving beyond the confused world of more or less aesthetic *Erlebnisse*, thus requires clarifying the features characteristic of the specifically aesthetic experience. In substance, as Scaramuzza emphasizes, enjoyment is an *Erlebnis* of pleasure. It is, however, different from other agreeable experiences, such as joy. The aesthetic *Erlebnis* is identifiable neither with cognitive acts nor with indefinite emotions, but has its own peculiarities. Joy has a sudden outbreak and implies an imbalance with regard to the object, while aesthetic enjoyment is perfectly balanced, recognizes itself in other persons and in other things, and extends in principle to all of existence.

From 1923 to 1933, Geiger was a full professor at Göttingen. During this period he published his most important writings. In them the second and final redaction of “Phänomenologische Ästhetik” (1925)—later collected with other essays in *Zugänge zur Ästhetik*—defined the field of inquiry of aesthetics from a methodological point of view. Aesthetics can be practiced as (1) a particular autonomous science; (2) a philosophical discipline; or (3) a field of application for other sciences. For Geiger, phenomenology finds its privileged sphere in aesthetics as intended in the first meaning. “Value” distinguishes aesthetics from other fields of inquiry.

The *Zugänge zur Ästhetik* (1928) again proposed some of the themes of the “Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses,” developing them under the title “Vom Dilletantismus im künstlerischem Erleben.” As in the “Beiträge,” so also in the *Zugänge* he tried to remove the main obstacles

that interfere with the purification of the aesthetic *Erlebnis*. These obstacles are the simply sentimental enjoyment of art and the confusion that derives from it, namely between deep effects and superficial effects of art. He deals with this theme in “Oberflächen- und Tiefenwirkung der Kunst” (1927), an essay in which he not only defends the authenticity, depth, and fullness of aesthetic experience, but also grasps the functionality of “superficial” moments within this kind of enjoyment. Geiger also republished this essay with slight modifications in the *Zugänge*. “Die psychische Bedeutung der Kunst,” intentionally written for that volume, tries to comprehend art in its deep meaning for human existence, i.e., as an irreducible spiritual process, comparable only to the emotions of religious experience and metaphysical knowledge. As Herbert Spiegelberg (1942–43) notes, this essay is illustrative of Geiger’s existential criticism. In sum, the *Zugänge zur Ästhetik* has the purpose of collecting phenomenological investigations within a systematic structure, and by proposing existential themes, it partially anticipates the subsequent development of his thought. Geiger’s analysis of aesthetic enjoyment will be received and further developed in works such as Ludwig Giesz’s *Phänomenologie des Kitsches* (1971) and Hans Robert Jauss’s *Ästhetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik* (1984). Essays written by Italian scholars and devoted to Geiger’s aesthetics can be found, among other philosophical studies, in *Il realismo fenomenologico: Sulla filosofia dei circoli di Monaco e Göttinga* (2000). Also significant is Marc Richir’s introduction to the recent French edition of “Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses.”

Geiger’s 1933 essay about Alexander Pfänder’s method clearly formulates the interpretation of phenomenology accepted not only by Pfänder, but by the whole Munich circle. That is why Geiger’s interpreters consider this work a well-grounded start for explicating the philosopher’s methodology: phenomenology wants to let things speak freely, without interposing any preliminary construction between them and the self that is studying them. He thought that empiricism always wanted to do something very similar, but that although it begins with facts, it does not hold to them strictly. Thus phenomenology wants to fulfill promises that empiricism cannot keep. But it is possible to do so only by giving expression to pure

itself-giveness, without intuitionistic and idealistic prejudices. If phenomenology sacrifices the expression of itself-giveness to the exigency of systematization, the description must nevertheless render the connections between groups of events. In its inner structure, nature is supported by a web of essences.

Geiger long entertained the project of developing his own comprehensive vision of aesthetics in a single work. Klaus Berger contends that this idea dates back to the beginning of the 1920s. It is certain that the introduction of the *Zugänge* announces the publication of *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*, a book that would come out only in a posthumous and fragmentary way. As a Jew, Geiger was forced out of Germany in 1933 and emigrated to the United States, where he obtained a chair at Vassar College.

At his death in 1937, Geiger had written only the first part of *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*, devoted to “Grundlegung der Wertästhetik.” The other parts of the book are only partially written. The “Metaphysik der Kunst” with which the entire work should have culminated is only outlined. “An Introduction to Existential Philosophy”—published posthumously by Herbert Spiegelberg—dates from this period. Wolfhart Henckmann asserts that Geiger’s aesthetics remained fatally fragmentary. But the very notion of a “fragment” already indicates a relation between the part and the whole. We can accordingly perceive the tendency toward a coherent and complete theory in Geiger’s work. Nevertheless, a progressive variation of accent is evident: from psychology to phenomenology to philosophy. This change, Henckmann contends, is strong enough to make inner unity questionable. “An Introduction to Existential Philosophy” clearly shows that by the time of that essay, human existence had become Geiger’s main interest. In this case too, Geiger shows a tendency to analytic rigor. Stressing the necessity of not confusing the ontological and the existential plane, he defines his own thought as “*kritische Existenzphilosophie*,” distinguishing it from the “*prophetische Existenzphilosophie*” of Karl Jaspers, an author whom he greatly appreciated, and from the “*hermeneutische Philosophie*” of MARTIN HEIDEGGER. In these works Geiger goes beyond phenomenological description. Because he had only enough time to outline his existential philosophy of art, a definite evaluation of the last phase of his thought is not possible.

Bibliography

- Avé-Lallemant, Eberhard. “Moritz Geiger.” In *Die Nachlässe der Münchner Phänomenologen in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975, 140–157 [includes a bibliography of Geiger’s unpublished writings].
- Avé-Lallemant, Eberhard. “Die phänomenologische Bewegung. Ursprung, Anfänge und Ausblick.” In *Edmund Husserl und die Phänomenologische Bewegung. Zeugnisse in Text und Bild*. Ed. Hans Rainer Sepp. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1988, 61–75.
- Beardsley, Monroe C. “Experience and Value in Moritz Geiger’s Aesthetics.” In *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 16, 1985, 6–19.
- Berger, Klaus. “Die Bedeutung der Kunst.” In Moritz Geiger, *Die Bedeutung der Kunst. Zugänge zu einer materialen Wertästhetik*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976, 8–16.
- Berger, Klaus. “Editor’s Introduction.” In Moritz Geiger, *The Significance of Art: A Phenomenological Approach to Aesthetics*. Trans. Klaus Berger. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1986, ix–xx.
- Besoli, Stefano and Luca Guidetti, eds. *Il realismo fenomenologico: Sulla filosofia dei circoli di Monaco e Gottinga*. Macerata: Quodlibet, 2000.
- Geiger, Moritz. “Methodologische und experimentelle Beiträge zur Quantitätslehre.” In *Psychologische Untersuchungen* 1. Ed. Theodor Lipps. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1907, 325–522.
- Geiger, Moritz. “Über das Wesen und die Bedeutung der Einfühlung.” In *Bericht über den IV. Kongress für experimentelle Psychologie in Innsbruck. 19.–22.4.1910*. Ed. F. Schumann. Leipzig, 1911, 29–73.
- Geiger, Moritz. “Zum Problem der Stimmungseinfühlung bei Landschaften.” In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 6, 1911, 1–42; rpt. in his *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976, 18–59.
- Geiger, Moritz. “Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses.” In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–684; 2nd ed. 1922, new ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1974; *La fruizione estetica*. Trans. Gabriele Scaramuzzi. Padua: Liviana 1973; *Sur la phénoménologie de la jouissance esthétique*. Trans. J.-F. Pestureau. Beauvais: Association pour la Promotion de la Phénoménologie, 2002.
- Geiger, Moritz. “Das Problem der ästhetischen Scheingefühle.” In *Bericht des Kongresses für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft. Berlin 7.–9. Oktober 1913*. Stuttgart: Enke, 1914, 191–194; rpt. in his *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976, 68–72.
- Geiger, Moritz. “Fragment über den Begriff des Unbewußten und die psychische Realität. Ein Beitrag zur Grundlegung des immanenten psychischen Realismus. Edmund Husserl zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet.” In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 4, 1921, 1–137; rpt. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1930.

- Geiger, Moritz. "Phänomenologische Ästhetik." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 19, 1925, 29–42; rpt., with little modification, in his *Zugänge zur Ästhetik* and in *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976, 271–293.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Oberflächen- und Tiefenwirkung der Kunst." In *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of Philosophy*. New York, 1927, 462–468; rpt., with little modification, in his *Zugänge zur Ästhetik* and in *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976, 178–201.
- Geiger, Moritz. *Zugänge zur Ästhetik*. Leipzig: Der Neue Geist, 1928 ("Vorwort," vi–viii; "Vom Dilletantismus im künstlerischen Erleben," 1–42; "Oberflächen- und Tiefenwirkung der Kunst," 43–66; "Die psychische Bedeutung der Kunst," 67–135; "Phänomenologische Ästhetik," 136–158); rpt. in his *Die Bedeutung der Kunst; Vie all'estetica*. Trans. Andrea Pinotti. Bologna: CLUEB, 2005.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Alexander Pfänders methodische Stellung." In *Neue Münchner philosophische Abhandlungen* [Pfänder Festschrift]. Ed. Ernst Heller and Friedrich Löw. Leipzig: Barth, 1933, 1–16.
- Geiger, Moritz. "An Introduction to Existential Philosophy." Ed. Herbert Spiegelberg. In *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 3, 1942–43, 255–278.
- Geiger, Moritz. *Die Bedeutung der Kunst. Zugänge zu einer materialen Wertästhetik. Gesammelte, aus dem Nachlaß ergänzte Schriften zur Ästhetik*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976 [includes an exhaustive bibliography]; *The Significance of Art: A Phenomenological Approach to Aesthetics*. Trans. Klaus Berger. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1986.
- Giesz, Ludwig. *Phänomenologie des Kitsches*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971.
- Henckmann, Wolfhart. "Moritz Geigers Konzeption einer phänomenologischen Ästhetik." In Moritz Geiger, *Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1974, 549–590.
- Holmes, Richard. "Editorial Preface." In Moritz Geiger, *The Significance of Art: A Phenomenological Approach to Aesthetics*. Trans. Klaus Berger. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1986, vii.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Ästhetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984, 83–88.
- Krenzlin, Norbert. *Das Werk "rein für sich." Zur Geschichte des Verhältnisses von Phänomenologie, Ästhetik, und Literaturwissenschaft*. Berlin: Akademia Verlag, 1979, 29–57.
- Métraux, Alexander. "Zur phänomenologischen Ästhetik Moritz Geigers." In *Studia Philosophica* 28, 1968, 68–92.
- Métraux, Alexander. "Edmund Husserl und Moritz Geiger." In *Die Münchner Phänomenologie*. Ed. Helmut Kuhn, Eberhard Avé-Lallement, and Reinhold Gladiatori. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1975, 139–157.
- Orringer, Nelson Robert. "El goce estético en Ortega y Gasset y en Geiger: Una fuente descubierta recientemente." In *Revista de Occidente* 140, 1974, 236–261. "Esthetic Enjoyment in Ortega y Gasset and in Geiger." In *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 89 (1974), 8–32.
- Richir, Marc. "Preface. Pour une architectonique phénoménologique de l'affectivité." In Moritz Geiger, *Sur la phénoménologie de la jouissance esthétique*. Trans. J.-F. Pestureau. Beauvais: Association pour le Promotion de la Phénoménologie, 2002, 7–26.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele. "Introduzione." In Moritz Geiger, *La fruizione estetica* [1913]. Trans. Gabriele Scaramuzza. Padua: Liviana, 1973, ix–cxxxiii.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele. "Presentazione." In Moritz Geiger, *Lo spettatore dilettante* [Vom Dilletantismus im künstlerischem Erleben, 1928]. Palermo: Aesthetica Preprint, 1988, 5–28 [includes an exhaustive bibliography].
- Spiegelberg, Herbert. "Editor's Preface." In Moritz Geiger, "An Introduction to Existential Philosophy." Ed. Herbert Spiegelberg. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 3 (1942–43), 255 ff.
- Spiegelberg, Herbert. *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction* [1960]. 3rd rev. and enl. ed., with the collaboration of Karl Schuhmann. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982, 200–211.
- Zeltner, Robert. "Moritz Geiger zum Gedächtnis." In *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 14, 1960, 452–466.
- Zeltner, Robert. "Geiger, Moritz." In *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 6, 1945, 145.

Gender Aesthetics

Gayle Salamon

The relationship between aesthetics and politics has long had a contested history, and this contestation continues in contemporary receptions of aesthetic theory. Within feminism, debates about the nature and use of aesthetics often engage this larger framework, in which aesthetics and politics are often considered mutually antagonistic. Feminism has both extended and contested this portrayal of aesthetics. In *The Ethics of Ambiguity*, SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR criticizes the aesthetic attitude as one of “detached contemplation,” and understands aesthetics to be “a position of withdrawal, a way of fleeing the truth of the present” (1948: 75–76). Construed in this way, the danger of aesthetics is that it seduces us away from the material conditions of life, and risks making us insensible to suffering there.

Phenomenology, however, articulates aesthetics in a way that helps us see it otherwise, and allows us to understand aesthetics and politics as mutually implicated. In “Cézanne’s Doubt,” MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY’s formulation of aesthetics would seem at first to be aligned with Beauvoir’s; he says of Cézanne that “painting was his world and his mode of existence” (1964: 9). This led inevitably to “the loss of flexible human contact” (ibid.: 10), and Merleau-Ponty describes the aesthetic world as that which opens only as a result of the contraction of the human world. But Merleau-Ponty cautions us against understanding aesthetics only as a mode of disengagement with the political and social aspects of the world, for aesthetics in its phenomenological sense must be understood not only narrowly—as the contemplation of the work of art—but also more broadly as the enlivening of

our perception as it is derived from sensation. Sensory experience is thus implicated in aesthetics, where both of these find their grounding in the body.

Phenomenological aesthetics can be understood as a way of attending to the relation between subject and object. This perceptive acuity can be achieved by creating a work of art, by viewing or contemplating a work of art, or more broadly by adopting an aesthetic comportment toward the world in which relations between subject and object are seen from a new perspective, a perspective that requires the disorientation of our habitual modes of seeing. In this re-visioning of the world through the prism of the object, the subject herself is changed, and the world is given back to her anew through the mediation of the object. Aesthetics in its phenomenological mode offers us a way of radicalizing our perceptions and thus our relations to the objects—and indeed, subjects—that populate the world in which we are embedded. If the naturalistic attitude is one in which “we become used to thinking that all of this exists necessarily and unshakably” (ibid.:16), aesthetics is the means by which that reflexive certainty is shaken, and thus we as perceiving beings are transformed. This transformative power of aesthetic vision is part of what makes us human, Merleau-Ponty suggests. He advances even further and gives us an aesthetics that, rather than persisting as estranged from the social order, takes the social order itself as its purview: “Indeed, only a human being is capable of such a vision, which penetrates right to the root of things beneath the imposed order of humanity.” The marvel of aesthetics, from a phenomenological standpoint, is that it asks us to immerse ourselves in the object in order that we might grasp the essence “beneath the imposed order of humanity.” We break through the patina of the familiar

G. Salamon (✉)
Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

by “remaining faithful to the phenomena” (ibid.:14) that appear before us. Thus transcendence is achieved not through abstraction away from the object, but by deliberate attention to the object itself.

We find that gender as an inquiry operates by this same phenomenological principle. It is only through attending with utter carefulness to the phenomena *of gender* as they appear that we might be able to imagine them otherwise, to see that the structures of gender as they manifest in all of their seeming necessity and unshakability are in fact the result of an externally imposed order whose ontological solidity must not be equated with necessity or inevitability. With these additional articulations of a phenomenological aesthetics—an emphasis on sensory experience, a grounding of experience in the body, a careful and particular attention to the mutually constituting relations between the subject and the object, and a radical disruption of familiar and habitual subject positions—the resonances between the projects of phenomenology, aesthetics, and feminism become clear.

Like the fields of feminism and aesthetics from which it emerges, “gender aesthetics” cannot properly be thought have a single referent, but can rather be seen as a way of apprehending and interpreting art, beauty, appearance, performance, and perception. Gender aesthetics might best be grouped into three different but related approaches to aesthetics, in the realms of criticism, art practice, and theory. An understanding of structures of gender is central to each of these, as is the importance of the body as both gendered object and gendered subject. If phenomenological aesthetics can be described in part as a critique of the naturalistic attitude toward the work of art, then gender aesthetics might be viewed as advancing a similar critique against the perceived naturalness of gender as read through critical and artistic practices.

The first approach to gender aesthetics is a mode of diagnosing and interpreting the absence of women from the history of art. This exclusion has been read in painting, sculpture, music, and literature. The critique has sometimes advanced by suggesting that artistic genius is characterized by androgyny rather than masculinity, offering aesthetic practice as a way to transcend the specificity of gender, but it has also been suggested that a denigration of the feminine is canonized in the history of Western literature and art (Woolf 1929; Heilbrun 1974; Battersby 1990). Some feminist

art historians have engaged in recuperative readings of the history of art, attempting to rectify the absence of women by championing the contributions of lesser-known women artists and writers, where those recuperations have themselves become inextricable from artistic practice. Other feminists problematizing the absence of recognition for women’s artistic production have argued that women’s exclusion points to a more intractable difficulty, that, in the words of Barbara Johnson, “Literature is not only a thwarted investigator but also an incorrigible perpetrator of the problem of sexuality” (1984: 13). Luce Irigaray has argued that this unmarked absence of the feminine has haunted the philosophical and psychoanalytic subjects, that the whole of the philosophical tradition is a history of the displacement and disavowal of the feminine.

The second approach to gender aesthetics aims to describe and enact a specifically feminine sensibility, experience, or mode of being. Within the realm of the literary, the French feminist *écriture féminine* is an attempt to write the specificity of the feminine into language, where this writing stages a struggle against what is understood to be language’s inevitable phallocentrism. Finding a way to write or speak “as” a woman in this regard involves the reconfiguration of language, an aesthetic project that aims to capture or transmit absence within the relentless presence of language. Within the visual realm, phenomenologies of vision—particularly JEAN-PAUL SARTRE’s formulation of the gaze and the relational structures of power it establishes—have profoundly shaped understandings of female spectatorship, authorship, and feminist film theory. Feminist criticism has also supplemented a primarily visual way of apprehending the world with an emphasis on auditory and haptic models of perception and relation (Silverman 1988; Irigaray 1985a; Irigaray 1985b).

Feminist Body Art works through each of these registers at once in order to fundamentally reconfigure the way that the female body is perceived. For example, in her performance piece *Tapp und Tast Kino* (Touch Cinema), Valie Export wanders through a crowded street with her naked torso covered with a box-like structure, curtained to suggest a theater. She then offers passers-by the opportunity to enter the “cinema” with their hands, with this cinema structured in such a way that in order for the (mostly male) passers-by to touch her breasts, they are forced to look

directly into her eyes while doing so. Export thus renders her body available to be touched, a haptic object, only to the extent that she herself retains control over the gaze and the power of mastery over the visual field. Export's body becomes not the fetishized part-object of masculine fantasy, but a materialization of the Merleau-Pontian body, comprised of distinct yet intertwined and inseparable aspects, object and subject, touching and touched, haptic and optic.

The third approach to gender aesthetics is markedly different from the first two; this approach understands *gender itself* to be an aesthetic practice. Joan Riviere's "Womanliness as Masquerade" (1929), for example, contends that femininity is a carefully cultivated mask, a deliberate performance, and this characterization is resonant with the place of the feminine as aligned with appearance (where "mere" appearance is opposed to the ontological solidity of the masculine position) and with artifice. This sense of the feminine as a cultivation, a never fully realized becoming, is suggested too in feminist philosophy, which has charted both the absence of woman and the feminine from universalized, and presumptively masculine, conceptions of personhood and the constitutive force of its absence. It is this making, crafting, and becoming as a specifically feminine condition that is marked in Simone de Beauvoir's claim that "one is not born a woman, but becomes one," which suggests just this making of the self as particularly characteristic of the feminine subject.

Perhaps the most influential explication of gender as an aesthetic practice has come from Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity. In opposition to conceptions of sexual difference that understand gender to follow inevitably from the sexed specificity of the body, Butler understands gender—and ultimately, sex itself—to be the effect of ritualized and repeated acts, and suggests that we become the gendered subjects that we are only through performance. Performativity shifts the relations between gender, sex, body, performance, and ontology from one of sameness to one that allows for difference, in order that one must not always follow determinatively from the other. This "theatricalization of identity" suggests that gender, in Butler's words, is "the practice of improvisation within a scene of constraint" (2004: 1), emphasizing the ways in which gender must not be understood only as an act of radical freedom, as the willful assertion of a freely choosing

agent. Butler has insisted, following Nietzsche, that there is "no doer behind the deed" of performance in this way, and that the acts by which we establish our gender are successful only to the extent that they are socially legible and temporally situated. Other feminists have advocated the use of Foucault's late work on the aesthetics of the self as a model for feminist inquiry into the question of identity and/as aesthetic practice, and a way to contest binary and heteronormative configurations of gender and sexuality through counter discourses that are sometimes linguistic and sometimes bodily (McWhorter 1999; Seppä 2004; Taylor and Vintges 2004).

The idea of gender as an aesthetic practice that can act to disrupt, destabilize, or resist normative configurations of gender has also been taken up by writers who read the transgendered body as exactly evidence of that destabilization. Sandy Stone (1992) has claimed that the transgendered body can be read as a text that not only resists normative discipline, but transforms the violence with which that normativity is enforced into a "reconstructive force." The suggestion that the transbody is a site of resistance finds its culmination in the work of trans writers who have argued that the phenomenological body is a "site of resistance to sex and gender ideologies," suggesting that gender as an aesthetic practice is able to overcome gender as a normative ideology (Cromwell 1999; Rubin 2003).

Some work in aesthetics has suggested that the concept of the sublime relies for its coherence on the denigration of the feminine, a region of being that resists description (Freeman 1995). The structure of the sublime and the structure of gender identification are indeed in some senses parallel. If sublimity is, as Longinus suggests, a kind of ec-stasis—a traveling outside of oneself toward something vital, something terrible and tremendous in the object in order to return to the self moved—then gender too might be read as a departure from the self in that the external forms of gender in which we are bound, and by which we are constituted, produce their effects by resonating internally, irresistibly, even as their structure and force is overwhelming and at times terrifying. In each of these domains, feminist aesthetics is motivated to dispute the common place that the effect of aesthetic engagement is a matter of escaping the body through transcendence, suggesting instead that aesthetic engagement may be precisely a means of more fully engaging with it.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Sara and Jackie Stacey, eds. *Thinking Through the Skin*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Barry, Judith. "Women, Representation, and Performance Art: Northern California." In *Performance Anthology: Source Book for a Decade of California Performance Art*. Ed. Carl E. Loeffler and Darlene Tong. San Francisco: Last Gasp/Contemporary Performance Arts Press, 1980, 439–463.
- Battersby, Christine. *Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Beauvoir, Simone. *Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947; *The Ethics of Ambiguity*. Trans. Bernard Frechtman. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1948.
- Bovenschen, Silvia. "Is There a Feminine Aesthetic?" Trans. Beth Weckmueller. In *Feminist Aesthetics*. Ed. Gisela Ecker. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985, 23–50.
- Broude, Norma, and Mary D. Garrard, eds. *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. New York: Icon Editions, 1982.
- Broude, Norma, and Mary D. Garrard, eds. *The Expanding Discourse: Feminism and Art History*. New York: Icon Editions, 1992.
- Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." In *Performing Feminisms*. Ed. Sue-Ellen Case. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990a, 270–282.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990b.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Butler, Judith. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Caputi, Mary. *Voluptuous Yearnings: A Feminist Theory of the Obscene*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1994.
- Cromwell, Jason. *Transmen and FTMs: Identities, Bodies, Genders, and Sexualities*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Felski, Rita. *Beyond Feminist Aesthetics: Feminist Literature and Social Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Ferguson, Frances. *Solitude and the Sublime: Romanticism and the Aesthetics of Individuation*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Freeman, Barbara Claire. *The Feminine Sublime*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. "Feminist Theory and the Politics of Art." In *Dissonance: Feminism and the Arts 1970–1990*. Ed. Catriona Moore. St. Leonards: Artspace/Allen and Unwin, 1994, 139–153.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn. *Toward a Recognition of Androgyny*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Hein, Hilde. "The Role of Feminist Aesthetics in Feminist Theory." In *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 48, 1990, 281–91.
- Hein, Hilde, and Carolyn Korsmeyer, eds. *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Ince, Kate. *Orlan: Millennial Female*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2000.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman* [1974]. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985a.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Ce sexe qui n'en pas un*. Paris: Gallimard, 1970; *This Sex Which is Not One*. Trans. Catherine Porter with Carolyn Burke. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985b.
- Isaak, Jo Anna. *Feminism and Contemporary Art: The Revolutionary Power of Women's Laughter*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Johnson, Barbara. "Allegory's Trip Tease: *The White Water Lily*." In *The Critical Difference*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985, 13–20.
- Kelly, Mary. *Postpartum Document*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. Korsmeyer, Carolyn. *Gender and Aesthetics: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Lichtenberg-Ettinger, Bracha. "Woman as *Objet a* between phantasy and art." In *Complexity: Journal of Philosophy and Visual Arts* 6, 1995, 56–77.
- Mayne, Judith. *The Women at the Keyhole*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- McWhorter, Ladelle. *Bodies and Pleasures: Foucault and the Politics of Sexual Normalization*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Les Éditions Nagel, 1961; "Cézanne's Doubt," *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert Dreyfus and Patricia Allen Dreyfus. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1964.
- Mueller, Roswitha. *Valie Export: Fragments of Imagination*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Nochlin, Linda. "Why Have There Been no Great Women Artists?" In *her Women, Art, and Power and Other Essays*. New York: Harper & Row, 1988, 147–158.
- Pollock, Griselda. *Generations and Geographies in the Visual Arts: Feminist Readings*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Pollock, Griselda. *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism, and the Histories of Art*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Riviere, Joan. "Womanliness as Masquerade." In *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 10, 1929.
- Rose, Jacqueline. *Sexuality in the Field of Vision*. London: Verso, 1986.
- Rubin, Henry. *Self-Made Men: Identity and Embodiment Among Transsexual Men*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2003.
- Scarry, Elaine. *On Beauty and Being Just*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Seppä, Anita. "Foucault, Enlightenment and the Aesthetics of the Self." In *Contemporary Aesthetics* 2, 2004.
- Silverman, Kaja. *The Acoustic Mirror*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Silverman, Kaja. *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Silverman, Kaja. *The Threshold of the Visible World*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Silverman, Kaja. *World Spectators*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Stone, Sandy. "The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttranssexual Manifesto." In *Camera Obscura* 29, 1992, 151–176.
- Suleiman, Susan Rubin. *Subversive Intent: Gender, Politics, and the Avant-Garde*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Taylor, Dianna and Karen Vintges, *Feminism and the Final Foucault*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. London: Hogarth Press, 1929.

Nicolai Hartmann (1882–1950)

Mirko Wischke

Nicolai Hartmann starts a renaissance in metaphysics and ontology and continues to exert a silent influence on his early pupil HANS-GEORG GADAMER in hermeneutics (Wischke 2001: 119–95) when he distances himself, in the name of closeness to the phenomenon, from neo-Kantian idealism and its fixation on epistemology. This reorientation toward the phenomenon begins the departure from the idea of form in aesthetics. In *Kants Grundlegung der Ästhetik* (1889), Hermann Cohen (together with Heinrich Rickert, the founder of the Marburg school of neo-Kantianism) attributes a systematic and central role to this idea (Cohen 1889: 360). Cohen's view that it is fundamental to characterize aesthetic content as form, must have seemed to Hartmann a reduction of the complexity of aesthetic phenomena, leading, for example, to the phenomenon of the apparent historicity of artworks.

Why does a work of art always give the impression of inexhaustibility and incompleteness? Art almost seems to lie beyond the time of its existence. As a work that is let loose from its creator, art fuses history and the present moment in a unique manner. But how can this phenomenon be explained?

These questions run through the aesthetics of Nikolai Hartmann. Like his student Gadamer, Hartmann is convinced that these questions cannot be answered satisfactorily with reference to the genius of the artist. The artist disappears, as it were, in the work of art and the observer sees the “artwork in complete separation from its creator.” The work of art “has eliminated the

subjectivity of the creator” (Hartmann 1953: 258). For this reason, concern with the personality of the artist and the genesis of the work is irrelevant to the question of the inexhaustibility and incompleteness of the work of art.

The seeming historicity of the artwork leads Hartmann back to the “incompleteness” of art resulting from the indeterminacy and generality of the work, which requires the imagination of the viewer, performer, or interpreter. According to him, artworks are characterized by the fact that something about them needs to be completed. Because the “great” works of art are only fixed in outline, one must finish writing, painting, or composing them, regardless of whether this “occurs in seeing, hearing, or reading or in their theatrical or musical performance” (ibid.: 469). The mere reception of a work becomes an active process of completion. Hartmann assumes that the artwork is unchangingly present in its incompleteness, while varying understandings are due to the reader, viewer, or listener and his/her imagination. Yet even when Hartmann offers a quite plausible explanation of the way in which an artwork gives rise to inexhaustible understandings, his account is always limited to the recipient of the artwork. This limitation leaves unclear whether Hartmann regards the hermeneutical completion as something belonging to the artwork or separate from it.

The attempt to explain the inexhaustibility and incompleteness of art in this way brings aesthetics into confrontation with a set of questions that Gadamer characterizes in his survey of the history of aesthetics as its subjectivization. Gadamer regards this at the attempt to understand the aesthetic object not on the basis of its being, but on the basis of the activities exercised by the subject on the object.

M. Wischke (✉)

Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Wittenberg, Germany

Translated by David Weberman

Hartmann deals with this problem in the context of his doctrine of ontological levels. With the help of this doctrine he explains the aesthetic observation of an artwork as a transformation (*Umschaffen*) that the observer carries out only for him. Whatever belongs to the artwork itself—according to Hartmann, the actual entity and its perceivable formation—remains unchanged. In the process of being observed, the artwork meets with its “fate” (*Schicksal*), which does not affect its seemingly timeless “contents” (ibid.: 494). Contrary to this timelessness is the fact that a poem can lie forgotten in the dusty shelves of a library. In that case what persists is not an actual artwork, but only the written text as such (ibid.: 427). Nevertheless, Hartmann believes that a handwritten document that lies lost for centuries in a cloister library, or an antique image of a god that is buried under ruins, remains an artwork. The question is whether an artwork exists at all when it lies forgotten under ruins (Hartmann 1949: 423). His answer is that art depends on a “living spirit” that always allows it to be brought back again as an aesthetic entity. What does he mean by “spirit”? How does this spirit effect the reactualization of an artwork?

According to Hartmann, art in its essence has two levels. The artwork exists at a “sensuous and real level” as well as in the form of a spirit that comprehends art. The spiritual content fixed on the sensuous level requires a spirit that comprehends it and that is the source of the artwork’s seeming historicity. Hartmann clarifies this thought with the terms “foreground” and “background.” While the foreground is the “sensuous level of an independent,” in-itself ontically real entity, the background is the actual spiritual content that does not have an autonomous mode of being, but rather always exists only “for” an observer of art (Hartmann 1949: 426). In this sense one can say that the background is unreal and the spiritual content of the artwork its the real aspect. For example, the representation of a landscape in a painting is only real for the view of the observer, but it would not occur to such an observer to regard it as an actually existing state of affairs.

Without oversimplifying his thought, one might object that Hartmann treats the processes of the appropriation of art as merely secondary, i.e., purely as repetition. Nevertheless, his basic ideas are quite far from the positions developed in Germany at the end

of the 1950s. His points of emphasis—the recognition and incompleteness of the artwork—continue to exist implicitly in Gadamer’s hermeneutics, but have not received much attention in recent aesthetic research. Although Hartmann analyzes the particular givenness of art by appealing to exemplary experience with special aesthetic objects, he does not make use of the concept of aesthetic experience—the key concept that marks the discussion of aesthetics in Germany during the late 1960s and early 1970s. This could be the reason why he has no significance for such discussions. In contrast to Hartmann, recent discussion distinguishes the experience of the objects of art from the traditional aesthetics of the work. While Hartmann is concerned to bring the experience and the artwork epistemologically into a conceptual unity, these discussions go beyond a theory of art in their attention to the aesthetic experience of a multiplicity of non-artistic objects.

Nevertheless, Hartmann’s aesthetics has continued to have an influence, particularly on György Lukács’s *The Distinctiveness of the Aesthetic* (1963). He may have had an influence on Arnold Gehlen and Jean-Paul Sartre as well. It is possible that Sartre attended lectures by Hartmann during his stay in Berlin in 1933–1934.

Bibliography

- Cadwallader, Eva Hael. *Searchlight on Values: Nicolai Hartmann’s Twentieth-century Value Platonism*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1985.
- Cohen, Hermann. *Kants Grundlegung der Ästhetik*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1889.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik* [1960]. In his *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Das Problem des geistigen Seins. Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der Geschichtsphilosophie und der Geisteswissenschaften*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1949.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953.
- Küpper, Joachim and Christoph Menke, eds. “Einleitung.” In *Dimensionen ästhetischer Erfahrung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2003, 7–15.
- Werkmeister, William H. *Nicolai Hartmann’s New Ontology*. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1990.
- Wischke, Mirko. *Die Schwäche der Schrift. Zur philosophischen Hermeneutik Hans-Georg Gadamer*. Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2001.

Martin Heidegger (1889–1976)

Françoise Dastur

Heidegger's most important work, *Sein und Zeit* (1927), includes no reflection on art. But in the mid-1930s, he studied Hölderlin and began to see an important ontological phenomenon in art and poetry. His conception of art breaks radically with the aesthetics that understands art and beauty in a subjective manner and is part of the modern metaphysics of subjectivity. In his course on "Der Wille zur Macht als Kunst" (1936–1937), he undertakes the analysis of the essence of aesthetics, its role in Western thought, and its relation to art history. After having recalled that the word "aesthetics" as reflection on art and beauty dates only from the eighteenth century, he points out six basic facts in history.

(1) Great art in Greece does not know or require aesthetics. (2) Aesthetics begins only when great art and great philosophy came to their end, at the time of Plato and Aristotle. (3) In modern times, when all certitude is grounded on human self-consciousness, reflection on art and beauty unfolds in relation to human sensibility, to *aisthēsis*, and simultaneously the decline of great art begins. (4) Aesthetics achieves its greatest height with Hegel's acknowledgment of the end of "great art." (5) With Wagner there is an unsuccessful attempt at the reunion of all kinds of art in the collective artwork, which gives the major role to music and seeks to dissolve feeling in sheer passivity; at the same time, art history arises and aesthetics becomes part of the positive science of psychology. And (6) what Hegel said about the end of art is with Nietzsche applied to all superior values, i.e., religion, morals, and philosophy; aesthetics then falls under the complete domination of

the natural sciences and becomes the physiology of art. For Heidegger, art and aesthetics are not compatible, and aesthetics flourishes only when great art declines.

Heidegger expounds his conception of art in the three different versions of the lecture of 1935 and 1936 on "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes." In the last version, published in *Holzwege* (1950), he begins by showing that the work of art is not a thing or a product, i.e., it cannot be understood as the unity of form and content, of sensible matter and spiritual meaning. By referring to a van Gogh painting of shoes, he wants to show that the work of art is not the mere imitation of a pre-existing object, but the revelation of the world of a specific human existence—in this case, the world of the peasant women wearing the shoes. The work of art is not a work because it is fabricated, but because it brings Being to a showing. Art can therefore no longer be understood as coming after nature, but on the contrary as the initial opening of the world.

The artist is the cause of the work of art, whereas Heidegger's question is about its *origin*, i.e., about what makes it possible and necessary. By selecting another, non-representational example, a Greek temple, he shows that the origin of the work of art is the opening of the clearing into which human existence can unfold. Art can therefore be defined as the "setting-itself-into-work of truth."

There are other ways in which truth establishes itself besides art, such as the act of founding a political state or the questioning of the thinker. Heidegger sees in art a special mode of *alētheia*, of truth in its Greek meaning of a coming out of the *lēthe*, of oblivion and dissimulation, and therefore considers the work of art itself to be the locus of a struggle between openness and seclusion, world and earth. The world is not for him the sum or the container of all possible objects,

F. Dastur (✉)
Archives Husserl de Paris, Paris, France

but a free space opened by the fundamental decisions of a people, which implies that world is in his view always a specifically historical one. In the same way, the earth on which the historical world is erected is what remains concealed and secluded each time in a specific historical manner.

Heidegger declares that art, as a becoming and a happening of truth, is in its essence poetry (*Dichten*). But this does not mean that primacy is given to poesy (*Poesie*) as a special kind of art. Poetry in the wider sense of the word is thought here in its intimate unity with language and word; language itself is not considered as a mere means of communication, but as what brings beings as beings into the open for the first time. Art can be defined as the poetic projection of truth.

Heidegger emphasizes, however, that nowadays works of art belong to the domain of tradition and conservation, and that in becoming objects of the art business, they have lost their capacity of initiating a world. But would this imply, as Hegel said, that “art is for us something past”? In a letter written on the April 25, 1960, to Rudolph Krämer-Bardoni, Heidegger explains that when he quoted Hegel’s saying in his 1936 lecture he did not mean that art was finished, but rather that the essence of art had become worth questioning for us. One question concerns the status that Heidegger gives to modern art. Rudolph Krämer-Bardoni considers that Heidegger “intentionally overlooks” the period of abstract art. Heidegger answers in the same letter that abstract art is not analyzed because nothing can be said about it as long as the essence of technology and the essence of truth that it implies are not sufficiently clarified.

Heidegger opposes his own conception to the metaphysical conception of art in a three-fold manner: (1) by rigorously differentiating artistic creation from handicraft production; (2) by making clear that the fundamental relation to the work of art is not the pleasure aroused by the presence of art objects, but the knowledge of the truth established in the work; and (3) by showing that initiation of truth, and not representation, is the essence of the work of art.

Heidegger’s “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” has received many critiques, especially with reference to Hegel’s conception of art (Taminiaux 1982), to the history of modern art (Granel 1995), to the political component of the text (Lacoue-Labarthe 1987, Bernasconi 1999), or to the different versions of the lecture (Dastur 1999), as well as to being the

source of a new perspective on art (Haar 1994). It has even received adverse criticism, such as Meyer Shapiro’s objection to Heidegger’s use of van Gogh in “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” (Shapiro 1968). In *La vérité en peinture* (1978), JACQUES DERRIDA discusses the assumptions shared by Heidegger and Shapiro, who both attribute the shoes to someone (to a peasant women for Heidegger, to van Gogh himself for Shapiro), and calls into question the possibility of art effecting a restitution of real experience.

Among other theories of aesthetics in the twentieth century related to Heidegger’s position, we find the aesthetics of MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY, which emphasizes the role of the body. Through his/her body, the painter is in contact with the realm of the visible in such a way that s/he is able to experience the world in a more originary manner than in daily life. The “phenomenology of art” of HENRI MALDINEY is similarly based on the idea that “art is the truth of feeling” (Maldiney 1973: 153), which means that the artwork reveals the truth of what remains dissimulated in the perceptive act.

Whereas Merleau-Ponty and Maldiney describe the aesthetic experience as the primordial experience of world before knowledge and perception, in *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960), HANS-GEORG GADAMER shares with Heidegger the idea that art is an ontological phenomenon. For him the notion of an aesthetic consciousness is an artificial creation of the eighteenth century, one that has to be deconstructed in order to regain a more adequate comprehension of art. He shows that with Kant art already becomes the object of a subjective experience; then art and reality are completely opposed with Schiller. His term for the process of abstraction from everything that relates the work of art to its cultural environment is “aesthetic distinction.” For both Gadamer and Heidegger, art is a kind of knowledge and not merely an experience concerning sensibility. Artistic experience is an experience of understanding, not just of sensation, and constitutes in itself a hermeneutical phenomenon.

A conception of art and aesthetics somewhat related to Heidegger’s is developed by Walter Benjamin and Theodor Adorno, the leading figures of the Frankfurt school, which emphasizes the sociohistorical conditions of art and culture. In his reflection on the present state of art, Benjamin develops a theme that is at the same time expressed in “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes,” namely, that art has lost its “aura,” i.e.,

the radiance emanating from the works of art through their existence in a single point of space and time (Benjamin 1935). Art has been transformed by modern technology, which allows both the endless reproducibility of the works of the past and the appearance of new forms of art that are by nature reproducible, such as photography and cinematography. For Adorno, the most eminent representative of “critical theory,” the belief that art is an autonomous phenomenon is an illusion that can be explained only by the sociohistorical conditions at the end of the eighteenth century (Adorno 1970). He criticizes what he calls “the cultural industry” of art, but also confers on art a political and social value and sees in the true work of art a protest against reality that can contribute to the regeneration of society.

It is possible to see a continuation of Heidegger’s question concerning the essence of art in contemporary reflection on art, because today the definition of art has become problematic and nobody can tell with certitude what is and what is not a work of art. Under the influence of Ludwig Wittgenstein’s last philosophy, the question is no longer “What is art?” but merely “What use do we make of the word ‘art’?” And contemporary analytic aesthetics focuses also, in opposition to Heidegger’s and Gadamer’s critique, on aesthetic experience, holding that there are no aesthetic objects as such, but only objects that become aesthetic through the aesthetic attitude adopted toward them. Aesthetics is again called into question at the end of the twentieth century, but in a way different from Heidegger’s. Should it not take into account the sociological conditions of art (Bourdieu 1979)? Should it be a metaphysical discourse on art that does not start from the works themselves, but only from a general idea of what art should be (Schaeffer 2000)?

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie. Gesammelte Schriften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970; *Aesthetic Theory*. Trans. R. Hullot-Kentnor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Benjamin, Walter. “Der Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit” [1935]. In his *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 1/2. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985, 709–39.
- Bernasconi, Robert. “The Greatness of the Work of Art.” In *Heidegger toward the Turn: Essays on the Work of the 1930s*. Ed. James Risser. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999, 95–117.
- Bourdieu Pierre, *La distinction, Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Ed. de Minuit, 1979.
- Dastur, Françoise. “Heidegger’s Freiburg Version of ‘The Origin of the Work of Art.’” In *Heidegger toward the Turn: Essays on the Work of the 1930s*. Ed. James Risser. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999, 119–142.
- Derrida, Jacques. “Restitutions de la vérité en peinture.” In his *La vérité en peinture*. Paris: Flammarion, 1978, 291–436.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode* [1960]. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990.
- Granel, Gérard. “Lecture de l’Origine.” In his *Etudes*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1995, 109–136.
- Haar, Michel. *L’oeuvre d’art: Essai sur l’ontologie des oeuvres*. Paris: Hatier, 1994.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; “The Origin of the Work of Art.” In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Vom Ursprung des Kunstwerks. Erste Ausarbeitung.” In *Heidegger Studies* 5, 1989, 5–22.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Der Wille zur Macht als Kunst.” In his *Nietzsche I*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1961, 11–254; *Nietzsche*. Vol. 1. *The Will to Power as Art*. Trans. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1979; rpt. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Die Kunst und der Raum*. St Gallen: Erker, 1969.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Ein Brief Martin Heideggers an Rudolf Krämer-Bardoni über die Kunst.” In *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 18, 1986, 170–181.
- Herrmann, Friedrich-Wilhelm von. *Heideggers Philosophie der Kunst*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1980; rpt. 1994.
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe. *La fiction du politique*. Paris: Bourgois, 1987.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Regard, Parole, Espace*. Paris: L’Âge d’Homme, 1973.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L’oeil et l’esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; “Eye and Mind.” Trans. Carleton Dallery. In *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 159–190.
- Schaeffer, Jean-Marie. *L’adieu à l’esthétique*. Paris: Gallimard, 2000.
- Shapiro, Meyer. “The Still Life as a Personal Object—A Note on Heidegger and van Gogh.” In *The Reach of the Mind: Essays in Memory of Kurt Goldstein*. Ed. Marianne L. Simmel. New York: Springer, 1968, 203–209.
- Taminiaux, Jacques. “Le dépassement heideggérien de l’esthétique et l’héritage de Hegel.” In *Recoupements*. Brussels: Ousia, 1982, 175–208.

Michel Henry (1922–2002)

Ruud Welten

Art plays a central role in Henry's phenomenology. Since every form of art makes something appear, art always already presupposes a phenomenology. His phenomenology of art, like those of MARTIN HEIDEGGER and MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY, does not thematize art as an empirical object in its own right, but discloses the phenomenological quality of art. "Art" is not so much a particular field of objects or a special human activity, but a kind of attitude. For him, the phenomenology of art is not just about certain things in the world, as mimetic theories teach. Art does not represent phenomena. What art makes visible is not the mere form of phenomena, but the very manifestation of their appearance as such. This manifestation is the core of Henry's phenomenology.

According to Henry, Western philosophy acknowledges only the visual appearing of objects. This "ontological monism" is biased in equating phenomenality with visibility and thus with truth, thereby failing to explore the possibility of manifestation as such (Henry 1963: §1). Within transcendental phenomenology, seeing is always seeing something and consciousness is consciousness *of* something. Due to this primacy of intentionality, EDMUND HUSSERL does not succeed in describing how appearance itself appears. In other words, appearance is elucidated in terms of something other than itself, namely, what appears, instead of its appearing. Henry's field of interest is not what appears, but how appearance as such is possible and can be described.

Appearance is possible only because it manifests itself. This manifestation of appearance cannot be

explained by intentionality, since it is precisely not a manifestation *of* something. It remains invisible within the horizon of intentional consciousness. It is a radically immanent *épreuve de soi* and nothing but the enduring of life itself, it is enjoyment and suffering of itself. Life is not a concept, but auto manifestation. Life itself is phenomenological. It manifests itself incessantly as what Henry calls *pathos*. This auto manifestation cannot be described in terms of either transcendental phenomenology (Husserl, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE) or difference (JACQUES DERRIDA). Consequently, Henry's phenomenology is defined by the primordial role of non-intentional sensuality and affectivity. In later works, this absolutely immanent auto manifestation is God.

From this viewpoint, representation is always already alienated from this auto manifestation. Abstract art, says Henry, implies nothing less than the abstraction of the mere form realized by a radical phenomenological reduction. In abstract art, the image is no longer understood as "an image *of* something," as it is in Sartre. It is not phenomena as such that are depicted, but the *pathos* that makes them appear (Henry 1988). In the theoretical works of the painter Wassily Kandinsky (1866–1944), Henry discovers a pure phenomenologist who penetrates the heart of radical appearance, appearance as such. The "self" in self-experience does not refer to any psychological entity, but to the self of auto manifestation, and is described by Kandinsky as an "inner pulsation." The subjective interior cannot be objectified, but is the enduring experience of subjectivity itself. In other words, Kandinsky does not depict the worldly appearance of the outward form of things, but their inner, primordial appearance, the colors and forms *as such*. He discloses the inner revelation of appearance. His

R. Welten (✉)
Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands

painting captures the inner pathos of life itself, invisible in its essence. Art is not primarily representational, but the disclosure of the inner pulsation of what is ultimately life itself. Thus art is an “intensification of life” (Henry 1996: 259). All art is “abstract art,” i.e., abstraction from the merely visible phenomenality that results from intentionality (Henry 1988: 13).

The question is not how to experience auto manifestation, because we always already undergo it, but how to disclose it, to bring it forth from oblivion. Henry makes use of Kandinsky’s *Point and Line to Plane* (1926), where a crucial distinction is already made: “Every phenomenon can be experienced in two ways. These two ways are not random, but bound up with the phenomena—they are derived from the nature of the phenomena, from two characteristics of the same: External-Internal” (Kandinsky 1994: 532). As Kandinsky elucidates, if I look through my window at the people on the street, my look is exterior. I see things and life outside me, but if I walk through my door and make my way to the street, into the thick of the crowd, the street and its life are no longer an object before me, since I am now involved in it, in its “pulsating life with all one’s senses” (Kandinsky 1994: 532). In Henry’s terminology: I *am* this seeing, I am this perceiving. The internal perception discloses subjectivity itself, a subjectivity not to be understood in dialectical relation with some object, but fundamentally as pure self-experience.

This distinction is reminiscent of Henry’s analysis of Meister Eckhart in *L’essence de la manifestation* (1963). Eckhart distinguishes between “two eyes of the soul,” the inner and the outer. The inner eye is the eye that immediately perceives God, while the outer eye looks at things in the world. God is therefore without any image (Eckhart 1979: 203). Henry and Kandinsky both recognize in mysticism a fundamental quality of inner revelation (Henry 1963: §§39–40). Initially, Kandinsky was fascinated by theosophy because of its disclosure of the inner life. Henry’s analysis remains phenomenological in that he appeals only to givenness. According to him, Kandinsky discloses the inner non-intentional tension of life itself, and not that of living things as such. Due to its ontological monism, Western thought cannot recognize this invisible manifestation. For Henry, this manifestation is nothing else than life itself, which can only be “known” through life. Art discloses the inner structure of this manifestation.

Since abstract art does not represent a tree or a man on a horse, but the colors, forms, and tonalities, it basically makes the invisible visible, as is intimated by the title of Henry’s essay on Kandinsky, and he says “Painting is a showing (*faire-voir*), but this showing intends to show what we do not see and what cannot be seen” (Henry 1988: 24). Auto manifestation does not make itself manifest outside itself, the “interior” never shows itself externally (Ibid.: 17). It is not the visibility of the world, but *pathos*. Since here there is no longer any difference between noema and noesis, the colors and abstract forms on the painting are the inner pulsations of the work itself (Kandinsky 1994: 533). This leads to a highly tautological discourse: *Interior = interiority = life = invisible = pathos* (Henry 1988: 18).

Henry focuses on Kandinsky’s “principle of internal necessity,” which liberates art from merely outward forms (Kandinsky 1994: 207). For Kandinsky, this principle leads to rules entailing that the artist must free him/herself of the accidental elements in the work. Only in such a way can art be authentic, that is, approximate the inner pulsation. Henry’s interpretation of this principle is entirely as a radical phenomenological reduction. That art follows nothing but its own inner rules means that all outer relations are abandoned (Henry 1988: 48). What exactly does Kandinsky paint when he paints mere colors and sounds? This is an important issue in art theory and history of art. Is his art and theory an iconoclasm that rejects all forms of representation?

Henry seems to disagree with some, such as the Kandinsky scholar Hajo Düchting, who maintains that Kandinsky writes and paints a kind of “iconology” close to symbolism. For Düchting, abstract art is in search of a new image-language freer than representational art. Abstract art expresses inner psychological phenomena, yet remains representational, since the inner is expressed in a language of images. Iconology is only possible in a representational language. Henry’s interpretation goes far beyond iconology, since phenomenology starts from the primordial inner manifestation that is in itself not mimetic. This does not automatically mean that Henry’s interpretation is “iconoclastic.” Iconoclastic art simply rejects all images. But Henry’s phenomenology cannot merely be described in a negative way, as if it simply exhausted itself in *not* revealing external objects. He emphasizes the essentially inner mode of manifestation, life,

which is in fact nothing but a positive presence, often described in *L'essence de la manifestation* (1963) as *parousia* (presenting).

Kandinsky paints not the external things out there in the world, but the inner pulsation. As becomes clear in John Golding's description of Kandinsky's development, abstraction is not a merely iconoclastic dogmatism. Kandinsky "worked towards the abolition of recognizable images" (Golding 2000: 94), which means that his paintings are not focused on outward forms, but, as Henry says, "make the invisible appear." To look at Kandinsky's abstract paintings, such as his *Composition IV* (1911), is not to look at representations of things, but to look beyond their outward appearances into their inner manifestations.

Alain Besançon, however, has criticized Henry on this point. He objects that Kandinsky does not paint "abstract art" at all, since he does not paint phantasms, and is not "abstract" in the way Henry describes. The principle of "internal necessity" is not Kandinsky's only guide, according to Besançon. In his paintings there is also a resemblance with things seen by the eye. Only because of this are we able to see the figures on his paintings. In this way Besançon seeks to refute Henry's thesis that Kandinsky makes the invisible visible (Besançon 1994: 472). Ultimately, Besançon's argument does not seem convincing, because it ignores Kandinsky's own stress on "internal necessity" and "spiritual dimensions." Henry remains much closer to Kandinsky's own intentions in *On the Spiritual in Art* by strongly affirming the forgotten "spiritual" dimension of art. This "spirituality," however, is now understood in a radical way, liberated from the all-overpowering mathematical reduction of the world in Western culture. The world understood from a mathematical viewpoint is a world without emotion, or experience, and therefore far removed from our origin, which is life itself. Art can help us to undo the alienation of our original, non-representational experience of life.

This is the purpose of the cultural critique offered in *La barbarie* (1987), in which the healing role of

art is emphasized. Every kind of representation, most notably the Galilean mathematization of our worldview, removes us from our original inner manifestation. Thus according to Henry, the representationalism inherent in geometrical reduction and mimetic culture is the ultimate cause of our culture's fundamental crisis (Henry 1987). In this respect, Kandinsky is a philosophical revolutionary, urging a radical change in our phenomenology, saying in a letter to Will Grohmann of November 21, 1925, "I want people to see finally what lies behind my paintings" (Kandinsky 1994: 776).

Bibliography

- Besançon, Alain. *L'image interdite: Une histoire intellectuelle de l'iconoclasme*. Paris: Fayard, 1994.
- Düchting, Hajo. *Kandinsky*. Köln: Taschen, 2000.
- Dufour-Kowalska, Gabrielle. *L'art et la sensibilité: De Kant à Michel Henry*. Paris: Vrin, 1996.
- Golding, John. *Paths to the Absolute: Mondrian, Malevich, Kandinsky, Pollock, Newman, Rothko, Still*. Washington, DC: Thames & Hudson, 2000.
- Henry, Michel. *L'essence de la manifestation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963, rpt. 1990; *The Essence of Manifestation*. Trans. Girard Etzkorn. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- Henry, Michel. *La barbarie*. Paris: Grasset, 1987.
- Henry, Michel. *Voir l'invisible: Sur Kandinsky*. Paris: Françoise Bourin, 1988.
- Henry, Michel. "La peinture abstraite et le cosmos (Kandinsky)." In *Phénoménologie de la vie*. III. *De l'art et du politique*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2004.
- Henry, Michel. "Art et phénoménologie de la vie" [1996]. In his *Auto-donation. Entretiens et conférences*. Montpellier: Prétentaine, 2002, 147–172.
- Kühn, Rolf. "Zur Methode einer radikalen Lebensphänomenologie in Auseinandersetzung mit Descartes, Husserl und Kandinsky nach Michel Henry." In *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 38, 1991, 369–383.
- Kandinsky, Wassily. *On the Spiritual in Art and Point and Line to Plane*. In his *Complete Writings on Art*. Ed. Kenneth C. Lindsay and Peter Vergo. New York: Da Capo Press, 1994.
- Meister Eckhart. *Deutsche Predigten und Traktate*. Ed. Josef Quint. Zürich: Diogenes, 1979.

Dietrich von Hildebrand (1889–1977)

John F. Crosby

Dietrich von Hildebrand was born in Florence in 1889, and the circumstances of his birth are significant for his later work in aesthetics. His father was Adolf von Hildebrand, one of the best known German sculptors around the turn of the century. The young von Hildebrand inherited keen sensibilities for art and enjoyed an upbringing that was ideally suited to awakening and developing them. He grew up in his father's villa in Florence and lived his earliest years immersed in the beauties of Renaissance Florence. Great artists from all over Europe visited the von Hildebrand villa, including Richard Wagner, Henry James, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Rainer Maria Rilke, and Richard Strauss (who was visiting on the day of Dietrich's birth). In 1906 he was invited by the widow of Richard Wagner to the festival of Wagner's operas in Bayreuth, Germany; it was the beginning of his lifelong passion for the music of Wagner. If it is true that a philosopher can do fruitful work in aesthetics only if s/he brings to the issues of aesthetics some real aesthetic sensibility and some real understanding of art, then Dietrich von Hildebrand was uniquely well prepared to do work in aesthetics.

The phenomenological aesthetician also needs, of course, a phenomenological formation, and this von Hildebrand received directly from EDMUND HUSSERL and MAX SCHELER. He began the study of philosophy at the University of Munich in 1907, where he immediately came in contact with the Munich phenomenologists, who were enthralled by Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901). Drawn by this epoch-making work, he studied with Husserl in Göttingen

for several years, completing his dissertation, *Die Idee der sittlichen Handlung*, under Husserl's direction in 1912. Husserl esteemed it so highly that he wrote in his evaluation: "I almost want to say that the genius of Adolf von Hildebrand has been inherited by his son, the author, as a philosophical genius." He also said that von Hildebrand "astonishes the reader by an incomparably intimate knowledge of the various formations of affective consciousness and their objective correlates." Recent research at the Husserl Archives in Leuven has shown that Husserl made repeated use of von Hildebrand's dissertation in his own research. Husserl published the whole of the dissertation in the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* in 1916. In later years, von Hildebrand, along with all of Husserl's Göttingen students, distanced himself from the master because of the latter's turn to transcendental phenomenology; von Hildebrand remained from beginning to end a philosophical realist.

Yet although von Hildebrand owed much to the early Husserl, he owed far more to Max Scheler, whom he first met in Munich in 1907 and with whom he was bound in a very close friendship for some 15 years. Von Hildebrand entirely shared Scheler's interests in an ethical personalism and in the philosophy of religion. His doctoral dissertation, dedicated to Scheler, owes much to Scheler's value-based ethics, even if von Hildebrand departs in some important ways from Scheler's concept of value. Scheler was also instrumental in von Hildebrand's conversion to Catholicism in 1914. It must be remembered that von Hildebrand had received no religious formation at home; everything had centered on high aesthetic culture. But he had displayed an unusual religious sensibility from a very early age. When Scheler spoke to von Hildebrand about the phenomenon of personal holiness as lived

J.F. Crosby (✉)

Franciscan University of Steubenville, Steubenville, OH, USA

by the Christian saints, he encountered a great receptivity in the young man. But von Hildebrand was different from other Catholic converts of the time, like Jacques Maritain, in that he felt no need to remake himself into a Thomist. He remained entirely faithful to his phenomenological roots, and in fact much of his work in ethics is conducted in debate with Thomistic philosophy. Most of the works that von Hildebrand published during his lifetime deal with issues of ethics and philosophy of religion (though there are exceptions, such as his *Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft* [1930] and his epistemological treatise, *What is Philosophy* [1960]). Among the works that he published, only one deals with aesthetics, a short book entitled *Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert* (1962).

But he was deeply concerned from the beginning with issues of aesthetics. His strong ethical and religious interests and commitments never weakened in any way his lived relation to beauty and art in any way, nor did they weaken his passion for the problems of aesthetics. And so in the last years of his life, when he was in his mid-1980s, he set out to write the treatise on aesthetics that had been growing in him throughout his life. It came to a work of 1,000 pages and was published posthumously in two volumes under the title *Ästhetik*. The first volume offers a philosophy of beauty, the second a philosophy of art and the arts (this second volume is not entirely finished, von Hildebrand was still working on it at the time of his death in 1977). It is surely one of the richest phenomenological achievements in aesthetics, though it remains relatively little known. Let me survey some of the main insights of this work, giving particular attention to what von Hildebrand saw as his greatest single contribution to aesthetics.

The first thing to be said about von Hildebrand's aesthetics is that it is embedded in his value philosophy. The concept of value that he had already developed in his doctoral dissertation and employed throughout his ethics, is taken over in the aesthetics. By "value" von Hildebrand means the intrinsic worthiness or excellence or nobility or dignity of a being. And according to him values are not scattered and random phenomena, but are gathered into an ordered whole, a cosmos, which he expresses whenever he speaks of "the world of values." Value for him differs from the traditional *bonum* in that *bonum* expresses the idea of the "perfective of" someone, or the "beneficial for" someone, whereas value lacks this

relation to a perfected or benefited person, expressing instead a non-relational or absolute worthiness. Whenever von Hildebrand discusses value he usually inserts it in the larger whole that he called value-response (*Wertantwort*), by which he means a response given to some valuable being in the consciousness that my response is *merited* by it, or is *due* to it. Thus when I express a value-responding admiration for someone, I am not primarily trying to benefit or enhance that person, but rather am filled with the consciousness that, due to his/her value, the person is *worthy of my admiration*. Now in the first volume of his aesthetics, he speaks of aesthetic values, of their relation to beauty, of their main kinds, of their unity, of their antitheses, of the ways of experiencing them, and of course of the aesthetic value-response.

Von Hildebrand finds a path from value in general to specifically aesthetic value in the following way. Take moral values, such as generosity, faithfulness, and truthfulness; all of these, though not themselves aesthetic values, have a certain radiance or splendor of beauty, and thus have aesthetic value. They are not in the first place aesthetic values, but they *also* have aesthetic value. Now von Hildebrand finds that with all values that are not in the first place aesthetic values, there is this radiance of beauty, and thus that all these values *also* have aesthetic value. For example, we speak of the dignity of human persons; though this is certainly not what is called an aesthetic value, it "gives off" its own beauty and thus also has its own aesthetic value. He gives a name to this aesthetic value that arises everywhere in the world of value, calling it "metaphysical beauty." By the way, this metaphysical beauty played a large role in von Hildebrand's religious conversion; what Scheler disclosed to him in the saints was precisely the beauty of their holiness. His conversion was not just based on the "apologetic" arguments in behalf of Christianity, including various historical arguments; it was also, and perhaps above all, based on this sacred beauty. It was the metaphysical beauty of Christian holiness and of the God-man of Christianity that caught and fired von Hildebrand's religious imagination.

It is worth noting that metaphysical beauty also plays a role in von Hildebrand's magisterial treatise on the nature of love. He insists at the beginning of this work that love is a value-response, which means that it is awakened by the sight of some personal value in the beloved person. He then develops the idea that this

value, though not a value that is in the first place an aesthetic value, is perceived by the one who loves as being radiant with beauty, and that it is only in this aesthetically potent way that it awakens love. In other words, von Hildebrand explores the connection, first studied by Plato, between love and beauty, and the beauty at stake in interpersonal love is what in his aesthetics he calls metaphysical beauty.

Now from metaphysical beauty he distinguishes all those values that are in the first place aesthetic values; these arise without the mediation of any other kind of value. For example, a well-formed human face may have a loveliness that is not the radiance of, say, the worthy moral character of the person, or of the dignity that the person has as a person, but appears immediately in and on the face; here we have what we call an aesthetic value. A lovely melody gives us another example of an aesthetic value that is nothing but an aesthetic value. Von Hildebrand tries to capture these aesthetic values under the heading of “the beauty of the visible and the audible.” Thus he begins his work in aesthetics by dividing the realm of beauty into metaphysical beauty and the beauty of the visible and the audible.

Von Hildebrand also engages in debate the claims of aesthetic subjectivism, giving particular attention to the subjectivism of Hume, Santayana, and W. D. Ross. Against all these subjectivisms he argues forcefully for the objectivity of aesthetic value. By objectivity he of course means, to begin with, that aesthetic value is not given to us as a component of our experiencing (as if it were a part of our conscious experiencing, or *Erleben*), but is given over against us, as an intentional object, in or on some being. But he also means more than this: he means that beings having aesthetic value really do have it, so that they show themselves for what they really are when we experience them as beautiful, which means that people who fail to experience them as beautiful also fail to experience what is really there. Thus his philosophical realism is manifested in his account of the ontological status of aesthetic values. He shows himself quite mindful of the special difficulties that one encounters in arguing for such objectivity precisely in the case of aesthetic values. For instance, he is fully aware that the visible and audible bearers of many aesthetic values are things of appearance, existing only in their being seen or being heard by human subjects. He argues that the appearance-character of the bearer does not interfere with the full

objectivity of the aesthetic value that is based on the appearances. But von Hildebrand does not pay attention to the issues of cultural and historical relativity that are often raised by way of challenging the objectivity of all value (Scheler was more sensitive to these issues than was von Hildebrand), including aesthetic value.

We now come to what von Hildebrand regarded, and rightly regarded, as his greatest single contribution to aesthetics. It is situated within his discussion of the beauty of the visible and audible. Take the beauty of the streaked colors appearing in a clear sky at dawn; von Hildebrand is struck by the depth and sublimity that can be found in this beauty, *and also struck by the fact that the beauty does not seem to be proper to, or proportioned to, the light and colors and spatial expanse from which it arises*. He means that this sublime beauty surpasses by far the “aesthetic capacity” of light and color and spatial expanse. He even suggests that this sublime beauty is somehow akin to the aesthetic dimension of the greatest moral value. In the case of moral value, we at least understand where it comes from; we understand the value, and the beauty of the value, of a person exercising his/her freedom and committing him/herself to the good. But with the comparably sublime beauty appearing in the sky at dawn, we cannot achieve the same kind of understanding, for the qualities of the visible appearance seem to be ontologically too modest to give rise to such beauty.

Von Hildebrand recognizes that visible and audible appearance-qualities do have some modest aesthetic value proper to them; he speaks here of *Sinnenschönheit*, or sense-beauty, examples of which would be the beauty of a circle, or of the rich mellow sound of a well-tuned cello. But this is for him a more primitive beauty, or what he calls a “beauty of the first power,” which he contrasts with a “beauty raised to the second power,” which is the beauty that mysteriously exceeds the aesthetic capacity of the visible and audible elements out of which it arises. The first and more primitive kind of beauty is the natural effluence of these elements; the second rests on them as on a pedestal. It is, of course, not only in nature but also in art that this mysterious beauty is found. Thus a haunting melody of Schubert that moves us deeply and makes us shudder within ourselves seems not to grow out of its musical elements but, as it were, to descend on them from above.

Von Hildebrand considers and rejects as unphenomenological two ways of dealing with this phenomenon. There is first of all the view that all beauty of the visible and audible can only be a thing of sense-beauty, and that the feeling we have in some cases of an “excess” of beauty must therefore be an illusion. He objects that one is simply not letting this excess come to evidence, that one is suppressing it because one feels that it is so inexplicable that it ought not to exist. But von Hildebrand also rejects the idea that this excess of beauty is to be explained by associating it with some great reality other than the audible and visible bearer of it. For example, some say that the mysterious beauty of a mountain as seen in a certain light arises only for a viewer who is reminded by the mountain of the immensity of God; one thinks that the sublime beauty of the mountain is now intelligible as being grounded not just in a physical reality, but also in a divine reality. Von Hildebrand objects that there is no phenomenological basis for such a supposition; a viewer of the mountain can fully experience its sublime beauty without any such theological thought in the back of his/her mind. He ends by marveling at the “sacramental” relation that exists between certain visible and audible things, on the one hand, and the sublime, unearthly beauty that is attached to them and exceeds them on the other. The result he achieves displays a kind of paradox: by staying very close to the experience of this beauty, he discerns in it a mysterious “signal of transcendence,” which does not, as one might at first think, come from some unphenomenological construction, but which on the contrary is blocked by unphenomenological constructions and is brought to evidence by letting the beauty show itself for what it is.

The account given so far of von Hildebrand’s aesthetics has neglected one remarkable aspect: the concreteness of the aesthetic phenomena he analyzes. I have so far presented some fundamental divisions that he makes within the realm of beauty, and one particularly significant structure that he tries to understand, but the reader would never know from this presentation of fundamentals that throughout his aesthetics he deals with very concrete aesthetic phenomena such as the poetic, the festive, the elegant, the trivial, the prosaic, the aesthetically boring, and the comical. Nor would the reader suspect that von Hildebrand exhibits great phenomenological sensitivity in expressing the aesthetic values that belong to the different times of

day, such as morning, evening, and night time. Thus von Hildebrand’s work in aesthetics conveys a much stronger “taste” of the aesthetic world than we find in the aesthetics of ROMAN INGARDEN, who stays for the most part at the level of rather abstract logical theory in his treatises on the literary work of art. If Scheler tried to bring to light a “material a priori” in ethics, von Hildebrand has tried to bring it to light in aesthetics.

We see more of this concreteness of von Hildebrand in the second volume of his aesthetics, in which he discusses five different realms of art: architecture, sculpture, painting, literature, and music. In connection with these he tries to characterize particularly significant individual works of art, such as Beethoven’s *Fidelio* or Bach’s *St. Matthew Passion*, an undertaking that is akin to the project of his earlier work, *Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert*, in which he tries to do a phenomenology of the spirit and genius of the music of each of these composers. Of course, he cannot achieve with respect to individual composers the same kind of essential insight that he tries to achieve as a phenomenologist throughout the first volume of his aesthetics. But everyone who reads von Hildebrand on the composers or on individual works of art will recognize his studies as genuinely phenomenological achievements.

Bibliography

- Crosby, John F. “Dietrich von Hildebrand: Master of Phenomenological Value-Ethics.” In *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy*. Ed. John Drummond and Lester Embree. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2002, 475–496.
- Crosby, John Henry. “Introduction to Dietrich von Hildebrand’s *Mozart*: Dietrich von Hildebrand in His Unknown Role of Master Phenomenologist of Art.” In *Logos* 7, 2004, 165–88.
- Hildebrand, Alice von. *The Soul of a Lion*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000. [life of von Hildebrand up to 1941 as told by his widow].
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. “Die Idee der sittlichen Handlung.” *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 3, 1916, 126–251.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *What is Philosophy?* Milwaukee: Bruce Publishers, 1960.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert*. Regensburg: Josef Habel Verlag, 1962; “Mozart.” Trans. John Henry Crosby. In *Logos* 7, 2004, 189–212. “Schubert.” Trans. John Henry Crosby. In *Communio* 33, 2003, 478–501.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Das Wesen der Liebe. Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 3. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1971.

- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Ethics*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1972.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft. Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 4. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1975.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Ästhetik*. Vol. 1. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 5. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1977.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Ästhetik*. Vol. 2. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 6. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984.
- Pongratz, Ludwig J., ed. *Philosophie in Selbstdarstellungen*, Vol. 2. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1975, 77–127.
- Preis, Josef. "Hildebrand-Bibliographie." In *Aletheia* 5, 1992, 363–430.

Edmund Husserl (1859–1938)

John B. Brough

The founder of the phenomenological movement is not known as an aesthetician, but he exerted decisive influence on a number of important philosophers of art working within that tradition. Furthermore, posthumous texts reveal that Husserl himself had important and interesting things to say about art and aesthetic consciousness, which, while not amounting to a full-blown aesthetic theory, chart directions in which one might be developed.

The central tenet of Husserl's phenomenology is his doctrine of the "intentionality" of consciousness. "Intentionality" refers to the fact that consciousness is always the consciousness of something. Husserl's own reflections on art and the aesthetic are tied to his investigations of image-consciousness, the kind of intentional experience we have when we look at a painting or photograph, contemplate a sculpture, or see a film or play. Image-consciousness is a form of re-presentation (*Vergegenwärtigung*), which distinguishes it from ordinary perception or presentation and places it in the same class of experiences as memory and phantasy. It is a peculiar kind of re-presentation, however, since unlike memory or phantasy, it has a foot in both the perceptual and imaginative worlds. Hence Husserl also calls it "perceptual re-presentation," "perceptual phantasy," or "physical imagination," all terms pointing to imaging's complexity. In contrast to simple perception, which has only one object, image-consciousness has three objects, each intended in a different way.

A painting, for example, possesses what Husserl calls a "physical image," by which he means the painting's physical support made from wood, canvas, and

pigment. The physical image is a material thing like any other; it can hang askew on the wall and deteriorate with age. It differs from ordinary physical things, however, in that its maker intentionally created it to awaken the consciousness of an "image-object" in the perceiver. The image-object, or simply "image," is what one actually sees when one looks at a painting; it is the image, not the pigment and canvas, that appears and that depicts or represents. Awareness of the painting's material substrate, while necessary if one is to have an image, recedes into emptiness in the image's presence. Images may represent actual persons, places, or events, or they may represent purely fictional things such as centaurs. To the extent that images have subjects, they involve a third moment, which Husserl calls the "image-subject." If the subject of the image is an actual person or event, it will be absent in its reality but be intended in its absence through the present image.

Unlike phantasy objects, which fluctuate and are resolutely private and subject to the whim of the phantasying individual, images, thanks to their rootedness in a physical support, enjoy a stable existence and public availability to multiple observers. Furthermore, the fact that the physical support has real colors and textures means that the image grounded in them appears with "the full force and intensity of perception" (Husserl 1980: 57, 60). Of course, the consciousness of the image is not a normal perception, since the image and what appears in the image are not taken to be actual things. The image itself is indeed there in person and actually seen, but I do not take the image-person I see to be real in the way in which I take the wall on which the picture hangs to be real. The image has no existence inside my consciousness or outside my consciousness; it is "a nothing," "a nullity," in comparison with real spatiotemporal things or

J.B. Brough (✉)
Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

mental acts. Thus in gazing at the bronze sculpture of a runner, I do not take the represented figure to be a real person; I am aware, unambiguously, that it is an image-person.

The capacity of the image to represent something within itself—a human being, a landscape, actions and events—depends on the fact that it is not something real. Merely real things simply are what they are and do not represent. The image is able to appear in its peculiar perceptual nonbeing, Husserl argues, because it floats in a play of conflicts. When I look at a painting, for example, I am conscious of a conflict between the image-landscape I see and the real pigment and canvas that support the image. The result is that I take what actually appears—the landscape in the painting—as something that is not real, that is, precisely as an image. Since the image is not a real object, Husserl characterizes it as “ideal.” The ideality of the image involves a second direction of conflict with the real. The ideal world the image represents has its own space and time, which means that it conflicts with the perceptual world surrounding it. The depicted landscape does not extend beyond the picture’s frame; if I attempt to fulfill my empty landscape intentions by looking to the left or right of the painting, I will see only wall, furniture, and windows. Again the conflict with what is actual lets me experience the appearing landscape as an image and not as a real thing. Finally, the image and its subject can conflict. A child in a sepia photograph appears in quite different colors from the actual child the photograph depicts. The differences between the child as s/he appears in the image and the child him/herself signal that it is an image I am experiencing. The conflicts involved in image-consciousness, unlike the conflicts that sometimes arise in ordinary perceiving, are never resolved by the triumph of one over the others, since it is precisely the preservation of conflict that insures the preservation of image-consciousness.

Essential to imaging is what Husserl calls “seeing-in” (*Hineinschauen*). Seeing-in operates in two ways. First, I can see something in the physical support: a human face in lines drawn in ink on a sheet of paper, for example, or a runner cast in the bronze of a sculpture. Seeing-in carries me beyond the perception of ink and paper or bronze to the consciousness of an image-face or image-body. I can also see something in the image itself, in the sense that I take it to have a subject. Thus I see Bismarck in the image-face before me. This is a case of meaning

what is absent—Bismarck himself—in what is actually present and appearing—the image of Bismarck. It is seeing-in that distinguishes image-consciousness from symbolic consciousness, the kind of awareness I have when I recognize an overhead sign in an airport as indicating the direction of a restaurant. Images represent things internally. I see the restaurant in the painting of the restaurant and am not carried beyond it. The sign or symbol, on the other hand, represents its subject externally; it points me toward something else that is not contained within it. Husserl also thinks that images can in addition contain moods or affective states. One can see compassion in a depicted face, and an entire image can be enveloped in a *quasi-mood*, such as melancholy.

Husserl intends his phenomenology of image-consciousness to apply to all images, whether works of art or not, and hence the features of imaging do not, by themselves, distinguish art from non-art. Husserl does insist, however, that all works of art are images, and to that extent, all of them have a physical substratum, an image object, and a subject. From the Husserlian perspective, then, it is a necessary condition that something be an image if it is to be a work of art. Husserl additionally holds that if something is to be art, it must be capable of being contemplated aesthetically, although aesthetic consciousness can also be directed toward things that are not works of art, such as actual landscapes. These two conditions—being an image and also being a target of aesthetic experience—taken jointly would constitute Husserl’s answer to the question about what distinguishes art from non-art.

Husserl takes aesthetic consciousness to be concerned with the way in which an object appears and not with its existence. In the case of an artwork, aesthetic delight is directed toward what presents itself simply as it presents itself in the depictive image. It is not interested in the actual existence of what is represented, but only in the existence of its ideal presentation. The physical materials from which the work is made, to the degree that they appear, can also play a role in aesthetic delight, as can such features of the work as the artist’s brushstrokes.

Husserl distinguishes different types of art according to their foci and the artist’s intention. There can be “realistic” art, which attempts to capture in images and in literary fictions the characteristics of a particular time and place. The point of realistic art is not to be beautiful, although, like all art, it is the target of aesthetic appreciation, which suggests that for

Husserl beauty is not a necessary condition of the artwork. In contrast to realistic art, whose motive is a kind of artistic empiricism or positivism, stands “idealistic” art, which does aim at beauty through embodying values and their collisions in fictional characters and situations. Husserl also claims that art can be philosophical, even metaphysical, elevating one “to the deepest world ground and uniting one with it” (Husserl 1980: 542), which anticipates aspects of the aesthetic theories of MARTIN HEIDEGGER and MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY.

Among aestheticians in the phenomenological tradition, ROMAN INGARDEN explicitly acknowledged a deep indebtedness to Husserl in the development of his own aesthetics. Ingarden seems to have been influenced chiefly by the central Husserlian doctrines of intentionality, eidetic insight, and ideal or irreal objectivities. His analysis, however, also coincides with and develops many of Husserl’s specific views about art, unpublished during the latter’s lifetime, but with which Ingarden may have been familiar as Husserl’s student and lifelong correspondent. He echoes Husserl’s claims about the distinction between and mutual dependence of the work of art and its physical support, for example, but also advances distinctions that were, at most, only implied in Husserl’s texts. He distinguishes, for example, between the work of art and the aesthetic object, and between artistic qualities and values and aesthetic qualities and values. He also sees differences between Husserl’s conception of ideal objects, such as mathematical entities, and works of art, although Husserl would probably agree that works of art form a unique class of ideal objects. JEAN-PAUL SARTRE and Maurice Merleau-Ponty carry the analysis of art in more “existential” directions, but both also investigate the connections and differences between ordinary objects and the work of art. MIKEL DUFRENNE joins Ingarden in distinguishing between the aesthetic object and the artwork, but particularly exploits the possibilities opened up for aesthetics by Husserl’s notion of intentionality, exploring in depth the correlation between aesthetic consciousness on the one hand and the aesthetic object on the other.

Husserl’s discussion of images and image-consciousness also has relevance for and affinities with a number of themes in recent analytic aesthetics, particularly representation, resemblance, and depiction. Husserl’s discussion of seeing-in and the

relation between the art work’s physical support and its image is especially interesting in connection with, for example, Richard Wollheim’s independently developed discussions of seeing-in and “twofoldness.” Furthermore, Husserl’s late (1936) work, *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie*, although not concerned with art or the aesthetic, offers possibilities for linking phenomenology to the current discussions of the “art-world” and the institutional theory of art through its rich analysis of history and the complex constitution of cultural worlds and objects.

Husserl wrote that art offers us an infinite realm of perceptual fictions. His phenomenological legacy provides us with an equally infinite realm of possibilities for aesthetic theory.

Bibliography

- Brough, John. “Art and Artworld: Some Ideas for a Husserlian Aesthetic.” In *Edmund Husserl and the Phenomenological Tradition*. Ed. Robert Sokolowski. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1988, 77–93.
- Brough, John. “Some Husserlian Comments on Depiction and Art.” In *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 66, 1992, 241–59.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie* [1913]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 3. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Husserl, Edmund.. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie* [1936]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 6. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954; *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund.. *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band, Teil 1,2* [1901]. Ed. Ursula Panzer. *Husserliana* 19–1, 19–2. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984; *Logical Investigations*. Trans. J. N. Findlay. 2 vols. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund.. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898/1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.

Imagination

Natalie Depraz

Even if EDMUND HUSSERL never created such a research field as phenomenological aesthetics, a great number of his first generation students did. Why? Either they felt that Husserl was about to develop one, or they were tempted enough by the phenomenology of imagination he invented to apply it to aesthetics. It is therefore worthwhile coming back to Husserl's understanding of the act of imagining as well as to his apprehension of images. Such an analysis is to be found very early in a 1904/1905 lecture course that he devoted to the relationships between (1) imagination as an act of imagining (*Phantasie*), (2) our consciousness of images (*Bildbewusstsein*), and (3) the act of remembering (*Wiedererinnerung*) (Husserl 1980).

Two remarks proceed directly from what has just been said. (1) Imagination is an *act* of our consciousness, which means that it is not a faculty as in the classical (Kantian and Cartesian) view: in short, it is a move directed toward the world, and not a closed-up mental state. Imagining is an activity of producing a new reality, the reality of the images, directly related to previous perceptions or indirectly linked to them (namely, via remembering), which enables the subject to enlarge his/her own inner world. (2) Consequently, imagination is not an isolated activity, which would, again, trap the subject within itself: it is closely related to perception, remembering, and empathy, since all of these acts of consciousness are identified as intentional, that is, as directed toward their object (imagined, perceived, remembered, or empathized) and opened up toward the world.

As early as 1904–1905, Husserl's original contribution with regard to the experience of imagination

is to make a new distinction between two different acts of imagination: on the one hand, *Phantasie*, which corresponds to an act through which the imagined object appears directly to me; on the other hand, *Bildbewusstsein*, which is the re-presentation of an imagined object much like the perceived object (Sallis 1989). Such a clear-cut distinction between two different intentionalities of imagination has deep consequences for the relationship between perception and imagination in both cases. On the one hand, in the experience of *Bildbewusstsein*, my experience of images is necessarily and experientially founded on my experience of previous perceptions; on the other hand, in the experience of *Phantasie*, my direct vision of images founds a renewed vision of perception. Both approaches to images therefore lead to specific and original apprehensions of aesthetic pictures, as Husserl mentions. They correspond, for example, to two different ways of looking at a picture: in the first case, you may look at Monet's painted sunsets as being founded on the painter's own previous perceptions of sunsets; in the second case, you will see them as a new creation of an unknown reality, that is, as the opening of the way for another perception of sunsets for both the spectator and the creator.

The methodological tensions emerging around 1913 are especially telling with regard to Husserl's quest for a radically renewed understanding of imagination. Indeed, in the first book of *Ideen*, and above all in §§111–12, he provides us with an intrinsic link between imagination and the very method of phenomenology, namely, the epoché. Contrary to perception, which is directed toward an object considered as being effectively existent, imagination suspends the actual existence of the object and is directed toward the pure possibility of the latter, that is, toward its

N. Depraz (✉)
Université de Rouen, Rouen, France

ineffective modality. Imagination therefore paves the way for the free openness of multifarious possibilities, whereas perception traps us in a closed and limited unique reality. Now the method of the epochē similarly operates as a gesture of suspension of preconceived and taken-for-granted realities, so as to question them as “being able not to be.” Epochē and imagination are therefore structurally linked by their common concern for freedom from facts and their quest for unlimited possibilities.

Consequently, such a methodological understanding of imagination paves the way for the primacy of imagination with regard to perception in the early 1920s. During these years (Husserl 1980: No. 18 [1918], No. 19 [1922–1923], No. 20 [1921–1924]), the dynamic of experience that is emphasized demonstrates a strong continuity between perception and imagination, which goes hand in hand with a phenomenon of graduality between them—hence the numerous intermediate experiences of dreams, lucid dreaming, and daydreaming, but also modalized perceptions (doubt, negation, probability, uncertainty), or motor imagination. The genetic-phenomenological experience of imagination stresses the process of imagining rather than the act as it is directed toward images; in contrast, the founding experience of perception that is given a privilege during the first decade of Husserl’s philosophical activity echoes a clear (hierarchized) stratification of the different acts of consciousness (Casey 1976).

In *Vergegenwärtigung und Bild* (1930), EUGEN FINK is the first phenomenologist to provide us with a view of Husserl’s 1905 phenomenology of imagination. Indeed, the early lecture course was unpublished then. Fink stresses the primacy of *Phantasie* by once again taking up the Husserlian distinction between *Vergegenwärtigung* (representation)—among others, imagination, but also for example, remembering and empathy—and *Gegenwärtigung* (presentation)—exemplarily perception—and by showing that perception corresponds to a full but static and therefore rigid and limited presence of the object, whereas imagination entirely creates its object—the image—while characterizing it by its inner distance from the full presence of the perceived object: the mode of being of the image lies in its fragmented presence, its constitutive dimension of possible nonpresence. Fink therefore emphasizes the relationship of imagination with the dynamic of its becoming present, starting from the abyssal reality of absence. In short, imagining is

a process of creation founded on nothingness as a starting point. This is why he is led to use another word for such a dynamic of absence: he calls it *Entgegenwärtigung*. The “Ent-” is meant to identify the move of “absentification.” Thus as a process of creation rooted in the experience of nothingness, imagining is the very matrix of every aesthetic experience, which literally presents a wholly unknown reality to our eyes, radically intensifying our primary sensations.

Finally, it turns out that imagination intrinsically has the power of transforming our habitual reality (Depraz 1996a). Such a powerful transformation can be accounted for in two ways: (1) Husserlian imagination is in itself a fragmented reality, where images may take up different forms, literally being transformed through each other; and (2) imagination contains in itself the originary experience of altering perceptual reality, and it is therefore a leading thread of much meditative visualization.

- (1) I is possible to distinguish four aspects of imagining (Depraz 1996b). (a) The first aspect corresponds to the imaginative eidetic variation of an object (external or internal), through which the different perceptual data are distinguished into essential or contingent ones. The process of varying sensory perceptions is primarily imaginative, for it not only lets the different possibilities of the existence of the object appear, but helps us to leave the sole level of effective factuality, which is *in principe* unique. (b) The second aspect has to do with the genuine link between perceptions and imaginations—hence the multifarious experiences of perceptual imaginations or imaginary perceptions we may have. This includes dreams on the one hand and their different forms (daydreaming, deep sleep, lucid dreaming, nightmares), and hallucinations on the other hand (hypnotic images, deliriums, drug like images). (c) The third aspect deals with the epochē as a neutralization of validities, and with the possibility of understanding epochē in terms of imagination as a neutralizing modification of effective perceptions. And (d) the fourth aspect finally puts empathy to the fore as an imaginative self-transposal, thus involving a particular relationship between self and other via my ability to imagine the thoughts, and the entire existence, of others. In short, imagining is a complex process that does not seem to possess a strong and

solid (a substantial) unity. But such an absence is neither a deficit nor a weakness: it defines the very identity of imagining, which is not state-like, but process-like.

- (2) As a consequence, there is an intrinsic power of imagining that goes hand in hand with its specific embodiment. If imagination aims at altering sensations, at modifying perceptions, at neutralizing preconceptions, and at self-transposal (in the case of intersubjective experience), it literally contains a transformative dimension that inherently involves a deep criticism of every grounding temptation. Interestingly enough, in contemporary debates that put together different approaches to imagination (scientific, spiritual, and philosophical), this is exactly what is stressed: in a pioneering article (Varela and Depraz 2003), it is shown how imagining is an embodying transformative process at the crossroads of mental imagery in neuroscience; of perception and imagination in Husserl, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty; and of meditative visualizations in Buddhism. Now such an embodied metamorphic power seems to be exactly what is needed for the subject in the world as a general aesthetic ability of creation.

Whereas the German circle of phenomenologists involved in aesthetics worked directly under the direction of Husserl and developed a phenomenological aesthetics immediately inspired by his methodology, the French generation of philosophers who were “summoned” by phenomenology did not meet Husserl himself (except for Emmanuel Levinas, Jean Hering, and Gaston Berger). Jean-Paul Sartre himself discovered Husserl’s phenomenology in the 1930s in Berlin while reading Levinas’s *Théorie de l’intuition* (1930) and his translation of Husserl’s *Méditations cartésiennes* (1931). As for Maurice Merleau-Ponty, he read some of Husserl’s D Manuscripts on space in the Husserl Archives in Leuven during the war.

In short, none of them was able to see Husserl directly at work with the phenomena and therefore appreciate the way they could be inspired by his methodological praxis. Such a difficulty, however, may be considered in the light of its benefit for the very study of imagination and of images. In that respect, Sartre is highly representative for the double ability to deal with methodological issues *and* to engage in concrete thematic analysis. And in addition, the author of

L’imaginaire (1940) is early enough in his discoveries to remain a permanent surprise for his readers.

In *L’imaginaire*, Sartre develops a phenomenological psychology of the consciousness of the image. He therefore links together the two main (so may one think) requirements of a phenomenological aesthetics: first, a concern for the phenomenological method as it may be illuminating for aesthetic experience (a concern shared by the early German phenomenologists after Husserl); and second, an interest in the experience of imagination and of images, an interest that is the heart of such an aesthetic experience (a concern of Husserl himself). These two threads come to be knotted together in the analysis of what Sartre calls the “*conscience imageante*” (imagining consciousness), the adjective being representative for the second thematic interest, the substantive for the first methodic concern.

Contrary to the classical representationalist view that erroneously understands the image as an object within consciousness, the image is for Sartre a particular kind of intentional consciousness that is characterized by its ability to intend an absent or nonexistent embodied object via a psychic or physical content that is not given itself, but plays the part of an “analogical representation” of the intended object. But image-intentionality is not a matter of the kind of empty intention that we can find in the case of the consciousness of meaning. Nor is it embodied like perceptual consciousness, which directly presents its object in flesh and blood. Hence the requirement is to find an analogical representation of the embodied perceived object, be it a physical or a psychic content.

Such a general definition of the imagining consciousness opens up the way for a description of a great number of images, be they natural or artistic. Hence a very great richness and diversity becomes possible for phenomenological aesthetics, both thematically and methodologically: the realm of imaginary experiences includes not only psychic images, be they pathological, kinetic, affective, or linguistic, but also images that are built on the basis of a physical content: a painting, a sculpture, a photograph, the play of an actor, a piece of music. And this does not merely have to do with an adaptation of the phenomenological (here intentional) method to works of art, insofar as the experience of images exceeds that of artistic images to the point of integrating the internal world of dreams, hallucinations, and emotions and thereby contributing to

a more encompassing theory of aesthetics (not limited to art although including it).

Nevertheless, what is striking in Sartre's phenomenological analysis is the structural duality between perception and imagination. Whereas the former is an activity that is situated *hic et nunc*, the latter refers to an irreal space and time. My consciousness is the producer of images, which do not possess any directly embodied content. In this respect, Sartre is faithful to Husserl's own static delimitation of both activities, but incredibly blind to their constitutive reciprocal permeation. Such an experiential mixture would unavoidably pave the way for another access to aesthetics—perhaps one that is less delimited and stabilized, that is, more chaotic and also more fluctuating.

In a sense, Maurice Merleau-Ponty clearly made such a second choice. Although his *Phénoménologie de la perception* (1945) deliberately focuses on the perceptual access to the world—primarily via kinaesthetic experience—and tends to push imagination to the rear as a less embodied experience, the entire description of our perception of the world is laden with the pregnancy of the memories, emotions, and encounters of the individual subject. Perception is therefore neither formal nor theoretical, as in a certain narrow understanding of Husserl's phenomenology: it is originally permeated by the images that inhabit me as a human subject. Hence detailed descriptions of daydreaming, for example, provide an exemplary case of the loose boundary between perception and imagination: daydreaming plays the role of an intermediate condition between dreaming as such and everyday perception insofar as the unique characteristic of daydreaming is that it manifests as imagined emotional meaning (Morley 2000). In this respect Merleau-Ponty is more akin to Husserl's genetic analysis of imagining as an affective and kinaesthetic process of my becoming-conscious.

Such a mobile relationship between perception and imagination gives way to an access to literature and painting where the very distinction between reality and irreality, between spatiotemporal perceiving and irrealized imagining, is completely blurred. In *L'oeil et l'esprit* (1964), Merleau-Ponty offers a radical criticism of the image understood as a representation. More than music or literature, his leading thread is painting, and more precisely, the art of the impressionists. Cézanne is his privileged case study: far from imitating

the nature painted in a realistic style, he aimed at expressing nature as it directly appears to the embodied subject.

Now Merleau-Ponty's use of metaphors as genuine expressions of the lived experience of the subject show how his very way of writing is a remarkable aesthetic experience of the writing process (Simon and Castin 1997). So it is not exaggerated to assert that Merleau-Ponty's metaphorical expression of experience is as such experiential. In other words, imaged expressing is an *experience* of language. In short, his language seeks to be the very language of perception itself, while perception is originally permeated with an immanent expressivity. The metaphysical distinction between concepts (categories) and images (metaphors) is superseded by an experiential expression where the genuineness of images refers to the originarity of our experience of the world. In this respect phenomenological writing is the immanent and continuous creation of an imminent meaning that is already given to us, but needs to be re-created each time (Depraz 1999).

Though he too wrote in the 1960s, MIKEL DUFRENNE is quite an original phenomenologist compared to others of his generation (Sartre, Merleau-Ponty). Indeed he is the first French phenomenologist to complete a systematic phenomenological aesthetics, *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique* (1953). In this respect he shares a common concern with the early German Husserlian circle. Like Sartre and Merleau-Ponty, though, he considers phenomenological analysis as a description of an embodied meaning (*sens sensible*). Aesthetic experience, i.e., the sensory perception of the work of art, is accordingly an experience of sensuousness at its height. On the part of the spectator (viewer, listener, etc.), the aesthetic relationship with the object of art is affective, grounded on the affective a priori qualities of the artistic work and on the expressed feelings of the attending subject; on the part of the creator, the relationship is one of performance: the artist makes of his/her work a "quasi-subject," i.e., a being endowed with expressivity, like other human beings showing emotions.

MICHEL HENRY goes one step further with his account of contemporary painting as radically non-representational. Whereas previous representational painting during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries only offered a "representation" of the world and is thus an objectifying artistic phenomenon, Henry's contention is that the artistic revolution conducted by

Kandinsky, who founded so-called abstract painting, freed human beings from our perplexity, once again furnish us with what we had lost. We therefore have to find our inner life as subjects once again. Instead of seeing lines and colors *as* lines and colors, as we usually do while looking at paintings, we will contemplate lines as so many ongoing forces, colors as so many emotional tones. If we see primarily force and affect, we see less geometrical form than a pure and moving expression. Abstract painting therefore paradoxically paves the way for a new popular vision of painting, since it is not ruled by language and concepts, i.e., mediation: it is a fully immediate pathic expression of the invisible. Beneath any idea of representing, i.e., of representing objects and people in an ideally scientific true way, such painting is an expression of our most archaic desires and impulses. In *Voir l'invisible* (1988), Henry opens the way for a truly radical phenomenology of primordial aesthetics.

In a sense, this is also JEAN-LUC MARION's purpose in *La croisée du visible* (1991). Indeed, the challenge is to become aware of the genuineness of visibility as such. In this respect painting does not belong to painters or to people dedicated to aesthetics. It is everybody's possession insofar as one learns to look at things a bit differently. As he rightly puts it, "*voir ne va pas de soi*" (seeing is not an activity that can be taken for granted)—which means that our looking at things needs to be worked out, cultivated, and submitted to an exercise of vision. And since phenomenology endeavors to help us in seeing how things are given to us, rather than what things are as being visible, it offers the most adequate approach to avoid taking visibility for granted.

In contrast to Henry's emphasis on abstract painting as the source of the most archaic affective pulsions of the subject, however, Marion relies on the tradition of religious iconography in order to reveal the multifarious modes of givenness that make the depth and variety of the visible: it is "saturated presence." In particular, whereas the icon appears as a force of self-irradiation that opens up visibility from itself as a full subject, the idol is what is being looked at according to its finitude and limitation as object.

Although not phenomenologically inspired, both Jaussian reception aesthetics in Germany and Balthazarian theological aesthetics in France begin with close links to phenomenology understood as a ruled experience and as a descriptive method for

approaching experience where style is governed by certain regularities.

Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss developed what they called an "aesthetics of reception" in the 1960s. Whereas the latter applied such an aesthetics within the framework of numerous literary works, the former stresses the activity of reading as an intrinsic part of the aesthetic process. The reader is thus constructing the text as a literary work. By leaving space, the author enables the reader to play an active part in the elaboration of the literary process. Thus the author is not the only creator of the work of art, for it is co-generated by the reading process. In a sense, the reader is the one who truly completes the creative role of the author. He is re-creating his/her own story within the written one, which is actually not entirely written, but needs to be continuously unwritten and rewritten. So we have to do with a dynamic process of co-generating the written work, which structurally echoes the phenomenological co-generativity of the subject and the world.

As far as Urs von Balthazar's thrust in theology is concerned, it is characterized by a new approach that puts aesthetics to the fore. Instead of considering revelation from the viewpoint of the true or the good, the divine is seen as beautiful. Theology is a science that puts the divine glory at the center: divine beauty is its glory, a glory that only appears to the faithful and is paroxistically manifested with the crucifixion of Christ. In this respect such an aesthetic theology is not a theological aesthetics insofar as the divine is seen as a beautiful phenomenon, not beauty as a divine experience. Such a contrast is also what radically distinguishes icons from idols. Whereas the latter are looked at as representations of the absolute, thus untruly absolutizing what is actually only a limited representation, the former are direct presentations of the absolute, thus showing the divine manifestation as such. And with this, Balthazar displays close links with the phenomenological approach to the phenomenon as opposed to the classical representative process.

Bibliography

- Becker, Oscar. *Dasein und Dawesen*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1963.
 Casey, Edwards. *Imagining: A Phenomenological Study*.
 Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.

- Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand. Eine phänomenologische Studie." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 2, 1908, 71–118; 3, 1908, 469–511; 4, 1909, 400–455.
- Depraz, Natalie. "Comment l'imagination 'réduit'-elle l'espace?" In *Alter* 4, 1996a, 179–213.
- Depraz, Natalie. "Puissance individuante de l'imagination et métamorphose du logique dans *Erfahrung und Urteil*." In *Phänomenologische Forschungen. Neue Folge* 1, 1996b, 163–338.
- Depraz, Natalie. *Écrire en phénoménologie: "Une autre époque de l'écriture."* Fougères: Encre Marine, 1999.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward Casey. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Fink, Eugen. "Vergegenwärtigung und Bild. Beiträge zur Phänomenologie der Unwirklichkeit" [1930]. In his *Studien zur Phänomenologie 1930–1939*.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–684; *Sur la phénoménologie de la jouissance esthétique*. Grenoble: Millon, 2003.
- Henry, Michel. *Voir l'invisible: Sur Kandinsky*. Paris: François Bourin, 1988.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie* [1913]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 3. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung: Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigung, Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image, Consciousness, and Memory*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931; *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976; *L'acte de lecture*. Brussels, Mardaga, 1985; *The Act of Reading*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. *Das Reich des Schönen. Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *La croisée du Visible*. Paris: La Différence, 1991, rpt. Presses Universitaires de France, 1996; *The Crossing of the Visible*. Trans. James K. A. Smith. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'œil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 159–90.
- Morley, John. "The Private Theater: A Phenomenological Investigation of Day dreaming." In *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology* 29, 1998, 116–134.
- Sallis, John. "L'espacement de l'imagination: Husserl et la phénoménologie de l'imagination." In *Husserl*. Ed. Eliane Escoubas and Marc Richir. Grenoble: Millon, 1989, 65–88.
- Saraiva, Marina M. *L'imagination selon Husserl*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'imaginaire* [1940]. Paris: Gallimard, 1989; *The Psychology of the Imagination*. Trans. Bernard Frechtman. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948.
- Simon, Anne, and Nicolas Castin. *Merleau-Ponty et le littéraire*, Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1997.
- Varela, Francisco J., and Natalie Depraz. "Imagining: Embodiment, Phenomenology, and Transformation." In *Buddhism and Science: Breaking New Ground*. Ed. B. A. Wallace. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003, 195–233.
- Urs von Balthazar, Hans. *Herrlichkeit. Eine theologische Ästhetik*. Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1961; *La gloire et la croix*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1990.

India and Intercultural Aesthetics

Ram Adhar Mall

In combination with the intercultural philosophical orientation developed in India, the concept of an intercultural aesthetics prepares the way for well-founded comparison and a new dialogue among different aesthetic traditions of the world. And it unmasks the myth of the total purity of a culture.

The present entry attempts to address the following points: (1) It is imperative to delineate the important concept of interculturality as clearly as possible and to work out the related concept of an “analogizing hermeneutics” of intercultural thinking and understanding, thereby avoiding a hermeneutics of total identity and radical difference. (2) It is necessary to apply an intercultural orientation to what is here termed the “situated unsituatedness” of an intercultural aesthetics. (3) Such an intercultural orientation will allow us to deal with the discipline of aesthetics within the comparison of cultures, thus enabling us to find basic similarities and illuminating differences among different traditions and theories. This will further allow us to use the term “aesthetics” in its generality as well as in its cultural specificity. (4) Intercultural aesthetics is thus the presupposition of a genuine comparative aesthetics. Any comparison worthy of the name must abstain from any absolutist, exclusive, and essentialist claim. And what an intercultural aesthetics aims at rejecting is exactly the two fictions of a total commensurability and of a radical difference among aesthetic traditions and theories.

The present globally intercultural context today has made one thing abundantly clear: the *de facto* intercultural hermeneutical situation has outgrown the Greco-European and Judeo-Christian interpretation of culture, philosophy, and religion. It calls for a deconstruction of an exclusive relation between truth and tradition. Truth *of* the tradition and truth *in* the tradition are two different things and must not be confused with one another.

The word “hermeneutics” is, no doubt, Greek and Western, but the idea and the practice of it is an anthropological constant. Indian thought, for example, possesses a very rich hermeneutical tradition. The science of hermeneutics as an art of understanding and interpretation is undergoing a fundamental change in the global context of interculturality today and experiencing an unprecedented widening of horizons that does not necessarily go hand in hand with a real fusion of horizons (HANS-GEORG GADAMER’s *Horizontverschmelzung*). This means that every hermeneutics has its own culturally sedimented roots and cannot unconditionally claim universal acceptance. Any dialogue—most importantly, of course, any intercultural one—has to begin from this insight.

The way that continents address each other today is of a different quality, for it takes place in the spirit of reciprocity. The *de facto* hermeneutical situation is characterized by a 4-fold relation. Let us apply this relation to an interculturally oriented discourse between European and non-European thought. First of all, there is the self-hermeneutics of the European mind. Second, there is the European understanding of the non-European mind. This has been the case since Alexander the Great’s invasion of India and the discovery of America by Columbus.

R.A. Mall (✉)

Department of Philosophy, Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Department of Philosophy, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany

Third, there is the self-hermeneutics of non-Europeans. Fourth, however—and this is something novel for the European mind—there is the non-European understanding of Europe. Hermeneutics is thus no longer a one-way street, and the question arises of who better understands whom, when, how, and why. Europe is often surprised today to see itself critically interpreted by non-Europeans.

The concept of an “analogizing hermeneutics” that does justice to such a *de facto* hermeneutical situation is neither the hermeneutics of total identity that reduces the other to an echo of oneself and repeats its own self-understanding in the name of understanding the other, nor is it a hermeneutics of radical difference that makes the understanding of the other quite impossible. It does not put any one culture in an absolute position of generality, reducing all others to some form of it. There is no one universal hermeneutical subject over and above the sedimented cultural and historical subject; what is needed instead is a reflective-meditative attitude accompanying the different subjects with a warning against reductionist tendencies. Such a hermeneutical attitude helps us to overcome the feeling of our being hopelessly involved in the hermeneutical circle. It further frees us from our tendency to define truth in terms of one particular tradition and that tradition in terms of truth.

Such an “analogizing hermeneutics” of overlapping structures beyond the two fictions of total identity (commensurability) and radical difference (incommensurability) also leads to a healthy concept of comparative philosophy that does not absolutize a particular philosophical convention (cf. Mall 1992, 2000). It rejects not only the idea of an absolute text, but also that of an absolute interpretation. Comparative philosophy worthy of the name presupposes an intercultural orientation in philosophy.

The concept of an intercultural world stands for a system or framework that consists of various positions of the *Lebenswelt* or lifeworld. An intercultural aesthetic orientation does not allow any one particular *Lebenswelt* to put itself in an absolute position. The universality of an intercultural perspective is not the universalization of any one particular cultural perspective. It is rather an attitude that requires abstaining from any universal claim of a system of categories embedded in a particular culture. Only such an attitude enables us to see the primordial manifold of cultures. Any aesthetics of an intercultural world thus has the

task of steering between the lack of any cultural pattern and the tendency to homogenize.

It is aesthetic experience as an anthropological constant that functions as a primordial response connecting us with the aesthetic value of beauty. What coincides among cultures is the aesthetic response itself and not so much the manifold of cultural patterns accompanying this response. It is only the manifold of our ways of response that points to the various ways in which aesthetic experience is culturally embedded.

The method that we follow here is a faithful phenomenological description of what we intend (mean) when we talk of aesthetic value, experience, and enjoyment. Such a method must avoid the temptation to ontologize. It is true that there is a necessary circle of cultural embeddedness—but recognizing this helps us further to recognize that situatedness is situatedness after all. There is no exception to it except our intercultural aesthetic orientation.

Aesthetics in an intercultural perspective enables us to see that there is an overlapping universal response that does of course show signs of cultural specificity. Such a view overcomes the tendency to put one particular aesthetic tradition in an absolute position. The science of aesthetics always deals with the subject and the object of aesthetic rapture, and the main concern centers around the relation and tension between the two. In the case of a painting as a work of art, for example, the painting may undoubtedly be a representation, but it is never just a mere echo of the subject. Conversely, the subject fails to find its full realization in the painting. The painting is thus neither totally different from the noetic intentions nor fully identical with them. The following question then arises: how can we overcome the so-called ontological relationship between the painter and the painting? This can be done by refusing to accept the circle of identity between the intended (noetic) meaning of the constituting subject and the intended (noematic) meaning as the constituted object.

The central factor of sedimentation is always at work here too. This helps us bid farewell to a rigid form of structuralism in aesthetics and emancipates the subject and the object of aesthetic experience from absolutizing any one particular *Lebenswelt*-situatedness. What does this emancipation mean, i.e., what does it amount to? It does not mean that we do away with the subject who creates the work, for a picture without an

artist is no picture at all. A painting needs not only a painter, but it also points to something beyond it. It is true that there is an essential relation between art and the artist, but in our acts of understanding, interpreting, and evaluating, we do not merely repeat the relation between the artwork and the artist; instead, we constitute a new relation. This applies to an interculturally oriented aesthetics very well.

The Western aesthetic tradition from Plato to Adorno via Nietzsche is a case in point for the bankruptcy of absolute aesthetic value. Europe knows both a very powerful essentialist and also a relativistic approach to the question of a foundation of the science of aesthetics.

Our concept of an intercultural aesthetics denies any essentialist interpretation that starts from the presupposition of a universally valid fundamental norm, call it God, nature, *Weltgeist*, or whatever. In a debate regarding aesthetics from above (deductive, a priori, speculative, etc.) and an aesthetics from below (inductive, empirical-experiential, open, and tolerant), our intercultural aesthetic orientation takes sides and pleads for aesthetics from below. This does not mean that an interculturally oriented aesthetics must land in a total relativism because it steers between essentialism and relativism and pleads for the discovery and cultivation of the overlapping presence of an aesthetic response that shows signs of cultural embeddedness the moment it takes a concrete shape. An intercultural aesthetics thus rejects the tendency of modernity to overrate the importance of unity as well as that of postmodernity to overrate the importance of plurality. The situated unsituatedness of an intercultural aesthetics makes room for cultural embeddedness, but also transcends it. Intercultural aesthetics appeals to a certain common and overlapping structure of feeling that is capable of manifold manifestations in and among cultures.

As application of our intercultural orientation in aesthetics, I would like to refer to the two most central concepts of Indian aesthetics (*Rashashastra*)—namely, the concept of *Rasa*, which stands for the artifact as well as the aesthetic experience (*rasotapatti* and *rasasvadana*)—and that of *Dhvani*, which does not denote but rather suggests. The Indian aesthetic tradition speaks of eight primordial aesthetic emotional states (*Rasas*). These are: erotic (*shringara*), comic (*hasya*), compassionate (*karuna*), furious (*raudra*), heroic (*vira*), terrifying (*bhayanaka*), disgusting

(*bibhatsa*), and awesome or wondrous (*adbhuta*). A ninth *rasa* (*shanta*) is a later addition to the list and stands for the *summum bonum*, a state of equilibrium, a unique experience of bliss (*ananda*). It is the beginning and end of all the other *Rasas*.

This 9-fold *Rasa*-system tries to explain even the most complex aesthetic experiences and emotions as manifolds of manifestations and organizations of different *Rasas*. Some form of their coexistence is always at work when a work of art is produced and viewed (cf. *Bharata Natya Shastra*, 1971–1981). Indian theories of aesthetic experience steer between the two extremes of the subject (the appreciator or reader) and the object (the artwork or work of literature). They neither declare aesthetic feelings to be merely fleeting and changeable qualities nor make them something fully independent of convention. Indian aesthetics pleads for overlapping contents in the spirit of an interculturally oriented analogizing hermeneutics allowing for fundamental similarities and illuminating differences among intra- and inter-cultural traditions.

Rasa-theory goes hand in hand with the theory of *Dhvani* or suggested meaning. The technical term used here is *Vyanjana*. Normally two kinds of meanings are ascribed to words we use: the primary or denotative meaning, and the secondary meaning, which, though related to the first, covers different forms of literary figures of speech. But Indian aesthetics speaks of a third meaning that is merely suggested and not denoted. It cannot be deduced from the other two meanings. This suggested meaning is really the intended meaning lying deeper than the literal meaning, yet ready to be experienced by a cultivated reader. In this sense, all poetic meanings are suggested. Literal meanings, on the other hand, are apprehended and understood with the help of syntax and semantics.

Many Western critics have maintained that Indian aesthetics is far too religious and mystical because it aims at the realization of an aesthetic *summum bonum* that is equivalent to bliss, eternal peace, and liberation. It is true that Indians speak of an aesthetic rapture called “*Shanta Rasa*” that really stands for a state of calm and repose. The Indian aesthetic theories of *Rasa* and *Dhvani* do presuppose the importance of psychological factors, but there is no psychologism. Such theories plead for the presence of permanent moods (*Sthayibhavas*) without ontologizing them. “The idea of universalization,” Mohanty correctly remarks, “as a step in the constitution of *rasa*

overcomes psychologism, while not falling into the opposite trap of Platonism” (Mohanty 2000: 136).

Since Indian philosophical thought tries to combine a way of thought with a way of life, it deliberately does not exclude the religio-spiritual dimension of emancipatory aesthetic experience. Under the influence of Christianity, philosophical wisdom in Europe was not given the status of a liberating wisdom. In this sense, Patnaik rightly maintains that “*Shanta Rasa*... is perhaps the most unique contribution of India to aesthetics...” (Patnaik 1997: 252). Thus cultures such as the Chinese, Japanese, and Indian, in which the final liberating wisdom is not an exclusive domain of religion, all pursue a goal that is quite close to the *Shanta Rasa* of Indian aesthetics.

Intercultural aesthetics defines aesthetic value to be a dispositional quality of the object of art and literature, a quality that gives rise to aesthetic experience in that it produces, under appropriate conditions, a certain type of response in observers—namely, the aesthetic response. All experience is, by nature, contextual, and this general contextuality of human experience applies to aesthetic experience as well. But this does not mean that aesthetic experience is bound to be purely subjective. What is common to human nature is the aesthetic response that does take different—but not radically different—shape under the influence of cultural traditions. Aesthetic responses may be contrary or even contradictory, but they overlap in that they are still aesthetic responses.

In the spirit of intercultural aesthetics, different aesthetic traditions and theories meet to differ and differ to meet. And this is one of the central contributions of an intercultural aesthetics in the field of aesthetics East and West. Intercultural aesthetics deconstructs narrow-minded fixations and binary division, and it urges all aesthetic traditions to find ways and means to come to terms with the perception of the real beyond all merely ideological constructions claiming to be an a priori of universal taste. The aesthetic subject can accordingly be characterized as a kind of “situated unsituatedness.”

Imaginative recontextualization is always needed when comparisons are made, and this holds true in both inter- and intra-cultural discourses. Aesthetic perception, experience, and enjoyment are beyond the dichotomous evaluation of high and low, refined and primitive. The conceptual framework of modernity was in favor of Western theories of aesthetics and of art. Theodor Adorno and Gilles Deleuze are the exceptions

in providing us with a theoretical and practical perspective to see the beautiful and the sublime in all cultures.

The theory and practice of intercultural aesthetics in the field of comparative aesthetics rejects the idea of an essentialist conception of aesthetic experience developed in one particular culture. It is also critical of the view that aesthetic experience is something purely self-sufficient and beyond all change. An applied intercultural aesthetics presupposes two forms of relativity: first, any work of art is a specific cultural product; and second, the different ways of viewing and interpreting it are contingent and relative to the context in which the viewer is situated. Different artistic performances such as painting, drama, dance, music, and film articulate artistic meanings that are not simply copies of some sort of Platonic ideas; instead, they are authentic expressions of nondiscursively cognized products of our thinking, feeling, and willing.

Nearly all Western theories from Plato to Hegel conceived of semblance (*Schein*) as something of second-rate importance in relation to metaphysical and speculative ideas as the real originals. Our postmetaphysical and postmodern view takes semblances as the originally given phenomena. The given here also means an aesthetic experience that is the result of our reflection and contemplation of the products of art. The well-known triad of truth (*Satyam*), goodness (*Shivam*), and beauty (*Sundaram*) found in many cultures is sometimes taken to be the goal of a holistic aesthetic experience. Whereas European aesthetic thinking about this triad remained more or less metaphysical and speculative, Indian theories of aesthetics suggested in their meditative literature ways and means to realize it. The ultimate aim is the realization of a state of calm or of equilibrium (*Shanta Rasa*). Indian aesthetics may be spiritual in the sense of this aesthetic *summum bonum*, but it does not belittle the importance of the human body and the different nuances of sensation.

Intercultural aesthetics believes in an anthropological anchorage of our aesthetic feelings, judgments, and enjoyments. Just as we receive the sensations of certain colors, sounds, tastes, etc., and this from the very constitution of our natures, so do we aesthetically approve or disapprove of certain actions and objects. This means that aesthetic judgments are primarily based on sensations and feelings, not on abstract and speculative definitions of beauty in works of art and nature.

Deleuze does not posit an opposition between art and technology; rather, he argues for the thesis that the science of aesthetics provides us with a direct knowledge of what is beyond the reach of merely discursive thinking. Thus, he distinguishes a logic of thought and a logic of sensation (cf. Deleuze 1969). This means that there is an epistemological dimension of aesthetic experience that is amply verified by various media, such as photography, painting, and film. Of course, aesthetic epistemology lays more emphasis on some sort of visual anthropology in contrast to metaphysical and purely rationalistic theories of knowledge. Added to this, aesthetic epistemology does not start with the presupposition that aesthetic consensus is the precondition for aesthetic communication. On the other hand, with their universalistic tendency, Kant and Hegel do plead for the universality of aesthetic judgments and do in fact universalize the Eurocentric aesthetic framework.

Intercultural aesthetics today is more empirical, experiential, and experimental and it possesses a philosophical breadth in comparing examples of art from different traditions and cultures. Intercultural aesthetics is thus rightly suspicious of the claim of a theoretical supremacy of any one particular aesthetic tradition. Even in the age of postmodern pluralism, there is, no doubt, a *de facto* acceptance of non-European works of art, but when it comes to judge the conceptual frameworks, the adjective “European” still claims universality and supremacy. But intercultural aesthetics does not and cannot give a privileged treatment to any one particular adjective, be it “European” or not.

In spite of the unparalleled service phenomenological method, particularly the phenomenology of perception (cf. MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY), has done for a philosophy of art and also for an aesthetics of nature, and in spite of the method of the *epoché* (particularly in the spirit of an intercultural orientation), the claim of reaching the most primordial given beyond all cultural, religious, and linguistic sedimentations betrays a tendency toward some sort of essentialism. Such a tendency neglects the irreducibility of our perceptual legacy as a culturally and historically contingent phenomenon. It seems that the very idea of a given beyond all sedimentations, of a context beyond all contexts, is a philosophical assumption. The only way out here seems to be to have recourse to some sort of an “anthropology of an open question” (*Helmuth Plessner’s Anthropologie der offenen Frage*). There is

no synthetic a priori faculty, and we are committed to a phenomenologically oriented empirical approach in the genuine spirit of an intercultural philosophy.

It is true that human beings always have a feeling of uneasiness in their contact with the bare reality as it is there to be confronted. There are mainly two moves to come to terms with such an experience. We either engage in a therapeutic process of freeing ourselves by developing a conceptual distance and forcing the real to fit into it, or we delve deeply into the intensive perception of the real (and do so with different degrees of commitment). This is where the purely philosophical and the aesthetic perception of the real differ. Whenever a particular tradition of thought emphasizes the role of ethics more than that of aesthetics, it fails to do full justice to aesthetic actions that claim to have a direct, unmediated approach to reality. Non-European traditions seem to have treated the two fields of human activity on an equal footing. A philosophical tradition that claims a special position for the human species in the greater household of cosmic nature tends to treat an aesthetics of nature as a stepmother. Cultures with the conviction of a general constitutive embeddedness of the human species along with other species on an equal footing tend to speak of a culture of feeling in its own right.

The Taoist aesthetics of “emptiness” is full of suggestiveness, simplicity, and faith in an all-encompassing cosmic nature, and rejects the idea of a nature *sui generis* of aesthetic judgments as a human prejudice. While taking a leisurely walk with his friend Hui Tzu along the dam of the Hao River, Chuang Tzu, the famous Taoist philosopher, spoke of the “happiness of the fish.” He said, “the white fish are swimming at ease. This is the happiness of the fish.” “You are not a fish,” said Hui Tzu. “How do you know its happiness?” “You are not I,” said Chuang Tzu. “How do you know I do not know the happiness of the fish?” Hui Tzu said, “Of course I do not know, since I am not you. But you are not the fish, and it is perfectly clear that you do not know the happiness of the fish.” “Let us get at the bottom of the matter,” said Chuang Tzu. “When you asked how I knew the happiness of the fish, you already knew that I knew the happiness of the fish, but asked how. I knew it along the river” (CHAN 1969: 209f.).

In this simple allegory lies the deep-rooted epistemological principle that the like knows the like, a principle that binds not only all human beings beyond cultural boundaries, but all things and beings in the

greater household of cosmic nature. Even Kant, in spite of his transcendental move in the field of epistemology and his idea of a higher meaning behind all forms of nature, speaks of the bird's song telling us "of joyousness and contentment with its existence" (Kant 1952: §42, 161f.).

It is art, then, that fulfills the promises that nature makes. To try to understand the beauty of nature in terms of art has always been a Western move in aesthetic theories claiming to redeem and correct nature. However, such an attitude seems to be quite arrogant toward nature. Intercultural aesthetics tries to bridge the gap between the philosophy of art and the aesthetics of nature at large (cf. Deutsch 1997, Patnaik 1997, Waldenfels 1987, Paetzold 1997).

To idealize the beauty of nature merely according to the model of human wishes and desires entails some type of human prejudice. Added to this, such a way of looking at the beauty of nature is far too anthropocentric. Any experience of the beauty of nature has hardly anything to do with promises made by nature; it is rather an experience of unity with nature that is, no doubt, both beautiful and ugly, peaceful and wild. The beauty of nature experienced without preconceived plans is, in the long run, full of consolation. The real spirit of an aesthetics of nature is against any total instrumentalization of nature whereby nature has no right to exist on its own. Nature is there to be perceived, felt, and understood with a deep-rooted hint at a reciprocal bond between human art and the beauty of nature. Cultivation of an aesthetics of nature is an imperative today more than ever before because of a deadly anthropocentric and arrogant attitude toward nature at large (cf. SASAKI 1997, Böhme 1997).

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973; *Aesthetic Theory*. Trans. R. Hullot-Kentor, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

- Bharata Natya Shastra*, with "Abhinavabharati" by Ahinavagupta. Ed. with Sanskrit commentary "Madhusudani" and Hindi translation by M. Shastri. 3 Vols. Varanasi: 1971–1981.
- Böhme, Gernot. "Aesthetic Knowledge of Nature." In *Issues in Contemporary Culture and Aesthetics* 5, 1997.
- Chan Wing-Tsit, ed. and trans. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Logique du sens*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1969; *The Logic of Sense*. Trans. Mark Lester and Charles Stivale. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Deutsch, Eliot. *Studies in Comparative Aesthetics*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilskraft* [1790]; *The Critique of Judgement*. Trans. James Creed. Meredith: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Mall, Ram A. "Metonymic Reflections on Shankara's Concept of Brahman and Plato's Seventh Epistle." In *Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 9, 1992, 89–102.
- Mall, Ram A. *Intercultural Philosophy*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
- Mohanty, Jitendra N. *Classical Indian Philosophy: An Introductory Text*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
- Paetzold, Heinz. "How to Bridge the Gap between the Philosophy of Art and Aesthetics of Nature: A Systematic Approach." In *Issues in Contemporary Culture and Aesthetics* 5, 1997.
- Patnaik, Priya-Darshi. *Rasa in Aesthetics*. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 1997.
- Sasaki Ken-icchi. "Consolation of Nature: An Essay in Critique of Formative Reason." In *Issues in Contemporary Culture and Aesthetics* 5, 1997.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. "Homogenisierung ohne Gewalt? Zu einer Phänomenologie der Interkulturalität im Anschluss an Husserl." In *Philosophie aus interkultureller Sicht*. Ed. Notker Schneider. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997; "Violence? A Phenomenology of Interculturality following Husserl." In *Phenomenology: Critical Concepts in Philosophy*. Ed. Dermot Moran and Lester Embree. London: Routledge, 2004, 292–299.
- Waldenfels, Bernhard. *Ordnung im Zwielficht*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1987; *Order in Twilight*. Trans. David J. Ponent. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1996.

Roman Ingarden (1893–1970)

Andrzej Gniazdowski

The foundations of Ingarden's aesthetics were formed in the context of his polemic with EDMUND HUSSERL'S transcendental idealism (Ingarden 1929). The critical function and productive employment of the *phenomenological method* determines the autonomy and theoretical relevance of his aesthetics. Aesthetics is a basic domain of his ontology (i.e., investigations into the necessary connections between pure ideal qualities by means of intuitive analysis of the contents of ideas). He first offered this definition in *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931), where he also indicated its object, thereby determining his later investigations: aesthetics should be a *realm of intentional objects*, as contrasted with objects of the real world (1973a: lxii). The eidetic investigations of the literary work of art prepared the starting point for an analysis of the idea and mode of real being in Ingarden's fundamental work, *Der Streit um die Existenz der Welt* (1964).

Ingarden's aesthetic reflections concern three basic areas: (1) the ontology of the various types of works of art (Ingarden 1989); (2) the problems of the *aesthetic experience* and the *cognition* of works of art (e.g., Ingarden 1937); and (3) *axiological topics* and their establishment in works of art (Ingarden 1957a: 167–173). He also deals with questions of aesthetic systematization, and his studies of aesthetic criticism and the history of aesthetics are yet another category (Ingarden 1985: 45–79). In general, he attempts to overcome both “objectivistic” aesthetics, which focuses on the work of art, and “subjectivistic” aesthetics, which focuses on the experiencing subject, and he critically examines

psychologism and reductionism in aesthetics (Ingarden 1985: 79–91). Based on the ontologically reinterpreted category of *intentionality*, aesthetics has as its object the unity of the aesthetic situation as a whole, and analyzes both its sides as constituting themselves in this situation (ibid.: 30).

Acknowledging the purely intentional mode of being of the work of art, Ingarden distinguishes between the artwork as an *aesthetic object* and as an *artistic object*. Aesthetic objects, as distinct from existentially autonomous individual objects, are existentially heteronymous, i.e., derivative and existentially dependent on the *acts* constituting them—the creative acts of the artist and the receptive experience of a reader, listener, or spectator. Although an aesthetic object arises as the object of an aesthetic experience, it is at the same time an existentially *separate* object: it forms a complete *whole* transcendent of the acts (Ingarden 1964: §50).

As an intentional object built on its material basis, the work of art is a *schematic formation*: it contains *areas of indeterminacy* and potential moments. A separate object does not constitute itself before the process of its *concretization*. Ingarden's category of concretization (actualization of the areas of indeterminacy of the aesthetic object in the aesthetic experience) underlines the *creativity* of aesthetic reception. He set the identity of the work of art against the multitude of its possible concretizations: the shape they take is determined by the work itself as well as by the epoch's cultural features. Each concretization is something in which the work manifests itself, and this is the basis of its historical *life* (Ingarden 1973: 251, 247, 343). The verification of the subjective character of concretization is conditioned by the possibility of a theoretical, cognitive (re-creative) approach to the

A. Gniazdowski (✉)

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa, Poland

work that goes beyond its purely aesthetic perception (Ingarden 1957b: I, 191).

The work of art is *stratified* from the lowest stratum founded in the material properties of its substrate to, in the case of a literary work, the stratum of *represented objectivities* and *schematized aspects*. This builds a *framework* of the work involving close, organic connections with the other strata that form its existential foundations (Ingarden 1958: II 210). On this stratum alone, which is *autotelic* to a certain degree, specific *metaphysical qualities* can arise: the sublime, the tragic, the grotesque, etc. (Ingarden 1973: 290). The number of those strata and the character of those connections depend on the type of artwork and the kind of material in which it is executed, from the single stratum of a musical work to the multistratified structure of a literary work as a cultural formation of high complexity. Besides the stratified structure, some types of work have a *phasic structure*, e.g., a literary or musical work, play, film, etc., as quasi-temporal objects (Ingarden 1973: 306). The temporality immanent in the concretizations of those works of art has a *qualitative* character and does not join in the *continuum* of real time (Ingarden 1986).

Another dimension “interwoven” with the stratification is the *qualitative structure*. The *system and typology of aesthetically relevant qualities* are important. The distinction between *artistic qualities*, existing in the work itself, and *aesthetic qualities*, appearing in its aesthetic concretization, is also significant (Ingarden 1969). Among the aesthetically neutral qualities fall artistically valuable qualities significant for the constitution of aesthetically valuable qualities that build the *aesthetically valuable skeleton* of the work. Thus selection and mutual connections allow aesthetically valuable qualities to appear that lead to the emergence of an overall *aesthetic value* in the work as a whole (Ingarden 1985: 105).

Ingarden’s conception of aesthetically relevant qualities reformulates the question of the *objectivity* of aesthetic values. He defied those according to whom aesthetic values and estimations are subjective and unverifiable. For him, aesthetic valuation is founded on “seeing,” i.e., on an intuitive grasp of the qualities themselves in the process of aesthetic experience, on the emotional response to the value in its final phase. The condition of possibility of this experience is the adoption of an aesthetic attitude and the preliminary emotion that triggers the process of perception

of the qualitative structure of the work and of its concretization. An aesthetic experience that constitutes a positively or negatively valuated aesthetic object is a composite process containing many phases and involving many factors: perceptual, emotional, imaginative, and intellectual. For Ingarden, only aesthetic judgments based on the achievement of the entire aesthetic process are sufficiently grounded (ibid.: 107–132).

The phenomenological aesthetics of Roman Ingarden was a constant source of inspiration for Polish representatives of many branches of the study on art, despite the absence of any clearcut “Ingarden school.” As early as the 1930s Ingarden’s students Bolesław Lewicki and Zofia Lissa, while making use of his ideas, presented their own approaches to the work of film (Lewicki 1935, Lissa 1937). After World War II, his methodological approach was continued by, for example, Janina Makota (1964), Jerzy Gątecki (1962), and Maria Gołaszewska (1973), who relates Ingarden’s ontological analysis of the aesthetic situation to research in empirical sociology. The course of the continuation as well as of the critical reception of Ingarden’s aesthetic views increased after the publication of previously untranslated work into English, in the three-volume *Studies in Aesthetics* (Ingarden 1957b, 1958, 1970). There was a debate about his ontology with the Marxist position of Stefan Morawski, Bohdan Dziemidok (a theoretician of literature), Henryk Markiewicz, and Michał Głowiński. Noteworthy is the polemic against Ingarden launched by semiotician Jerzy Pelc, who does not accept Ingarden’s conception of the literary work of art as an intentional object, and by the Polish writer Stanisław Lem (1968).

Ingarden’s aesthetics has exercised considerable influence in Europe and North America. The first influence was on NICOLAI HARTMANN, who applied the concept of stratum to other art forms. Ingarden emphasized his affinities with Emil Staiger and also influenced the works of Günther Müller, Julius Petersen, and Wolfgang Kayser. In Germany after World War II, research on the structure, morphology, and truth-value of the literary work develops in constant dialogue with Ingarden’s views. This involves, for example, Franz Stanzel, Käte Hamburger, Frank Maatje, Joseph Strelka, and Erwin Leibfried. Ingarden’s ontology of the literary artwork also provided useful frameworks for Hans Robert Jauss’s reception theory and Wolfgang Iser’s reader-response theory. In contrast to

the traditional interpretation, which sought to elucidate a hidden meaning in the text, Iser, like Ingarden, wanted to see meaning as an effect that is experienced, not an object that must be found (see Holub 2001: 659). MIKEL DUFRENNE adopted many of Ingarden's central concepts; Harold Osborne sympathized with Ingarden's phenomenological approach; and Jerome Stolnitz developed his distinction between artistic and aesthetic values. In the United States, there are echoes in the work of René Wellek and Austin Warren (1949), who are translated into many languages, and Wellek's later book (1981) offers an extensive analysis of Ingarden. The terminology of Tzvetan Todorov (1967) goes in a direction similar to Ingarden's aesthetic theory. Dietrich Steinbeck (1970) continued his phenomenological approach in his theory of the theater, but in opposition to Ingarden's conception of the theatrical artwork as a "borderline" phenomenon of literature.

The most instructive confrontation is between Ingarden's ontology and the doctrines of Russian formalism (Victor Shklovsky, Jan Mukarovsky, Roman Jakobson), which was also influenced by Husserlian phenomenology. They share antipsychologism; they focus on the literary work itself; they exclude such factors as biography, history, sociology, etc.; acknowledge the fictionalness of the literary work of art based on the "quasi-judgmental" character of literary sentences; and they are concerned with its "structure." What is unacceptable for Ingarden, however, is the formalist definition of the literary work of art as a "linguistic formation," i.e., a verbal product, and the reduction of its analysis to "stylistic studies" (Ingarden 1957a: I, 337). He challenges the formalist and the Prague structuralist rejection of "form" and "content" in the literary work (Ingarden 1958: II, 357–494) and differs with the formalist view whereby the "form" of a work is perceivable only as a "deviation" from the "canon" (Striedter 1969). For Czech structuralism (e.g., Felix Vodicka), Ingarden took into consideration neither the dynamics of the total literary process nor the changes of social structure in the various periods of its reception.

His theory of the artwork was also criticized from Marxist and semiotic orientations, e.g., the semiotics of culture as introduced by the Tartu school (Jurij Levin, Jurij Lotman, and Boris Uspenskij). The main objection is against the primary topic of investigations being the structure and essential features of the

work treated as an isolated objectivity, rather than as a mere component of communicative acts within the framework of a particular language of artistic conventions.

Bibliography

- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Dziemidok, Bohdan, and Peter J. McCormick, eds. *On the Aesthetics of Roman Ingarden: Interpretations and Assessments*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- Falk, Eugene H. *The Poetics of Roman Ingarden*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- Gałecki, Jerzy. *Problematyka estetyki*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1962.
- Gołaszewska, Maria. *Zarys estetyki: Problematyka, metody, teorie*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1973.
- Grabowicz, George G. "Translators Introduction." In Roman Ingarden, *The Literary Work of Art*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Graff, Piotr, and Stanisław Krzemień-Ojak, eds. *Roman Ingarden and Contemporary Polish Aesthetics*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1975.
- Hamburger, Käthe. *Die Logik der Dichtung*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1957.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953.
- Holub, Robert C. "Reception Theory." In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Ed. Thomas O. Sloane. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Ingarden, Roman. "Bemerkungen zum Problem Idealismus-Realismus." In *Festschrift. Edmund Husserl zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1929, 159–90.
- Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature. With an Appendix on the Functions of Language in the Theater*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973a.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Vom Erkennen des literarische Kunstwerks* [1937]. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 13. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1997; *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973b.
- Ingarden, Roman. "La valeur esthétique et le problème de son fondement objectif." In *Atti del III Congresso internazionale di Estetica*, Venezia 3–5 Settembre 1956. Turin: Edizioni della Rivista di Estetica, 1957a, 167–173.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Studia z estetyki*. 3 vols. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1957b, 1958, 1970.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst. Musikwerk, Bild, Architektur*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1962; *Ontology of the Work of Art: The Musical Work, the Picture, the Architectural Work, the Film*. Trans. Raymond Meyer with John T. Goldthwait. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1989.

- Ingarden, Roman. *Der Streit um die Existenz der Welt*. 3 vols. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1964a; *Time and Modes of Being*. Partial trans. [from the Polish ed.] Helen R. Michajda. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1964b.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Erlebnis, Kunstwerk und Wert. Vorträge zur Ästhetik 1937–1967*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1969.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Selected Papers in Aesthetics*. Ed. Peter J. McCormick. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press/Munich: Philosophia Verlag/loc, 1985.
- Ingarden, Roman. *The Musical Work and the Problem of Its Identity*. Trans. [from the Polish ed. of "Das Musikwerk"] Adam Czerniawski. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976; *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Jauss, Hans R. *Toward an Aesthetic Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Kayser, Wolfgang. *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk*. Bern: Francke, 1948.
- Leibfried, Erwin. *Kritische Wissenschaft vom Text*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1970.
- Lem, Stanisław. *Filozofia przypadku: Literatura w świetle empirii*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1968.
- Lewicki, Bolesław. *Budowa dzieła filmowego [1935]; O filmie. Wybór pism*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1995.
- Lissa, Zofia. *Muzyka i film*. L'vov: Ossolineum, 1937.
- Maatje, Frank C. *Der Doppelroman*. Groningen: Wolters, 1964.
- Magliola, Robert R. *Phenomenology and Literature: An Introduction*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1977.
- Makota, Janina. *O klasyfikacji sztuk pięknych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1964.
- Mitscherling, Jeffrey A. *Roman Ingarden's Ontology and Aesthetics*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1996.
- Müller, Günther. "Über die Seinsweise der Dichtung." In *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 17, 1939, 137–152.
- Osborne, Harold. *Aesthetics and Criticism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955.
- Pelc, Jerzy. "O istnieniu i strukturze dzieła literackiego." In *Studia Filozoficzne* 3, 1958, 121–164.
- Petersen, Julius. *Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1939.
- Smith, Barry. "Roman Ingarden: Ontological Foundations for Literary Theory." In *Language, Literature, and Meaning*. Vol. 1. Ed. John Odmark. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1978, 373–390.
- Sosnowski, Leszek, ed. *Estetyka Romana Ingardena: Problemy i perspektywy*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1993.
- Staiger, Emil. *Grundbegriffe der Poetik*. Zürich: Atlantis Verlag, 1946.
- Stanzl, Frank. *Typische Formen des Romans*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1964.
- Steinbeck, Dietrich. *Einleitung in die Theorie und Systematik der Theaterwissenschaft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.
- Stolnitz, Jerome. "The Artistic Values in Aesthetic Experience." In *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32, 1973, 5–15.
- Strelka, Joseph. *Vergleichende Literaturkritik*. Bern: Francke, 1970.
- Striedter, Jurij. "Introduction." In *Texte der Russischen Formalisten*. 2 vols. Ed. Jurij Striedter. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1969, IX–LXXXIII/misc.
- Szczepańska, Anita. *Estetyka Romana Ingardena*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1989.
- Tihanov, Galin. "Why Did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe? (And Why is it Now Dead?)." In *Common Knowledge* 10, 2004, 61–81.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *Littérature et signification*. Paris: Larousse, 1967.
- Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa, ed. *Ingardeniana III: Roman Ingarden's Aesthetics in a New Key and the Independent Approaches of Others: The Performing Arts, the Fine Arts, and Literature*. *Analecta Husserliana* 33. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- Felix Vodička, "Literární historie, její problémy a úkoly". In his: Čtení o jazyce a poezii. Ed. B. Havránek and J. Mukařovský. Prague: Družstevní práce, 1942, 309–339.
- Węgrzecki, Adam, ed. *Roman Ingarden a filozofia naszego czasu*. Kraków: 1995 [includes, among others, Walter Biemel, "Ingarden als Phänomenologe der Kunst. Bemerkungen zu seiner Deutung des Musikwerkes," 193–208, and Hans Rainer Sepp, "Ingardens Ontologie des filmischen Kunstwerks im Kontext klassischer Filmtheorien," 229–246].
- Wellek, René. *Four Critics: Croce, Valéry, Lukács, Ingarden*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981.
- Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949.
- Wilkożewska, Krystyna (ed.). *Wizje i re-wizje: Wielka księga estetyki w Polsce*. Krakow: Universitas, 2007.

Japanese Worlds

ŌHASHI Ryōsuke

In the strict sense of the word, there has been no “aesthetics” in Asia, as has also been the case with “philosophy.” If “aesthetics” in the traditional sense is applied in observing Asian lifeworlds, the phenomena of these worlds are looked at through colored glasses, i.e., in a way of thinking that is alien to them. A gap between interpretation and fact will be inevitable. Such a gap was pointed out when the Japanese thinker KUKI Shūzō (九鬼周造) (1888–1941) visited MARTIN HEIDEGGER in Marburg around 1926. At that time KUKI was writing his book *いきの構造* (*Iki no kōzō*, The structure of “iki,” 1930), which became renowned in Japan, while Heidegger was preparing *Sein und Zeit* (1927).

“*Iki*” (いき) is an aesthetic expression in gestures, speech, styles of dress, architectural space, color, design, and so forth. It was formed in the lifeworld of the late Edo period. (although Heidegger did not record his recollections of the dialogue with KUKI until 1953–1954; see Heidegger 1985: 79–146). Because Heidegger saw that KUKI tried to explain “*iki*” with the method and concepts of European aesthetics, he asked whether it is necessary and right for Asians to accept and follow the conceptual systems that evolved out of European traditions. He had misgivings about the language with which Western metaphysics was built, and which was also used in the dialogue (Kuki spoke German and French fluently)—a language that inevitably transferred everything into something European.

In the published version of their dialogue, KUKI attempts—perhaps because of Heidegger’s caution—to approach to “*iki*” in a hermeneutical way, though he still uses the traditional metaphysical categories of *causa finalis* or *causa materialis*. If phenomenology is understood as an approach that takes a critical attitude toward the self-evident superiority of reason, and is characterized with the motto “to the matters themselves” (*Zu den Sachen selbst*), it is *also* to be understood as a fundamental methodology of letting the matter “*iki*” be visible from itself, as it is implied in every philosophical argument.

Our topic is the Japanese world. How can a phenomenological hermeneutics be employed in elucidating this topic? It will not be a matter of collecting data from these various worlds and analyzing them to produce an image. The image thus produced might give a bird’s-eye view of the phenomena in these worlds, but it cannot make these phenomena visible directly in their own being. The approach taken here is to treat individual phenomena directly in such a way that their essential character and meaning are made visible. That goal requires anticipating an entire horizon.

This horizon can be addressed under the title of “climate.” It is the most fundamental element in determining a lifeworld in general. In addition to the ordinary meteorological understanding of climate, we say that climate is also determined historically and socially. It must be differentiated from the mere natural surroundings, and can be regarded as the natural world as determined by social history. Pioneers in this approach are Johann G. von Herder and WATSUJI Tetsurō (和辻哲郎) (1889–1960). I am influenced by WATSUJI, but he did not develop the notion of “climate” as the basic determination of the field of aesthetic sense.

ŌHASHI R. (✉)
Ryūkyoku University, Kyoto, Japan

The aesthetics of the Japanese world addressed in such a phenomenological approach is different from the research presented in the classic literature on painting, poetry, calligraphy, etc. Literature supports the argument here, but it is neither the topic nor the starting point of the analysis. This is because lifeworlds often remain behind the documents, which are written with letters or characters, reaching abstract thought at very high levels, and are usually produced on the side of those in power. Therefore we should seek the starting point not in literary works, but in “climate” as a basic element of the lifeworld.

The concept of “climate” at stake here is taken from WATSUJI’s 風土 (Fûdo; Wind-Earth, 1935), which he wrote under the influence of Herder’s “climatology,” but mainly as a critical response to Heidegger’s *Sein und Zeit*. He argues that Heidegger pays attention to “time” but almost ignores “space.” Although this objection against Heidegger cannot be maintained today, WATSUJI’s idea of “wind-earth,” the Japanese word for climate, still deserves attention. Climate in his sense is differentiated from the mere natural environment. It is the natural circumstance as formed by culture and history, which are in turn conditioned by mere nature. It is a cultural, historical, and environmental concept of the lifeworld. He tries to characterize and categorize lifeworlds according to their type of climate. Yet he did not apply his own concept to his own aesthetic reflections in his many essays on art.

As the first step, let us direct our attention to “earth,” “water,” “fire,” and “wind,” which are the four natural elements—not in the sense of mere objects, but of lifeworlds. Within the tradition of metaphysics, they were conceived as materiality, something that has no life and has a low rank in the hierarchy of ontological values. They were therefore not regarded as aesthetic topics. But as long as they make up the basis of lifeworlds, they deserve more attention, and the human experience of them differs from region to region.

Due to limitations of space, we shall confine ourselves to “water,” but the following reflection could also be developed for “earth,” “fire,” or “wind.” As Gaston Bachelard attempted in *La psychanalyse du feu* (1949), excellent reflections on the phenomena of fire are possible, and while he limited himself to fire, he believed it possible to extend his approach to all other natural elements. He treated fire not as an object of scientific research, but as—to say it with our term—an element of the lifeworld, because fire has determined

human life in the psychoanalytical dimension since ancient times.

“Water” is not only a possible subject for aesthetics, but is of course a fundamental element of any lifeworld as well. In his *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (1963), Mircea Eliade has collected various images of water that are common to religions all over the world: life, inundation, purity, salvation, monsters, fairies, etc. In this regard, Bachelard’s *L’eau et les rêves* (1969) supports the same result. But we offer a case study to show what is possible for a “climatologic aesthetics” and we limit ourselves to the geographical area of Japan.

It is still too early to conclude that the experience of “water” is the same all over the world. In Europe, Thales, the founding father of the philosophy of nature, said that “the principle origin of everything is water.” Inasmuch as this saying triggered the beginning of speculation, one can say that an experience of water contributed to the beginning of philosophy. This experience was developed into a philosophy of nature that, through the long process of the history of alchemy in the Middle Ages, became the matrix of modern natural science. In this cultural tradition in Europe, water was always seen as a material thing. Thus one can find 811 proverbs in the *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon*, all of which mention “water” with regard to its material character.

The water experience in China is different. A striking tendency of expressions including the word “water” in ancient Chinese literature is that it is often seen in a moralistic viewpoint. The comparison that Chuang Tzu (莊子) makes of the way wise men keep company with the image of flowing water is only one example. It is well known that Lao Tzu (老子) tells the secret of living in the world with the image of water, often together with images of babies and women.

Specialists in art history will remind us of the fact that there is a long Chinese tradition of so-called “mountain-water painting.” But the deep motif of this painting is mostly shown in small human figures in the middle, usually Taoist monks walking up the mountain. The motif is religious and moralistic, because the inner experience of the monks is expressed with the environmental features of mountains and rivers.

What about Japan? To anticipate the conclusion, water experience in Japan is extraordinarily aesthetic, and this fact already suggests the specific climate in Japan. In the middle of the mainland between the

Pacific Ocean and the Sea of Japan, mountainous regions extend through the greater part of the island, where a humid climate is formed by the rainy season before summer, typhoons in summer and autumn, and snowfall in winter. This climate is of course quite different not only from that of a desert area, but also from that of the Asian continent. It is no wonder that the sensitivity of the Japanese to “water” is also different from that in the other climates.

At first we may pay attention to a group of expressions in which the Japanese word “water” (*mizu*, 水) is contained. “*Mizu-mo-shitataru-yoi-otoko*” (水も滴る良い男) means “handsome boy.” But the description “handsome” (*mizu-mo-shitataru*, 水も滴る) tells us nothing when translated literally into English: “as-if-water-is-dripping down.” Similarly, the expression “*mizu-kusai*”, (水臭い), literally the smell of water, has nothing to do with smell; instead it has a slight nuance of blame for a close friend who is distant and will not be open. Thus behind the expression there lies a particularly sensitive comparison of people to water, flows on without becoming attached to anything. “*Mizugiwa-datta*” (水際だった) means “outstanding,” but this English word does not need to be supplemented by the word “water.” The Japanese expression alludes to the beauty of “*mizugiwa*” (水際) the water landscape on the shore of a pond or the sea. “*Mizu-shobai*” (水商売)—literally, “the water business”—means the profession of a hostess in a bar or club. This expression is combined with the image of an unsteady state of flowing water, that is, of someone who often changes his/her partner, and has a nuance of decadence.

A term used in Kabuki theater, “*nure-ba*” (濡れ場) or “*nure-goto*” (濡れ事)—literally, “wet scene” or “wet thing”—means a love scene. Such usage may come from the hot summer in Japan, when trees and grasses are caught in a sudden shower and become wet and refreshed. The feeling can be compared with that of the lovers sitting close together, with the direct expression of love rather moderated.

“*Mizuho*” (瑞穂) the beautifully ripe rice, is written with a Chinese character that originally meant “gem.” What the ancient Chinese found especially beautiful was the gem, while the ancient Japanese found the corresponding beauty in “*mizu*” (瑞), water. “*Mizue*” (瑞枝) means beautiful and young twigs, “*mizugaki*” (瑞垣) means a pretty hedge, and “*mizu-ha*” (瑞歯) means a the healthy tooth. “*Mizu-mizu-shii*”

(瑞瑞しい) means a certain quality of being fresh and shiny with dew; the literal translation into English would be “water-water-like,” which does not make sense.

Additionally, we should recollect some Chinese characters formed with the left-hand side meaning “water”—for example, those for “pure” (清) “dirty” (濁) and “muddy” (汚) None of the equivalent European words developed out of expressions originally pertaining to “water.” As mentioned, these words in Chinese are often used with a moralistic nuance, but in Japan they are often used in an aesthetic context. The so-called “purifying” or “pure and light heart” in Shintoism is written with the character “pure,” whose left-hand side means “water.”

The traces of these verbal expressions can also be confirmed in the plastic arts and architecture. A typical example is to be found in the Ise Shrine, which is rebuilt every 20 years on the neighboring site kept vacant during this period. The form of the roof is the prototype of the style named “*nagare-zukuri*” (流れ造り), the flow style. The name is surely derived from the flow of water in rivers, which, in contrast with those on a continent, are relatively short in Japan and flow rather swiftly, particularly in fields near mountains. It thus expresses the climate in Japan.

The climatic-cultural element of water is to be seen in every Shinto shrine. To enter the ground, one must cross a bridge, which divides the secular and the purified worlds. Being beyond a river or a brook, the precinct is sacred, because it is sanctified by water. Therefore visitors should wash their hands with water at the entrance before they enter the precinct.

Let us now turn to painting. The motif of “water” is dominant in Japanese art history. The most remarkable phenomenon is the painting of “rain.” This motif is quite rare in European painting, while it is quite popular in Japanese woodcuts. Usually it is the rain in the afternoon in summer, called “*yu-dachi*” (夕立, summer afternoon shower). When it comes, the trees and grasses that were drooping and wilted because of the heat become fresh again, while passers-by caught in such a shower run into or shelter under the eaves of a house. Vincent van Gogh once tried to copy a work by the woodcut painter HIROSHIGE Ando (安藤広重) (1797–1858). The scene shows a bridge caught in a summer afternoon shower, over which passers-by are running, which is a typical summer afternoon scene in Japan. The long and fine lines of the rain cross the

picture from right above to left below. Painters knew that these lines can be a good motif for wood-cut painting. But van Gogh did not know the feeling of the lifeworld related to the shower that is called “*yudachi*.” What he painted on the canvas was an exotic landscape put into a drowning frame, not the summer afternoon shower that is familiar to the Japanese.

Of course, there is an Austrian painter who repeatedly painted rain as a main subject: Fritz Hundertwasser (1928–2000). But it was after his visit to Japan in 1961, and as a result of his cooperation with Japanese woodcut painters, that he began to paint rain. He married a Japanese woman and named himself “HYAKUSUI” (百水) which means “hundred water.” What he expressed, however, was phantasy-like rain, and not the rain experienced in the lifeworld in Japan.

After the Meiji era, the motif of rain was also pursued by modern Japanese painters. In a work by FUKUDA Heihachirō (福田平八郎) (1892–1974) entitled *Rain*, we see the moment when it has begun to rain on the tiled roof. The first drops of the rain reach the roof tiles forming a line associated with the works of so-called formalist painters. In this moment, the otherwise inorganic tiles begin to live with the shining freshness expressed in the term “*mizu-mizu-shii*.”

The examples above are all drawn from the realm of the arts, which seems to distance them from everyday life, hence from the “lifeworld.” But it is not so difficult now to overcome this distance, since the “water” experience in these artistic expressions is originally the same as that in everyday life. The most refined but at the same time the most direct expression of this experience can be found in the way of tea, the tea ceremony. In the canonical text “*Nampōroku*” (南方録)—a text on the tea ceremony in the form of notes of the words spoken by the tea master RIKYŪ (1522–1592), presumably recorded by his disciple NANBŌ Sōkei (南坊宗啓)—it is said that the essence of the way of tea is “nothing but to make fire, boil water, and drink tea” (§2 of Chapter “*Metsugo*” [滅後]). The tea ceremony will perform nothing that is not done in the everyday lifeworld.

A possible aesthetics of a Japanese lifeworld could be developed if one could find the “climate”-character in it with the experience of the natural elements “earth,” “water,” “fire,” and “wind.” It must be pointed out that there are many texts treating the practical etiquette and secret of the tea ceremony or way of tea, albeit without developing a systematic theory. This is

the same as in other art-ways, because in all these fields the way of “art” is always combined with that of life, and the distance needed for a theoretical reflection has often been regarded negatively. The weakness of being undeveloped in theory is the obverse of the strength of practical training. But phenomenological description can cope with this dilemma.

Let us consider the specifically aesthetic expressions of “water” experience in the tea-way. It is no wonder that drinking water of special quality is sought and chosen. If it is found, the transport must be done extraordinarily carefully, so that the taste is not spoiled. If normal well water is used, “the water fresh from the well in the morning is used,” and “the water of the afternoon is not to be used,” because the water in the morning is “in the beginning of the Yin-part and the clear air is on the surface,” while the water in the afternoon and night is “in the Yang-part, into which air has sunk, and something harmful is contained” (§12 in Chapter “*Oboegaki*” [覚書]).

The next concern is for the water to be sprinkled in the garden and on the path to the tea house. There is what is termed the “three-times-water,” i.e., the sprinkling of water in the morning at noon, and in the evening, or before, during, and after the visit of the guests at the tea ceremony. The water sprinkling should not be taken too lightly. “The [sprinkling of] water in the morning, at noon, and in the evening is all deeply significant” (§5 in Chapter “*Oboegaki*” [覚書]) for this three-times-water requires the watchfulness of the host who performs the “once-ness of the meeting” (*ichigo-ichie*, 一期一会). The same watchfulness with regard to aesthetic sense is performed when the host uses water to extinguish the footprints of the guests left on the snow. The purity of the snow can thus be restored.

It should be added that this watchfulness is also directed toward keeping the lavatory clean. “As to the lavatory at the tea room path, the detail of the rules follows that of a Zen monastery, determined by HYAKUJŌ” (百丈), who was a Zen master during the Tang dynasty, 749–814 (§21 in Chapter “*Metsugo*” [滅後]). The lavatory must be purified with dry sand and water. The book *Nampōroku* (南方録) describes the astonishing carefulness of the tea master SEN NO RIKYŪ in keeping the lavatory clean for his guests. This alertness seems to be dispensed with today, since the lavatory is replaced with a flush toilet. But the spirit will remain the same today when a tea ceremony is performed, a spirit dedicated to realizing the uniqueness

of a meeting between host and guests. The manner of a party and how refined conviviality is developed in Europe has a long history, but so far as the present author is informed, there is no example of a special rule for keeping the lavatory clean in using water with an aesthetic watchfulness.

Finally, to suggest that this aesthetics of water in the way of tea can be extended to that of other elements such as earth and fire, some sentences need to be added. The aesthetic sense regarding the “earth” can be seen first, for example, in the way in which mud is arranged on the wall inside and outside of the tea room, as well as in the disposition of rocks and the undulation of the ground in the garden. In addition—and this is quite important—tea cups are made from special clay and “fire” is also a decisive element for achieving their artistic color and form. It is perhaps unconceivable in the tradition of metaphysics that a natural element like “earth,” the lowest rank in the hierarchy of cosmological values could become an object of subtle and aesthetic sense. This is to be understood as a phenomenon in the context of the cultural and historical “climate” in Japan. The same can also be said to the element of “fire,” as is mentioned in the following.

The watchfulness of arranging “fire” in the way of tea is just as essential as that of “water.” The “fire arrangement” (*hi-ai*, 火相) for boiling water is also made three times: in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, or according to another interpretation, before, during, and after the tea meeting. This so-called “three-times-coal” signifies the hospitality of the host who meets the guest, just as the three-times-water does, so that the expression is often paired with the latter: “Three-times-coal; three-times-water.” With this watchfulness, the meeting should offer the chance for the host and the guests to enjoy and exercise the once-ness of the meeting, unique in their life (*ichigo-ichie*, 一期一会). Every act and every thought should be refined as the aesthetic-spiritual expressions of this exercise.

The fire in “three-times-coal” is not all the fire involved in the tea-way. The fire as the “light” in the lanterns in the room and the stone lanterns in the garden is indispensable for a tea meeting in the evening. When it snows, says Rikyū, the lanterns on the path to the tea-house should not be kindled. The sight of the snow in the garden will otherwise be spoiled. This also demonstrates the aesthetic sensitiveness to the

light of the lantern, which should be seen in its own atmosphere.

If the different characters of “climate” in Asian regions are observed, analyzed, and described with hermeneutical attention, the aesthetics of Asian lifeworlds could be developed in various ways. This lifeworld is very diverse; the variety of religions (Buddhism, Islam, Hindu, Confucianism, Taoism, Shintoism, and missionary Christianity, etc.) and of letters (Chinese characters, Japanese alphabets, Korean alphabets, Sanskrit) form a contrast with the Western European world. The description of these lifeworlds will not only lead to a special case of aesthetics, but also bring Western-born aesthetics itself in question concerning above all its range and meaning. This has partly been done by some contemporary Western authors. Yet other viewpoints are to be expected as well if careful attention is paid to the experience of the Japanese lifeworld, which is mostly inherited without philosophical reflection, but is characterized by a practical mind and by a concern with embodiment in particular. One simple question will be enough to suggest the possibility of questioning aesthetics in a conventional meaning: is the way of tea an “aesthetic art,” and what do “art” and “aesthesis” mean in this case?

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie. Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 7. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970.
- Bachelard, Gaston. *La psychanalyse du feu*. Paris: Gallimard, 1938, rpt. 1949; rpt. *The Psychoanalysis of Fire*. Trans. Alan C. M. Ross. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Bachelard, Gaston. *L'eau et les rêves: Essai sur l'imagination de la matière*. Paris: José Corti, 1942, rpt. 1969; *Water and Dreams: An Essay on the Imagination of Matter*. Trans. Edith R. Farrell. Dallas: Pegasus Foundation, 1983.
- Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb. *Aesthetica*. Frankfurt/Oder, 1750, rpt. Hildesheim, 1961.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Asthetik. Vorlesungen über Ästhetik als allgemeine Wahrnehmungslehre*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2001.
- Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon*. Ed. Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander. 4. Vols. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1867–1880.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Trans. Rosemary Sheed. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1958; rpt. 1963.
- Foster, Hal, ed. *The Anti-Aesthetic*. Essays on Postmodern Culture. Seattle: Bay Press, 1983.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Aus einem Gespräch von der Sprache—Zwischen einem Japaner und einem Fragenden” [1953–54]. *Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. 12. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1989, 79–146.

- IMAMICHI Tomonobu (今道友信). **東洋の美学** [*Tōyō no bigaku*, The aesthetics of the orient]. Tokyo: 1980, Chapters 1, 2.
- Malraux, André. *Anti-Aesthetics*. Trans. Robert Harvey. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- MURAKAMI Yoshimi (村上嘉実). **道教思想と山水画** [*Dokyo shiso to sansui-ga*; Taoistic thoughts and river-painting]. **東方宗教** [*Toho shukyo*; The Journal of Eastern Religions, Nippon Dokyo Gakkai (Society of Taoistic Research)] 45, 1975, 1–14.
- Nampōroku (南方録), text on the tea-ceremony in the form of notes of the words spoken by the tea master Sen no Rikyū (千利休) (1522–1592), presumably recorded by his disciple NANBŌ Sōkei (南坊宗啓).
- ŌHASHI Ryōsuke. “Aesthetics of water.” In *Wasser. Schriftenreihe Forum*, Vol. 9. *Elemente des Naturhaushalts I*. Ed. Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland GmbH. Köln, 2000, 270–281.
- WATSUJI Tetsurō (和辻哲郎). **風土** [*Fūdo*; Wind-Earth, 1935]. Rpt in **和辻哲郎全集** [Watsuji Tetsuro zenshū; Complete works of Watsuji Tetsurō], Vol. 8. Tokyo: Iwanami’s Shorter Publishers, 1940; *Fūdo. Wind und Erde*. Trans. Dora Fischer-Barnicol and Ryōgi Okochi. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997; *A Climate*. Trans. Geoffrey Bownas. Tokyo: Print Bureau of the Japanese Government, 1961 (rpt. as *Climate and Culture*, Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1971); German translation:, Tokyo, 1940.
- Welsch, Wolfgang. *Ästhetisches Denken*. Stuttgart: Philipp. Reclam, 1990.
- Zhuang-zi (莊子) [Chuang Tzu]. *The Book of the Huge Tree*, in “Outer Department”; *Wandering the Way*. Trans. V. H. Mair. New York: 1994, Chapter 20.

Fritz Kaufmann (1891–1958)

Christian Lotz

In his short but brilliant “Art and Phenomenology” (1940) Kaufmann gives a comprehensive overview of the relation between phenomenology and art. He was concerned with finding a way that combines elements of EDMUND HUSSERL’s phenomenology, e.g., transcendental reduction, and elements that can only be uncovered by a hermeneutics of facticity, such as the wholeness of one’s life and existential affectivity. In his Freiburg lectures, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, as a follower of Dilthey, tried to develop a hermeneutics of life that understands all phenomena as rooted in one’s concrete historical life-project and its coherency, which is produced by care, trouble, and temporality. The duality that Kaufmann found in Freiburg explains why his original thought can be seen as an attempt to transform Husserl’s concept of intentionality into an existential category. Put briefly, Husserl conceived intentionality, which is formally indicated by the relation between *cogito* and *cogitatum* (*noēsis* and *noēma*), as the primal and a priori dimension of experience. But Husserl still conceives this relation as a *belief*. Having accepted from Heidegger that intentionality in Husserl is an empty abstraction of life, Kaufmann conceives intentionality as a relation between the factual life of a self and the historically situated world of this self, which is ultimately characterized not through a “belief,” but rather through an ontologically conceived “openness,” the form of which can be traced back to Aristotle’s *noein* (*Vernehmen*—Kaufmann 1960: 18).

The aesthetic experience, according to Kaufmann, goes back to this primal structure out of which it emerges and to which it returns. As he puts it, the

vision of art and the artist is to gain insight into the relation between “life and world” (Kaufmann 1940: 187). In contrast with Husserl’s phenomenology, Kaufmann, generally speaking, is more concerned with emotions and moods, which are indicators of the whole life situation, and they are expressed, created, and rendered visible in art. Though not explicitly stated, the intersubjective nature of art, as it comes to the fore in its connection to religion, celebration, ritual, and play, functions as the mediator and exudes the “binding power” (HANS-GEORG GADAMER in Kaufmann 1960: 400) between the poles of life and world.

The relation of life and world becomes visible in a mood “tuning us” (Kaufmann 1940: 188) in such a way that an *entire* life-experience becomes expressed in art. In this vein, the purity, depth, and greatness of art is dependent on how the artwork is able to uncover (passively) and create (actively) this wholeness. If successful, art creates an image “of things unknown” through the ideal expression of what Kaufmann calls “mood,” which is where the intentional relation between life and world becomes visible as such. A work of art “does not substitute, but institutes an original awareness of existence on the whole; it does not so much reproduce and represent as produce and present a total experience” (ibid.: 191). In this vein, Kaufmann claims that the artwork “suggests an undivided feeling of the whole of being” (ibid.). Mood or attunement (*Stimmung*) becomes a central term for Kaufmann; the “basic attunements” (*Grundstimmung*—ibid.: 129, 194) of human life display basic attitudes of and towards life as a whole, which are present in art (see ibid.: 97). Put differently, world and lifeworld as the whole of “all of our intentions” (ibid.: 388) is at stake in art. Art is, so to speak, a world concentrate; it “condenses” (*dichtet*), and invents the world as something

C. Lotz (✉)
Michigan State University, Detroit, MI, USA

we live in. Since basic attunements are shared with others, and since basic moods are interconnected with basic attitudes as well as with “life and world conceptions” (Kaufmann 1960: 128), the artist can be seen as a creator of community and history, the thread of which leads Kaufmann—as heir to Hölderlin, Hegel, and Schelling—to suggest a connection between art and religion, which is the topic of “Art and Religion” (1941).

Due to a similar structure, art and religion have a relation to the absolute, which becomes expressed in a feeling of the whole that art uncovers and at the same time creates. Unfortunately, Kaufmann remains ultimately unclear about the nature of this feeling. Both art and religion remove us “from the inferences of actual life” (Kaufmann 1941: 467), although art is unable to give us any hope regarding the possibility of overcoming the “misery of life” (ibid.: 467). Whereas art glorifies life, religion transcends life, even though both forms deal with a removal from our everyday struggles and the imperfection of life. The pull toward perfection, according to Kaufmann, is based on a *fascinosum* for the perfect and beautiful, the idea of which he probably gleaned from Rudolf Otto’s *Das Heilige*. Besides the religious dimension, Kaufmann is also aware of the dimension of play that is present in art, leading us to the feeling of freedom and removing us from our everyday struggles. The aesthetic experience is a celebration of our being, in which “the facts of life lose their absolute weight and ultimate seriousness” (ibid.: 1941: 468). And this idea becomes very important in Gadamer’s theory of aesthetic experience presented in *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960).

The religious aspect of art is visible in its communicative structure as well. As early as 1924, Kaufmann’s thought already implicitly points forward to Heidegger’s essay on art; in addition, it points back to the ideas not only of the early Hölderlin, but also of Hegel and Schelling as expressed in the so-called “Das älteste Systemprogramm des Deutschen Idealismus” that they wrote together (see Hegel 1796). As Kaufmann points out in his essays “Das Bildwerk als ästhetisches Phänomen” and “Kunst als Feier,” art discloses possibilities of understanding our life and world within a unity that we *share* with others. Put differently, art is deeply communicative, especially since it *creates* an openness that can be shared with others in and *as* a community (Kaufmann 1960: 38), even though we might be separated in our everyday

lives. In his later essay on “Artistic Communication,” Kaufmann goes so far as to call the creation and celebration of being through art a “church service” or “mass” (*Gottesdienst*), a “eulogy” (*Lobpreisung*), and a “glorification” (ibid.: 335, 337, 311).

In addition, poetry such as Rilke’s can only be understood by its metaphysical and ontological dimension, a dimension through which things are shown as they really are (ibid.: 280). Quoting Rilke, he states that language “makes holy and celebrates” finite being (ibid.: 166). The artist becomes God-like by re-creating the world and by showing us its inner meaning in relation to life. Art repeats and celebrates the creation of the world; it revolutionizes our perception in the form of a “conversion” (ibid.: 331). The great artist and great art are, according to Kaufmann, deeply characterized by a “religious seriousness,” for and in which the *whole of our existence* is at stake. As Kaufmann points out in “Universale Representation bei Thomas Mann” (ibid.: 316), although art can never fully reach the perfection of the universe, the artist, like the philosopher, is concerned with the absolute. Indeed, as Kaufmann empathically writes, “God is enthroned on the songs of his people” (ibid.: 337), that is to say, in poetry.

The presupposition for the successful expression of an entire attitude toward the world is the suspension of and “listening to” (Kaufmann 1940: 190) life through artwork, which leads Kaufmann back to Husserl’s epochē, as well as back to Kant’s “intuition without interest.” Kaufmann primarily interprets the aesthetic attitude as an antipractical attitude and a bracketing of everyday human life: “The productive receptivity and documentary value of aesthetic experience accounts for life holding its breath and having a rest in this interval of attentive concentration” (ibid.). Kaufmann’s idea of interpreting the aesthetic attitude as an inhibition of our (everyday) life is already indicated in his early essay “Das Bildwerk als ästhetisches Phänomen.” As he puts it, aesthetic experience is characterized by an attitude that eases “the burden of reality” (*Wirklichkeitsentlastung*). To put it differently, aesthetic experience is characterized by a double structure: on the one hand, it pushes us into a direct confrontation with what shows up in art, while on the other hand, it removes us from our “usual” and normal modes of life. Our practical and theoretical lives and their interests become bracketed in such a way that the person who lives in an aesthetic

attitude becomes elevated in his/her viewpoint, which in turn allows one to view the phenomena in a “pure” way. He characterizes this attitude as a “holding open toward” (*Sich-ihm-Hinhalten*—Kaufmann 1960: 13).

Within this openness toward what is shown in the aesthetic object, the experiencing subject is able to receive what Kaufmann calls a pure “impression.” Interestingly, although he does not pursue this path any further, he characterizes the aesthetic double structure of openness and neutralization as a form of forgetting (ibid.: 18), which could lead to a Heideggerian analysis of the temporality included in the aesthetic shift from our everyday life into the aesthetic mode. The connection between art and philosophy, or between the phenomenological attitude and the aesthetic attitude, becomes immediately clear: both the philosopher and the aesthete can reach a point of view that has the *whole* world embodied in either philosophy or art. “The aesthetic experience,” as Kaufmann puts it, “is not bound to a single region” (ibid.: 19). In this way art and the correlating aesthetic experience pushes the self into a new dimension of understanding life—a dimension that is usually leveled down and suppressed in its everyday mode. Art, so to speak, makes visible what is hidden behind our everyday concerns. It allows the world to *be seen*. In other words, art holds—as philosophy does—a connection to truth and cannot be reduced to a “subjective” expression of feelings, moods, or impressions; rather, it displays the world and our life in a new perspective (though it does not change them).

Kaufmann elegantly transforms some of Heidegger’s insights into aesthetic language: art, we might say, deals with the fundamental tendencies of life in its full and empty modes of meaningfulness. Consequently, art is a form of life itself; it can be conceived as a “self-understanding of life” (*Selbstverständigung des Lebens*—Kaufmann 1960: 26), as well as a *self-realization* of life (Kaufmann 1960: 90). Life expresses *itself* in the form of “basic experiences” (*Grunderlebnisse*—ibid.: 91) in art, and art therefore possesses the foremost power to express, to deal with, and to *fulfill* the tendencies of factual life. Accordingly, the artist in Kaufmann’s theory receives a Nietzschean status: rather than contemplating and reflecting on life, the artist is the creator of the meaningfulness, the tendencies, and the directions (ibid.: 35) that life can take, as well as of its unity (ibid.: 37).

Creativity is the metaphysical center of the universe, and the artist is the originator of it. A similar status can be reached in religion and philosophy. This Hegelian scheme is present in all of Kaufmann’s writings, and it finds its center in his analysis of poetic and creative speech, insofar as imagination as the organ of art and philosophy needs language in order to exist.

Kaufmann’s analyses of Rilke and Thomas Mann accordingly deserve special attention, since they shift the focus of aesthetic theory to an ontological dimension that manifests itself through the poet and the artist. As we have seen, according to Kaufmann, art visibly renders the relation between life and world by means of moods and attitude, which, through the inclusion of language, leads to a superior function of art as a “world-forming power” (*weltbildend*—Kaufmann 1960: 141). Language plays an important role in this process, especially since, as Kaufmann puts it, the artist does not merely *use* a given language; instead, language becomes part of the creative process itself and as such the artist is not only the *creator* (*Bildner*) of language (ibid.), but consequently the *creator of a world*.

Although the scope of philosophy and phenomenology is, according to Kaufmann, is broader than that of art (especially since the former is able to cover transcendental consciousness as such), both art and philosophy are revolutionary and deeply creative in their character. Both “break through all conventions in order to realize the original meaning of being” (Kaufmann 1940: 192). Connecting it to Husserl’s conception of eidetic variation, Kaufmann claims that the artwork should be understood as an “artistic variation” (ibid.: 194) through which a feeling is produced that leads us to potencies of our world instead of to a rational insight into pure possibilities and conceptual schemes, as is the case in phenomenological variation. In this connection, as he points out, the phenomenological variation of essences is based on imagination (see Kaufmann 1947: 372ff.). Given that imagination is also the originary power of the artist, both philosophy and art can be traced back to the same roots, the idea of which Kaufmann finds within the German tradition of aesthetics, such as in Kant’s *Kritik der Urteilkraft* and Schiller’s *Briefe zur ästhetischen Erziehung des Menschen*, as well as in the early romantics. And in a letter to Kaufmann, even Thomas Mann acknowledges the importance of this category (see Kaufmann 1943–1944: 3).

Bibliography

- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, "Nachwort." In Kaufmann, *Das Reich des Schönen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960, 397–403.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. "Das älteste Systemprogramm des Deutschen Idealismus" [1796]. In his *Werke*, Vol. 1. *Frühe Schriften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986, 234–239.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. *Das Reich des Schönen. Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960 [includes a complete bibliography].
- Kaufmann, Fritz. "Art and Phenomenology." In *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*. Ed. Marvin Farber. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940, 187–202.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. "Art and Religion." In *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 1, 1941, 463–469.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. "The World as Will and Representation: Thomas Mann's Philosophical Novels." In *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 4, 1943–1944, 1–36, 287–316.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. "On Imagination." In *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 7, 1947.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. [Letters (in German)]. In Edmund Husserl *Briefwechsel*. Vol. 3. *Die Göttinger Schule*. Ed. Karl Schuhmann with Elizabeth Schuhmann. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994, 337–353.
- Natanson, Maurice. "Review: Thomas Mann by Fritz Kaufmann." In *Judaism* 7, 1958, 86–88.
- Oppenheim, Lois. "Fritz Kaufmann's Literary Aesthetics as Defined by His Study of Thomas Mann." In *American Phenomenology: Origins and Developments*. Ed. Eugene F. Kaelin and Calvin O. Schrag. *Analecta Husserliana* 26. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989, 31–42.
- Rudnick, Fritz. "Fritz Kaufmann's Aesthetics." In *American Phenomenology: Origins and Developments*. Ed. Eugene F. Kaelin and Calvin O. Schrag. *Analecta Husserliana* 26. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989, 17–30.
- Skarda, Christine, and Fred Kersten. "Fritz Leopold Kaufmann." In *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology*. Ed. Lester Embree et al. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997, 385–387.

Emmanuel Levinas (1906–1995)

Daniel Marcelle

When reading the works of Emmanuel Levinas one cannot help but to note the rich and insightful aesthetical references and allusions to painting, sculpture, drama, and literature that are prominent and plentiful throughout. While he does at certain points focus on aesthetical themes and has even developed interesting and controversial positions concerning the artistic image, expression, and criticism, these discussions are never solely meant to be contributions to aesthetics for the sake of aesthetics. Rather, it plays a supportive role in the context of his phenomenology and are properly understood within this context. The role that aesthetics plays enables the phenomenological description of alterity that is beyond traditional ontology.

Levinas's descriptions begin on the level of ontology with a subject in a world of objects intending to them and living its life in various natural ways. While it is his claim that this subject and its worldly existence tend to mark the limits of traditional phenomenology, he strives to show that there is a deeper kind of existence revealed through certain happenings or moments in one's life, aesthetics being one such possibility. Aesthetics meant in the original sense of *aisthesis*, i.e., sensation without form, reveals what he calls the *il y a*, literally the "there is," which is a limitless and world less being in general that is indifferent to individual beings and threatening for the subject in its hypostasis, the advent and occasion of its own existence. Art, accordingly, does not reveal, represent, or express a world or one's place in it, but extracts and removes objects from their place in the world;

rather than representing or expressing, art sensation-alizes and erodes form and worldly context in order to reveal these things as they are. Art has a deworlding function, rather than the enworlding often found in phenomenological aesthetics, such as that of MARTIN HEIDEGGER.

In order to understand how Levinas conceives of aesthetics, it is necessary to set the stage, so to speak, with his understanding of the subject's existence in the world according to traditional ontology. The world in general is the theoretical and practical context within which the objects of our intentions are meaningful and understood. For him the world includes both the life-world and the transcendental subject of phenomenology, both of which are interestingly encompassed by a kind of natural attitude that is naïve with respect to any genuine sense of alterity. He uses the metaphor of light to describe our being in the world; our intentional activity illuminates the world according to its own categories of understanding. This is important because art is described by him as a descent into night and darkness away from the world.

The world and its objects are not perceived as they are in themselves, but as they appear to the subject within the context of the world. It is not that one is anonymous in the world, rather one is, in a sense, the center of the world for which all things are relevant. Levinas writes: "Things refer to an inwardness as parts of the given world, objects of knowledge or objects of use, caught up in the current of practice where their alterity is hardly noticeable." (1947: 52) The subject approaches the world and reduces it to its own measure and disposal: "Property constitutes the world." (48) It is in this way that he understands our being in the world as one of consumption and totalizing assimilation; "Nourishment . . . is the transmutation of the

D. Marcelle (✉)
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven; Florida Atlantic University,
Boca Raton, FL, USA

other into the same.” (1961: 111) In its natural activity, then, the subject consumes the world and all of its objects and totalizes them according to its own theoretical and practical understandings. This totalizing activity amounts to a kind of violence to alterity about which the subject is naïve; it is taking the other object or person not as they are in themselves but according to the role they are assumed to play in the world. Without knowledge of its own violence and oblivious to genuine alterity, the subject is comfortable in this world and in a sense uses it to escape from its ontological realities and ethical responsibilities.

Regarding ontological realities, the being of the subject is not something like a substantive or noun, but rather that of a verb, a miraculous kind of activity named “hypostasis” by Levinas. It is through this activity that a private or individual being is established in the expanse of anonymous being in general, an interiority or position from which the subject may approach the world or from which the subject may retreat into itself. The anonymous and impersonal infinity of the *il y a* is suspended by this effort in order to create an instant of interiority. Existing is essentially an activity, a kind of personal occasionalism in which existence must be continually renewed, and the *il y a* is ever threatening to erode the borders of this interiority and collapse it again into exteriority. This activity effects a kind of dreadful duality and tragedy within the subject. Levinas describes a doubling of being, an unbearable weight and too-muchness for the subject that is ineluctably enchained to existence; the existent is riveted to existence for which there is “no exit.” Existence is not a choice; being cannot be evaded even by death. He emphasizes this with Hamlet’s soliloquy “to dye, to sleepe, perchance to Dreame,” and Phaedra’s dilemma “Where may I hide?” This creates the drive for the existent to either excede or transcend itself.

The world and art therein offer the possibility of excedance; the ecstasies and economy of the world partially and temporarily compensate for this need to leave oneself, but the stay in the world is and can only be a sort of sojourn. With art, there is the possibility of evading responsibility in enjoyment; art offers a point of escape and frees us from these worldly bonds “To make or to appreciate a novel and a picture is to no longer have to conceive, is to renounce the effort of science, philosophy, and action.” (1948: 141) One can be carefree in enjoying the colors of a painting or the ruse of a literary plot and forget about the problems of

the world. This is irresponsible because there is selfishness in placing oneself ahead of the other, living at the expense of the other, or not answering to the distress of the other. “There is something wicked and egoist and cowardly in artistic enjoyment. There are times when one can be ashamed of it, as of feasting during a plague.” (1948: 142) As art is enjoyed there are preventable wars and starvation rampant in the world.

The artistic image itself also offers the possibility of excedance, but one that reveals the truth of existence rather than evading it. Levinas’s aesthetics, to a great extent, concerns the function of images, which begins with the work of art, but he shows how this can extend to even practical and theoretical works. Images have traditionally been understood to be representations or symbols of some sort that stand for objects or states of affairs and serve as a kind of window for our contemplation of these things; it has been assumed that images reveal the place and meaning of objects and events in the world, and there have even been attempts to understand the musical arts in this way. This is a conception of the work of art that places its function and being firmly within the domain of the world.

Levinas’s understanding of the function of the image in art is quite contrary to the traditional understanding. For him, an image does not stand for an object or state of affairs in order to reveal, express, or represent the meaning of some object or event within the context of the world, but instead he holds that images work in the opposite direction. Substituting an image for a being has the function and effect of loosening or obscuring the connection of these things to their place in the world. This is the genuine function of art according to Levinas. Art is exotic in the etymological sense of being something outside or from the exterior; it is not an object of this world or any world. Art objects do not reveal things as they appear through the illuminations of intentionality, but as they are; being in itself, the *il y a*, is revealed. Thus it has been pointed out that there is a kind of phenomenological reduction at work in art. (Visker 1999) Such a reduction is passive and not sought after, it is the aesthetic quality of art, its sensationalism, its musicality, that invades the subject with its revelations of being in general like a catchy tune that cannot be put out of one’s head.

Works of art are certainly encountered in the world and it is possible to deal with them as worldly objects

as do art dealers, collectors, security guards, and department stores with their aisles of framed decor. Art can be shipped around, sold, or even burned for heat. But Levinas points out that the truth of art is that there is something essentially unworldly about it: “The elementary function of art . . . is to furnish an image of an object in place of the object itself. . . . This way of interposing an image of the things between us and the thing has the effect of extracting the thing from the perspective of the world.” (1947: 52) Furthermore, “A painting, a statue, a book are objects of *our* world, but it is through them the things represented are extracted from our world.” (ibid.) In art an image is not some independent reality that stands in place of or represents the original, rather it is substituted for being and amounts to a kind of double or shadow, i.e., an image in the Platonic sense (1948: 134–35).

An art image is a symbol, but with a reverse functionality. Levinas writes: “In the absence of the object they do not force its presence, but by their presence insist on its absence.” (1948: 136) The image does not somehow transport our understanding to the absent object, but forces us to realize that the object is not there and instead mires our gaze in the aesthetic, sensational element of the work that is present. It is in this way that art extracts objects from the world and renders them exotic; the worldly perspective is brought to collapse by sensationalism marking the foray of the *il y a*.

It is in this way that we can understand how what we may call the aesthetical gaze or contemplation does not work along the lines of intentionality according to Levinas. It is not that one intends these art objects and comes to know them as objects of the world. Art images are exotic in the sense that they are exterior to us and maintain their alterity in that they resist becoming the property or knowledge of the subject; “The ‘objects’ are outside, but this outside does not relate to an ‘interior.’” (1947: 52) The image neutralizes the relationship to the object; it renders the real relationship into a “magical” one (1948: 132). The circuit of intentionality is broken and our gaze becomes lost in the aesthetic element of art. Our interests become disinterested. Levinas describes this in the following way: “Instead of arriving at the object, the intention gets lost in the sensation itself, and it is this wandering about in sensation, in *aisthesis*, that produces the aesthetic effect.” (1947: 53) Like in the alliteration or rhyme of a poem, it is the sensation that comes to the forefront. It

is in this way that he speaks of a kind of elementalism of art.

Such aesthetical exoticism is not limited to artistic expression, but, according to Levinas, extends throughout human work. “Yet we might wonder if we should not recognize an element of art in the work of craftsmen, in all human work.” (1948: 131) When we confront the ruins of civilizations these temples and buildings have lost their worldly functions and appear as sensations without form or impaired form, much like works of art. As present work loses its presence, so to speak, we must deal with these things indirectly, we are dealing with an image or representation of what once was. “The whole of our world, with its elementary and intellectually elaborated givens, can touch us musically, can become an image.” (1948: 134) Levinas points out that modern painting is especially attune to the destruction of representation in sensationalism: “In contemporary painting things no longer count as elements of a universal order On all sides fissures appear in the continuity of the universe. The particular stands out in the nakedness of being.” (1947: 56) Modern art arises from a feeling of the end of the world; images no longer represent and the subject is no longer secure in its interiority with no exits and no place to hide.

It is the elemental quality of art that invades the subject. This is readily apparent with music. The abrasive aggression of speed-metal, the hypnotic qualities of trance electronica, or the moods of orchestral compositions from Beethoven’s 9th to Stravinsky’s *Le Sacre du printemps* can but do not have to be sought after; “they impose themselves on us without our assuming them. Or rather, our consenting to them is inverted into a participation.” (1948: 132) It is just the presence of these sensations that carries the subject away and is difficult to resist. Levinas identifies the same kind of musicality at work in images; “An image is musical.” (1948: 132) It is the rhythm of sensations that music and images share, and invades the subject in both cases. This amounts to a kind of hostility to the subject.

The ecstasy of musicality carries the subject away and becomes a “passage to anonymity.” (1948: 133) The aesthetic experience is anonymous in the sense that the subject has lost its freedom and cannot retreat to some depths within itself; it is being transported to exteriority. The bubble of interiority has become invaded by exteriority; “Their entry into us is one with our entry into them.” (1948: 132) It is in this way

that art works as a kind of revelation, not of some object or world, but of being in itself or being in general; art opens up a kind of “metaphysical intuition” and through which we can gain “knowledge of the absolute.” (1948: 130)

There is a kind of ambiguity about this metaphysical intuition. On the one hand, there are passages in which Levinas seems to be saying that art reveals things-in-themselves, and, on the other, he seems to be saying that it reveals being in itself, i.e., the *il y a*. In the first regard, he writes: “Sensation and the aesthetic effect thus produce things in themselves.” (1947: 54) Thinking about artistic creation, he writes: “There is in all that the common intention to present reality as it is in itself.” (1947: 56) It would seem that he is discussing the revelation of objects in their nudity of form. But it is not the case that art enables some kind of Kantian noumenal intuition that perfectly grasps the *Ding an sich*, rather it turns out that reality as it is in itself is the impersonal *il y a*.

The movement of criticism, though, is reverse that of the image. Levinas conceives of art criticism and history as intellectual attempts to find some role or place for art objects in the context of the world. As art is a movement away from the world, criticism is the attempt of a return or restoration. It is a kind of scientific approach to works of art in which the goal is to explain their expression in worldly terms. Levinas explains this critical approach in the following way: “It enters into the artist’s game with all the seriousness of science. In artworks it studies psychology, characters, environments, and landscapes—as though in an aesthetic event an object were by the microscope or telescope of artistic vision exposed for the curiosity of the investigator.” (1948: 130) It is assumed that art is some mysterious expression that can be understood if we know the influences, history, friends, and character of the artist. But it is the power of images and their revelation of the *il y a* that forever haunts the critic; “the most lucid writer finds himself in the world bewitched by its images . . . [and] nonetheless plays the fool.” (1948: 142–43) Criticism leads a kind of parasitic existence preying on a metaphysical intuition that is beyond the power of conceptual intelligence.

We have seen how art works to obscure and erode the forms of the world, but I will conclude by alluding to the way in which aesthetics also offers the possibility of transcendence. The excedence made available by the artistic image or any image, as we have seen,

is a dangerous affair. The danger is double—there is the possibility of the loss of one’s self and subjectivity in the ecstasy of enjoyment, on the one hand, and the danger of irresponsibility, on the other. It is interesting that for Levinas aesthetics makes possible a kind of salvation from these dangers in the form of literature that works beyond the level of ontology at the level of ethics. The value of literature is that it is not beholden to the schemes of the world and can reveal the ethical lesson of the Other. The Other calls attention through “face to face” accusation to the violence and irresponsibility of one’s own existence for its objectifying and totalizing acts. Alterity is revealed without the dangers of excedence, in this way ethical transcendence brings the subject to its genuine self. Literature can capture this call to ethical responsibility without totalizing it unlike logical discourse.

Bibliography

- Caruna, John. “The Drama of Being: Levinas and the History of Philosophy.” In *Continental Philosophy Review* 40, 2007, 251–73.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; “The Origin of the Work of Art.” In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *De L’existence a l’existant*. Paris: Editions de la Revue Fontaine, 1947; *Existence and Existents*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. “L’autre dans Proust.” In *Deucalion* 2, 1947, 117–23; “The Other in Proust.” Ed. and Trans. Seán Hand. In *The Levinas Reader*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1989, 160–65.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. “La réalité et son ombre.” In *Les Temps Modernes*, 38, 1948, 771–89; “Reality and Its Shadow.” Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Ed. Seán Hand. *The Levinas Reader*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1989, 129–43.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. “La transcendence des mots: A propos des ‘Biffures’ de Michel, Leiris.” In *Les Temps Modernes* 44, 1949, 1090–95; “The Transcendence of Words.” In *The Levinas Reader*. Ed. and Trans. Seán Hand. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1989, 144–49.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totalite et Infini: Essai sur l’exteriorite*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1961; *Totality and Infinity*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. “La servante et son maître: A propos de L’attente l’oubli.” In *Critique* 229, 1966, 514–22; “The Servant and her Master.” In *The Levinas Reader*. Trans. Michael Holland. Ed. Seán Hand. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1989, 150–59.

- Tallon, Andrew. "Nonintentional Affectivity, Affective Intentionality, and the Ethical in Levinas's Philosophy." In *Ethics as First Philosophy: The Significance of Emmanuel Levinas for Philosophy, Literature, and Religion*. Ed. Adriaan Peperzak. New York: Routledge, 1995, 107–21.
- Visker, Rudi. *Truth and Singularity: Taking Foucault into Phenomenology*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
- Wyschogrod, Edith. *Emmanuel Levinas: The Problem of Ethical Metaphysics*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974.
- Wyschogrod, Edith. "The Art in Ethics: Aesthetics, Objectivity, and Alterity in the Philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas." In *Ethics as First Philosophy: The Significance of Emmanuel Levinas for Philosophy, Literature, and Religion*. Ed. Adriaan Peperzak. New York: Routledge, 1995, 137–50.
- Wyschogrod, Edith. "Levinas's Other and the Culture of the Copy." In *Yale French Studies* 104, 2004, 126–43.

Literature

Pol Vandeveld

The practice of literature has always been resistant to conceptualization. The notion has changed in the course of time, what we understand as “literature” being a fairly recent concept. In addition, the fact that it is, before all else, a practice entails that the qualification and categorization of works as literary result from two opposite forces: the constraints of the canon and the challenge of the avant-garde. The established practice of literature imposes constraints and encourages the production of works conforming to the implicit rules of the practice, while any particular work can challenge any implicit rule of the practice and force a rearrangement of these rules. Literature is thus both a retrospective qualification of works once produced and the result of some groundbreaking works.

The current use of the term “literature” encompasses many types of texts. Two of the most important are: (1) the revered canon of formative texts, such as Thucydides’ *The History of the Peloponnesian Wars* or Voltaire’s *Le siècle de Louis XIV*; and (2) a body of works, mostly written, produced by imagination and with aesthetic qualities. The latter sense is the most common and appeared at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century.

Theoreticians thus have many options for approaching the phenomenon of literature. They can focus on our current and common concept of literature as a body of texts produced by imagination with aesthetic properties, and try to determine whether it is a kind of mental product (ROMAN INGARDEN), a type of discourse with specific features (Michel Foucault), a kind of writing called “text” (Roland Barthes, JACQUES DERRIDA),

a special use of language (Mikhail Bakhtin, Roman Jakobson), or a specific art form. Or instead of taking a synchronic approach, theorists can opt for a diachronic one, offering historical accounts of how literature has evolved or what its previous forms were.

The advantage of combining the synchronic with the diachronic approach is to identify those features that have remained constant through the vicissitudes of the conceptual history of literature and the names the practice has received over time: literature has always been regarded as an institution, and as a source of a particular type of knowledge. It is an institution in the sense of a socially recognized practice in which the writer enjoys a certain status of authority. It also conveys a particular knowledge that is more than the craft of making verses: poets were inspired by the muses or had a genius. The way the practice works and the type of knowledge such a practice provides has changed quite significantly in the course of time and is still the subject of much discussion today. But these two features of institution and knowledge seem to be good constants among all the variations that have affected what literature is, what it is called, and in what it consists. I will address both aspects, starting with the institutional character of literature and will discuss some phenomenological approaches in the second half of this entry.

Because the practice of literature is an institution, it is embedded in the social and cultural web of beliefs and mental attitudes of particular periods of time. Besides the prescriptive role it exercises on writers, who have to fit between the margins of the practice, literature also has an influence on this web of beliefs and mental attitudes, while at the same time being influenced by it (a modern version of literature as institution is defended by Lamarque and Olsen 1994). This

P. Vandeveld (✉)
Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, USA

explains why literature necessarily changes along with the web of beliefs and mental attitudes in which it is entangled.

In Greece, Plato already ascribed to poetry (*poiesis*), which included tragedy, lyric poetry, and epic poems like *The Iliad* or *The Odyssey*, the two features of being an institution and involving a particular type of knowledge. However, he claims, on the one hand, that the authority of poets is in fact detrimental to the city, because they encourage the lowest types of passions and, on the other, that the knowledge poets have is not genuine, but is of a derivative type. Aristotle offered the positive view on these two aspects and gave to the practice of literature its intellectual legitimacy: it is a representation (*mimēsis*)—and thus a specific type of knowledge superior to history and inferior to philosophy—and it has a direct and positive effect on the audience as an institution: the audience is involved in what is represented and can be transformed.

“Poetry” remained the name for the general practice of literature well into the seventeenth century, the word “literature” taking over around the end of the eighteenth century. In the mean time other forms also existed, some of them marginally: for example in the French practice of the Middle Ages there were “songs” like *La chanson de Roland*, forms of theater called *Mystères* and *Jeu*, and the *roman*, such as *Le roman de la Rose* by Guillaume de Lorris. In the Renaissance, Rabelais published his *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* as parodies of the historical *Chroniques*. These forms of literature came under the term *bonnes lettres*, which became *belles-lettres* in the seventeenth century.

The English word “literature” appeared in the fourteenth century and the French word *littérature* in the sixteenth century. In both cases the word does not mean what we understand now by that term. In Samuel Johnson’s dictionary, “literature” means the character of a well-read person. In French, “*littérature*” designates “discipline,” as in the second volume of Montaigne’s *Essais*: “Julian the Apostate ... was excellent in all sorts of literature” (quoted in Escarpit 1973: 47) or the culture of the educated person. Literature can also name a set of past works, representing a canon that one needs to learn and appropriate. The social role of such a literary canon consists in cementing the unity and identity of a nation. “Without trade and literature, mutually commingled,” Coleridge says, “there can be no nation” (1853: 458). For Madame de Staël in *De la littérature*, literature names the art

of intellectual expression: “The progress of literature, that is to say, the perfecting of the art of thinking and expressing oneself, is necessary for the establishment and conservation of liberty” (quoted in Escarpit 1973: 47).

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century a change takes place in the distribution of intellectual disciplines. With the ever growing specialization of the sciences, it becomes less and less common to subsume the specialized writings in the sciences under the term “literature.” This concept more and more serves to name the nonscientific intellectual productions of imagination. The criteria used to identify a work as literary are its aesthetic qualities, especially through the use of a special technique of writing.

The change that took place in the eighteenth and nineteenth century regarding the status of literature as an institution was caused by the convergence of many different factors. Some are extrinsic to literature, while others are intrinsic. Among the extrinsic factors, two seem prominent: the recognition of the semiotic autonomy of language, and the emergence of copyright laws.

The Grimm brothers, Raynouard, August Wilhelm Schlegel, and Humboldt, among others, were instrumental in the recognition that languages have their own specific systems, so that before words can designate, they owe their existence to systematic links to other words in the closely connected web of a language. Literature becomes a particular use of language not just for aesthetically pleasing effects, but also as the manifestation of the genius of cultures. It is no coincidence that the rise of literature as an aesthetic product of the imagination takes place at the same time as the emergence of “national” literature. The romantic age became the age of translations. In Germany, Hölderlin translated Sophocles and Pindar, Schleiermacher translated Plato, and August Wilhelm Schlegel translated Shakespeare.

Another extrinsic factor for the rise of the modern concept of literature is the formulation of copyright laws in England in 1710—upheld in 1774 (Ross 1992)—and in France in 1777, which reinforces the two aspects of institution and knowledge. By recognizing authors as owners of their labor, and thus having their own specificity and genius, these laws turn the literary work into a product for consumption. At the same time, the laws recognize the rights of the audience to enjoy those products by limiting the author’s

rights in time. After 50 years, literary works would belong to the public domain. Besides turning literature into the canon of works that have an obvious cultural and educational value, the law also encourages literary originality. Because ideas separated from their formulation are deprived of any objective social presence, the law can only protect the very formulation of ideas, i.e., their linguistic embodiment (Ross 1992). Authors are thus strongly, albeit implicitly, encouraged to emphasize their individuality and uniqueness, the “literary” character residing in their manner of writing. In the eye of the law, literature has become an “aesthetic” enterprise.

However, the major change in the conception of literature came from within the practice of literature itself. Romanticism, and German romanticism in particular, is one of the most important intrinsic factors in the emergence of modern literature (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy 1978). Under the traditional term of *Dichtung* (poetry, literary production), Friedrich Schlegel and other romantics promote a new way of practicing literature both in its forms and its content. There is a keen awareness that writers are those who, like sculptors, shape the very semiotic material out of which ideas and thoughts are made. “Language or the word, when thought originally in its identity with the symbolic force, is the first immediate tool through which the spirits exert their effect and enter in a magical encounter” (Schlegel 1967: 354). Expressions, uses of words, qualifications, ideals, feelings, and the ways of characterizing things are all both described and molded by literature. The “universal poetry” Schlegel advocates is not only a new mode of expression, but *eine Urkraft der Menschheit* (a primordial power of mankind—Schlegel 1967: 285).

What the new “romantic” literature involves is quite complex and has not been fully conceptualized. I will only mention one crucial characteristic of the institutional aspect of literature: it explicitly claims to be a type of knowledge as a critique or a criticism.

“The romantic way of doing poetry,” Schlegel writes, “is still in becoming. Such is, in fact, its real essence: that it should forever be becoming and never be perfected” (Schlegel 1978: 91). Literature becomes the practice of producing a discourse that asks to be continued. It might well be an aesthetic genre, but it claims to shape and organize the world by bringing out its intelligibility. However, because it is incomplete, literature works essentially by invitation, so to speak:

it asks readers to colonize the text and thus insure its survival.

The fact that the power of literature largely consists in the invitation extended to readers to colonize it has led to many efforts to identify the mechanisms involved in a literary work for achieving such a result. One of the most comprehensive attempts in the twentieth century to understand the inner workings of a literary work was made by Roman Ingarden, a student of EDMUND HUSSERL, in his works *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931) and *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks* (Polish 1937, German version 1968). He considers the literary work as a purely intentional product of a subjective creative act that can be studied independently of its author and readers. The identity of the work, he claims, transcends the mental acts and the physical reproductions (as in a play). Concretely, he sees the work as a composition of different strata that enter into a polyphony: words and phonic configurations lead to meaningful unities, which in turn provide schematized aspects under which the objects represented in the work appear and, in the strict sense, can be read. However, these aspects contain points of indetermination; they need to be made concrete for represented objects to become quasi-real objects and for the work to reach a real existence. It is from the polyphony of these strata that the aesthetic quality of the total work is constituted. (Other similar attempts had also been made before—for example, by the Russian formalists and Roman Jakobson, who try to identify the features of what they call “literariness.”) This focus on the autonomy of the work does not go against the status of literature as institution, but rather defines this institution as aesthetics.

The second constant aspect of the literary practice, besides being an institution, is the belief that writers provide a type of knowledge to their readers. While the practice of literature or poetry had always been seen as educational, pedagogical, or enlightening, with romanticism, especially German romanticism, it is literature itself that claims to have such a power. This second constant in the history of the literary practice could be qualified as an ontological dimension: if literature offers ways of knowing or understanding things, the world, or others, it has an impact on what is known or understood. Literature’s ontological claim is seen most clearly through its confrontation with another practice: philosophy. Plato mentioned an ancient quarrel between the two, since they seem to compete for

access to true knowledge. The more modern form of this quarrel—the issue about the kind of knowledge literature provides—concerns one of the key elements of literature: fiction. The way philosophy has formulated the question consists in asking how fiction can somehow lead to truth.

Gottlob Frege formulated this question quite forcefully, arguing that a fictitious sentence like “Ulysses disembarked at Ithaca” can be neither true nor false, since the name “Ulysses” does not have a referent. He concluded, and with him stands a large part of contemporary philosophy, that literature provides aesthetic pleasure, but is not concerned with the truth. J. L. Austin and John Searle keep this frame of reference and see literary fictions as parasitic: literature is a pretense to the truth. But the weakness of considering literature as a modification of established usages of language is that it does not explain why literature can be so influential and why it appeals to readers who sometimes think while reading a novel that “it is so true.”

The most prominent philosopher who granted poetry and art in general a claim to truth was MARTIN HEIDEGGER. According to him, poetry has the power to open a new world. Such a world disclosure issuing from poetry significantly reformulates what consciousness is and how it relates to the world. Consciousness is in essence a matter of interpretation, and the world in its phenomenality is a discursive formation (*Rede*) that has to be deciphered and read. Because the language we use bears the layers of hermeneutical decisions made by generations preceding us, it cannot be stripped of its historical heritage and turned into a simple linguistic garment for our thoughts. Our thoughts themselves lack transparency to the extent that they are formed by the use of concepts and notions conveyed through language and laden with historical and cultural residues. When we go to the well, when we go through the forest, Heidegger claims, we go through the word “well,” through the word “forest.” Poetry thus becomes the original language (*Ursprache*) of a people, and poetry has this extraordinary power to disrupt the order of the world by unsettling its building blocks: the words themselves.

In Heidegger’s philosophical practice this disruption has taken at least three forms. (1) Mostly in the 1930s, he sees some poets as being privileged in their perceptions of fundamental shifts in the way we understand the world. Hölderlin was one such poet granted

a metaphysical mission: in his poems he articulates the end of metaphysics—i.e., the Western way of relating to things in their origin, use, and values—and in so doing, he paves the way toward another manner of thinking—what Heidegger calls another beginning. In the 1940s and 1950s, Heidegger abandons this massive ontology, which foretells an end to metaphysics and envisages a history of being, in favor of local ontologies.

(2) One of these more limited powers of poetry consists in making use of familiar words in unfamiliar contexts or combinations. A poem causes the evidence of the specific organization of our daily world to explode. In interrupting the transitive scheme where we live and use things or words, art shows that their self-evidence is the result of a familiarity that has a long provenance. What is self-evident to us because it is familiar then appears instead as the result of customs and habits that have eroded and trivialized the role of things, which, as Heidegger says, “gather a world” and crystallize the unity of a world. Art withholds the world we commonly take for granted and by creating this wedge in our common understanding, renders it strange and so unsettled that it can yield to transformation.

(3) A third power of poetry consists in offering a sequence of words that gives traction to another manner of thinking. This is in part how Heidegger proceeded in some of his philosophical essays, using some verses by Hölderlin, George, or others to prime his own reflection. For example, George’s verse “*Kein Ding sei wo das Wort gebricht*” (“No thing be where the word breaks up”) has been a formidable inspiration for Heidegger’s views on the power of language. Poetry is an original language in the sense of the original arising of a way of ordering our world, and thus becomes the disclosure of a new world.

The view that literature has a power of disclosure gained currency in phenomenological circles. In *Qu’est-ce que la littérature?* (1948) JEAN-PAUL SARTRE considers literature as an action that generates history. Author and reader are engaged in a contract in which two freedoms fight any form of mystification for the sake of progress and peace. In his “existential psychoanalyses” of Baudelaire, Jean Genet, and Flaubert, Sartre attempts to show that the literary work is the story of a liberation through writing. He wants to show that the works these authors produced were the means they themselves used for coming to terms with

their own existence. JAN PATOČKA (1987) also sees art as a manifestation of human freedom. As reflection, critique, or disruption, literature is directly locked onto the social and historical praxis in which human existence comes to its realization.

Another powerful and original version of literature as disclosure is offered by PAUL RICOEUR in his theory of narratives. The disclosure takes the form of narratives and scenarios that articulate what can happen. Taking from Aristotle the notion of emplotment, he shows that narratives are not just stories told after the fact, but the very articulation of what structured the action itself or what could structure a future action. Narratives make explicit what already lies implicit at the heart of any action or event. There is a pre-narrative quality in actions and events that make them susceptible to be narrated. When an action unfolds, it is a narrative in its nascent state or an inchoate narrative. This ontological aspect of narratives means that actions are symbolically mediated—through what Ricoeur calls a symbolics of action—in the sense that they unfold in time with a beginning, a transformation, and an end through the involvement of goals, motives, agents, circumstances, and other subjects with or against whom something is done. By fleshing out those components and concatenating them in a story, narratives bring to the fore the intelligibility of the action and its meaningfulness. Thus an action offers a readability and can be deciphered as a quasi-text.

The lucidity that narratives provide can in turn play an enlightening role by making readers of those narratives aware of what they only feebly perceived in actions and events, or by offering readers the opportunity by proxy to live new experiences, exotic or horrific. As a set of narratives, then, literature functions as a “laboratory for moral judgments”: by reading stories, readers can pass judgment on characters, evaluate situations, formulate what they would have done, and decide to try or avoid those situations. Literature opens a world in the sense that it makes available to readers a richer pool of beliefs, mental attitudes, and moral judgments, as well as more sophisticated scenarios for acting and behaving.

An analogous view of literature as world disclosure can be found outside phenomenology in Nelson Goodman or Richard Rorty, for example, who consider literature as a version of the world, thereby seeing the notion of truth itself as a construct.

Another way literature claims to be a form of knowledge can be characterized as bearing witness. To illustrate this, I appeal to the heuristically rich notion of *differend* as presented by Jean-François Lyotard (1983). A *differend* is a situation of conflict where there is a feeling on one side that a wrong has been inflicted, but this side does not have the means to formulate and articulate what the wrong is clearly. As a result, no litigation is possible because of the lack of a common idiom between those who suffer and those who are in power. What remains is a vague feeling, a silence, or a suffering. What literature has done in many instances is to bring the wrong into a narrative form, thereby providing some means to start identifying the wrong itself. We can think of the literature of former colonies embedding in plots the experiences of those who lost and could not make their own story intelligible in the dominant discourse. In a similar vein, several of Günter Grass’s novels were in this regard instrumental in forcing postwar Germans to come to terms with their past and with what they or their parents did during the Nazi period. Through novels and their characters, J. M. Coetzee has notably depicted and debated apartheid and its aftermath in South Africa. This role as witness has sometimes been called ethical, in a somewhat broad sense of ethics: by allowing stories to be told that were not intelligible in terms of a dominant discourse and often not permissible, a first step is made toward the reconciliation of antagonistic communities.

With the ever expanding power of the media, especially in their electronic forms, literature now faces an institutional crisis, manifested by the crisis of publishing houses and the instability of the literary product, which can be downloaded, copied, and modified by any “reader.” And with the institution shaken, the knowledge that literature possesses is also questioned. But the practice is not and has never been dependent on one institutional form. Greek tragedies and epic poems disappeared, only to leave room for other forms of literature. The fate of literature, under whatever name the practice may be carried out, is in the hands of readers. And judging by its history, it has had good fortune.

Bibliography

- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. R. Janko. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987.
 Biemel, Walter. *Philosophische Analysen zur Kunst der Gegenwart*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.

- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "Essay XI." In *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, Vol. 2. *The Friend*. Ed. William Greenough Thayer Shedd New York: Harper and Brothers, 1853, 458–472.
- Derrida, Jacques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1967; *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Escarpit, Robert. "Littérature." In his *Dictionnaire international des termes littéraires*. The Hague: Mouton, 1973, 47–53.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Hölderlins Hymnen "Germanien" und "Der Rhein"*. Ed. Susanne Ziegler. *Gesamtausgabe* 39. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1980.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Unterwegs zur Sprache*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1959. *On the Way to Language*. Trans. Peter D. Hertz. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk. Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931; *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe, and Jean-Luc Nancy. *L'absolu littéraire: Théorie de la littérature dans le romantisme allemand*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1978.
- Lamarque, Peter, and Stein Haugon Olsen. *Truth, Fiction, and Literature: A Philosophical Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Lamarque, Peter, and Stein Haugon Olsen. "Literature." In *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. Ed. Berys Gaut and Dominic McIver Lopes. New York: Routledge, 2002, 449–461.
- Livingston, Paisley. "Literature." In *The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics*. Ed. Jerrold Levinson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, 536–554.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *Le différend*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1983; *The Differend*. Trans. Georges Van Den Abbeele. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.
- Marino, Adrian. *Biografia ideii de literatur*. Bucharest: Editura Dacia, 1991; *The Biography of "the Idea of Literature" from Antiquity to Baroque*, trans. Virgil Stanciu and Charles Carlton. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Miller, J. Hillis. *On Literature*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Patočka, Jan. *Kunst und Zeit. Kulturphilosophische Schriften*. Ed. Klaus Nellen and Ilja Srubar. Trans. Ilja Srubar, Vera Srubar, et al. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Temps et récit*. 3 vols. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983, 1984, 1985; *Time and Narrative*. 3 vols. Trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University Press of Chicago, 1984–88.
- Ross, Trevor. "Copyright and the Invention of Tradition." In *Eighteenth Century Studies* 26, 1992, 1–27.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* Paris: Gallimard, 1948; *What is Literature?* Trans. Bernard Frechtman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'idiote de la famille*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971–72.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*. Vol. 2. *Charakteristiken und Kritiken I*. Ed. H. Eichner. Zürich: Thomas Verlag, 1967.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. *Kritische und theoretische Schriften*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1978.
- Skilleas, Ole Martin. *Philosophy and Literature: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.
- Wellek, René. "Literature and its Cognates." In *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*. Ed. Philip Wiener. Vol. 3. New York: Scribner's, 1973, 81–89.
- Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1942.
- Widdowson, Peter. *Literature*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Henri Maldiney (1912–)

Eliane Escoubas

Maldiney elaborates a phenomenology of art within the horizon of themes opened up by EDMUND HUSSERL and MARTIN HEIDEGGER, while avoiding any sort of systematization. His texts concern painting and poetry.

The gap between an aesthetics of “feeling” (aesthesis in the sense of *aisthēsis*) and an aesthetics of art is that of truth: “Art is the truth of feeling,” and the mediation between the one and the other depends upon the notion of rhythm: “Art is the truth of feeling, because rhythm is the truth of aesthesis” (Maldiney 1985: 193–195). However, the point of departure is the irreducible opposition between sensation and perception. Relying upon the analyses and terminology of Erwin Straus and Ludwig Binswanger, Maldiney describes sensation as non-intentional, and therefore as not intending an object. Sensation is a pathic or thymic moment, whereas perception is intentional and constitutes an objective or epistemic moment. Maldiney also writes: “Art is the truth of feeling . . . in which the objective perception that suppresses aesthesis is cut off. The word ‘aesthetic’ has two meanings: one relates to art, the other to sensible receptivity. Artistic-aesthetic is the truth of sensible-aesthetic, in which being has its revelation in the being-an-artwork . . . in which the directions of sense are the spatiotemporal articulations of presence” (Maldiney 1973: 16). Here is rooted the Maldineyan distinction between two types of art: “illustrative art, which confers epithetic qualities upon objects, and existential art, which shows the

‘presence’ that we are” (1985: 10). Only existential art is “art.” “Existing” is what the artwork and the human being have in common. Thus we must define two types of “images.” The image as imitative image, i.e., as perceptive and cognitive image, is deprived of any artistic function. In this sense, the artwork is not an “image.” The image in art has nothing in common with the imitative image. The image, in art, “does not have the function of imitating but of appearing” (1973: 155). And painting, as artwork, “is not made to be seen but to see” (1973: 123).

This is continuously the very sense of phenomenology—and of “phenomenon”—that is implied here. The first sense of “phenomenon” is the sense of the Greek term “*phainesthai*”: Appearing. Appearing is an emergence without preliminaries, without a “before.” “The Appearing of a thing cannot result from something ‘prior.’ The Appearing of the ‘*phainesthai*’ does not have a ‘before’” (Maldiney 1993a: 17). It is thus that “Cézanne’s Mont Sainte Victoire emerges It renders visible the invisible dimension of reality: the *there* of *there is*” (Ibid: 32). Appearing, in art, rejects all chronological temporality, that is, all precedence and all causality. A second sense of “phenomenon” is implied: the phenomenon as “Event,” and the “Event” “is not that which is produced in a world, it opens a world” (Ibid: 21). It is thus that the Cézannian “motif” is not an object in a world of objects, but an aspect of a world that is appearing. “The Cézannian space is not a receptacle, a container of images or signs. It is a field of tensions. Its elements or formative moments are themselves occurrences: outbursts, ruptures, encounters, modulations . . . the rhythm that pulls them together confers upon these elements their formal dimension, that is, the dimension according to which a form forms itself” (Ibid: 131).

E. Escoubas (✉)

Department of Philosophy, Université de Paris XII—Val de Marne, Paris, France

Translated by Marina P. Banchetti-Robino, Florida Atlantic University

Form in the process of formation is “rhythm.” This is at the root of the distinction between “form,” “sign,” and “image” that Maldiney elaborates with regard to the emergence of the “phenomenon/rhythm” in the work of art. Whereas a sign and an image implicate an intentional aim and reach a epistemic moment, a form, on the other hand, “is neither intentional nor signitive.” This is because a sign or an image both point to something other than themselves, a referent or a model, which they replace or recall or commemorate. This assumes that they are indifferent to and independent of the space in which they are found. They are indefinitely transportable and repeatable. “When transported, a sign remains unchanged On the contrary, a form is not transposable within another space, it establishes the space in which it occurs” (Ibid: 259). The singularity of the “form” and the manner in which an artwork abides by the notion of “form” is elaborated in a few lines. Without referent and without model—or rather, indifferent to any referent or model—“form” is that which forms itself while forming the space in which it forms itself. It is inseparable from the space that it forms while forming itself. Not transposable and not transportable, it brings and bears its space with itself. Maldiney writes that “it opens a space. It does not represent, it manifests. In it, signification and manifestation are one. It implicates a pathic moment.” This difference between the gnostic moment (sign and image) and the pathic moment (form) is concretized within pictorial space. Forms are never “made” but are always “making themselves,” always in formation. Artistic form coincides with its genesis: it is always form in formation—*Gestaltung*, to use Klee’s term, and not *Gestalt*, incessant metamorphosis or mutation of artistic forms, forms always in motion. Thus the notion of rhythm becomes the central notion of Henri Maldiney’s phenomenological aesthetics: “*Gestaltung* and rhythm are linked” (1973: 155–56).

In the very beautiful chapter of *Regard, parole, espace* (1973) entitled “The Aesthetic of Rhythms,” Maldiney appeals to the analyzes of Benvéniste on the Greek term *rhythmos*: “The Greek term *rhythmos* . . . means *form*, like *schēma*, but another type of form than *schēma*”; whereas *smhēma* means “fixed form, realized and composed like an object, *rhythmos* . . . designates form in the instant that it is assumed by that which is moving, mobile, fluid” (Ibid: 157 f.). Taking support from this Greek notion of *rhythmos*, Maldiney superbly demonstrates, in this

chapter, how simultaneously “a form is not but light in the Byzantine works of Ravenna or the relationship between mountains and water” in Chinese Sung painting. Some 20 years later, in *L’art, l’éclair de l’être*, this notion of rhythm continues to resonate. We read, again, that rhythm does not occur in space but “implicates” space, “opens” space. As pre-objective fabric of the world that is prior to the disassociation of subject and object, rhythm founds an aesthetic that could be described as without subjectivity or objectivity. Moreover, Maldiney writes that “a rhythm is non-objectifiable. It can only be lived” (1993a: 362 f.). But what does the term “lived” mean in this context? Is it an act of consciousness? Not really, because “rhythm is the articulation of breath” (Ibid). At this point, we can affirm that rhythm is, at the same time, the reality of the real and “the constitutive abstraction of all art.”

We should then read the magnificent description of Goya’s painting *Marquesa de la Solana* in which Maldiney notes the three “whites” that constitute the picture: “They are, together, the axis around which the work emerges. But this axis by itself is nothing: if it liberates itself, the painting becomes mechanical. The ‘whites’ exist only with reference to the whole that is articulated around them and that internalizes them as it articulates itself” (Maldiney 1985: 200). Two remarks must be made. Such a description of the painting plainly manifests the way in which a figurative picture is also perfectly abstract—and why the distinction between figurative and abstract is inessential in art. We must, on the contrary, agree with Maldiney that “abstraction is the vital act of art” (1993a: 29). A second remark is that what Maldiney shows us here is not the “image of reality,” but rather the “reality of the image.” This is what he also writes when, with regard to the emerging Sainte Victoire mountain, he states that it is “in the real” (Ibid). It is strange when painting or art is that which plunges us into the real! Perhaps it is one of the great merits of Maldiney’s aesthetics that it elaborates a new concept of “reality,” one that the history of philosophy has never brought to light: the real is not the objective. The real is the surprising: “The real is that which we did not expect but, once it appears, it seems it has always been there” (Ibid: 250).

In Maldiney’s latest book, *Ouvrir le rien. L’art nu* (2000), there is a powerful focus on abstract painting. Thus beyond the luminous chapters on “emptiness” or “the space of the landscape” in Chinese painting or in the khaki monochromes of Mu Ch’i, the

largest section of the book focuses on twentieth century Western painting by being devoted primarily to Kandinsky, Jawlensky, Malevitch, Klee, Delaunay, and Mondrian, as representatives of “creative abstraction,” and to Bazaine, Nicolas de Stael, and Tal Coat as representing “three clearings of Openness.” But it is an entire general investigation of abstraction that is at work in *Ouvrir le rien: L’art nu*, to the point that “abstraction” is no longer restricted to the limits of an epoch, an aesthetic doctrine or procedure, or a pictorial method. It is “enlarged” into a fundamental existential determination that constitutes the essential access to the phenomenon of art, and more particularly, to the pictorial phenomenon. “Abstraction is neither a system nor a method, it is a manner of existence” (2000: 197). Thus *Ouvrir le rien: L’art nu* invites us to a general theory of abstraction.

The Maldineyan phenomenology of painting is articulated according to the fundamental themes of the Husserlian and Heideggerian phenomenologies. However, it inscribes itself immediately in the rejection of two central themes of these phenomenologies, the Husserlian theme of intentionality and the Heideggerian theme of the project. “The motifs (in Cézanne) are not the structures of intentionality or of the project” (Ibid.: 421). Thus Maldiney displaces in an essential manner the status of the pictorial work as Husserlian or Heideggerian phenomenology would describe it. Maldiney’s concern is that of articulating four notions: Nothingness/One and Openness/Emptiness. Let us conclude by referring to the notion of “openness” by which we designate the being-human of a human being and the being-a-work-of-art of a work of art. It has neither the banal and trite

sense of receptivity nor of impressionability. “The aesthetic tonality of the work is inherent in its Appearing and cannot be reduced to the impression produced by a constituted object” (Ibid.: 328). Openness is what Maldiney calls “*transpassibilité*.” For Maldiney, the issue is the logic of aesthetics, and this logic of aesthetics is fundamentally a logic of “feeling.” But “feeling” does not mean “having sensations.” It means “keeping oneself open.”

Bibliography

- Maldiney, Henri. *Regard, Parole, Espace*. Lausanne: L’Âge d’Homme, 1973.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Le legs des choses dans l’oeuvre de Ponge*. Lausanne: L’Âge d’Homme, 1974.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Aîtres de la langue et demeures de la pensée*. Lausanne: L’Âge d’Homme, 1975.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Art et existence*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1985.
- Maldiney, Henri. *In media vita*. Seyssel: Comp’act, 1988.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Cézanne et la Sainte Victoire. Peinture et vérité*. Paris, Musées Nationaux, 1990a.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Tal Coat*. Nice: Galerie Sapone, 1990b.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Penser l’homme et la folie*. Grenoble: Millon, 1991.
- Maldiney, Henri. *L’art, l’éclair de l’être*. Seyssel: Comp’act, 1993a.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Le vouloir-dire de Francis Ponge*. La Versanne: Encre Marine, 1993b.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Avènement de l’oeuvre*. Saint Maximin: Théâtète, 1997.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Ouvrir le rien: L’art nu*. La Versanne: Encre Marine, 2000.
- Maldiney, Henri, et al. *Une phénoménologie à l’impossible*. Ed. Serge Meitingier. Puteaux: Le Cercle Herméneutique, Collection Phénoménologie, 2002.

Jean-Luc Marion (1946–)

Michael Staudigl

Through his critique of metaphysics and ontotheology, Marion seeks to retrieve the possibility of accessing God differently (Marion 2001). Since the “death of God” only consisted in the death of idolatry (Marion 1991: 25ff.), the distinction between idol and icon has paramount importance for him. In the beginning, he defines an idol as a form that approaches God by retaining the proximity of his divinity (ibid.: 10ff.). The icon, however, names a relationship that preserves God’s distance by retraining the gaze to find itself envisaged by his unenvisageable invisibility (ibid.: 18ff.).

A shift in interest from this theological setting to a more phenomenological perspective is achieved in *La croisée du visible* (1996). There Marion analyzes seeing and visibility in painting and its “exceptional visibility.” Investigating perspective and the “autonomous glory” of painting, he discloses the paradoxical relationship of visibility and invisibility that is constitutive for its very phenomenality. Marion shows that a fundamental invisibility—one that arises from the work of what cannot be fixed visibly in the plane presence of the painting—determines both the “life of an authentic painting” (Marion 2004: 41) and its relationship to the gaze upon which it imposes itself by way of fascination and terror (ibid.: 31): inasmuch as the “autonomous glory” of the painting is assigned by the rush of the unseen (*l’invu*—ibid.: 25ff.), which imposes itself in its internal rhythm but can only be recorded and framed by the painter, both the painter’s activity and the spectator’s capability to objectify come upon limits. That the unseen “exerts a demand to be seen” (ibid.: 25)

and imposes a “pure desire to see otherwise” (ibid.: 33) shows that the visible “gives itself to be seen.” As becomes fully intelligible in the painter’s purified sight, “to see” consequently means “to await a donation” (ibid.: 44), which due to its novelty exceeds conceptual understanding.

Against this background, the distinction between the idol and the icon has the highest importance for a theory of the image. In the case of the idol, the visible glory of the given saturates the intentional aim, but only to the point that it becomes an “invisible mirror” of the gaze (ibid.: 33). The idol therefore amounts to a “first visible” that captures the look and requires adaptive attention, but due to the intuitive excess set free by its splendor, it prevents the gaze from transpiercing and consequently from abandoning it (Marion 2002b: 60f.). By a systematic impoverishment of the visible spectacle offered to the gaze (conceived alongside the clue of the Christological *kenōsis*), the icon contrarily exceeds the scope of expectation (Marion 2004: 33), subverts the ego’s intention, and finally subjugates it to a “counter-gaze” that performs the paradoxical “monstration of the invisible in the visible” (ibid.: 58).

Marion’s radically iconic account of the image and the arts are his answer to the iconoclastic temptations of our televisual epoch of “self-idolatry” (ibid.: 81ff.). But even if the icon is assigned priority here, it is also obvious that he considers both the idol and the icon as possibilities of intentional consciousness to open itself to the intuitive excess of what gives itself in a *non-objectifiable* way. This consequently leads him to admit them as different forms of “sense bestowal from outside” (Drabinski 1998: 51ff.). Without any recourse to a constituting I, such a *Sinngebung* is exerted solely by the lesson the pure given—here, the painting—teaches in exposing us to a “nonobject”

M. Staudigl (✉)
Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna, Austria

(Marion 2004: 42). Since the irresistible excess of intuition provided by the ascent of the unseen cannot be measured conceptually, the painting displays itself as a “privileged case of the phenomenon” that is no longer characterized by the requirements of a constituting I and a fixed horizon, but—as Marion subsequently shows—intrinsically by *givenness*.

In the wake of this nontheological option offered by the artistic procedure, Marion not only acknowledges the concept’s weakness, but starts to analyze it with respect to the relation of intention and intuitive fulfillment. Exposed to the unforeseeable “jurisdiction of the invisible,” as it is articulated by the “autarchic authority” of the work (ibid.: 33f.), the possibility of an adequation of intention and intuition (a possibility presupposed by Husserl’s phenomenology) collapses. For Marion, this result does not, however, break with phenomenology, but rather announces an “irreducible excess of intuition” (cf. Marion 2002b) over the power of conceptualization. Marked by this excess, “saturated phenomena” are a type of phenomena different from so-called “poor” or “common-sense phenomena,” where intuition either never fulfills the intention but assures certainty through abstraction, or on the contrary, establishes objectivity due to intuitive deficiency (cf. Marion 2002a, 221ff.).

In as much as the painting can neither be considered adequately in the horizon of objectivity and with reference to a transcendental I (EDMUND HUSSERL) nor in the horizon of Being’s disclosedness (MARTIN HEIDEGGER) (cf. ibid.: 39ff.), Marion reconceives it based on the autonomy of its pure and unconditioned givenness. Since it is not, but yet appears, it shows itself only inasmuch as it gives itself, which attests to Marion’s ultimate phenomenological principle: “so much reduction, so much givenness” (Marion 1998: 203f.). This insight has consequences for our understanding of the spectator and foremost the painter, whom Marion characterizes as the one who “tries to receive” (Marion 2002b: 69; cf. 2004: 43f.) whatever effect the painting “gives off” (*ce que cela donne*—Marion 2002a: 51; cf. 2004: 44f.). As painters render themselves witnesses of the creation of a still unknown world, they not only risk losing themselves in the work, but liberate “the look from all inscription in the world” (Marion 2002b: 61). By imposing the “barbaric force” of the unseen (Marion 2004: 29) on the one who tries to receive, the painter subsequently gives to see more than has been visible thus far, and so by the act of painting

becomes engaged in a “matter of moral choice” (ibid.: 27).

In the wake of this exemplary analysis of the painting, which indicates a new conception of the phenomenon in terms of intuitive saturation, Marion by a “third reduction” (cf. Marion 1998: 192ff.) discloses givenness (*donation*) as the innermost horizon of all phenomenalization (cf. Marion 1998; 2002a). Here, finally, the distinction between the idol and the icon loses its acuity, but becomes of major importance for his systematic reconfiguration of phenomenology as such. Besides the “event” and the “flesh” (which saturate according to quantity and relation respectively), he now conceives of them as two other generic modes of intuitive saturation according to the Kantian categories (Marion 2000; 2002a: 199ff.), which interrupt and possibly blind the intentional aim (Marion 2002a: 221–33). In a “topics of the phenomenon,” the “work of art” is now analyzed exclusively with respect to the completely positively evaluated figure of the idol, which in the last analysis always masks the human drama it renders visible (cf. Marion 2002b: 75ff.). But still the unbearable intuitive excess exerted by this work’s pure visibility (i.e., saturation according to quality) demands an ongoing change of our gaze (ibid.: 230), which attests to the fact that it needs to be “re-seen,” since we can “never see it once and for all” (ibid.: 70ff.). On the contrary, the icon—which is assigned priority among the modes of saturation and foreshadows “revelation” as the maximum degree of saturation (Marion 2002a: 234ff.)—is used to account for the Other as the “saturated phenomenon *par excellence*.” As in Emmanuel Levinas’s thinking of the Other, the counter-intentionality provoked by his/her face not only overcomes all horizontal determinations and so gives rise to an “infinite hermeneutics” (Marion 2002b: 126), but also renders the Other irregardable and irreducible to the I (i.e., saturates according to modality), who is thereby converted into a “witness” (Marion 2002a: 216f.).

Altogether Marion’s “phenomenology of givenness,” which discloses the possibility of intuitive saturation as the innermost horizon of all phenomenalization (cf. ibid.: 221), offers a *radically aesthetic understanding of reality as such* (Alferi 2002: 89ff.). Because it permits conceiving of the reversal of the transcendental I into a “giving of oneself up to” (*adonné*—ibid.: 248ff.) that is receptive, and because of the care it devotes to a fundamental “interdonative”

dimension of givenness (Marion 2002a: 323) in the light of (God's) love, it can be understood as a non-foundational phenomenological *aesth-ethics*.

Due to its novelty—and perhaps due to its placement in the so-called “theological turn” of French phenomenology (Janicaud 2000: 50ff.)—distinct lines of reception of Marion's aesthetics are difficult to distinguish. Some interest in this work and its relationship to Marion's undertaking radically to reformulate phenomenology can be found only very recently (Horner 2001: 165ff.). Still, the majority of commentators remains interested in disclosing the undoubtedly far-reaching theological consequences of his distinction between idol and icon (e.g., Esterbauer 1997), as can also be seen in some rising reception in theological discussions concerning a theory and critique of Christian painting (e.g., Wohlmuth 1994: 42ff.).

On the contrary, works concerned with the “perfectly non-theological option” (Horner 2001: 175) of Marion's phenomenology of the work of art, as well as critical works concerning internal problems, e.g., the dismissal of the painter's “creative productivity” (Steinmetz 2000: 123), are nearly as exceptional as are monographs making a productive use of his aesthet(h)ical insights. Alferi's (2002) attempt to bridge the gap traditionally dividing the theory of art and the didactics of religion is an extraordinary exception.

Bibliography

- Alferi, Thomas M. *Kunst als Ernstfall von Wahrnehmung. Kunsttheoretische und religionsdidaktische Studien*. Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, 2002.
- Drabinski, John E. “Sense and Icon: The Problem of *Sinngebung* in Levinas and Marion.” In *Philosophy Today*. SPEP Supplement, 1998, 47–58.
- Esterbauer, Reinhold. “Kunst zwischen Idol und Bild. Die Position von J.-L. Marion.” In *Gott-Bild. Gebrochen durch die Moderne?* Ed. Gerhard Larcher. Graz: Styria 1997, 87–98.
- Horner, Robyn. *Rethinking God as Gift: Marion, Derrida, and the Limits of Phenomenology*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2001.
- Janicaud, Dominique. *Le tournant théologique de la phénoménologie française*. Combas: Éclat, 1991; Trans. Bernard G. Prusak in Dominique Janicaud et al., *Phenomenology and the “Theological Turn”: The French Debate*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000, 16–103.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *L'idole et la distance*. Paris: Grasset, 1977; *The Idol and Distance: Five Studies*. Trans. Thomas A. Carlson New York: Fordham University Press, 2001.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *Dieu sans l'être. Hors-texte*. Paris: Fayard, 1982; *God Without Being*. Trans. Thomas A. Carlson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *Réduction et donation. Recherches sur Husserl, Heidegger, et la phénoménologie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1989; *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*. Trans. Thomas A. Carlson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1998.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. “Le phénomène saturé.” In *Phénoménologie et théologie*. Ed. Jean-François Courtine. Paris: Criterion, 1992, 79–128; “The Saturated Phenomenon.” Trans. Thomas A. Carlson. In Dominique Janicaud et al., *Phenomenology and the “Theological Turn”: The French Debate*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000, 176–216.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *La croisée du visible*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996; *The Crossing of the Visible*. Trans. James K. A. Smith. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *Etant donné: Essai d'une phénoménologie de la donation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1997; *Being Given: Toward a Phenomenology of Givenness*. Trans. Jeffrey L. Kosky. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002a.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *De surcroît: Études sur les phénomènes saturés*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2001; *In Excess: Studies of Saturated Phenomena*. Trans. Robyn Horner and Vincent Berraud. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002b.
- Steinmetz, Rudi. “L'icône du visible.” In *Études Phénoménologiques* 31–32, 2000, 103–23.
- Wohlmuth, Josef. “Bild- und Kunstkritik bei Emmanuel Lévinas und die theologische Bilderfrage.” In *Theologie und ästhetische Erfahrung: Beiträge zur Begegnung von Religion und Kunst*. Ed. Walter Lesch. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994, 25–47.

Media

Paul Majkut

Phenomenology has occupied a significant though peripheral place in the development of media and communication studies in the last century. Such studies have centered on technology. Consequently phenomenology has only recently contributed insights into media art and aesthetics as such. Historically, its importance in media studies and aesthetics has been indirect, providing fundamental grounding in epistemology and ontology. And while interest in issues current in contemporary media studies dates back to the first quarter of the twentieth century, this interest was seen as phenomenological investigation and not explicitly as media study as it is understood today.

The strength of phenomenology has been its concentration on the audience and the aesthetic experience, not content or aesthetic evaluation in terms of formal analyses of the object in its own terms. Studies have recently looked at media in the broadest sense, including the aesthetics of architecture, gardens, and the human body as well as mass media. Traditional art media have received attention within the last decade, and studies of new media have also started to appear. Aesthetics is concerned with all media, from illustrated manuscripts, the book, comic books, dance, drama, film, and other traditional art media, to contemporary technologies, including blogs, computer games, cyberspace, iPods, the Internet, digital games, installations, and mobile phones. Media have their meaning as intermedia, so applying the substance of aesthetics to one medium without accounting for its relationship to a medium from which it arose or is related to (as in the case of historical development and various multimedia) debilitates its study.

Phenomenological media studies begin with ROMAN INGARDEN's investigations into the ontology of a literary work, but extensions of ideas that were confined to print media are easily made to other media. Ingarden himself extended his theoretical view to include music and architecture. *Das literarische Kunstwerk. Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft* (1931) covers the same ground as contemporary, non-phenomenological theorists, but Ingarden's introduction of EDMUND HUSSERL's eidetic description marks a departure from previous aesthetics.

Wolfgang Iser revived Ingarden's ideas in a series of literary and media studies, most importantly *Der implizite Leser. Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett* (1972a), which established a phenomenological tradition initiated by Ingarden and HANS-GEORG GADAMER. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach" (1972b) was a seminal essay that introduced reception theory to literary and media studies and brought phenomenology into the mainstream of literary and media aesthetics. Together with his colleague, Hans Robert Jauss, Iser brought the mediated reading experience to theoretical center stage. His work on the process of the reception of a work and the relationship of mediation and aesthetics was soon taken up by others interested in spectatorship, audience-centered aesthetics, and detailed analyses of mediated modes of consciousness.

In *Technology and the Life World: From Garden to Earth* (1990), Don Ihde provides three phenomenological insights into the mediated world: (1) the essential distinction between analogue and digital media; (2) a structure of media-consciousness modeled on the theory of intentionality; and (3) the notion that digital transformation "lies embedded in

P. Majkut (✉)
National University, La Jolla, CA, USA

the preferred quantitative praxis of science" (1990: 91). Speculations about "garden" and "earth" place him among phenomenologists concerned with the aesthetics of nature seen in the garden (de Certeau, Irwin, Majkut, Tilley), as well as among those investigating artificial media such as digital communication and games.

With the English translation of Vilém Flusser's *Towards a Philosophy of Photography* (2000) and *The Shape of Things: A Philosophy of Design* (2006), his ideas on media have become increasingly important. The powerful observation with which he begins "What is Communication?" sets the approach: "Human communication is an artificial process. It relies on artistic technology, on inventions, on tools and instruments, that is, on symbols ordered into codes" (1999: 3). This insight, based on his understanding of history as a print-medium phenomenon, finds syllogistic reasoning to be the consequence of the act of reading a book. "Technical images" (photographs, films, videos), he claims, have referential meaning in relation to texts, and texts present information in a linear fashion. Media not only shape meaning, a thought similar to McLuhan's "the medium is the message," but the very reasoning we apply to understand phenomena arises from the structure of the print medium. In "Images in the New Media," this framework leads to the conclusion that "new media can turn images into carriers of meaning and transform people into designers of meaning in a participatory process" (2002: 73).

Christopher Tilley extends the meaning of media to the natural world in *A Phenomenology of Landscape* (1994). Inspired by Michel de Certeau's walking as a "reading of a narrative structure," Tilley brings phenomenological analysis to descriptions of specific places. Unlike Flusser's insistence on visual perception, Tilley finds that "movement through space constructs 'spatial stories,' forms of narrative understanding" (1994: 31). Whether communication as a natural process is pre-predicative or initially takes the form of a naming of places during a walk understood as a "reading" of the book of nature, Tilley's breakthrough is to understand that spatial stories employ landscape for the ends of the art of narrative.

In *Being and Circumstance: Notes Towards a Conditional Art* (1985), Robert Irwin, the creator of the Central Garden at the Getty Center in Los Angeles, openly embraces MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY's ideas on perception. In an interview, Irwin claimed that "A

garden is by its basic nature phenomenological and it defies... ideas of confinement." He believes that he stands in a pivotal position in the history of Western art, arguing that "the history of modern art is essentially phenomenological history, that is, moving away from intellectual structures..." (1998).

Two publications have focused phenomenological research on media in general and media aesthetics in particular. The *American Journal of Semiotics*, published by the Semiotic Society of America, draws from phenomenology as well as semiotics. *Glimpse*, the publication of the Society for Phenomenology and Media, deals more narrowly with phenomenological approaches, introducing new voices on media and media aesthetics in technologies such as mobile phones, e-mail, computer games, and the Internet, in addition to traditional media.

Beginning at a conference in 1999 on the visual arts in the twentieth century in Kiev, where I delivered a paper later published as "The Monster in the Maze: A Phenomenological Glimpse at the Aesthetics and Ontology of Cyberspace" (Majkut 1999c), I sketched a post-phenomenological concept that drew on influences as diverse and seemingly contradictory as Althusser, Lukács, Marx, Tran Duc Thao, and above all, EDMUND HUSSERL. Having made Husserl's transcendental turn, other varieties of phenomenology seemed incomplete: narrowly sociological (eidetic "realist" phenomenology), spiritually perceptual (existential phenomenology), or excessively subjective (hermeneutical flights of rhetoric). The transcendental turn led me back to the world of things and "Husserlian Marxism." I concluded with Tran Duc Thao's observation that "we end with dialectical materialism as the truth of transcendental idealism" (Majkut 1999c: 66). Along the way, I found that I had a great deal in common in spirit (if not approach, terms of analysis, or interpretation of facts) with neo-Luddites and joined Jean Baudrillard, Guy Debord, Jacques Ellul, Neil Postman, and Marshall McLuhan (after he renounced his earlier enthusiasm for technology) in pointing to the ominous destructiveness of "post-modern" electronic technology.

The reader-response or reception theory presented by Wolfgang Iser and easily extended to other media is as useful to Marxist and neo-Marxist aesthetics that assume that being precedes consciousness as it is to idealist phenomenology. Reception theory is particularly useful in fleshing out Marxist and neo-Marxist

aesthetics, which hold that all art arises from and is directed to a class. Further along this line, a readable text (print, film, the Internet, games, garden, etc.) is the location of an ideological struggle for control of that text. Contending theories are seen as “reading” strategies in this struggle.

Visual representation of motion in various media—photography, film, video, digital imaging, etc.—as discrete perception as opposed to motion qua motion, continuous movement, is a primary concern in my recent work. Specific genres, I argue, are closely aligned to the media in which they appear. For example, digital “film” leads to a preference for phantasy over realism, the result of the ease with which what were postproduction analogue “special effects” of filmstrip technology are manipulated in digital photography, which has effects built into its technology as a recording mode. These effects, no longer “special” in digital technology because they are not add-ons but located in a mode of image production that favors phantasy genres (*The Matrix*, *Lord of the Rings*), provide a fanciful escape from transcendent reality. The text—in this case, visual representation—becomes an ideological battleground.

Questions concerning the nature of the visual perception and representation of motion and its aesthetics, whether discrete or continuous, and motion per se are taken up in “Cool Media, Cold Consequences” (Majkut 2007). This consideration is necessary because art in the 21st century, whether digital or physically constructed, has committed itself to movement as an essential aesthetic quality, though much of the movement is little more than directionless motion for its own sake. Neurologically, cognitive science reveals that visual perception is a series of discrete snapshots that yields the illusion of motion. Vision is an inadequate representation of the continuous movement that takes place in nature.

With this in mind, I discuss visual perception as an abstracting process of discrete images, a process that is further abstracted in turn by visual-media representation. Muybridge’s early photographic studies of motion and filmstrips are prime examples.

In order to find the most generalized message of television, I propose the concept of “metaTV,” a “viewing-totality that is obfuscated by attention too closely fixed on autonomous programming” (Majkut 2006: 86). Channel-surfing clicking is a disruption of disruption, an act of viewer empowerment in the

struggle to control the text by viewer disruption of commercial disruption of an autonomous narrative—a news program, a sitcom, a drama, etc. The voice of the narrative disruption of autonomous programming is the voice of the corporate sponsor; the voice of the clicker is that of the consumer.

My approach to media aesthetics is broadly phenomenological because it begins with reception and the participant’s ability to constitute to some extent—and the extent is the key factor here—the message, but diverges from a phenomenological approach in its emphasis on a medium as a mode of production and on the instrument itself, as well as in finding in technological structures the determinants of (meaning though not their source). Audience constitution and determination of message are found primarily to rely not on cultural and social construction, but on economic class, endorsing the Marxist notion that all art arises from and is directed to a class.

The quantitative density of superfluous information and impenetrable mediation of new media distance the participant to a degree that a qualitative dissociation of empathy and perception is unavoidable. “Apparently, the new dark ages are to be brightly lighted, though the lighting is artificial. Describing this light and the cyberspace it illuminates is an unenviable task. . . . The purpose is to describe what is seen in cyberspace and I prefer to begin with light, a light that not only illuminates virtual reality, but is virtual reality. What is called for is a descriptive phenomenology of dirty light” (Majkut, 1999c: 1) In order to begin this description, I bracket assumptions about electronic media based on bad metaphors such as “superhighway,” “window,” “net,” “web,” etc., and fashion new descriptive terms—“dirty light,” “electronic iconostasis,” “media zombification,” etc. (Majkut 2007: 47).

The ontology and aesthetics of new media, the Internet, virtual reality, and computer games begin with an essential distinction between digital and analogue media. Digital objects, including *objets d’art electronique*, are rendered impregnable and static behind mathematical walls, and as a consequence, the structure of digital media lacks humanist values historically associated with the aesthetics of art. Electronic media anaesthetically distance the observing subject from transcendent reality. Digital media, I argue, extend the object of consciousness into the subject, reversing the constituting direction of analogue media and leading to zombification of the participant. Digital

technology is unable to carry empathy (in the Internet, in a game, in computer imagery, etc.) unless face-to-face communication existed prior to digital encounter, or possibly when face-to-face meeting is established after electronic communication begins. The speed of electronic switching creates a delusion of simultaneity, and the power or robustness of the medium gives off the illusion that mediated distance has no empathetic distance.

The anaesthetics of speed and power that have developed out of observations on new media practice are not new. They are unrecognized rediscoveries of older values that can largely be seen as a continuation of the fascist aesthetic values of speed and power proclaimed in the early 20th century, values originally associated with artistic and ideological admiration of American mechanization, and a little later by fascist philosophers who drew inspiration from German idealism, above all Hegel's ideas on the state. The aesthetics of speed and power, today as well as in the twentieth century, confronts its rational and historical antithesis, humanistic aesthetics.

While phenomenological analyses of media and media aesthetics today partake in themes prevalent in other contemporary media studies, phenomenology is markedly distinct in its approach. Consideration of questions of identity, embodiment, and gender reveal phenomenology as thematically a twentieth century aesthetics, but its grounding in intuition and experience distinguishes it openly from cognitive, feminist, and overtly political and sociological approaches, specifically Marxist and neo-Marxist aesthetics. Phenomenology's descriptive strength, as fulsome as that found in any approach, has gained considerable attention among non-phenomenologists—aspects of its theory such as intersubjectivity and embodiment being appropriated by other approaches—but its weakness in ethical, historical, and political investigations has been sharply criticized or ignored by postcolonial, narratological, material-culture, and Marxist theorists.

As the speculative analyses of Vilém Flusser on media history and mediation gain a wider audience, these criticisms may be overcome; moreover, when the implications of Tran Duc Thao's discovery of the origin of language in the "indicative gesture" are revisited, theoretical bridges to other approaches to media, mediation, and media aesthetics are sure to be built. Flusser and Thao demonstrate that phenomenology has

the potential of overcoming the criticism and misunderstanding on the part of other approaches, criticism stemming, for example, from a rejection of MARTIN HEIDEGGER's failure to grasp the meaning and use of technology in our times.

Phenomenology has long had a reciprocal relationship with subjectivist French feminism, particularly in themes taken up by Luce Irigaray, Julia Kristeva, and Hélène Cixous, although Lacanian psychoanalysis, because of its reliance on the unconscious (whether buried in linguistic or Freudian repressed memories), is at odds with the theory of intentionality. Phenomenological media aesthetics has placed greater emphasis on how a work is received by an audience than on its auctorial source. Lacanian psychoanalysis, unlike Freudian psychoanalysis, does not derive its aesthetics from implied intentions of the artist as the underlying subtext of an object of art, committing what formalists consider an "intentional fallacy," but the subjectivity introduced in its discourse is at odds with Husserl's observation that "residue" of the psychological ego, as well as the natural ego, remains to be bracketed after the natural attitude is set aside.

The most comfortable interchange of ideas that phenomenology has is with semiotics. Of particular note is the convergence of ideas employed by American semioticians such as Richard Lanigan. Also significant is the radical extension of reader-response theory by George Landow in *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Theory and Technology* (1992), one of the first full theoretical treatments of the decentered text in new media.

Some hermeneutical approaches to the media aesthetics of process have cast phenomenology as the antithesis to Marxist and neo-Marxist aesthetics. Louis Althusser, who claimed that he "detested any philosophy which claimed to establish a priori any transcendental meaning and truth at a fundamental level, however prepredicative it might have been" (1993), expresses a double distrust directed toward Husserl and Merleau-Ponty. Phenomenology, it can be foreseen, will do little to overcome such objections as it moves closer to psychoanalysis. It will nevertheless continue to gain respect from other media theorists by the way in which it differs detailed descriptions of how an audience receives a message; focuses on the structure of messages embedded in a communicative code; and demonstrates how this affects the participant, thereby showing how the structure of the message and its

meaning are made possible. And there is ample room for theoretical cooperation with projects proposed, for example, by Walter Benjamin—more specifically, with his observations on the “aura” of a work of art and the impact of electronic technology on media aesthetics and “art.”

Bibliography

- Althusser, Louis. *The Future Lasts Forever*. Trans. Richard Veasey. New York: The New Press, 1993.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Flusser, Vilém. *Towards a Philosophy of Photography*. London: Reaktion Books, 2000.
- Flusser, Vilém. *Writings*. Ed. Andreas Ströh. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Flusser, Vilém. *The Shape of Things: A Philosophy of Design*. London: Reaktion Books, 2006.
- Ihde, Don. *Technology and the Life World: From Garden to Earth*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931; *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1962; *Ontology of the Work of Art*. Trans. Raymond Meyer with John T. Goldthwait. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1989.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Selected Papers in Aesthetics*. Ed. Peter J. McCormick. Munich: Philosophia, 1985.
- Irwin, Robert. *Being and Circumstance: Notes Towards a Conditional Art*. San Francisco: The Lapis Press, 1985.
- Irwin, Robert. “Interview with Robert Irwin: San Diego Artist.” In *These Days*. Interviewer: Dirk Sutro. KPBS. San Diego. 8 Oct. 1998.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Der implizite Leser. Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett*. 1972a; *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Iser, Wolfgang. “The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach.” In *New Literary History* 3, 1972b, 279–299.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Landow, George P. *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Theory and Technology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Lanigan, Richard. “The Self in Semiotic Phenomenology: Consciousness as Other Conjunction of Perception and Expression in the ‘Science’ of Communicology.” In *The American Journal of Semiotics*. Ed. Richard Lanigan. Semiotic Society of America. vols. 15–16, nos. 1–4, 2000.
- Majkut, Paul. “The Concept of the Dog Doesn’t Bark: Notes on a Materialist Phenomenology and Film Noir.” In *Glimpse: Proceedings of the Society for Phenomenology and Media* 1, 1999a, 60–73.
- Majkut, Paul. “Radical Empiricism and Phenomenological Descriptiveness in Friar Laurence’s ‘Earth Monologue’ in Romeo and Juliet.” In *Analecta Husserliana* 71. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999b, 71–80.
- Majkut, Paul. “The Monster in the Maze: A Phenomenological Glimpse at the Aesthetics and Ontology of Cyberspace.” In *Visual Arts of the 80–90s of the XX Century*. Ed. Olga Zhuk. Kiev: 1999c, 19–32.
- Majkut, Paul. “Empathy’s Imposter: Intersubjectivity versus Interactivity.” In *Glimpse: Proceedings of the Society for Phenomenology and Media* 2, 2000, 59–65.
- Majkut, Paul. “Edith Stein.” In *Catholic Women Writers: A Bio-Bibliographical Sourcebook*. Ed. Mary R. Reichardt. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001, 382–368.
- Majkut, Paul. “Búhos y ruiseñores: Un examen del autoengaño.” In *Areté: Revista de Filosofía* 14, 2002a, 79–102.
- Majkut, Paul. “The Selflessness of Transcendental Deception.” In *Glimpse: Proceedings, Society for Phenomenology and Media* 4, 2002b, 9–19.
- Majkut, Paul. “The Phenomenological Flâneur and Robert Irwin’s ‘Phenomenological Garden’ at the Getty Center.” In *Analecta Husserliana* 78. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003, 295–303.
- Majkut, Paul. “Buscándole tres pies al gato y haciendo réplicas: Teoría neocolonial ‘post-colonial’ y Nappy Hair.” In *Dialectica* 29, 2005a, 122–135.
- Majkut, Paul. “Garden and Jungle: Narratives of Indigenous Globalized Space in a Neo-Colonial World.” In *Denken des Raums in Zeiten der Globalisierung*. Ed. Elke Uhl. Lit Verlag, 2005b, 159–177.
- Majkut, Paul. “Notes on Shadows.” In *Glimpse: Proceedings of the Society for Phenomenology and Media* 7, 2005c, 127–133.
- Majkut, Paul. “Toque intolerable: Notas acerca de la subjetividad reactiva en el cosquilleo exteroceptivo.” In *Acta Fenomenologia Latinoamericana* II. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2005d, 51–60.
- Majkut, Paul. “MetaTV.” In *Outis* 5, 2006, 83–90.
- Majkut, Paul. “Cool Media, Cold Consequences.” Adelaide, Australia: Experimental Arts Foundation, 2007.
- SeaJay. From Rocks to Avatars: The Phenomenology of Virtual Objects. 5 May 1999. <http://bridgestorage.simplenet.com/archives_97/intersection_7/7712.10.htm>
- Shaffer, C. Allen. Virtual Reality and Husserlian Phenomenology. 18 Sept. 1998. <<http://www.abdn.ac.uk/~phl1002/shaff.htm>>
- Thao, Tran Duc. *Phénoménologie et materialism dialectique*. Minh Tan, 1951; *Phenomenology and Dialectical Materialism*. Trans. Daniel J. Jerman and D. V. Morano. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1986.
- Thao, Tran Duc. *Recherches sur l’origine du langage et de la conscience*. Paris: Éditions Sociales, 1973; *Investigations into the Origin of Language and Consciousness*. Trans. Daniel J. Herman and R. L. Armstrong. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1984.
- Tilley, Christopher. *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments*. Oxford: Berg, 1994.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908–1961)

Galen A. Johnson

Merleau-Ponty's signature contribution to aesthetics is *L'oeil et l'esprit* (1961). Like his two earlier essays on art, "Le doute de Cézanne" (1945) and "Le langage indirect et les voix du silence" (1952), *L'oeil et l'esprit* exhibits two remarkable aesthetic features: the arts are the gateway for philosophical thought above the sciences; and modern art, more than classical or Renaissance art, uniquely merges with the effort of phenomenology "by reason of the same kind of attentiveness and wonder, the same demand for awareness" (Merleau-Ponty 1945: xvi). In "Le doute de Cézanne," he was interested in Cézanne for the latter's attempts to paint the "lived," prescientific experience of the world as a painterly analogue to phenomenological "seeing." He had qualified his endorsement of EDMUND HUSSERL's epochē in *Phénoménologie de la perception* (1945), but he was nevertheless struck by Cézanne's insistence on a peculiar kind of "germinating" (*germinait*) with nature in which the artist comes to be present "at the world" (*l'être au monde*). The landscape "thinks itself in me" (*se pense en moi*), Cézanne would say.

In "Le langage indirect," Merleau-Ponty studies the structures of language and history in relation to the theory of signs developed by Ferdinand de Saussure and the theory of history developed by André Malraux, as well as the existential philosophy of literature articulated by JEAN-PAUL SARTRE in *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* (1948). The essay is obviously multilayered and complex. It was intended to appear as the third chapter of Merleau-Ponty's unpublished *La prose du monde*, in which the philosopher was concerned

with a general theory of expression, language, and signs. He argues for an expressive theory of art that rethinks the notion of style focused on the artist's process of painting (*peindre*) rather than on the works, the paintings (*les peintures*) that appear in museums and galleries and turn artists into rivals. Institutions should be understood in Husserl's sense as fecund foundations (*Stiftung*) that open fields for investigation. Thus style is historical and intersubjective; it is the special way in which our living body experiences, practices, and takes up a tradition of gesture and meaning, both to perpetuate it and to challenge it in a "coherent deformation." Sartre was wrong to claim that, in contrast with the writer, the painter is "mute." The silence of painting is not an absence of meaning, but a silence pregnant with the style of a painter at work intermingled with the structures of the world that are figured.

L'oeil et l'esprit deploys a gallery of artists to develop a new theory of vision and a new ontology that would be further elaborated in *Le visible et l'invisible* (1964). The essay includes photographs of eight artworks by Giacometti, Cézanne, de Stael, Matisse, Klee, Richier, Rodin, and the unknown Alain de la Bourdonnaye. The range of artists upon whom Merleau-Ponty draws is remarkable in spite of his own humble comment that he is a "layman" who lacks "both competence and space" (Merleau-Ponty 1961: 63) to draw upon art history properly. In addition to these eight artworks, he refers throughout *L'oeil et l'esprit* to at least another dozen artworks, including the Lascaux cave paintings and works by Rembrandt, Henry Moore, Duchamp, Marey, Gericault, Caravaggio, Roualt, and Ingrès. The dominant new artistic voices are Auguste Rodin, especially Rodin's conversations in *L'art: Entretiens réunis par Paul Gsell*, and above all, Paul Klee. The multiple

G.A. Johnson (✉)
University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, USA

references in *L'oeil et l'esprit* to Klee's notebooks, journals, and nature studies (*Wege des Naturstudiums*, 1923) indicate that Klee had become the most influential artist for Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of vision and Being. Volume I of Klee's notebooks, *Das bildnerische Denken* (translated into English by Ralph Manheim as *The Thinking Eye*), prefigures Merleau-Ponty's own title and theme. Part IV of Merleau-Ponty's essay ends with Klee's words written at age thirty-seven and inscribed on his tomb: "I cannot be grasped in immanence" ("*Je suis insaisissable dans l'immanence*").

L'oeil et l'esprit has five parts. Parts I and V are brief. Part I is a prelude, arguing that modern painting and sculpture bring us closer to Being, the "there is" (*il y a*), than does the operationalism of contemporary science. Part V is a postlude, drawing the essay to a close with reflections on the durability of the artistic quest in which, from Lascaux to our own times, there is never "progress" toward a "universal painting" or a totalization of painting. This is not a disappointment or failure, Merleau-Ponty argues, but the endless quest for the confirmation, exaltation, and re-creation of Being. The truly substantive and original parts of *L'oeil et l'esprit* are parts II, III, and IV. Part II discusses the meanings and enigmas of vision, particularly the painter's vision. Part IV plunges us into the original ontology for which modern art provides the inspiration. Part III is the hinge between the philosophy of vision of Part II and the ontology of Part IV, and contains the philosopher's critique of the philosophy of vision and metaphysics in Descartes' *Optics*.

Cartesian rationalism, Merleau-Ponty argues, was unable to grasp the central artistic dimension of depth, either bringing the world too close to the eye by reducing vision to thought, or shifting to the divine perspective of God in which the world is surveyed from above (*survol*). When one is too close or too far, Being is flattened and Merleau-Ponty argues that this is why Descartes favored drawings and etchings over painting and sculpture. This argument pertaining to vision and depth is supplemented by a metaphysical-epistemological argument against Cartesianism: as flattened, the visible world is reduced to mere representations or icons for the mind to know as ideas or thoughts, rendering problematic the relation between mental representations and things. Finally, Cartesianism mistakenly takes for granted the perspectival techniques of the Renaissance as yielding an "exact and infallible art of painting" (Merleau-Ponty

1961: 49), while Leonardo's own studies of linear perspective themselves involve competing and sometimes contradictory claims. This tripartite critique and rejection of rationalism enables the philosopher to surpass Cartesianism toward a new ontology with depth as the central problem, and Flesh (*la chair*), Merleau-Ponty's innovative ontological notion, is introduced in Parts II and IV.

Painting "scrambles all our categories" (Merleau-Ponty 1961: 35)—essence and existence, real and imaginary, visibility and invisibility, and activity and passivity. There is a reversibility between painter and painted that has led painters so often to say, as did Cézanne and Klee, that the landscape or the forest was speaking in them. It must be that there is a system of exchanges between body and world such that eye and hand become the obverse side of things, the inside of an outside in which both are enveloped. This is not a logical reversibility of the biconditional, but an aesthetic reversibility that is best exemplified in the phenomenon of the mirror and in self-portraiture where there is reversibility with difference, without the implication of symmetry or substitutability. In the mirror, the right hand is transposed as the left. The one who sees is also visible, yet there is no coincidence between seer and seen. This envelopment, generality, and anonymity Merleau-Ponty named Flesh (*la chair*), a term he compared to the Greek idea of element, which is neither substance, nor mind, nor matter.

We are held by a speech and a thought that have us. The world and the painter are the inverse and obverse of one sole Power that breaks open in an unending generosity of creation and expression. This ontology of Flesh and reversibility may be interpreted approximately as a new neutral monism, but a loosely knit monism that both (1) preserves the gaps (*écarts*), strife, and differences among colors and things and between self and world, and (2) prioritizes genesis and process over substance. Verbs and adverbs replace nominatives. The incarnate principle of Flesh imbues life and the world with a longing for unity that is deferred, but a deferral that keeps open the genesis and metamorphosis of expression.

The gains for Merleau-Ponty's aesthetic theory offered by *L'oeil et l'esprit* are multiple, for the work includes discussions of color, iconography, etchings, sculpture, mirrors, self-portraits, motion, depth, luminosity, line, and abstraction. His discussion of line emphasizes the flexuous line and cites Klee's ability to

“let a line dream” (*laissé rêver une ligne*), as well as Henri Michaux’s phrase “to go line” (*aller ligne*). The reflections on line and abstraction, as well as on color as a dimension, indicate that Merleau-Ponty’s aesthetic ontology is not limited to the artists and works at the turn of the 20th century and in the mid-century he himself knew so well, but extend to the more abstract and experimental artistic works of contemporary times.

The influence of Merleau-Ponty’s aesthetics has been profound and is not easily summarized in a few sentences. In France, his theme of visibility and invisibility underlies the work of Michel Foucault, especially the famous opening of *Les mots et les choses* (1966) that analyzes *Las Meninas* by Velázquez, and the theme of blindness and invisibility is taken over from Merleau-Ponty by Jacques Derrida explicitly in the catalog for the Louvre exhibition entitled *Mémoires d’aveugle: L’autoportrait et autres ruines* (1990). From Italy, the recent work of Mauro Carbone has led to the founding of a trilingual international journal, *Chiasmi International*, devoted to Merleau-Ponty studies with important work in aesthetics. In the United States, Véronique M. Fóti (1996) has extended Merleau-Ponty’s aesthetics toward abstraction in painting, and an important study of landscape painting by Edward S. Casey, *Representing Place: Landscape Painting and Maps* (2002), is inspired by Merleau-Ponty’s rethinking of the meaning of representation and horizon.

Merleau-Ponty’s aesthetics now crosses over as well into other non-phenomenological philosophical traditions. The influences on postmodernism are direct and immediate. Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida are already transitional figures in this regard. Merleau-Ponty’s influence continues while the rupture widens in the writings of Jean-François Lyotard, author of *La condition postmoderne* (1979). In *Discours, Figure* (1970), Lyotard develops an aesthetic philosophy beginning from Merleau-Ponty’s elevation of Cézanne and the presentation of pictorial space as depth, but at the same time is critical of insufficient attention within Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenological aesthetics, he argues, to the contributions of desire and passivity in artistic creation. Gilles Deleuze’s *Francis Bacon: Logique de la sensation* (1981) is influenced by Merleau-Ponty’s interpretation of Cézanne and phenomenological themes such as *sens*, figuration, body and spirit, and eye and hand, even though Francis Bacon (1909–1992) is a very different painter than

Cézanne and Deleuze’s aesthetic logic stresses its departure from phenomenology and notions such as the “lived body” (*le corps propre*) in favor of concepts like force, rhythm, and chaos. Contemporary feminism incorporates appreciative and critical readings of Merleau-Ponty, especially Luce Irigaray’s *Ethique de la différence sexuelle* (1984), which grows from a critical reading of the idea of Flesh introduced in *L’œil et l’esprit*. Merleau-Ponty’s critique of Cartesian representationalism and his new accounts of depth and movement in *L’œil et l’esprit* have been taken up within cognitive science and philosophy of science through the work of both Shaun Gallagher and Hubert Dreyfus, and in the journal *Phenomenology and Cognitive Science*. Moreover, links with pragmatist theories of art, especially John Dewey and George Herbert Mead, with Friedrich von Schelling, Henri Bergson, Alfred North Whitehead, and Ludwig Wittgenstein are being researched and discussed, all demonstrating the vitality and fecundity of Merleau-Ponty’s aesthetic thinking.

Bibliography

- Barbaras, Renaud. *De l’être du phénomène: L’ontologie de Merleau-Ponty*. Grenoble: Millon, 1991; *The Being of the Phenomenon: Merleau-Ponty’s Ontology*. Trans. Ted Toadvine and Leonard Lawlor. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- Carbone, Mauro. *The Thinking of the Sensible: Merleau-Ponty’s A-Philosophy*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2004.
- Casey, Edward S. *Representing Place: Landscape Painting and Maps*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Francis Bacon: Logique de la sensation*. Les Éditions de Seuil, 2002.; *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensations*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Mémoires d’aveugle: L’autoportrait et autres ruines*. Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1990; *Memoirs of the Blind: The Self-Portrait and Other Ruins*. Trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. “Eye and Mind.” In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 256–61.
- Fóti, Véronique, ed. *Merleau-Ponty: Difference, Materiality, Painting*. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1996.
- Foucault, Michel. *Les mots et les choses*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1966; *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. Trans. anonymous. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.

- Johnson, Galen A. "The Colors of Fire: Merleau-Ponty's Question of Depth." In *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 15, 1994, 53–63.
- Johnson, Galen A. "The Invisible and the Unpresentable: Barnett Newman's Abstract Expressionism and the Aesthetic of Merleau-Ponty." In *Analecta Husserliana* 75. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002, 179–189.
- Klee, Paul. *Das bildnerische Denken*. Basel: Benno Schwab, 1956; *The Thinking Eye*. Trans. Ralph Manheim. New York: George Wittenborn, 1961.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *Discours, figure*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1970.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. "From *Discours, Figure*" [excerpts]. Trans. Michael B. Smith. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993a, 309–22.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. "Philosophy and Painting in the Age of their Experimentation: Contribution to an Idea of Postmodernity." Trans. María Minich Brewer and Daniel Brewer. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993b, 323–35.
- Mallin, Samuel. "Chiasm, Line, and Art." In *Merleau-Ponty: Critical Essays*. Ed. Henry Pieterma. Washington, DC: Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology/University Press of America, 1989, 219–50.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962; rpt., with translation revisions by Forrest Williams and Daniel Guerrière, 1989.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. "Le doute de Cézanne." In his *Sens et non-sense*. Paris: Nagel, 1948, 15–44; "Cézanne's Doubt." In his *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Patricia A. Dreyfus. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 9–25; trans. Michael B. Smith. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 59–75.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. "Le langage indirect et les voix du silence." In his *Signes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1960, 49–104; "Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence." In his *Signs*. Trans. Richard C. McCleary. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 39–83; trans. Michael B. Smith. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 76–120.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'oeil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 159–90; trans. Michael B. Smith. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 59–149.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *La prose du monde*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1969; *The Prose of the World*. Trans. John O'Neill. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *La nature: Notes, cours du Collège de France*. Paris: Gallimard, 1995; *Nature: Course Notes from the Collège de France* [1956–60]. Ed. Dominique Séglaard. Trans. Robert Vallier. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2003.
- Rodin, Auguste. *L'art: Entretiens réunis par Paul Gsell*. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1911; *Art: Conversations with Paul Gsell*. Trans. Jacques De Caso and Patricia B. Sanders. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Silverman, Hugh. "Cézanne's Mirror Stage." In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 262–277.
- Taminiaux, Jacques. "The Thinker and the Painter." In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 278–292.
- Watson, Stephen. "On the Withdrawal of the Beautiful: Adorno and Merleau-Ponty's Readings of Paul Klee." *Chiasmi International* 5, 2003, 201–220.

Metaphor

Annamaria Lossi

Etymologically, the meaning of the word *metaphor* can be traced back to the ancient Greek word composed by the prefix “*meta*,” implying a change, and “*pherein*” meaning “to carry, to bear.” In modern Greek the word “*metaphor*” also exists and can be translated with “transport” or “transfer.” In general it can be said that a metaphor makes a qualitative leap from a comparison to an identification or fusion of two objects. Thus one thing is not like or as something else, but one thing is something else.

More precisely, Aristotle defines a metaphor as follows: “*The greatest thing by far is to be a master of metaphor. It is the one thing that cannot be learnt from others; and it is also a sign of genius, since a good metaphor implies an intuitive perception of the similarity in the dissimilar.*” (*Poetics* 1459a 3–8). Thus according to him, a metaphor is the recognition of that which two things might have in common. Nietzsche defines metaphor in a similar way, stating: “Metapher heisst etwas als gleich behandeln, was man in einem Punkte als ähnlich erkannt hat” (metaphor means to treat a thing as another that is recognized as similar in some respect—1869–74: §19 [249], 498.). Hence similarity is the basis of the metaphorical transposition. In fact, in Ricoeur’s words, metaphor is the trope of similarity *par excellence* (Ricoeur 1975).

Throughout the history of philosophy, there has been considerable interest in the concept of metaphor. In general, the use of metaphor in philosophical argumentation is not positively valued by many philosophers. Aristotle accuses Plato of not being precise because he uses too many metaphors (*Metaphysics* D,

9, 991a 19–22); Hegel, in his lectures on *Aesthetics*, describes metaphor as an image that brings together the clarity of allegory with the pleasure of an enigma. According to him, metaphor is a shortened comparison whose meaning reveals itself only thanks to that connection. Metaphor has a purely ornamental meaning for him, since it is the result of a progressive loss of *sensuous* meaning.

But the creation of new metaphors opens new possibilities for the formation of meaning, it discloses new rules in linguistic behavior, rules related to the symbolic sphere. Accordingly, the concept of symbol has to be related to that of metaphor. Nietzsche defines symbol as “*die Übertragung eines Dinges in eine ganz verschiedene Sphäre*” (the transposition of one thing into another completely different sphere—1869–74: §3 [20], 66). This implies that metaphor reveals to us the relationship between two different areas that were completely separated up until that moment. Since metaphor is due to the “perception of a similarity,” it means that it relies on the human faculty of mimesis. And if mimesis is understood as the human capacity to perceive similarities in the surrounding world, then language is the highest level of mimetic behavior. In “On the mimetic faculty” (1933), Walter Benjamin analyzes “the archive of *nonsensuous similarities*” concealed in human language (Benjamin 1999, 696). The linguistic gesture is the transformation of the image produced by an artistic movement such as dance, whose original function was essentially that of reproducing similarities.

In EUGEN FINK’s *Spiel als Weltsymbol* (1960), the role of symbol and metaphor appears in paradigmatic connection. In fact, the concept of *Weltspiel* (the play of the world) is “*primär ein spekulatives Symbol, um in Analogie zum Menschenspiel die Gesamtbewegung der*

A. Lossi (✉)
University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

Weltwirklichkeit zu 'deuten' (primarily a speculative symbol using an analogy with human play to "indicate" the whole movement of the world's actuality—(1960). Metaphor is interpreted by Fink expressly as "eine Entsprechung zwischen einem innerweltlich Seienden und der Welt selbst. Die 'Übertragung,' sagt man vielleicht, hat ihre Basis im Spielphänomen, das ja eine menschliche Realität ist" (a correspondence between an intraworldly being and the world itself. What one might call "transferral" here has its basis in the phenomenon of play, which of course is a human reality—1960).

The use and understanding of metaphors is also paradigmatic in Franz Kafka's works. As Günther Anders (1951) emphasizes, Kafka interprets metaphors literally, that is, they do not create something new, but—coming from the linguistic field itself—they are the world as a given. In this sense, metaphors do not replace concepts, but situations.

In "Ensayo de estética a manera de prólogo" (1914), JOSÉ ORTEGA Y GASSET proposes another way to think about metaphors. In his interesting analysis of poetic metaphor, he confirms the tendency to look at metaphors as meaning-generators. He calls metaphor "the aesthetic cell" that links the object to a new reality in which its real features no longer count. Through metaphors, the artist is able to generate a new world.

The relationship between philosophy—or more precisely, metaphysics—and metaphor is one of the main themes developed by MARTIN HEIDEGGER in his work *Der Satz vom Grund* (1957). According to him, the power of metaphors can only be revealed in metaphysics. Metaphors are what makes such word pairs as "sensuous-rational," "true-false," and "physical-ideal" meaningful. Searching for the origin of metaphor means searching for something that escapes its own definition. JACQUES DERRIDA too states in his essay *La mythologie blanche* (1971) that metaphors have their own origins and ends in philosophical speech. The origins of words has to be identified with their proper sense. When philosophical speech begins, metaphors are already implied. A double cancellation therefore occurs in philosophical speech, a double *effacement* takes place: the original sense, which a metaphor cancels, goes with the cancellation of the metaphor itself, which is meant in a proper

sense. For Derrida, as for Heidegger, metaphors can occur only in the white mythology, i.e., metaphysics, where metaphors remain active, even if cancelled. Consequently he states that "We are unconscious metaphysicians in proportion to the use and of the wear of our words," for metaphors are like the light, which is there and nevertheless cannot be seen in showing the other things (Derrida 1972, 35; see also Marrone 1991b).

PAUL RICOEUR also understands metaphor as *the* creative dimension of language itself, but in a different way. In opposition to the traditional idea of metaphor as *substitution*, Ricoeur points out that metaphor does not take the place of a "proper" expression, but is a new source of signification: *a metaphor is a rhetorical process liberating the capacity of a fiction to redescribe reality*. In *La métaphore vive* (1975), Ricoeur compares metaphors and models. To bring metaphor close to the model makes it possible to develop the theory of metaphor in the referential dimension. According to him, *the central argument of Max Black's "Models and Metaphors" is that with respect to the relation to reality, metaphor is to poetic language what the model is to scientific language*. In this sense, Ricoeur also speaks of a *metaphorical expression* in which a *semantic innovation* is the main character. This is literally the result of a metaphor manifesting itself as a logical contradiction or, as Beardsley writes, a "logical absurdity" (Beardsley 1966). Nevertheless, it is only as a such a logical contradiction that does metaphor does indeed realize a semantic innovation; in other words, metaphor manifests a new linguistic meaning that cannot be achieved in other ways.

In is sense a metaphor can be what Marrone, paraphrasing Ricoeur, calls an *event of meaning* (Marrone 1991a). This event has to be understood in a double sense: on the one hand, the metaphor establishes a new literal meaning; on the other hand, it also contributes to relating two different realities with each other. In fact, for Ricoeur (1975) every linguistic expression has at its own origin a "fundamental metaphoric," which is the way in which new relations and new perspectives on reality can be revealed. He therefore also speaks of a "metaphorical truth" (Ricoeur 1975). Accordingly, he understands philosophical speech as a living area in which the concepts must not be understood as a progressive "white

mythology” in Derrida’s sense. In other words, here he is arguing against Derrida’s own idea of philosophy as a series of “dead metaphors” (ibid.). For Derrida, the creativity of a metaphor is spread in its own desperate misuse. Ricoeur’s phenomenological-hermeneutical perspective in *La métaphore vive* is therefore paradigmatic. As a result, it is reasonable to consider *La métaphore vive* as an answer to Derrida’s work (Marrone 1991a).

According to Ricoeur, philosophical reflection has the particular function of taking poetic-metaphorical expressions into consideration and elaborating them with its own rational tools. Metaphors contribute to understanding what philosophical speech means and how it has to be comprehended (Tischner 1982). Some examples of philosophical metaphors make this evident: Plato’s cave myth, Descartes’ image of the evil genius, or—as Ricoeur points out—the stain as symbol of guilt. All of these metaphors create an image of philosophical reflection that cannot manifest itself in other ways. Thus the pregnancy of metaphor in philosophy consists in expressing the intentionality proper to thinking itself. In other words, metaphor permits thoughts to express themselves and to be understood thanks to a new visualization of things. According to Ricoeur, this is the task of metaphor, and in this respect he distinguishes himself from Derrida. The intentionality that characterizes philosophical thinking cannot do without metaphors (Tischner 1982). Metaphors describe a reality outside of reality itself. As the etymology indicates, a metaphor transfers us from an “old” meaning to a “new” one allowing a different understanding. The function of metaphors is to convey attention to something different in order to be able to understand how something was given.

Bibliography

- Anders, Günther. *Kafka pro und contra. Die Prozeß-Unterlagen*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1951.
- Beardsley, Monroe C. *Aesthetics from Classical Greek to the Present*. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- Benjamin, Walter. “On the Mimetic Faculty” [1933]. In *Walter Benjamin—Selected Writings*. Ed. Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith. Vol. 2 (1927–1934). Trans. Rodney Livingstone, et al. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999, 720–722.
- Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962.
- Davidson, Donald. “What Metaphors Mean.” In his *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Derrida, Jacques. “La mythologie blanche.” in *Marges de la philosophie*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1972.
- Fink, Eugen. *Spiel als Weltsymbol*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Marrone, Pierpaolo. “Ricoeur e Derrida: Due approcci ermeneutici al tema della metafora.” *Idee* 6, 1991a, 65–79.
- Marrone, Pierpaolo. “Ricoeur versus Derrida: Sulla funzione della metafora nel discorso speculativo.” In *I filosofi e l’eguaglianza* (Atti del XXXII Congresso Nazionale della Società Filosofica Italiana). Vol. 2. Messina: Sicania, 1991b, 341–353.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Nachgelassene Fragmente 1869–1874*. In his *Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Studienausgabe*. Ed. Giorgi Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Munich: Deutsche Taschenbuch Verlag, 1988.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. “Ensayo de estética a manera de prólogo” [1914]; “An Essay in Aesthetics by way of a Preface.” In his *Phenomenology and Art*. Trans. Philip W. Silver. New York: W. W. Norton, 1975, 1227–50.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *La métaphore vive*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1975; *The Rule of Metaphor*. Trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Tischner, Józef. “Das Denken aus dem Innern der Metapher.” In *Zur Phänomenologie des philosophischen Textes*. Ernst Wolfgang Orth. *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 12. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1982, 123–144.

Methodology

Lester Embree

While the appreciation of art is itself typically unreflective or straightforward, phenomenological aesthetics is, at the very least, reflective, intuitive, analytic, and descriptive. In order to produce the methodology of this orientation in this discipline, one reflects on the already reflective *practice*, and thus engages in reflection on reflection. *Cartesianische Meditationen* (1931) and other works of EDMUND HUSSERL contain quite a few methodological passages, but those of most post-Husserlian phenomenologists—MARTIN HEIDEGGER and MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY to begin with—contain hardly any. The post-Husserlian paucity of methodology also shows that reflective analysis of the way in which research results are obtained is not a necessity. This difference does not preclude the phenomenological tradition differing from other traditions by its broadly if implicitly shared approach.

Nevertheless, when an approach can be followed more or less successfully and a description of it is also available, it is easier to obtain improvements in future results, whether by the same investigator on later occasions, or by others in the same or later generations of what is then an explicitly method-based tradition. Methodological reflections are thus valuable and useful, and this is as true for aesthetics as it is for epistemology and ethics. It helps to know how results have been obtained.

The present entry sketches a methodology for phenomenological aesthetics that is derived from Husserl's mature philosophy, i.e., the constitutive phenomenology that first clearly emerged with his *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen*

Philosophie (1913). Constitutive phenomenology is not the only version of phenomenology, but reflections on procedures followed in other versions—e.g., realistic phenomenology or hermeneutical phenomenology (cf. Embree et al. 1997, Introduction, and Embree 1998)—can be developed through comparison with an account of constitutive phenomenological method. The present account of Husserlian methodology is indebted to Dorion Cairns (1960, 1973), but there are some differences in terminology and emphasis (cf. Embree 2003).

Aesthetics has to do with art, or better, the arts. The number of arts is large enough to invite efforts at classification. For example, one can distinguish those that focus on human performance, such as dance, film, and theater, from those that do not. But the distinction to be discussed here differentiates arts relying on representation from non-representational arts. In the broad signification of “thing” whereby anything is a thing, film, opera, photography, and theater typically involve things that stand for other things in what can be called a *depictive* way, which is to say that what is seen and/or heard stands for something else that is similar. Such depictive representation is frequent but not obligatory in painting, and is also possible but not necessary for sculpture, music, and dance. On the other hand, fashion and architecture (including gardens) rarely depict. However, they can still stand for such things as wealth and power in non-resembling or *indicative* ways. Similarly, the mental processes of characters do not resemble the bodily movements of actors, but are indicated by them, and music can indicate feelings or moods without depicting them in the way a musical sleigh ride might depict a real one. Note, however, that what is represented in much representational art does not actually exist, while what is

L. Embree (✉)
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL, USA

represented in most photographs, documentary films, and portrait paintings at least did and may still exist.

Literature is representational through the reference of the things called words to the things spoken and written about. Words regularly occur in film, opera, song, and theater, and words are sometimes included in paintings, buildings, etc. That the title “aesthetics” derives from the Greek word *aisthēsis* may suggest that the whole discipline is about sensuous experience, but thematizing the experience of seeing letters on surfaces (or hearing sounds in mouths) is not central in the specifically literary arts. And while stories and poems are typically about characters and events that do not exist, there can be beautiful descriptions of things that do.

Art so often involves things standing for other things that one may wonder if non-representational art is even possible. Yet some paintings, e.g., some by Jackson Pollock, are composed of colors and shapes that do not stand for anything beyond themselves, although it has been suggested that these can indicate the viewer’s mental processes, which arguably holds for all objects and is hence not specific to representational art. The same can be the case with sculpted shapes and with patterns in carpets, and cinematic art is still possible even if nothing more is projected on the screen than colors and unfamiliar shapes. In sum, there can indeed be non-representational art in the basic ways sketched above, but most arts have perceived things standing for other things.

Let us now reflect on the last few paragraphs. The above discussion certainly pertains to aesthetics, but it is not especially phenomenological. The statements in it can be expressed and comprehended in a chiefly unreflective or *straightforward* attitude, which is to say in an attitude in which neither the manners in which artworks are given to, and posited by, appreciators, artists, critics, art historians, etc., nor the experiencings and positings distinctive of such professions are focused on; they are, as it were, overlooked. However, one can do more than just describe the thing-determinations (e.g., colors, patterns, etc.) or the relations of representations with the represented things (as in the brief sketch above). For example, there is the phenomenological issue of how in comparison with the representation, the representatum is given only emptily (or at best, fictively) and correlatively, the issue of the relation between the perceiving of the thing that represents and the different (fictive

or blindly serious) experiencing of what it represents. Such matters require reflection.

Now phenomenological aestheticians do occasionally proceed in a straightforward way, and phenomenology is certainly not the only philosophical tradition in which reflection occurs. But phenomenology is arguably more thoroughly reflective in its approach than are other orientations. And the approach is methodical, its methodology can be produced. The approach of phenomenological aesthetics has at least four but possibly seven distinct procedures.

(1) To characterize phenomenology as *reflective*, it may first be remarked that reflection can be theoretical, but it is not coterminous with theorizing because theorizing can be—and most often is—straightforward, and because reflection may serve more than cognitive purposes. What is reflected on in phenomenological aesthetics? There is what can be called the aesthetic or appreciating attitude; correlatively, there is that toward which this attitude is taken up, which may be called the artwork. This attitude is formed of *encounterings*—or more specifically, enjoyings—and correlatively, the thing-as-encountered is the thing-as-enjoyed or the thing-as-appreciated. Aesthetics is then about the appreciating and the appreciated-as-appreciated.

Appreciating also plays a role in artistic production, art history, and art commerce, but seems clearest in the attitude of someone who does not have the other concerns that those professions involve. This typically straightforward appreciation may occur in the same person who additionally reflects on it aesthetically, and that same person may furthermore reflect on this aesthetic reflection methodologically, but these functions may also be performed by different people who resort to reflection on others, which will be discussed below.

(2) It would be an error to believe that what has been said thus far must necessarily be *intuitive*. This is because the existence and essence of appreciating might be constructed in arguments for subjective conditions of objects. But phenomenological method is indeed fundamentally intuitive, not argumentative (although phenomenologists do offer arguments now and then, particularly for polemical purposes). Intuiting can be straightforward or reflective, and it is usually perceptual, but can be (or include) recollection. A phenomenological aesthetician does not need to haunt the museum or concert hall. S/he can do much not only with recollection, but also with

photographs and sketches, to say nothing of musical scores and recordings. Yet if differences arise between the work-as-recollected or the work-as-represented and the work-as-perceived, the latter decides.

(3) Phenomenological aesthetics includes more than the reflective intuiting of appreciating and things-as-appreciated. It is also *analytic*. Thus the abstract components called experiencings and positings can be reflectively distinguished and intuited within concrete encounterings; then at least three species of positing components can be distinguished and called doxic, pathic, and praxic. Moreover, each of these has positive, negative, and neutral modalities, and their positive and negative modalities—but not the neutral ones—are observably firm or in some degree shaky. In this way, fifteen subspecies of encounterings can be recognized that range from firm positive believing to neutral willing, the last mentioned not being irrelevant in aesthetics, where appreciating typically prompts neither striving for nor against the actual or possible existence of anything.

There are in addition fifteen correlative positional components analytically discernable on this level in the concrete things-as-encountered. This species includes belief-characteristics, values, and uses, which can all be called subspecies of positional characteristics. When particular positional characteristics are objectivated, i.e., discerned and believed in, they can then be attributed to things in judgments such as “This is existent,” “This is good,” and “This is useful.” Assertions in which the values of beauty and ugliness are signified are essential to aesthetics.

Three types of attitudes can be recognized on the basis of what has been said so far. When the doxic component predominates, the attitude can be called cognitive; when the pathic component predominates, the attitude can be called valuative; and when the praxic component predominates, the attitude can be called volitional or practical. (“Believing,” “valuing,” and “willing” and synonyms derived from Greek roots are here used in broad significations that include not only primarily passive or automatic positings and secondarily passive or habitual-traditional positings, but also active or operational positings.)

On the basis of this reflective analysis, it can furthermore be asserted that the appreciating or aesthetic attitude is valuational, although it is different from another attitude in which what can be called moral valuing predominates. But just as there is moral approval and

disapproval, there is positive and negative aesthetic valuing (even though the dispositions to act that can follow, including *laissez-faire* willing; are typically different). In addition, comparative valuing occurs in the aesthetic as well as moral spheres, so that there are better and worse artworks as well as deeds.

(4) Some remarks must now be offered about how the approach of phenomenological aesthetics is *descriptive*. Not only have reflection, intuition, and analysis been used in the characterization of one another above, but description has already been employed as well. Describing can be recognized to be a species of accounting for things and distinguished from another species called explaining.

Explanation can be said to be a way of accounting for things in terms of other things, which can include purposes and causes, and the subspecies of teleological and aetiological explanation can thus be recognized. Under the influence of practical concerns, there is a strong interest in explanations that can guide attempts to influence events, as well as a strong tendency to consider all accounts explanations. But if explaining is telling *why* something is, only a little pondering can lead one to recognize that it is necessary to know *what* something is before its cause and/or purpose is sought. What describing focuses on is what things are. For example, that an aesthetic attitude is a valuational attitude and that values can be positive, negative, and neutral are descriptive and not explanatory claims.

Two sorts of description can be distinguished and described reflectively. One sort of describing is focused on individual actualities or facts, such as a particular statue being appreciated in the inner garden of a museum. The statue can be recollected, but it will probably be intuited more clearly if it is perceived under normal conditions (if a heavy rain is falling, however, recollection may offer more clarity). As intuited, the statue has either perceptual or recollectional manners of givenness that are discernable through reflection on the thing-as-encountered, which Husserlians call noematic reflection. Of course, the perceiving and recollecting of realities are not the only types of experiencing in the broad signification; mathematicians speak of beautiful formulae, and there may be an aesthetics of ideal things. For real things (i.e., things in time), however, experiencing also includes expecting, which is not a species of intuiting, but nevertheless ought not to be neglected. There is foreshadowing in literature (including theater), and how things have

been anticipated is not irrelevant to how they are encountered.

Phenomenological aesthetics not only recognizes the intuiting of subtle thing-determinations, such as the texture of brush strokes that the viewer of a painting can want to touch, but is also concerned with the manners of givenness of what is appresented by what is presented; with what is represented obscurely as well as clearly; with what captures and guides attention; and with the positional characteristics, especially beauty, of that which is encountered. In the factual direction, describing seeks to be ever more specific and detailed, but it can never fully capture the unique work in all its nuances. Factual description can facilitate more sophisticated appreciation, but there is no substitute for going back to the artworks themselves.

Except for those expressed in proper names, the concepts used in factual descriptions result from a second type of description. What is described in this second type are *eidē* or universal essences (by contrast, the individual has its individual essence, what it uniquely is). *Eidē* are formal or material. Formal *eidē* are of central importance in grammar, logic, mathematics, and music, but of less concern in most areas of aesthetics. Material universals form taxonomies, so that, e.g., sound, color, and texture are species of the genus of sensuous property and what they all share is alluded to when shapes or movements are said to be sensuous. Then again, the statement "This is a white building" presupposes the experiencing, in the widest signification, of what it is in general to be white and what it is to be a building. And what may be called eideation is necessary for recognizing art movements such as Cubism and Impressionism, as well as to what it is to be an art movement.

Interest in the method of describing universal essences arose in the beginning of the phenomenological tradition and has always been widely accepted there. Yet philosophers have been relying upon what is here termed eideation since long before phenomenology began, going back in methodology at least to Plato and standing behind all general nouns in language. The advance of phenomenology lies in methodologically recognizing the roles (a) of eidetic *epochē* or refraining with respect to the actuality of the particular case taken as a point of departure in order to consider it as merely possible; and (b) of the free varying of fictive as well as serious possibilities of the same sort in order to make the universal essences they exemplify

clearer. Eideation can be performed straightforwardly, but is always employed reflectively in phenomenology. Phenomenological aestheticians rarely reflect on in the method of eideation itself, but are consciously under its influence.

Phenomenologists usually analyze and describe their own appreciative attitudes and what is appreciated in them. This is what they have direct access to in *self-observation*. Yet there is also what can be called *reflection on others*. This is still a species of reflection because it thematizes encounterings and things-as-encountered, even if they do not occur in the mental life of the person reflectively observing them. Encounterings that go on in the mental lives of others are accessed indirectly on the basis of what those others say and do. Things-as-encountered by others and the correlative encounterings are not presented, but appresented. However, when there is conflict between what is presented and what is appresented, the former decides.

A factual statement by an aesthetician about an artwork—e.g., how a shadowed background makes the illumination in the foreground brighter and more exciting—is not merely a private note meant only for its author, but is addressed to an audience of others who are thereby urged to consider whether this is so in their own encounterings of things that can be described in the way stated. Then again, whether a case of encountering and things-as-encountered is indirectly observed in another or directly in oneself, both are examples of universals, and universal as well as factual claims are sought in aesthetics. Through reflection on others, the methodologist can be a different person than the artist and even than the aesthetician who proceeds methodically, who in turn can be different from the person experiencing and appreciating things aesthetically.

A methodologist ought not to think that people skilled in the attitude of a discipline, e.g., aesthetics, and in an orientation, e.g., phenomenology, are continually considering procedural steps to take, like someone following a cookbook while preparing a new dish. "Being skilled" signifies that the attitude has been well learned, is deeply habitual, and is, if shared, traditional. This skill can be taught through instruction, but it is also often taught with examples and by example. What has been said thus far about reflection, intuition, analysis, and eidetic as well as factual description should find wide acceptance among

phenomenological aestheticians if they reflect on the approach that they take (which they are, of course, under no obligation to do).

Now since intuiting, analyzing, and describing can be straightforward as well as reflective, the crucial feature is reflection, and the method of phenomenological aesthetics is best characterized concisely as reflective. The emphasis in it is most often on the thing-as-appreciated, i.e., the thing-as-valued as well as the thing-as-experienced. But reflection on appreciations of the appreciated helps, at the very least, to maintain the reflective attitude.

(5) Other procedures may not be so easily recognized, especially by colleagues subscribing to other versions of phenomenology. Thus there is the possibility of approaching aesthetics transcendently with the aim of ultimate grounding. One can indeed refrain from accepting the status of the aesthetic attitude as intramundane and recognize its original non-worldly status. But without denying that possibility, it seems sufficient at this stage in the history of phenomenological aesthetics merely to consider phenomenological-psychological epochē, reduction, and purification.

The attitudes of oneself and others are originally found as parts of the world, and thus as having so-called real relations with other realities. These include temporal relations of simultaneity as well as succession and the if-then relations of causation, above all between the bodily organism and the surrounding sociocultural world. Few moderns doubt that photons bounce off physical things into eyes and stimulate neurological events. In performing the psychological-phenomenological epochē, however, one refrains from accepting such real relations (which are still there, albeit disregarded). As thus psychologically purified, the reflected-upon appreciating attitude and what is intended to in it, can more easily be analyzed and described in their own right. One can then see that mental lives have their own temporalities apart from the spatiotemporality of nature. Furthermore, this epochē helps one to get clearer about the intentionality of encounterings: it is not a real relation, which requires that the relata actually exist, but rather a quality of pointing. The things encountered are then nothing more than things-as-intended-to or things-as-encountered—they can also be called intentional objects—and may include, for instance, spherical cubes, which cannot exist. Has conscious or unconscious recourse to such a psychological epochē not

played a significant role in the rise and advance of phenomenological aesthetics?

(6) Another procedure is *regressive inquiry*. In it one takes the thing encountered as a clue and searches reflectively for the encounterings intently correlative to it. These make up syntheses in which identities and similarities are said to be “constituted.” Regressive inquiry thus produces analyses of constitution, thereby giving constitutive phenomenology its name. By this procedure, which has also already been implicitly relied upon above, the variety and roles of types of sensing in perceiving can be distinguished; the types and relations of valuings to perceivings can be recognized; and the problematic of representation unreflectively discussed at the outset of this entry can be analyzed phenomenologically.

Consider, for example, representational films as well as photographs and paintings. Beginning from what is represented and what represents it on the screen, print, or canvas, one can delve into the way in which the perceiving of the representing thing founds and motivates the encountering of the representatum. The former experiencing is typically intuitive, and the other is blind, or at best fictive. There are also two valuings involved, one accompanying the experiencing of the representation and the other accompanying the founded experiencing of the representatum; there can be a beautiful picture of an ugly thing, e.g., one of *Las desastres de la Guerra* by Goya, or a badly done picture of what is nevertheless a recognizably beautiful thing. In other words, more than the thing-determinations—i.e., properties and relations—of things standing for other things in various ways are to be recognized.

(7) Finally, there is a procedure called *intentional analysis of horizons*. An actual encountering has a horizon of potential encounterings of the same thing; for example, while one view of a thing is presented, other possible aspects of it—how it would look from various other standpoints—are appresented. Braque and Picasso seem to have tried to paint not only the presented, but also the appresented aspects of things. Actualized seeings “predelineate” inactual touchings possible in the future, and perceivings likewise predelineate remembering that can be actualized. Thus it would be an error to describe a thing merely in terms of the actualized encounterings and the aspects that are presented, for the thing encountered richly correlates with the inactual as well as the actualized

encounterings. Clarification requires either actualizing the inactual, or feigning the other encounters in the horizon; this might include, for example, feigning a statue or building from a different point of view.

Lest it be thought that the foregoing analysis is complete with respect to the scope of phenomenological aesthetics even on its rather general level, two more topics may be mentioned. In the first place, nothing has been said above about appearances. These are important for aesthetics, and are also disclosed through reflective analysis. Thus a building can be presented from the same side, but the appearance gets larger as one approaches it, and there is an optimal distance as well as an optimal angle from which to appreciate the building. A painter such as Velázquez can be said to have tried to emphasize appearances, and when they are recognized the question arises concerning their relations to the thing that appears. Then again, the appearance of a play or symphony to sight and/or hearing is optimal from what are considered, for this very reason, the best seats in the hall.

Second, while the traditional classification of the senses into five does not need to be challenged on this occasion, when cloth woven of silk or cashmere is run over one's fingertips, it can be beautiful; when one smells perfume, it can be beautiful; when one eats and drinks fine food and wine, it can be beautiful; and there are many things heard or seen that can be beautiful. What is especially interesting is that things sensed in different sorts of sensings do not occur separately. Thus one can walk into a building and feel (and hear) a distinctive floor under one's feet as one proceeds, encounter a smell different from outside, and above all, see much in the way of walls, ceiling, decoration, and furnishings. Then there are the kinaestheses involved as one walks around, stands, and looks at the building from without or within. Hence architectural encountering is synaesthetic or intersensorial, but then all encountering of art is—like all encountering—intersensorial, and phenomenology is able to show this.

What, finally, is pursued in the methodology of aesthetics? Is the goal knowledge, and is it thus a science in the strict signification, i.e., a strictly cognitive discipline? If so, then it would not be valuative. But it is at least implicit in what has been said above that one indeed *ought* to reflect, intuit, analyze, describe, etc. For Husserl in the *Prolegomena zur reinen Logik* (1900) of the *Logische Untersuchungen*, "A warrior

ought to be brave" is equivalent to "A brave warrior is positively valued." Analogously, "Aesthetics ought to be reflective" implies that this discipline is normative.

Norms are often ambiguous. Sometimes they are expressive merely of advice, i.e., suggestions about what it would be good to have happen. On other occasions, however, they express imperatives, i.e., what one is commanded—including self-commanded—to be and to do. Cognition of what is actual and possible is fundamental; then there is the valuing of alternatives, e.g., reflective vs. straightforward intuiting, analyzing, and describing. But the culmination in methodology is volitional action, which includes affecting courses of events indirectly through research, writing, and teaching. Phenomenologists have been employing their reflective method in aesthetics for a century, receiving influence in this regard and in turn transmitting it. But methodology produced through explicit reflection on that reflective practice can advance it still further.

Bibliography

- Cairns, Dorion. Lecture of March 1, 1960. Cairns *Nachlass* (013143–013164). Archival Repository of the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology, Inc., at the University of Memphis.
- Cairns, Dorion. "An Approach to Husserlian Phenomenology." In *Phenomenology: Continuation and Criticism. Essays in Memory of Dorion Cairns*. Ed. Fred Kersten and Richard Zaner. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973, 223–38.
- Embree, Lester. "Advances Regarding Evaluation and Action in Husserl's *Ideas II*." In *Issues in Husserl's "Ideas II"*. Ed. Thomas Nenon and Lester Embree. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996, 173–198.
- Embree, Lester. "Phenomenological Movement." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward Craig. Vol. 7. London: Routledge, 1998, 333–43.
- Embree, Lester. *Análisis reflexivo: Una primera introducción a la investigación fenomenológica Reflective Analysis: A First Introduction into Phenomenological Investigation*. Trans. Luis Román Rabanaque. Edición Bilingüe. Morelia: Jitanjáfora, 2003.
- Embree, Lester, et al., eds. *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Méditations cartésiennes*. Trans. Emmanuel Lévinas and Gabrielle Pfeiffer. Paris: Colin, 1931; *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge*. Ed. Stephan Strasser. *Husserliana* 1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950; *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*. Trans. Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen. Erster Band. Prolegomena zur reinen Logik* [1900]. Ed. Elmar Holenstein.

- Husserliana* 18. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975; *Logical Investigations*. Trans. J. N. Findlay. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie* [1913]. Ed. Karl Schuhmann. *Husserliana* 3/1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book: General Introduction to Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Kersten, Fred. *Phenomenological Method: Theory and Practice*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.

Music

Augusto Mazzoni

EDMUND HUSSERL left no specific contribution to musical aesthetics. Nevertheless, there are references regarding sound and music scattered throughout his writings. Early references chiefly bear on the subject of the part-whole relationship, with some influences from Carl Stumpf and Christian von Ehrenfels. According to Husserl, a melody, as a musical unit, is an example of a whole of which the different tones are parts. Similarly, the qualities of pitch and loudness are parts of tones (Husserl 1900–1901: III. Untersuchung, § 19).

The topic of the part-whole relationship in sound and music is of considerable significances, but Husserl's investigations of time are also of great importance. The research on the consciousness of internal time often includes musical examples. Time-consciousness is the fundamental place where melodic or rhythmic units arise. In fact, every musical sequence is a temporal object phenomenologically constituted by an interrelation of acoustic impressions, retentions, and protentions. This constitution concerns the formal temporal synthesis of hyletic data and the passive synthesis of their contents (Husserl 1966). Perceptual units can emerge because—quite apart from any relationship in time—tones are associated with each other by “fusion” (a term also used in Stumpf's theory of consonance). Other Husserlian observations deal with the status of a musical work. He thinks that a work of music is not a real object, but an ideal (unreal) object that can be reproduced many times in many performances (Husserl 1929: §3). The distinction between the real acoustic object and the musical work implies the distinction between mere acoustic hearing and musical hearing.

Beyond the scattered hints in Husserl's writings, extensive contributions to musical aesthetics come from his students (Mazzoni 2004). In this regard, WALDEMAR CONRAD's study of the aesthetic object is particularly remarkable (Conrad 1908–1909). He examines the aesthetic musical object in depth. After a preliminary analysis directed toward the essential qualities of sound (pitch, duration, loudness, and timbre), he considers two different approaches to the musical object. A naive approach tends to describe it as a natural acoustic object, i.e., as a pure collection of physical sounds, while a phenomenological approach tends to describe it as an intentional object. Like Husserl, Conrad affirms that the aesthetic object is an ideal object and not a real object. It has intentional properties and not natural properties. A phenomenological description analyzes a complex network of meanings that are inherent directly or even indirectly in the musical object. This intentional field presents different levels of prominence. For instance, a simple melody exhibits its linear shape and its psychic characteristics (expressive or emotional characteristics) in the foreground, while the secondary elements (its dynamic or timbric course) stay in the background. Moreover, the melody is articulated into two kinds of musical units: units of rhythm (metric units) and units of meaning (phraseological units). Such an articulation is constituted by two distinct even if interlaced musical structures.

Sometimes Conrad's observations enter into technical discussions that engage questions of musical theory (in so doing, he undertakes a comparison with the famous musicologist Hugo Riemann). This especially happens when his analysis concerns tonality. According to Conrad, tonal relationships within a melody entail the need to refer every melodic tone

A. Mazzoni (✉)
Istituto musicale “O. Vecchi”, Modena, Italy

to a fixed point. All tones are to be related to the tonic, so they acquire a specific meaning within a harmonic scheme of reference. The aesthetic musical object is a meaningful network of relationships that are to be realized. Not just any perception can grasp it, because it arises only when the exact relationships in question are accomplished. Conrad therefore says that the aesthetic object is a task. In realizing the musical object, this perceptual task is as important as a performative task. In fact, beyond a restricted "sphere of irrelevance" concerning both the performative and the perceptual aspect, each correct realization has to yield the same intentional object, so that the aesthetic object, as an ideal object, maintains its identity in spite of its possible incorrect realizations.

Other researchers among the first phenomenologists also produced reflections on music. MORITZ GEIGER's investigation of concentration in the face of art is significant in this regard (Geiger 1928). He thinks that music, like any other art, requires an attitude of external (and not of internal) concentration. Listening to music involves concentrating one's attention on the musical work and not on oneself. Dilettantish sentimentalism is to be avoided.

ROMAN INGARDEN's discussion of the ontological status of a musical work is perhaps the most complete of the phenomenological researches on music (Ingarden 1958). Its results have absolute value not only for phenomenology, but also for musicology. On the other hand, the ontological problem examined by Ingarden is quite similar to some questions sketched earlier by Husserl and Conrad. His analysis proceeds by essential distinctions between: (1) a musical work and its performances; (2) a musical work and subjective experiences; and (3) a musical work and its score. For Ingarden, musical works are neither real objects (real acoustic processes) nor ideal objects (eternal ideas). He concludes that ontologically a musical work is a purely intentional object that is heteronomous in its being and depends on specific psychic acts and other specific objects (score and performative acoustic processes).

According to Ingarden, every work of (absolute) music is a monostratified object, namely, an object constituted by a single layer. It presents a great variety of elements: melodic, rhythmic, and harmonic properties; agogic, dynamic, and timbric properties; quasi-temporal structure; movement, form, emotional qualities, aesthetic qualities, and so on. Nevertheless,

all of these elements belong to a single fundamental layer. In this regard, his opinion is opposite to that of NICOLAI HARTMANN, who affirms that every musical work is constituted by at least two layers (Hartmann 1933, 1953).

Ingarden also says that when it is fixed in writing, the musical work is correlated to its score, and as such, appears as a schematic construction. In fact, many agogic, dynamic, and timbric properties are not indicated by the musical notation, so there are innumerable points of indeterminacy in the work. On the contrary, during its performance, the musical work appears in concrete form (concretization), although even then, it remains a purely intentional object, distinct from the acoustic process, which is a real and totally determined object. For each performance, many concretizations are possible, because every one of them depends on several objective and subjective factors. Aesthetic concretizations, in particular, depend on the listener's experience, which is constitutive of aesthetic values. The problem about the ontological status of a musical work is linked with the problem of its identity. A musical work, in its historical life, maintains a firm identity, in spite of its different performances and concretizations. As Ingarden observes, such an identification is based on the score to which the work is correlated as a schematic construction with innumerable points of indeterminacy. In fact, the historical variety of performances and concretizations emerges as realizations of new potential forms of a unique invariable scheme. The scheme guarantees the identity of the work, but also permits its variable life in history.

In his considerable contribution to the study of music, ALFRED SCHUTZ was concerned with additional phenomenological questions. A musical work is regarded by Schutz as a meaningful context, namely, as an ideal object (Schutz 1976). However, music is not bound to a conceptual frame of reference, so a musical meaning cannot be grasped monothetically, in one single ray of consciousness, but can only be grasped polythetically by reproducing it step by step. In grasping the meaning of a musical work, the listener has to reproduce its polythetic constitution. Schutz connects the polythetic constitution of a musical meaning to the essential temporality of the musical experience. During the musical experience, the flux of consciousness and flux of music are interrelated and simultaneous. The experience of music originates in

the “stream of consciousness” (William James), in the inner *durée* (Henri Bergson), where retentions, reproductions, protentions, and anticipations are constitutive of it. In other words, the flux of consciousness and musical experience arise together. The listener must therefore assume a specific attitude, ceasing to live in acts of daily life and changing his/her tension of consciousness, relaxing this tension and surrendering to the musical flux that is interrelated to that of the stream of consciousness in inner time.

As long as the listener lives in these acts of listening, s/he is directed toward the ongoing flux of music as it flows. In so doing, the listener can experience the musical units, but is not yet able to grasp their meaning. According to Schutz, the listener must stop participating in the ongoing flux and turn back to his/her past experiences, making the acts of listening the object of reflection as soon as the flux of the music itself (by its articulation) invites this moment of reflection. A reflective glance then enables the listener to discern the mechanism of retentions and protentions by which the musical units are constituted—a mechanism that become accessible when the listener reflects on it, allowing the musical units to be perceived as a meaningful context. And for Schutz, music is a meaningful context that can be communicated as such. In his opinion, musical communication presents a complicated structure of social relationships among composer, performer, and listener (Schutz 1964). The relationship between composer and beholder (performer or listener) is founded upon the reconstruction of the original musical meaning, namely, upon the establishment of a quasi-simultaneity between the stream of consciousness of the composer and that of the beholder. On the other hand, the sharing of the same flux in inner time is characteristic of any musical relationship (relation between performer and listener, or face-to-face relation between performer and co-performer) and of any social relationship in general.

Phenomenological investigations of music are not limited to these efforts by Husserl’s students. Indeed, in their musical studies, several philosophers and musicologists were influenced by phenomenology. Some phenomenological considerations have also come from eminent musicians (Ansermet 1961, Schaeffer 1966). The phenomenology of music is increasing. In recent years there has been a conspicuous production of researches regarding this subject, particularly in the United States (Smith 1979, Ferrara 1991) and in

Italy (Piana 1991). Today, the framework in which phenomenology operates is quite enlarged; in fact it comprehends a rich, but perhaps a bit too eclectic, complex of interests concerning music.

A phenomenological attitude can have significance not only for the philosophy or the aesthetics of music, but also for music theory and music analysis. This happens because phenomenology focuses its attention on essential elements that are basic for any theoretical account of music. Thomas Clifton’s reflections on musical time and musical space, for instance, indicate the importance of a phenomenological foundation for music analysis (Clifton 1983). Those who analyze music can be considerably helped by a phenomenological approach. Very frequently, traditional methods of music analysis examine the musical structure from a rigid point of view. The piece of music is dissected into its formal elements (phrases, chords, intervals, and rhythmic patterns, which are abstractly ordered and classified). Thus music is reduced to its static architectonic aspect. On the contrary, a phenomenological attitude can restore the dynamic aspect of the vivid experience in which the musical units arise as meaningful units. Once again, time is the central topic. Conventional methods of music analysis neglect the study of time when they explain musical structure. Concrete structures of sound are often condensed in abstract schemes and formal diagrams, which totally expel time. Thus a phenomenological analysis may be necessary in order to apprehend the temporal element of music and to examine it in depth. Above all, it can be considered as lived time, in its interrelation with the listener’s experience, and not merely as chronological time.

As mentioned, time-consciousness is the place where the musical units are phenomenologically constituted. Sounds associate with each other by a passive synthesis that concerns both their temporal determination and their contents. Acoustic impressions are interlaced with retentions and protentions. The phenomenological network of intentional functions creates a manifold temporal horizon. Retentions and reproductions determine protentions and anticipations, which are empty intentions requiring a perceptual fulfillment. The examination of this intentional network is fundamental both in order to understand how the listener perceives the musical structure and in order to understand how the structure arises during the musical experience.

Syntactic aspects can also be explained in relation to the listener's experience of time. For instance, every musical sense of accomplishment (phraseological closure, harmonic closure, and so on) is to be connected to the perceptual fulfillment of specific protentions and anticipations; every musical sense of astonishment is to be connected to the lack of such a fulfillment. In general, a different fulfillment of protentions and anticipations produces or inhibits musical tension and determines the different syntactic meanings. Syntactic structures are perceptually established, and can refer to music of any kind when it is heard. Temporal musical structures can therefore refer not only to tonal music, but also to contemporary (post-tonal or atonal) music (Lochhead 1986). In other words, from a phenomenological point of view, musical syntax is a matter of temporal perception and not of compositional grammar.

As regards musical time, phenomenological analysis is opposed to traditional methods of music analysis and seems closer to post-Schenkerian methods. Apart from any philosophical question, a common characteristic is attention to perceptual aspects. In analyzing the musical structure, all these methods deal with a perceived temporal structure. The respective technical languages are indeed different: phenomenology chiefly considers the perceptual fulfillment of protentions and anticipations; music theory describes such intentional mechanism by turning, for instance, to the so-called "implication-realization model" (elaborated by Leonard B. Meyer and Eugene Narmour). But there are no great differences between the protention-fulfillment model and the implication-realization model. Musical implications are phenomenologically constituted by intentional protentions, so any realization depends on their perceptual fulfillment.

Phenomenological analysis and post-Schenkerian analysis have been compared by many scholars. David Lewin's comparison is based on an attempt at formalizing a model for musical perceptions (Lewin 1986). Potential links with Artificial Intelligence are also sketched in his attempts. Thus the phenomenological study of music is of interests within a wide framework involving both music theory and cognitive science. Strong relationships between phenomenology and the cognitive sciences have frequently been noted and the investigation of music perception confirms such a theoretical connection. By focusing on this subject, phenomenological analysis follows the guidelines

of a non-empirical psychology that is very close to cognitive psychology. In any case, the perspectives of a phenomenology of music are manifold. Beyond cognitive sciences and psychology, they can include sociology, semiotics, hermeneutics, and so on. Often all these perspectives are at least indirectly implied by a phenomenological approach, so different theoretical suggestions are available. Sociology, semiotics, and hermeneutics can offer conspicuous spurs for phenomenology and vice versa.

In order to develop a phenomenological reflection about musical aesthetics, it seems useful to unfold some of Ingarden's ideas. The process of musical communication can be described as a complex network of relationships among composer, performer, and listener, as Schutz indicated. Nevertheless, such a communicative network is regulated by specific relationships to the musical object. There are several intentional correlations between musical subjects and the musical object, according to the sequence: composer—*compositional idea*—score—*work-scheme*—reader—performer—*performative project*—acoustic process—*concretization*—listener (the terms in italics denote purely intentional objects).

This sequence is articulated in four phases according to the personal role of the musical subject: composer, reader, performer, and listener. (1) The composer elaborates his/her compositional idea little by little, creating the musical work and fixing it in writing. In the end, the complete score is settled. (2) The reader deciphers the signs of the score, reading the score and obtaining the work-scheme, namely the schematic construction designed by the musical signs. (3) The performer elaborates his/her performative project and realizes it making explicit or implicit decisions about the agogic, dynamic, and timbric properties that are not designed by the score. In the end, the acoustic process is produced. (4) The listener hears the acoustic process, obtaining a concretization—namely, a concrete form of the work, with its musical properties and values.

These four phases are not to be thought too rigidly. In popular music or ethnic music, for instance, some phases coincide or do not exist. Sometimes music is not fixed in writing, so the score and the work-scheme (like the reader) do not exist. In musical improvisation the composer is also immediately the performer, so the compositional idea and the performative project coincide. The sequence, in a way, does not represent

a mechanical series. In the process of creating a musical work, the composer is often the reader, performer, and listener as well. During the performance, the performer is also listener and often reader. During the listening, the listener can also be a reader. In general, the communication of music presents a confusion (or better, an interchange) of roles. Moreover, these roles are often collective. The public includes many listeners. A musical ensemble includes many performers (co-performers). Sometimes a single musical work can have many authors (composer, arranger, and so on). Another special case regards the technological reproduction of a performance on disk, tape, etc., when performative project and acoustic production are no longer directly connected.

Some important characteristics are to be noted. Score and acoustic processes are necessary means in order to approach the musical work. They are different means, although in classical music they are strictly coordinated. In any case, a musical object (a musical work) cannot intersubjectively exist (namely, exist after its creation) without a score and/or a performative acoustic process. In fact, beholders cannot have access to music if they are not readers and/or listeners. In spite of its identity, a single musical work has manifold forms of manifestation depending on its intersubjective communication: compositional idea, work-scheme, performative project, and concretization. The musical object maintains the mode of existence of a purely intentional object. However, the quantity of its points of indeterminacy is changeable according to its form of manifestation. The work-scheme, for instance, has many more points of indeterminacy than a concretization or even a performative project.

All these purely intentional objects (forms of manifestation of the same musical work) are related to the different musical subjects and sometimes to a specific means of access (score or acoustic process). The compositional idea is correlated to the composer's intentional acts when s/he creates the work and writes the score; the work-scheme is correlated to the reader's intentional acts when s/he deciphers the score; the performative project is correlated to the performer's intentional acts when s/he projects the performance and produces the acoustic process; and the concretization is correlated to listener's acts when s/he hears the acoustic process. Thus the work of music (a purely intentional object) appears through intentional acts,

and the different forms of manifestation of the musical work are based on the specific intentionality of the acts. The composer's intentional attitude is a creative attitude, even if, in general, it is not a practical attitude. The performer's intentional attitude is a re-creative and practical attitude. On the other hand, the reader's and the listener's attitude is a receptive (even if not passive) attitude.

The analysis of these relationships suggests further links with other contemporary contributions to musical aesthetics. Above all, the comparison with hermeneutics seems significant. Concepts like "work-scheme," "performative project," and "concretization" are very useful for the study of musical interpretation and musical understanding. Phenomenology of music and musical hermeneutics deal with the same topic. The reader's acts (referred to the work-scheme) are acts of interpreting and understanding musical signs. The performer's acts (referred to the performative project) are acts of reproductive interpretation of the musical work. The listener's acts (which refer to the concretization) are acts of comprehensive interpretation of the musical work. Musical hermeneutics (in either its musicological or philosophical aspects) is concerned with several questions about the performer's or the listener's tasks. Frequently, theoretical contrasts arise between the need for fidelity to the work and the need for interpretive freedom. These opposite needs can be explained and justified by using phenomenological concepts (cf., e.g., Benson 2003). The need for fidelity to the musical work is related to the respect of limits indicated by the score, namely, by the work-scheme. Nevertheless, the work-scheme, as schematic construction, is not a definite object, so it permits a variety of interpretations because there are many points of indeterminacy in it. Therefore, beyond any interpretive fidelity, an interpretative freedom is also guaranteed, because in deciding the agogic, dynamic, and timbric properties (which are not determined by the work-scheme), the performer can choose among innumerable potential performances.

Similarly, in the act of hearing the acoustic process, the listener can choose among innumerable potential concretizations, all founded on the same acoustic process. Every single concretization is a form of manifestation in which the musical work concretely appears to the listener. The listener has to grasp the work with its concrete properties. However, such properties necessarily appear through an interpretive perspective

depending on personal and cultural factors. The musical hearing has to be adequate to the work. It has to be appropriate to its properties. But these properties, even if concrete, are not properties that are completely determined. Above all, they are not the real properties of the acoustic process; they are intentional properties, namely, musical contents and meanings. Thus an interpretive variety is always at the listener's disposal.

As observed, the listener's intentional attitude, like the reader's intentional attitude, is not a passive attitude. The listener is neither productive nor creative. Nevertheless, s/he has to grasp the musical properties of the work, namely, to understand its contents and meanings, so a listening attitude is a receptive attitude that entails an activity of interpretation. The examination of this aspect reveals the connection not only between the phenomenology of music and hermeneutics, but also between phenomenology and the theory of reception. Those who hear and understand music realize an act of musical reception. A listener's concretization is correlated to his/her personal reception of the musical work. Therefore the phenomenological study of musical concretizations can contribute both to an aesthetics of musical reception and to the history of musical reception.

Bibliography

- Ansermet, Ernest. *Les fondements de la musique dans la conscience humaine*. Neuchâtel: Éditions de la Baconnière, 1961.
- Benson, Bruce Ellis. *The Improvisation of Musical Dialogue: A Phenomenology of Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Clifton, Thomas. *Music as Heard: A Study in Applied Phenomenology*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand. Eine phänomenologische Studie." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3, 1908, 71–118, 469–511; 4, 1909, 400–55.
- Ferrara, Lawrence. *Philosophy and the Analysis of Music: Bridges to Musical Sound, Form, and Reference*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Vom Dilettantismus im künstlerischen Erleben." In his *Zugänge zur Ästhetik*. Leipzig: Der Neue Geist, 1928, 1–42; rpt. in his *Die Bedeutung der Kunst*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976, 136–77; *The Significance of Art: A Phenomenological Approach to Aesthetics*. Trans. Klaus Berger. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1986.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Das Problem des geistigen Seins*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1933.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen*. 2 vols. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1900–1901; rpt. in his *Logische Untersuchungen*. *Erster Band. Prolegomena zur reinen Logik*. Ed. Elmar Holenstein. *Husserliana* 18. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975; *Zweiter Band. Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*. Ed. Ursula Panzer. *Husserliana* 19/1, 19/2. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984; *Logical Investigations*. Trans. J. N. Findlay. New York: Humanities Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. "Vorlesungen zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewußtseins." Ed. Martin Heidegger. *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 9, 1928, 367–498; rpt. in his *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins (1893–1917)*. Ed. Rudolf Boehm. *Husserliana* 10. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966; *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*. Trans. John Barnett Brough. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991, 3–137.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Formale und transzendente Logik*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1929; rpt. in his *Formale und transzendente Logik. Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft*. Ed. Paul Janssen. *Husserliana* 17. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974, 5–333; *Formal and Transcendental Logic*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis. Aus Vorlesungen und Forschungsmanuskripten 1918–1926*. Ed. Margot Fleischer. *Husserliana* 11. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966; *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis: Lectures on Transcendental Logic*. Trans. Anthony J. Steinbock. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- Ingarden, Roman. "Utwór muzyczny i sprawa jego tożsamości." In his *Studia z Estetyki*, Vol. 2. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958, 169–307; *The Work of Music and the Problem of Its Identity*. Trans. Adam Czerniawski. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986; also in his *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst. Musikwerk, Bild, Architektur, Film*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1962, 3–136; *Ontology of the Work of Art: The Musical Work, the Picture, the Architectural Work, the Film*. Trans. Raymond Meyer with John T. Goldthwait. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1989.
- Lewin, David. "Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception." In *Music Perception* 3, 1986, 327–92.
- Lochhead, Judith Irene. "Temporal Structure in Recent Music." *Journal of Musicological Research* 4, 1986, 49–93; rpt. in *Understanding the Musical Experience*. Ed. F. Joseph Smith. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1989, 121–65.
- Mazzoni, Augusto. *La musica nell'estetica fenomenologica*. Milan: Mimesis, 2004.
- Piana, Giovanni. *Filosofia della musica*. Milan: Guerini e Associati, 1991.
- Schaeffer, Pierre. *Traité des objets musicaux*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966.
- Schutz, Alfred. "Making Music Together." In his *Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory*. Ed. Arvid Brodersen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964, 159–78.

- Schutz, Alfred. "Fragments on the Phenomenology of Music" [1944]. In *In Search of Musical Method*. Ed. F. Joseph Smith. New York: Gordon & Breach 1976, 5–72; rpt. as "Fragments Toward a Phenomenology of Music." In his *Collected Papers IV*. Ed. Helmut Wagner and George Psathas with Fred Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996, 243–75.
- Smith, F. Joseph. *The Experiencing of Musical Sound*. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1979.

Maurice Natanson (1924–1996)

Michael D. Barber

Natanson devoted most of his aesthetic writings to linking phenomenology with literature. He distinguishes the philosophy *of* literature from philosophy *in* literature. The former explores literature's categories in relationship to the being of the artwork, and addresses such issues as the ontological status of a literary microcosm, the truth of art works; and the strata of meaning and their interaction—as did ROMAN INGARDEN in the formal aesthetics of *The Literary Work of Art* (1973). Philosophy *in* literature, by contrast, makes explicit the philosophical achievement of an already realized literary work. Self-admittedly inclined to this task, Natanson the existentialist turned to literary experience to reconstruct it, not thereby diluting “real” philosophy, but extending it (Natanson 1962: 87, 98–99, 123; 1996: 8–9).

In pursuit of this project, Natanson conceives phenomenology and literature as mutually illuminating. For instance, literature, like phenomenology, presupposes a world taken for granted, so taken for granted that one is not aware of even taking something for granted until rhetoric “draws us up to face what hitherto in seeing we have always ignored” and authors, by inviting us to learn all over again how to see, “return us to ourselves” (Natanson 1962: 97, 129, 139–142, 186). In addition, upon entering the fictive world, readers engage in an analogue of phenomenological reduction by “suspending”—not denying, but attending more carefully to—their ordinary believing in the world (Ibid.: 96–97), and thereby encountering the “miracle of the ordinary, a theme more brilliantly developed in literature than in philosophy” (Natanson

1969: 109). As is the case with phenomenology, fiction does not so much reflect the world as reveal its experiential foundation by engaging in a directional activity of consciousness (Natanson 1962: 97), just as art explores the familiar by exhibiting its structure in forms that disclose the taken-for-granted in a unique moment of aesthetic contemplation (Ibid.: 112, 186). However, one ought not to underestimate the risk of self and its achievements, when, through phenomenological reduction or reading literature, one strives to appreciate the reality of transcendences such as birth, sociality, and death in mundane experience. Hence Natanson (1970: 122) takes the irruption of literary art in everyday life to upset readers' bad-faith subterfuges and to invite them to appropriate their own world by eliciting from them a “perpetual willingness to *agree* to undertake the having of a world.” The phenomenological recovery of intentionality thereby converges with existential self-appropriation (Natanson 1962: 32–33).

In developing literature as a phenomenological analogue, Natanson (1962: 64, 107; 1974: 19; 1984: 258–59; 1996: 21) manifests his own understanding of phenomenological reduction, which involves no flight from this world to another, but rather a more careful seeing of that in which one had previously been unreflectively immersed. To avoid viewing literature as merely derivative from phenomenology, however, he argues that the models of the theorist and those of the imagination each contain enclaves within which literature and philosophy irradiate each other (Natanson 1986: 136). Furthermore, one who reduces literary style to mere ornamentation for philosophical concepts would be likely to believe that “despair is a neurological frailty and Gregor Samsa someone with a periodontal problem” (Ibid.: 138).

M.D. Barber (✉)
Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO, USA

In *The Erotic Bird*, Natanson masterfully models the project suggested by the book's subtitle, *Phenomenology in Literature*, by exploring philosophical themes in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain*, and Franz Kafka's *The Metamorphosis*. Though spatial constraints prohibit discussion of these rich analyses, omitting such details might mislead one into reducing literature to a dispensable adornment for philosophical ideas. But it is precisely Natanson's view of phenomenology that corrects such excessive rationalism. For phenomenology, "every fact can be thought of merely as exemplifying a pure possibility" (Natanson 1996: 130) that results not from theoretical definition based on negative qualifiers, but on an intentional seeing that reveals the impulse of what is given. Thus Hans Castorp, who earlier dismissed form as "folderol," comes to see it as the fundamental adventure of his life insofar as the running off of time is comprehensible only within the immutable form of temporality itself (Ibid.: 104). Likewise, Gregor Samsa, suspended as an insect from the ceiling and thereby viewing the world through a novel, inverted perspective, discovers that everyday life, sociality, and familiarity are essentially unstable and conceal an essential and inescapable solitude (Ibid.: 118, 121–22, 126).

In sum, one can discern essences precisely through that combination of nearness to everyday experience and reflective distance that literature affords. For this reason, phenomenology was always closer to Plato, the erotic bird, which takes flight by deeper penetration within the eros that might at first seem prohibitive of flight itself (Ibid.: 126). The literary symbol mediates between concrete typifications and forms of transcendence, between the existentially concrete and the phenomenologically essential, such that the universal becomes the "lucidity of the particular" (Natanson 1970: 107, 114–19).

Though concentrating on philosophy in literature, Natanson also addresses formal problems of the philosophy of literature by examining the object of art, which requires of the philosophical aesthetician an attitude distinctively different from that of an art critic (Natanson 1962: 80). To explore the epistemological grounding of the aesthetic object, whether from the viewpoint of its artist or audience, one first undertakes a particular kind of reduction, separating by self-conscious attention the art work from the rest

of experience, recognizing, for example, the stage cordoning off the play *Hamlet* (Natanson 1962: 80–83). The artwork also depends upon "reconstruction," that is, the intentional acts of synthesis by which the artist unifies the work and its underlying constitutive activities, whether such synthesis is achieved through critical self-consciousness or with minimal cognitive direction. Just as the audience participates in the reduction, so it must reconstruct the meaning-complex of the art work, which presents a world not necessarily coincident with the artist's and which would be stillborn without the potential infinity of interpretations it generates (Ibid.: 83–85, 90, 110; 1970: 111–12).

By recognizing that the artwork embodies meanings beyond the artist's cognitive grasp or deliberateness, Natanson shows himself attuned to questions typically raised in Marxist, psychoanalytical, structuralist, and poststructuralist circles. In addition, his awareness of the intersubjective character of art and the need for audience interpretation alerts him to the indispensable creativity of interpreting and reading that is emphasized in deconstructionism (Natanson 1962: 110, 142). Insofar as he emphasizes an infinite number of reconstructions without explaining in depth the notion of the "objective interpretation" of an artwork (Ibid.: 85; 1996: 36; 1974: 281), he risks succumbing to the relativism frequently attributed to JEAN-PAUL SARTRE's *L'être et le néant* (1943). However, Natanson *does* limit the creativity of the reader who must still be responsive to the text (Natanson 1962: 110); and thus, for instance, "Kafka demands that we become responsible for his world, but that world remains *his*." Furthermore, the Sartre of *Verité et existence* (1990) resists relativism, which permits one to escape easily the risks and contingency of responsibility involved in assuming a position and justifying it—possibilities to which Natanson (Ibid.: 110) alludes when citing Sartre on how one assumes responsibility for the book one opens.

This Sartrean basis for objectivity, though, still remains a bit too subjectively oriented and could profit from inclusion within a more fully intersubjective ethics of interpretation, in which interpreters are accountable to artists and other interpreters, with whom they ought to disagree responsibly if necessary. Moreover, the fact that one always interprets from the sociohistorically determined "fore-having" that MARTIN HEIDEGGER (1962: 191) has described

and that exceeds one's rational comprehension does not preclude one from arriving at a weakly holistic verdict about a work's aesthetic merits (Bohman 1991: 124–26). Such a verdict, undertaken in responsibility to many interlocutors, does not seek to determine which interpretation is infallibly correct, but which interpretation is better or worse with reference to other interpretations and to the text.

In later reflections on the art object, Natanson (1970: 110–13) emphasizes how it “requires” the implementation of the aesthetic reduction, setting in abeyance our usual ways of seeing. As a result, the art object appears distinctive in that in its unity of meanings (as opposed to its character as a physical object), it cannot be changed, possessed (although as a physical object it could be owned by someone), or used (as persons cannot either) without being “degraded.” By stressing this “nonfunctional and irreducible independence” of the art object, Natanson draws out parallels between aesthetics and ethics, as did Immanuel Kant in his *Kritik der Urteilkraft* (1790).

In addition to studies on philosophy in literature and on the object of art, Natanson (1986: 92, 126–27; 1974: 186–87) also explored phenomenological themes in literature, especially the transcendental ego, which, existentially interpreted, lies at the root of one's own uniqueness, and which for ALFRED SCHUTZ was “the most profound prime suppressed” or negated when the “anonymous [e.g., role] replaces inwardness.” This ego, or “current of existence”—taken for granted in everyday life, thematized in phenomenology, and reconstructed in transcendental phenomenology (Natanson 1962: 97, 140)—provides “the phenomenological clue to the essence of literature” (Natanson 1996: 20) whose irruptive force confronts readers with their individual birth and final destruction (Natanson 1970: 122). Hence he approvingly cites Sartre that “the literary object has no other substance than the reader's subjectivity” (Natanson 1962: 110). This ego, though, is not merely an “object” disclosed through literature, but is presupposed as the condition of the possibility of such disclosure, which phenomenology, ever “attending to the circumstances and conditions of its own procedures,” reveals. Thus Natanson describes the ego as both object disclosed and subject disclosing insofar as “the transcendental ego in this sense is the condition of my being able to find out, through the performance of my life, who I am” (Ibid.: 47).

Two distinctive features of Natanson's aesthetics serve as junctures for praise and further consideration. First, just as he reconciles EDMUND HUSSERL's abstract transcendental ego with Sartrean existentialism, so in his nonrationalistic approach to phenomenology, understood not as fleeing this world but as attending more carefully to it, he permits phenomenology's fruitful collaboration with literature, never conceivable as dispensable ornamentation for philosophical ideas. Occasionally, however, Natanson (1974: 19) falls prey to this rationalism, ever endangering phenomenology, when he suggests that the phenomenologist starts with experience and then mobilizes language to comprehend it, as if language did not frequently and unconsciously structure the intentionality through which experience is given, as MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY observed. Finally, one does not subtract from the sophisticated phenomenological existentialism that Natanson developed and used to interpret literature when one questions whether he has the whole picture, especially given his endorsement of Sartre's striking comment that “the literary object has no other substance than the reader's subjectivity.”

On the contrary, one could imagine taking as an interpretive key to literature the suffering of the other, which Emmanuel Levinas has developed and which would expand the meaning of the transcendence of sociality to which Natanson refers. Then one might read Natanson's chosen works differently, with Gregor Samsa, for example, representing the quintessential experience of being excluded. Furthermore, one might have selected other works as paradigmatic for exploring the theme of philosophy in art, such as Leo Tolstoy's *Twenty-Three Tales*, José Clemente Orozco's and Diego Rivera's murals, or Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. But insofar as one cannot think the suffering of the other apart from the ego to which it appears and from whom it elicits a freely chosen response, in the end one will never be able to bypass Natanson's phenomenological existentialism, or the fecund relationship with art he has shown it entails.

Bibliography

- Bohman, James. *New Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1927; *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward

- Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962; rpt. San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco, 1962.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk* [1931]. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1960; *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilkraft*. Berlin: Lagarde and Friederich, 1790; *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 1987.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. "Art and Phenomenology." In *Essays in Phenomenology*. Ed. Maurice Natanson. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966, 144–156.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totalité et infini: Essai sur l'extériorité*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1961. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans. by Alphonso Lingis. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.
- Natanson, Maurice. *Literature, Philosophy, and the Social Sciences*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.
- Natanson, Maurice. "Philosophy and Psychiatry." In *Psychiatry and Philosophy*. Ed. Maurice Natanson. New York: Springer, 1969, 85–110.
- Natanson, Maurice. *The Journeying Self: A Study in Philosophy and Social Role*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Natanson, Maurice. *Phenomenology, Role, and Reason: An Essay on the Coherence and Deformation of Social Reality*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.
- Natanson, Maurice. "Descriptive Phenomenology." In *Essays in Memory of Aron Gurwitsch*. Ed. Lester Embree. Washington, DC: Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology/University Press of America, 1984, 249–60.
- Natanson, Maurice. *Anonymity: A Study in the Philosophy of Alfred Schutz*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Natanson, Maurice. *The Erotic Bird: Phenomenology in Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'être et le néant: Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1943; *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Verité et existence*. Ed. Arlette el Kaim-Sartre. Paris: Gallimard, 1990; *Truth and Existence*. Trans. Adrian van den Hoven. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Nature

Cathrin Nielsen

In Greek, the word “nature” derives from the verb *phyō*, to come forth, to grow, to become. It is life independent of thought, and non-constructed. Aristotle calls *physis* “the coming-to-be what it is” (1960: 193a). Nature as *physis* contains both the movement of emergence and the specific growth, becoming and being, productivity and product. Growth in this context implies that withering and demise belong to it; *genesis* is always *phthora*, decay is integral to the act of coming-to-light. In pre-Socratic thought, the human being is seen as part of *physis*, which contains the human as a whole and in his/her individuality. The focus of the Roman words *nasci* and *natura* is, however, on being conceived and being born. *Natura* now means “native” and “inherent,” but is also defined in terms of the right of disposal, which influenced the formation of the modern term of object (cf. Picht 1998: 90). Nature as the quintessence of objects is nature as the sum of everything that is at our disposal in thought and action.

Nature and spirit or freedom diverge with the emergence of modern natural sciences. Nature now becomes a mathematically calculable substance in contrast to the imaginative subject. Descartes posits nature as an extended, quantitatively measurable substance (*res extensa*) as different from the mind (*res cogitans*). By reverting to Galileo and Newton, Kant coins the term nature as that of a *natura formaliter spectata*; it determines the being of things as long as this being adheres to the parameters of general laws devised by reason. This type of nature shows no marks of inwardness, i.e., being for its own sake, purpose-driven

liveliness, spontaneity, etc.; it is only the transcendental subject that can grow beyond itself. This definition has created an as yet unresolved chasm between the realm of nature as an externalized system of laws and the inaccessible realm of freedom to which the human being, as a creature of reason and thus purpose itself, exclusively belongs.

German Idealism, as it is called, explicitly tried to reconcile reason and nature. In this attempt, the focus alternates between spirit and nature as the all-encompassing principle. In his *Aesthetics*, Hegel views nature as the integral idea, but “in terms of being an other,” i.e., nature is spirit in its “externality.” While the spirit’s activity consists of tracing the external back to inwardness, nature is ultimately also “sublated” in the absolute. Hegel studies the process of “sublation” into which natural materiality vanishes by means of a type of retranslation of spatial dimensions as this occurs in the various arts. While object-oriented arts such as architecture and sculpture represent the liberation of spatial restrictions and matter, the art of painting limits itself to the surface dimension and the line. The subjective arts of music and poetry present a point of finality as the spatial dimension contained in them disappears into time. They point to the “end of art” as a *sensory* representation of the idea. For Hegel, the beautiful, in the explicit sense of the word, only springs from the mind of the observer who leads nature to freedom. Hegel thus ranks the beauty of art higher than beauty in nature because the beauty of art is beauty born of the spirit and born again (cf. Hegel 1986: 14).

In contrast, F.W.J. Schelling’s speculative philosophy of nature takes the approach of a *poietic ontology* that conversely states that reason is incarnate in nature. Nature is “subject-object.” Reason is invisible nature, just as nature is visible reason. Taking on the

C. Nielsen (✉)
Eugen Fink Archive, Freiburg, Germany

identity of nature and spirit, nature contains both the passive side of materiality and of a product (*natura naturata*) as well as the active spiritual side of productivity (*natura naturans*). It is not only the product of an incomprehensible creation, but is this very creation itself (Schelling 1985: 378). In daily interaction with nature, we are inclined to see nature in terms of its characteristics as a product, i.e., in a finished or completed state; philosophy, however, seeks nature's hidden inner productivity. Philosophy uses art as a guideline because in the artistic approach, the "unconscious," i.e., nature, and the "conscious," i.e., freedom, interact until they have reached a common identity; it is the artistic approach that achieves the miracle of temporarily bridging a seemingly insuperable polarity. Schelling sees unconscious nature as the older element that is always inside us as in all things as well. Anticipating Nietzsche, he interprets the eighteenth century as an era that wrapped original nature in theory and thus presented it divorced from its dark creativity.

Poietic ontology—i.e., the idea of an original productivity of nature that encompasses the spiritual, as devised by Schelling—proved decisive for various phenomenological concepts well into the twentieth century. Friedrich Nietzsche (1988), for example, initially identifies two irreducible roots of art as "Apollonian" and "Dionysian." While the Apollonian represents the measured and figuratively defined idea, Nietzsche interprets the Dionysian as the chaotic, boundless, and non-pictorial act of becoming that destroys the Apollonian pattern at the same time as it determines its creative foundation. Later, he defines both impulses in the formula of the "will to power" (*Wille zur Macht*) that is also a "will to art." This will is what shapes the inaccessibly natural core of our appropriation of reality, a core that our conscious principles never reach. The "physiology of art" originating from the body as "great reason" finds its bearings in the physiological actions of consuming, digesting, and energizing. Beauty is no aesthetic category elevated above life but the "*Stimulanz*" (stimulation) of life.

MAX SCHELER picks up on this approach to nature in a note in his literary estate on the subject of *Metaphysik der Natur* when he refers to the "urge" (*Drang*) that initially motivates the mind to create ideas, values, and purpose. This is a creative, constructive urge without which the mind would remain unproductive; conversely, this urge must form a coalition with the mind in order to have a reasonable

goal. Nature itself thus contains an imaginative force based on two principles without forming a dualistic relationship (Scheler 1979: 185ff.).

For French phenomenologist MIKEL DUFRENNE (1973), the creative expression (*le poétique*) that takes shape in works of art is likewise based in the original creativity (*poïesis*) of nature. At the same time, it echoes nature's action, just as nature conversely discloses itself as the origin only in the continuous renewal of the creative process inspired by it. Aesthetic experience, aside from presence and representation, is defined by the sensuous dimension of *sensation*. In this dimension, we reach the limits of our conceptualizing and analytic capacities; instead, our affinity to nature steps forward.

In an explicit recourse to Schelling, MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY advances into the unconscious in the context of a phenomenology of pre-reflective being. The philosophy of nature is no theory to him, but life within nature (cf. 1995: 73); nature is not simply inaccessible material (and as such the subject matter for natural sciences), but a pre-objective, "wild" (*sauvage*), or "brute" (*brut*) being, and as such is a type of material source of any meaning that eludes any and all laws. This earthly material is ontologically conceivable as "chiasm" in which consciousness and thing, subject and object are interwoven. Through this interweaving, the structures within consciousness are reintroduced into the flesh (*chair*), which, by means of corporeal existence, expands into the "flesh of the world" (*chair du monde; carnalité*); as flesh, nature is conversely receptive to the mind (cf. 1964b, 1995). This subjectivity inherent in nature does not result from projection. On the contrary, Merleau-Ponty asserts that what we call I and that what we call a living being share a common root in the pre-objective sense. Art, and painting in particular, draw on this "third dimension" between subject and object in which the nature of the I and the inner life of things are as yet undivided (cf. 1964a).

In phenomenology based on EDMUND HUSSERL's *Ideen* and its focus on the problems of constitution, nature emerges initially only tangentially as an "existent in and of itself" (*von sich her Seiende*). In this context, nature refers primarily to the field of objects in natural sciences (cf. Husserl 1952: §11). Despite his later insight into the inaccessible lifeworldly structures and the corporeity to which the core of the theorems of modern natural sciences must be traced back, Husserl

never saw nature as an entity that exceeds consciousness or even encompasses it. Nature constitutes itself as material and animate, originating from and for the subject: "Nature is a unity of appearance posited by subjects and to be posited by them, to be posited, specifically, in acts of reason" (Husserl 1952: §47). Early aesthetic phenomenology as a whole is caught up in the tension attributed to the term "thing itself" (*Sache selbst*), i.e., the tension between retracing the beautiful, including nature, to subjective contemplation (as in receptive aesthetics) on the one hand and its constitution through the being of the object on the other.

It is initially ROMAN INGARDEN who places into ontological question the complete suspension of the material moment during the subjective perceptual process and emphasizes it instead as a pivotal moment of the object's constitution (Ingarden 1931).

In his analysis of natural beauty DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND points, albeit in a different context, to the concept of an "independent state" (*Eigenstand*) of nature. He stresses the *reality* of the natural object as definitive; the visual entity of appearance is not enough because in it, natural beauty's own "dimension of validity and enchantment" is left out (1977: 312 ff.). What is "real" in this sense is therefore not the material layer of nature accessible in principle, but instead its authenticity, volatile as it is. It vanishes "when what we see appears to have a different dimension of reality than it actually has" (1977: 313). Thus the temporal volatility and instability of a sunset, for example, contain beauty, while artificial flowers do not. In this context, von Hildebrand differentiates between "appearance" and "aspect"; the appearance misleads us, while the aspect refers to another infinite wealth of beauty valid in and of itself.

Within the context of ontological questions with regard to nature, we also find the large-scale project of "Real Ontology" by phenomenologist Hedwig Conrad-Martius (1944) that pursues essential structures in the self-organization of nature (*Selbstaufbau der Natur*) based on empirical material and entelechy.

While here nature taken in terms of ontological characteristics such as entelechy again moves to the forefront, standing in opposition to the one-dimensional appropriation of modern sciences while remaining within the context of established European thought, MARTIN HEIDEGGER focuses on the espousal of nature in the sense of the ancient Greek *physis*. It too

is explicitly impacted by the overcoming of modern-day subjectivism. Just as nature currently appears to be dissipating into science, the essence of art is in the process of fading into subjective aesthetic experience. This act of withdrawing or vanishing Heidegger also called "abandonment of being" (*Seinsverlassenheit*). Nature in the sense of *physis*, however, is "being itself, by virtue of which essents become and remain observable" (1959: 17). The act of disclosing is what itself specifically becomes evident in this luminous process of unfolding and growth toward daylight (*phyein*)—for instance, in the way a flower opens, but also in the way something gathers into a gesture or a word and emerges from there. In this context, Heidegger focuses primarily on the fundamental connection between *physis* and *alētheia* that is the occurrence of disclosure or unconcealment (*Lichtung*) as well as on its controversial connection with the basic experience of the withdrawnness of nature.

This counter-strife is discussed in "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerks" (1935–36) as the struggle between rising world and withdrawing earth. Here Heidegger refers to the manner, characterized by struggle, in which being is exposed—like an oeuvre—as that which is "beautiful." "The shining that is set into the work is the beautiful. *Beauty is one way in which truth as unconcealment comes to presence*" (1950: 44). "Beauty" in this instance does not refer to our aesthetic sensitivity but is an ontological attribute; its opposite is not "ugly," but "non-being." The work of art is paradigmatic because the inaccessibility of the dawn of the world becomes especially evident in it. The "world" as a known, historically explored context of meaning arises in relation to the "earth," which, as its dark soil and foundation, enables the world at the same time as it withdraws from visibility and access. *Physis* in its complete interpretation therefore encompasses both the act of showing and the act of hiding while both continue intermittently to refer to each other. Later on, Heidegger (2000) expands the interplay of world and earth into the concept of the fourfold (*Geviert*) of earth and heaven, the divine and the mortal.

A critical continuation of the contemplative focus on the withdrawnness of *physis* can be found in the phenomenology of OSKAR BECKER. In Becker, we revisit the antagonistic principles of nature and freedom and find the wide-open center in which he places art. While the artist realizes him/herself in historical existence, s/he is

simultaneously subject to para-existential demands of “sustenance” (*Getragenheit*) that creates a dependency on the laws and goodwill of nature. Later, Becker (1963) coins the term “*Dawesen*” for the sustenance that stands in opposition to the historicity of being (*Dasein*); it is not characterized by ecstatic transcendence, but by the withdrawnness of the subhistorical and prehistorical *Da* (There) of the existence of nature. The aesthetic appearance that is thereby based in an intransmutable tension of nature and freedom is utterly fragile and frail, since it can only be maintained temporarily. The work is only momentarily complete; the artist surrenders to the “adventure” (*Abenteuerlichkeit*) of its explicit success.

In the context of his *cosmological* rephrasing of Heidegger’s thoughts on being, EUGEN FINK also emphasizes the traditionally marginalized dimension of “earth” (cf. Fink 1992). The point is to base thought not simply in disclosure, but equally in *physis* in the sense of withdrawn nature as the darkness concealed from that which is uncovered or disclosed. *Physis* not only adds a privative counter-pole to the historical world, but also provides a second ontological principle, i.e., a dimension that runs counter to the luminous and the open. The disclosed world has “a power on the earth that overpowers brightness” (Heidegger and Fink 1982: 48), the “circuit of lights is surrounded by the night” (ibid.: 53), and “*alētheia* is surrounded by *lēthe*” (ibid.: 131). From an elemental point of view, human beings are permeated by nature as *physis* even in this nocturnal terrestrial sense. Human beings are not only uncovered beings, but also natural beings; we are not only world-open, but also “open to the earth.”

In contrast to Heidegger, Fink does not necessarily see “earth” as a type of boundary to the phenomenal. Instead, within both areas of being, there are things that are visible and that can be expressed as well as things that remain inaccessible to historical comprehension. All that is visible and can be expressed (or the “innerworldly”) refers symbolically, as a fragment, to that which is elusive to the phenomenal presence, to the whole of the world as a pairing of heaven and earth, of light and night. This symbolic reference occurs among other things in Fink’s *Spiel als Weltsymbol* (1960).

Korean phenomenologist CHO Kah Kyung also pursues the concept of the *symbolon* that, in its fragmentary characteristics, illuminates that which withdraws from phenomenal presence. The primary concept in this context is the Taoist notion of a creation

in letting be, of achievement in the non-self (cf. 1987: 313). The focus is less on the intentional emphasis on an element within the work than on the suspension of all laws in favor of the nonmaterial, the fundamental reason for being that underlies all that is discernible (*Tao*). The *passive* attitude of letting be thus turns into the positive motif of artistic work; the original, “art-less” natural being becomes the measure of artistic beauty. The central term of this type of aesthetic is not beauty as an assembled appearance, but the “void” as a manner of implication, reserve, and empty space for all that is as yet unsaid and unfilled (cf. 1987: 324). Cho continues to expand this thought pattern in terms of ecology based on the gentle, preserving approach to things.

Several attempts are made to counterbalance the modern dichotomy between freedom and history on the one hand and nature as subject-object opposites, a dichotomy based in the *Lichtmetaphysik* arising from the occidental tradition on the other. Strategies include (1) attempts to negotiate the two divergent areas of being or a re-translation of one into the other; (2) by highlighting the correlation, reflected in the authentic matter of thought (*Sache selbst*), between transcendental subjectivity and materiality (primarily as detailed in the problems of constitution in early phenomenology); and (3) stepping back into an area that precedes the dichotomy, as for instance in the case of poietic nature as raised by Schelling, or Nietzsche’s thoughts on the body as a “great” reason comprising humankind and nature in thought, or Husserl’s “life-world” (*Lebenswelt*), or Heidegger’s *physis* thought in terms of a radical upgrading of the dimension of withdrawnness (*lēthe*) that had vanished from the metaphysical tradition. In all of these conceptions, the term “nature” is directly woven into the core issues of occidental philosophy, including questions of appearance and reality, of space, time, and motion, of the nature of truth, and last but not least, of the role of sensuous perception, along with the closely related question of aesthetics in its original meaning of *aisthēsis*. But it is especially certain newly established aesthetic theories—those in particular that are based on the philosophy of nature and see themselves as theories of sensuous perception—that acknowledge the human need for nature, affirming as Gernot Böhme states, “that there is something present which is of itself and touches human beings through its independent being. Human beings have a profound need for

the other, different from themselves. They do not wish to live in a world where they only meet their own kind" (Böhme 1989: 92).

Bibliography

- Aristotle. *Physics*. Revised text with introduction and commentary by W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.
- Becker, Oskar. "Von der Hinfälligkeit des Schönen und der Abenteuerlichkeit des Künstlers" [1929]. In his *Dasein und Dawesen. Gesammelte philosophische Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1963, 11–40.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Für eine ökologische Naturästhetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989.
- Cho, Kah Kyung. *Bewußtsein und Natursein. Phänomenologischer Ost-West-Diwan*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1987.
- Conrad-Martius, Hedwig. *Der Selbstaufbau der Natur: Entelechien und Energien*. Hamburg: H. Goverts Verlag, 1944.
- Dufrenne, Mike. *Le poétique, précédé de Pour une philosophie non-théologique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1973.
- Fink, Eugen. *Spiel als Weltsymbol*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Fink, Eugen. *Natur, Freiheit, Welt. Philosophie der Erziehung*. Ed. Franz-Anton Schwarz. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1992.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik I. Werke*, Vol.13. Ed. Eva Moldenhauer and Karl Markus Michel. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986; *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Trans. T. M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; *Off The Beaten Track*. Ed. and Trans. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes. Cambridge: University Press, 2002.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Einführung in die Metaphysik*. Ed. Petra Jaeger. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1983; *An Introduction to Metaphysics*. Trans. Ralph Manheim. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Das Ding." In his *Vorträge und Aufsätze (1936–1953). Gesamtausgabe* 7. Ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000, 165–187.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Seminare. Gesamtausgabe* 15. Ed. Curd Ochwaldt. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann 1986; Martin Heidegger and Eugen Fink, *Heraclitus Seminar: 1966/67*. Trans. Charles H. Seibert. University of Alabama Press, 1982.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Ästhetik*. Vol. 1, *Die Schönheit in der Natur. Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 5. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1977.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch. Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Konstitution*. Ed. Marly Biemel. *Husserliana* 4. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1952; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Second Book: Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931, rpt. Tübingen, 1972; *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'oeil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964a; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Michael B. Smith. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *La nature: Notes, cours du Collège de France*. Ed. Dominique Ségolund. Paris: Gallimard, 1995; *Nature Course Notes from the Collège de France*. Trans. Robert Vallier. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2003.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* [1872]. In his *Kritische Studienausgabe*. Ed. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Vol. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988; *The Birth of Tragedy Out of the Spirit of Music*. Trans. Shaun Whiteside. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Picht, Georg. *Der Begriff der Natur und seine Geschichte*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1998.
- Scheler, Max. "Metaphysik der Natur." In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 11. *Schriften aus dem Nachlass*, 2: *Erkenntnislehre und Metaphysik*. Ed. Manfred S. Frings. Bern: Francke, 1979.
- Schelling, F. W. J. *System des transcendentalen Idealismus* [1800]. In his *Ausgewählte Schriften*. Vol. 1. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985, 395–702; *System of Transcendental Idealism*. Trans. Peter Heath. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978.
- Schelling, F. W. J. "Über das Verhältnis der bildenden Künste zur Natur" [1807]. In his *Ausgewählte Schriften*. Ed. Manfred Frank. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1985, 579–619.

NISHIDA Kitaro (1870–1945)

KANATA Susumu

NISHIDA is one of the most influential philosophers in the modern Japan and the founder of the Kyoto school of philosophy. He was probably the first to introduce EDMUND HUSSERL's phenomenology into Japan, and his many students so sympathized with it that they went on to study abroad under Husserl, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, and EUGEN FINK. NISHIDA started from analyses of what can be called, prior to the differentiation of *noēsis*, *praxis*, and *poiēsis*, 行為直観 (action intuition). Besides, he had had a world-class thinker of Zen Buddhism, SUZUKI Taisetsu, as a friend since boyhood, and he himself practiced also Zen meditation in temples. His philosophy consists in the East Asian tradition, in Buddhism, and intended to fuse it with the European philosophy all his life.

NISHIDA'S first major work, 善の研究 (*Zen no kenkyū*; A study of good [1911], 1987–89) determined the subsequent directions of his thought. It has four topics: (1) pure experience, (2) real being, (3) the good, and (4) religion. "Pure experience" is the most fundamental consciousness and is immediate and impersonal. The term "pure experience" was borrowed from the introspective psychology of William James, but under this concept NISHIDA understands a transcendental reality that is an undifferentiated subject-object or consciousness-matter unity persisting through transient streams of consciousness.

NISHIDA devoted his philosophical life to the worldwide twentieth century philosophical movement that tried to replace the dualism of mind and matter accepted since René Descartes with a new system based on their interrelation. In order to reach

this goal, he established a logic of "locus" (place). The concept of "locus" is also a central term of his aesthetics. Already in his 働くものから見るものへ (*Hatarakumono kara mirumono he*; From that which acts to that which sees, 1927), against the logic of the thing or object, he proposes a logic of the nothing that can be filled with things and yet seems to remain itself a void-space, turning this into a logic of activity. Since ancient Greece *locus* has been an important theme, as we know from Plato's *chōra* (*Timaeus*) and Aristotle's *topos* (*De Anima* and *Topica*). Especially the latter inquired into the *topos* as that *wherein* there is the being of things, but there he inquired into the isolated *topos* of the individual thing. In early modern times, Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz treated the *monad* as a new concept of the individual thing, which is itself an isolated unity without any windows and yet simultaneously mirrors other monads and the world on its surface. A *monad* has its own place where its function is to mirror the reflecting-reflected relation not only of other monads, but of the world.

For NISHIDA, *locus* means the place in which the conscious *ego* is realized. What exists must be in some place, a *wherein*, otherwise existence could not be distinguished from nonexistence. And yet the relation between *locus* and thing does not mean the external relation between a vessel and the water it contains, but an internal relation in such a way that the thing possesses some shared quality of *locus* (*methexis*). The judgment, "this apple is red," is not logically correct. "The color of this apple is red" or "this apple is red in color" ought to be said instead. In this case, a property "red" (the individual) of this apple is recognized in the *locus* "color" (the general). It is also said that the same apple is round (individual) in shape (general), which is another *locus*.

KANATA S. (✉)
Hiroshima University, Higashihiroshima, Hiroshima, Japan

When NISHIDA says that “I know myself in myself,” a definite difference is revealed from “I know this tree.” While “this tree” is entirely object, “myself” is the objectified subject, which makes possible the relation of “I” (subject) and “myself” (object) on the foundation of the *locus* “in myself.” What does not become subject at all, but becomes predicate is revealed as the foundation of consciousness, and thus can be developed in breadth and depth into more and more articulated knowledge.

With respect to the subject-predicate judgment, NISHIDA also called the logic of locus the “predicative logic” in contrast with the logic of the subject (= the logic of the thing). Predicative logic is developed in the *locus* as concretization of the general concept. Consciousness and thing are not opposed to one another in the *locus*, but enveloped in themselves. Recognition means that the self (A) reflects the self (B) in the self (C). The self (A) means consciousness, the self (B) the individual, and, finally, the self (C) is general. Three kinds of self are thus identified in the logic of the *locus*. And yet in order for this sentence to be reasonable, recognition needs to be joined with practice. This too needs to be realized in a certain *locus*. For NISHIDA’s philosophy, *locus* is the most significant concept. It consists of three strata: (1) the *locus* of being; (2) the *locus* of relative nothingness, which occurs between two beings or around them; and (3) the *locus* of absolute nothingness, which is the endless openness in the foundation of all beings.

“Constitution” is a very important and essential concept in the transcendental phenomenology of Husserl. It is not that consciousness constitutes any object, but that the object constitutes itself in consciousness. This means that the property of *locus* is shown in the phenomenological “constitution” of consciousness. There constitution is equal to the appearance or the revealing of itself. Husserl’s constitution can be conceived also near the level of ontology.

Now NISHIDA’s *locus* is equal to corporeal consciousness and consists of horizontal extension and vertical depth. (1) Horizontally, *locus* is the substratum of being that extends to surroundings, unconsciousness, community, etc. This has some affinity with Husserl’s *Lebenswelt*, Heidegger’s *In-der-Welt-Sein*, Sigmund Freud’s unconscious, etc. Consciousness extends through the medium of the body to the material world and the world opens the self to consciousness. (2) Vertically, the *locus* is the human body. The human

body takes part in the *genesis* of the world through negation of the self by making the body medium of expressing others.

NISHIDA’s logic of *locus* is above all adequate to the process of artistic creation. When a painter (subject) draws a line on a paper in front of a model (object) (= the logic of the thing), the picture space (*locus* as consciousness) comes into appearance through a drawn figure (*locus* as individual) on the picture plane (*locus* as general). The figure possesses the property of the shared picture plane. The logic of the predicative is more adequate to artistic creation, because it does not matter what one draws (= the logic of the subject), but how one draws it (predicative logic).

NISHIDA’s aesthetics is an aesthetics of pure will, which penetrates the entire process of artistic activity. This is why he opposed the aesthetics of Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, who named aesthetics the science of sensuous knowledge, because aesthetic truth should be considered as a preparation for epistemological truth. Baumgarten separated judgment of fact (what is) and judgment of value (what ought to be). The judgment of aesthetic taste belongs to the latter and is opposed to idiosyncrasy, which belongs to the former. NISHIDA does not regard the proverb “tastes differ” as right. He thinks that aesthetic judgment can differ from taste in the sense of the proverb “tastes differ.” If this differentiation were to hold good in aesthetic taste judgement, one could not claim that another person should have the common judgment of taste. He insists that the artwork should have aesthetic value in common and that both we, Japanese and non-Japanese people, can share aesthetic values.

NISHIDA loved the style of Japanese painting in India ink and of short poems consisting of several lines. He says that the space of mind is better comprehended in oriental art, while space of things is better depicted in occidental art. He also says that oriental aesthetics does not express the mind in the thing, but expresses the thing in the mind. “To grasp human life in the middle of the present,” “to see it in a point of instantaneousness,” is characteristic of oriental art. To forget the past and not to hope for the future, but to see and practice in close touch with the present is characteristic of the Japanese people. They try to depict one side of human life intuitively with only several lines, not to understand it in concepts, in didactics, or in satirical art.

NISHIDA agreed with Schopenhauer that rhythm is the essence of life and is realized in music as the deepest art. He referred to Japanese calligraphy (“*sho*,” 書) as art with less objective restriction and more expressive vibration of life. He thought that French impressionism is similar to the oriental style in that it refuses to depict external things with clear-cut features and represents instantaneous impressions instead, but it also depicts the external view as reflections of physical sunlight. It is thereby only a matter of relations among the surfaces of nature. On the contrary, he sympathized with expressionism, e.g., van Gogh, Gauguin, Matisse, and Hodler, who gave a dynamic and symbolic power to colors and thus succeeded in spiritualizing nature and in composing the lyrics of nature in terms of color. In this he found a lively activity of human feeling.

In the theory of art, he sympathized with the “*Kunstwollen*” (the willing of art) in Alois Riegl, who criticized the three concepts of material, technique, and purpose in Gottfried Semper as belonging to a past phase of art creation and emphasized “*Kunstwollen*” in its active phase. NISHIDA also considered the impulse of abstraction in Wilhelm Worringer’s *Abstraktion und Einfühlung* (1908) to be an original property of all sorts of artistic creation, and not just a stylistic concept found only in non-European modern arts.

Above all, NISHIDA felt an affinity with the art theory of Conrad Fiedler (1887), who considered the bodily activity of an artist as a natural development of his/her visual act (= intuition). Fiedler saw the origin of artistic activity in expression carried out with the hands and the body, through the process of which vague and unstable images and ideas mature into clear and distinct forms. In the opposite direction, when vision is intuitive without any prejudice or judgment, it makes the immediate visual representation develop into its own expression, which will be connected with the activities of the hands and the body. In Fiedler’s art theory NISHIDA saw 心身一如 (*shin-shin-ichijo*, as if mind and body were one).

In his last years NISHIDA wrote 歴史的・形成作用としての芸術的創作 (*Reki-shiteki keiseisayo toshiteno geijututeki sosaku*; Artistic creation as historical form activity, 1941), where he considered the subjectivity of expression as “historical existence,” not as superhistorical “reality itself,” which was argued under the influence of MIKI Kiyoshi, who

had studied with Heidegger in Freiburg and tried to fuse the latter’s philosophy of existence with the Marxian philosophy of history. Miki published a masterpiece, 構想力の論理 (*Kosoryoku no ronri*; Logic of imagination, 1946), and, mainly on the ground of Kant’s *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (1781) and *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790), used the originality of imagination in life to analyze the structure of artistic activity and later endeavored to re-establish the human existence as historical existence by Marx philosophy.

HISAMATSU Shin’ichi belonged to the Kyoto school, and along with SUZUKI Daisetsu and NISHITANI Keiji, was a representative Zen Buddhist. HISAMATSU studied religious philosophy under NISHIDA and explained the identification of the self with the absolute through spiritual awakening. He expounded the world of visual arts, the tea ceremony, the art of flower arranging, and Japanese calligraphy in the life of Zen Buddhism.

Bibliography

- Fiedler, Conrad. *Über den Ursprung der künstlerischen Tätigkeit*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1887.
- HISAMATSU Shin’ichi. 増補版久松真一全集 [Zohoban Hisamatsu Shin’ichi zenshū; Complete works, enl. ed.], 10 Vols. Kyoto: Hozokan Publishers, 1994–96. Esp. *Sadou no tetugaku*; Philosophy of the tea ceremony, vol. 4 (1995), and *Zen to Geijutu*; Zen Buddhism and art, vol. 5 (1995).
- IWAKI Ken-ichi, ed. 芸術哲学論文集 [Geijutsu-tetsugaku ronbunshu; Collection of papers on art philosophy], 西田哲学選集第6巻 [Nishida tetsugaku senshu; Nishida Selected Works], Vol. 6. Kyoto: Touseisha Publishers, 1998.
- MIKI Kiyoshi. 構想力の論理 [Kosoryoku no ronri; Logic of imagination]. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten Publishers, 1946.
- NISHIDA Kitarō. 西田幾多郎全集、全19巻 [Nishida Kitarō zenshu; Complete works with letters and diary]. 19 vols. 4th ed. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten Publishers, 1987–89.
- NISHITANI Keiji. [“Nishida tetsugaku; Nishida Philosophy”]. In [Nishitani Keiji sakuhinshu; Works of Nishitani Keiji], Vol. 9. Tokyo: Sobunsha Publishers, 1987, 95–123.
- OGAWA Tadashi. “西田幾多郎” [“Nishida Kitarō”]. In *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology*. Ed. Lester Embree et al. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997, 490–94.
- OHASHI Ryōsuke. “芸術” [“Geijutsu; Art”], in 西田哲学の世界 [Nishida tetsugaku no sekai; The World of Nishida Philosophy], Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo Publishers, 1994.

- ŌHASHI Ryōsuke, ed. 現象学論文集 [*Genshogaku ronbunshu*; Collection of papers on phenomenology], 西田哲学選集第4巻 [*Nishida tetsugaku senshu*; Nishida Selected Works] Vol. 4. Kyoto: Toueisha Publishers, 1998.
- Salice, Alessandro. “Chōra bei Derrida und Nishida.” In *Aesthetics 11*. Tokyo: The Japanese Society for Aesthetics, 2004, 162–71.
- TAKANASHI Tomohiro. “芸術論としての西田哲学—西田幾多郎の対フィードラー関係をめぐって” [*Geijutsuron toshiteno Nishida Tetsugaku-Nishida Kitarō no tai Fiedler kankei womegutte*; Nishida’s Philosophy as art theory – on the relation of NISHIDA Kitaro to Fiedler”. In *Bigaku* 186. Tokyo, Bigakukai [Japanese Society for Aesthetics], 1997, 13–23.
- Worringer, Wilhelm. *Abstraktion und Einfühlung. Ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie*. Munich: R. Piper, 1908.

José Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955)

Javier San Martín

Ortega includes reflection on art as an integral part of his philosophical work. This is because his mission was to help import European high culture into Spain, where an absence of the fundamental fruits of enlightenment, science, and necessary public morals was clear. As for art, the third pillar of high culture, he believed that Spain was a teacher of Europe during modernity, and he intended to write on aesthetics focused on Spanish art for that high European culture. This is the objective of an early text (1910) where he aims to develop that aesthetics and opposes nationalism, because the object of art is not for particular human beings, but for “Adam in paradise” (Ortega 1983: I, 473ff.).

We can summarize Ortega’s contribution to aesthetics in three ways: first, to the general theory of art; second, to the study of literary genres such as the novel and the theater; and third, applications of his theories in concrete cases, as much in the literature of the moment as in painting, with splendid commentaries on Goya and Velázquez, on El Greco, or on such contemporaries as Ignacio Zuloaga.

Moreover, aesthetics was what directed Ortega to phenomenology, because the interpretation of Ignacio Zuloaga’s painting was the driving force for his shift from neo-Kantian philosophy—into the framework of which he could not fit Zuloaga’s painting—to phenomenology. During his stay in Marburg in 1911, Ortega understood that as a constructivist philosophy, neo-Kantian philosophy was obliged to adapt the facts to the theory. In that sense, Zuloaga was more a sociologist who worked not with words but with colors.

The subject matter of art was the human being in general, while Zuloaga depicted particular problems of Spain. Then Ortega understood that it was necessary first of all to approach the things just as they are, and to analyze the work of art in itself. Thus for him, encountering phenomenology was “good luck” (1983: VIII, 42).

Ortega’s general contribution to aesthetics is given mainly in two well-known texts, one in connection with poetry and the other with painting. The first one, “Ensayo de estética a manera de prólogo” (1914), is a foreword to a book of poetry, and in it he proposes the function of art as the creation of *unreal* or *virtual* worlds that grant us access to the intimacy of being—something that neither thought nor action do, since the latter remains caught up in utility, while the former subsumes it under the concept (or into a *virtual* network of connections, which amounts to the same thing). Art gives us the things in their being made, in their performance, in what they are in and from themselves. Ortega describes the mechanism of production, first, of the *virtual* world and, second, of aesthetic pleasure. The analysis of poetic metaphor, “the aesthetic cell,” is a key contribution of his aesthetics. Eliminating the human reality of the object, the metaphor links it to a new reality in which the real features no longer count, so that we have a cypress that is a flame or tongue of fire. With these metaphors the artist generates a new world.

The second great text, *La deshumanización del arte* (1924/1925), continues the previous one with a reflection on vanguards. Ortega presents three ideas that have their origin in the intent of explaining the new music of Claude Debussy (1983: III, 353). First, art has the task of creating virtual worlds that are not linked exclusively to the human being, and for that reason

J. San Martín (✉)

Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid, Spain

they are *dehumanized* worlds. Second, art appears in its purity in the vanguards. Here another of his main ideas appears: the necessity of art lies in the need that the human being has of amusing oneself, of diverting oneself from serious business, and for that one duplicates one's life. The sporting sense of life will appear in connection with this tendency of art. Ortega will end up interpreting human life from this idea (1) because his ethics will be inspired by this sporting character and (2) because his life is a willing of style. Third, and already at the end of his productive life, he will consider that, displaced from nature, the human being will be seen in terms of the necessity of producing ideal worlds. Technology is a consequence of this situation.

But Ortega also made important contributions to the concrete arts, mainly to literature and painting. In *Meditaciones del Quijote* (1914), his first work and a book of complex genesis (see Fox's introduction in Ortega 1988), several topics are included, among them comments on Pío Baroja and on Azorín. But a discussion with Miguel de Unamuno (San Martín 1999) led him to change the goal of the manuscript and to use it to speak about *Don Quixote*.

The positivism of the nineteenth century had taken *Don Quixote* as a shallow book. Ortega, on the contrary, shows the depth of what, like everything in the world, has a *latent structure*. But on this occasion he also shows the meaning of the novel as a genre in contrast to epic poetry. One of his fundamental achievements is thus to offer a philosophical perspective on that book (and one that has not yet been refuted) that is useful for the study of literary genres. In *Don Quixote* the common reality is indeed mastered by poetry, and this is the creation of the genre "novel." Until then, poetry centered on lyric and epic poetry, but did not look at ordinary reality.

The study of *Don Quixote* also has yet another function, namely, to show, against Descartes, the complexity of reality. The Spanish baroque, exemplified in Cervantes' work, offers Europe a modernity beyond the one established by Galileo and Descartes. For that reason Ortega says in 1920 that reading *Don Quixote* in the secondary schools (obligatory in Spain until recently) was inappropriate because it is "too modern" a book.

Ortega's aesthetic theory is not unconnected with comments on his contemporaries. The mechanics of creating virtual worlds by means of metaphors can be

seen in Antonio Machado's poetry. Ortega highlights, first, how art is able to notice the most insignificant things and, then, removing them from time, can eternalize them, making them live forever. Reflection on Pío Baroja's novels shows to what extent the novel, as soon as it novelizes, should forget about being a treatise of sociology. Art must be autonomous and the novel hermetic.

Although Zuloaga's painting was decisive in the development of Ortega's philosophy, Ortega dwells more on Velázquez, Goya, and El Greco. Like Cervantes, and when painting the painter's study in *Las Meninas* and the workshop in *Las Hilanderas*, Velázquez knows on the one hand how to elevate conventional reality to a pictorial reality. Realities that were not previously pictorial topics become subject for the painter's work and demonstrate the complexity of reality. *Las Meninas* includes the painter who painted it, that is to say his representation of himself, just as the crazy Don Quixote imagines the adventure in his own mind.

Ortega wrote many pages about Velázquez and Goya, whom he will interpret from the conviction that "*Todo hecho humano concreto ... sólo es inteligible ... si lo integramos en su todo de realidad humana ...*" (Every concrete human thing ... is only intelligible ... if we integrate the totality of human reality into it ...—1983: VIII, 583). He tries to interpret the painter from his life within its social context. The change from a popular context to the court, the nobility, and illustrious people shows a great revolution in Goya's life that Ortega includes in an interpretation of his paintings after 1790, when his paintings lose their voluminous or sculptural aspect and appear "virtualized and ironic." Goya disregards tactile experience, hence the ghostly, disturbing, and elusive appearance of his figures, because, contrary to what is sought in Italian art, the object is never there completely. In this respect Goya resembles Velázquez, who had eliminated the tactile element as much as anybody.

But Ortega is best in his interpretation of Velázquez. He did not propose him in vain as the prototype of the Spanish baroque in contrast with European modernity. Velázquez paints purely visual individualities, eternalizing the instant, eliminating any reference to tactile elements. His art is the art of distance. The elimination of the tactile makes his figures intangible, distant,

inapprehensible, unreal. Velázquez de-realizes the real things—not by elevating them to ideality, which was the classical method, but by eliminating the tactile element, liberating painting from submission to sculpture. And since it is not stopped from being itself, “reality itself . . . acquires the prestige of unreal being,” and he paints it as a pure ghost, like an unfinished reality in contrast to a mythical reality that is already made, finished (1983: VIII, 477). It is not that Velázquez paints the air, as is usually said, but rather that he leaves reality without finishing it. He will also oppose mythical painting by painting the “logarithm of the reality” of myths, i.e., painting myths in relation to the reality that can exist in the myth, and that is “*volcar del revés el mito*” (to turn the myth on its head—1983: VIII, 481). “But at every moment Velázquez produces comfortable pictures in which the spectator can rest. They are unlike what happens in other pictures of the Baroque, such as with El Greco, with this pure expression, its *dynamis*” (Ortega 1988, 245), or as he will say in another place, “*puro movilismo formal*” (1983: VIII, 576) or incandescent matter, as can be seen in *El caballero con la mano en el pecho*.

In the history of Spanish literature, Ortega is a member of the generation that is called “Novecentismo” and located between the generation of 1898 and that of 1927. But he transcends his generation completely, because the generation of 1927 read *La deshumanización del arte* as a manifesto or as the critical description of the aesthetics of that generation. Rosa Chacel (1898–1994) deserves special mention (López 2003) because, faithful to the ideal of a speculative and self-absorbed artistic story, she found inspiration in Ortega’s aesthetic theories. She was also the only one among his novelist followers who did not abandon him after the Civil War. But the young followers for whom he created the collection *Nova Novorum* in the Editorial Revista de Occidente were divided between those who understood the “*dehumanization*” as an absence of political commitment and those who see in it the recovery of commitment. In this context José Díaz Fernández stands out; he refers to Ortega in his *El nuevo romanticismo*, where he proposes not “dehumanized,” art but what will be recognized in the “generation of 1930.” María Zambrano belongs to this group; she developed an entire philosophy in which thought is linked to poetic reason. Exiled to Cuba, she contacted the writer Lezama Lima, who remained

close to Ortega. Special mention is also due in this context to Rafael Dieste, who developed a wide range of artistic and theoretical work no matter how much he is ignored in Spain.

Thus Ortega’s aesthetic work had influence not only in Spain, but also in Latin America through exiles such as María Zambrano in Cuba and José Gaos in Mexico. It had a direct influence on Latin American aesthetics, although in a critical way due to his rejecting of an art for the people and for his being rather Eurocentric. Although Ortega’s theory is apparently incompatible with the search for a national identity that characterized much of Latin American modernism and the avant-garde movement, his theory actually inspired the fundamental theorists of cultural identity, e.g., José Vasconcelos, Samuel Fields, and Leopoldo Zea, even though they were influenced not so much by his aesthetics as by his idea of the necessity of saving the circumstances in order to survive oneself.

Bibliography

- Díaz Fernández, José. *El nuevo romanticismo. Polémica de arte, política y literatura*. Madrid: Ediciones Zeus, 1930.
- Dieste, Rafael. *El alma y el espejo*. Madrid: Alianza, 1981.
- García Alonso, Rafael. *El naufrago ilusionado: La estética de José Ortega y Gasset*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1997.
- Hernández, Rafael E. “The Ludic Element in Orteguian Aesthetics.” In *José Ortega y Gasset: Proceedings of the Espectador universal*. Ed. Nora de Maval-McNair. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983, 99–104.
- Lezama Lima, José. *Analecta del reloj*. Havana: Orígenes, 1953.
- López Sáenz, María Carmen. “Influencias de las ideas estéticas de J. Ortega y Gasset en las vanguardias.” In *Analogía filosófica* 1, 2003, 29–42.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *Obras completas*. 12 vols. Madrid: Revista de Occidente/Alianza Editorial, 1983.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. “Meditaciones del Quijote” [1914]. In *Obras completas*, Vol. 1. Madrid: Revista de Occidente/Alianza Editorial, 1983, 309–400; Trans. Evelyn Rugg and Diego Marín. University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *Phenomenology and Art*. Trans. Philip W. Silver. New York: W. W. Norton, 1975 [includes “An Essay in Esthetics by Way of a Preface” and “The Idea of a Theater”].
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *The Dehumanization of Art and Other Essays on Art, Culture, and Literature*. Trans. Helene Well et al. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968 [includes “Notes on the Novel” and “On the Point of View in the Arts”].

- Ortega y Gasset, José. *Meditaciones sobre la literatura y el arte: la manera española de ver las cosas*. Ed. E. Inman Fox. Madrid: Castalia, 1988.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *El sentimiento estético de la vida (Antología)*. Ed. José Luis Molinuevo. Madrid: Tecnos, 1995.
- San Martín, Javier. *Fenomenología y cultura en Ortega*. Madrid: Tecnos, 1999.
- Zambrano, María. *Filosofía y poesía* [1939]. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1996.
- Zambrano, María. "Cuba y la poesía de José Lezama Lima." In *Insula* 260–61, 1968, 4.

Painting

Eliane Escoubas

In *L'Oeil et l'esprit*, MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY writes, "I would be at pains to say where the picture is that I am looking at. For I do not look at it in the way one looks at a thing, I do not focus on it in its place, my gaze errs in it as in the nimbus of being, I see by way of or with it rather than seeing it" (Merleau-Ponty 1964a: 23). The expressions, "to see by way of" or "to see with" mark the gap between "mere seeing" and "seeing" in painting; they mark the gap between the thing as thing and the thing as tableau, the gap between the space of perception or representation (the space of the copy-image or of the reproduction-image) and pictorial space. If "seeing by way of" or "seeing with" are the conditions of the constitution of the tableau *as tableau*, it is precisely because pictorial space is neither a space of the representation-reproduction of the real, nor an *après-coup* or a doubling of the real. But what then does painting paint? And what does the space of the tableau put to work?

The answer is that painting paints the conditions of visibility in accordance with their historical modalities, and not the conditions of the reproduction of the real. The space of the tableau is above all a space of appearing and of manifestation, and not a space of representation. Pictorial space is the putting to work of the exercise of the gaze in accordance with its historical modalities. "Exercise of the gaze" means putting the gaze in movement, putting it to work, its *energeia*.

What do we mean when we speak of the historical modalities of the exercise of the gaze? The space of the tableau, pictorial space, the space "according to" or

"with" which we see is *plural*: the history of painting attests to this. Indeed, how can we deny that the space of Uccello's *Battle of San Romano* is different from that of Rembrandt's *Nightwatch* or that it differs from the space of one of Cézanne's *Mount Sainte-Victoire* or from the space of Braque's *Houses at l'Estaque*? However, if we want to show that painting paints not the conditions of the reproduction of the real, but rather the conditions of visibility in accordance with their historical modality, then it will not be enough to establish a chronology or history of painting. We will rather have to unfold the *being* of the space at play each time.

Merleau-Ponty points us in the right direction: "Essence and existence, the imaginary and the real, the visible and the invisible, painting blurs all our categories in unfolding its oneiric universe of carnal essences, of efficient resemblances, and of silent significations" (ibid.: 35). If the categories blurred by painting are among the most important in philosophy, must we not say that painting is primordially inscribed in a history of philosophy? Exercise of the gaze—ec-stasis of the gaze: the space of the tableau puts to work *a meaning of being as appearing*. In the space of the tableau, the *phenomenon of the world* (in Greek, *phainesthai*: to appear and to shine forth) is exposed more visibly than the recognizable or expressible things of representation are. This is to say that an analysis of pictorial space is essentially rooted in a phenomenological elaboration that is a disclosure of the ontological foundation in each case of the exercise of the gaze—of the ec-stasis of the gaze.

What then are the ontological foundations of pictorial space? In §24 of *Sein und Zeit* (1927), MARTIN HEIDEGGER writes that "Dasein is spatial." The spatiality of human Dasein is an existential, an essential characteristic of this singular being "that is concerned

E. Escoubas (✉)
Université de Paris XII—Val de Marne, Paris, France

Translated by Hakhamanesh Zangeneh and Susanne Schilz

in its being with its own being” or of this being “whose ontic privilege consists in its being ontological.” The spatiality of Dasein can only be explicated in opposition to the Cartesian notion of space: the *extensio* as “*omnimodo divisibile, figurabile et mobile*”—homogeneous extension, divisible (“*partes extra partes*”) and describable in terms of “figure and movement.” The spatiality of Dasein, on the other hand, can only be understood from out of its mode of being: Dasein’s mode of being is being-in-the-world. The spatial characteristics of Dasein are rooted in the “in-the-world” of being-in-the-world. In §§22–24 of *Sein und Zeit*, Dasein’s being-in-the-world is above all practical being-in-the-world (in the modes of concern [*Besorgen*] and of circumspection [*Umsicht*]).

Dasein’s spatiality is thus inscribed in a pragmatic ontology. The being of a *pragma*-thing is rooted in its usage, and the thing is above all a tool. It is only within this pragmatic ontology that the existentials of the spatiality of Dasein can be described and can become meaningful: de-distancing (*Entfernung*) and directionality (*Ausrichtung*). This de-distancing does not refer to the distance of Cartesian extension; de-distancing, for Dasein, is removing farness, it is nearing. The same goes for directionality. In looking there, hearing over there, going there, Dasein is not here but there, yonder (there where it sees, where it hears, where it is going). In contrast with the Cartesian ego, which coincides with its here and now, Dasein is *outside* of itself: it is there and comes here from over there. Dasein’s spatiality is thus from the outset a de-localization—what Merleau-Ponty will call *ubiquity*. Dasein is also not beyond distances and directions, but rather carries them along with itself; this is why space is not that in which Dasein finds itself, but that which Dasein *opens*: it is region (*Gegend*). Region is the network of de-distancing and of directionality; from the pragmatic ontology of *Sein und Zeit* onward, region is a *topos* (place).

It is still the notion of “region,” which—beyond the pragmatic ontology of 1927—constitutes the space of art in *Die Kunst und der Raum* (1969). The concept of region is here unchanged, although the characteristics by which it is determined are no longer de-distancing and directionality, but rather spacing (*das Räumen*) and placing (*das Einräumen*). This means that space will have been, from the beginning, not dimensional but topological. “Spacing” and “placing” then means: “freeing places.” A “place,” however, is a “taking

place” (*Geschehen*). Thus “place” happens, “place” is not pre-inscribed in the totality of the “objects” of the world, place is nothing other than the happening of that which happens: it is, strictly speaking, *the phenomenon of world*. At the heart of this topological space, defined in terms of *event*, is the property of the work of art to *incorporate* places. An ontology of pictorial space is not centered around the notion of the representation-reproduction of volume, but rather around the instauration of corporeality: *the instauration of “bodies” as events*.

Consider Jan van Eyck’s *The Virgin and Chancellor Rolin*, where the *tabella plana*, governed by the law of transparency and volume, presents three or four successive vertical planes. In the foreground, a big plane, we see the Virgin, the child, and the donor chancellor in their sumptuous garments. On the second plane, much smaller than the foreground, a small wall with two people are seen from behind looking at the third plane. This third plane is a city around a river, and in the distance there is a fourth plane of blurred hills. The four planes, whose objects, figures, and constructions converge toward the same vanishing point, are juxtaposed without interfering with one another, without one reaching over into the other. We can add that the people looking at the third plane are like a reminder or a replica of us looking at the entirety of the tableau. Are they not here the mark of the abstract (Cartesian) equivalence of the parts of the tableau? In other words, do perspective and measure prohibit the putting into work of *topos* (place) and the event of “place?” Must we not say, on the contrary, that the bodies are not essentially “parts” of space, but rather places?

The tableau presents *postures*, and these postures are, in Renaissance painting, nothing other than “places.” They are places because they are of the order of the event. What sort of event? The event that van Eyck paints here is the suspension of representation—which is the suspension of time as necessary condition, in representation, for the gazing of the gaze and the happening of painting. Painting happens in this suspension, before the swallowing up of everything in the vanishing point. It is neither solely nor firstly the extension of “*partes extra partes*” that unfolds around the vanishing point, as the point that engenders perspectival construction, but rather and above all *time* as the mode of appearing and disappearing. Can we then not say that the moment of epochē (in the sense of EDMUND HUSSERL), *as the moment when we leave*

the thing to its mode of unfolding, is precisely that by which pictorial space presents itself as the phenomenon of the world? Here painting would put into work the “how” (*das Wie*)—the *eidōs* (aspect)—insofar as the aspect is *no being*, but *the appearing of that which appears*.

Turning now to Heidegger’s “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes,” three lectures given in 1935–36, we shall discover a circularity in the search of an origin that is neither a chronological beginning nor a causal anteriority, i.e., the artist makes the works, but the work also makes the artist. Circularity formulated in this banal fashion is nonetheless the mode in which his analysis works. Here circularity will be played out on many levels, and these will be designated by him as the “step back.” On the first level, we ask whether the work is a thing (or basically the conjunction of a matter and a form, as are the tool and the product). But if the answer is no, then this does not mean that the work is something other than a thing, that it is to be found somewhere beyond the thing, as in “allegory”—since Heidegger refuses all division of the work into two (form-content, sensory-spiritual).

The work must be sought in a “unity”: “the thing must be allowed rest in itself.” Thus it is that the work—for example, a van Gogh painting of a pair of shoes—shows not another particular thing, but the world of this thing and the world of the peasant who wears these shoes. The tableau thereby refers to the “disclosure of beings,” to their unveiling—what the Greeks called *alētheia*—truth as unconcealment, *Unverborgenheit*. It is thus truth as unconcealment that is at work in the work of art: the work of art is the “putting into work of the truth.” Here then, art is neither an illustration nor an embellishment of existence—neither a copy of nature, nor an allegory of something beyond nature, nor a sensory manifestation of the beautiful. The different possibilities found in traditional aesthetics are invalidated. What is at work in the work of art is the happening of truth—but of which truth? As we have said: truth as “*alētheia*”—and hence we must deal with the question of the essence of truth: what is truth?

This is dealt with in the rest of Heidegger’s investigation with the example of a Greek temple. Examples from architecture, which (it is claimed) has no natural model, are found frequently in aesthetics. Heidegger states basically this same position: the temple is not the image of anything. But it uncovers a world—not a

natural world, but a historical world. What is a world? Neither a mere collection of objects nor a mere frame for things, world is the “site” where the human being exists and which the human being makes exist. Here we find the circularity again. A world is always “historical,” made by human beings, which in turn it brings into existence. This double play is what Heidegger will affirm as the play of truth: the (circular) play of concealment and unconcealment that he will designate as “the struggle between earth and world,” the struggle between unconcealment and withdrawal. The confrontation between “world” (historical) and “earth” (ahistorical) is the naming of the tension immanent to art, as the struggle of unconcealment and concealment is immanent to truth itself. Truth carries within its very essence un-truth (the *lathon*, *lēthe*, oblivion). Hence the essence of truth coincides with the essence of art. Beauty, traditionally attributed to art, is one of the modes of the dwelling of truth as unconcealment (the city or the state being another mode of unconcealment). The work of art thus does not refer to *aisthēsis*, but rather to *alētheia*. Such is the Heideggerian critique of aesthetics, which accords to painting a status that French phenomenologists, such as Merleau-Ponty and HENRI MALDINEY, would then develop further.

When Merleau-Ponty speaks in *L’œil et l’esprit* of “the concentration and coming-to-itself of the visible,” he describes this moment when the thing is left to its mode of unfolding, he describes the instauration of appearing as such in painting itself. What do we mean when we say that what painting paints is the appearing of that which appears, appearance as such? What does this mean other than that appearing is not something among appearing things? That appearing is the visibility of things—their invisible visibility, which only painting makes visible. Painting does not paint this visible thing here or there (painting is neither the reproduction nor the representation thereof), but rather it paints the invisible visibility of this visible thing here or there. Painting (all painting, even figurative) paints a world without object, since the world that it gives birth to in the gaze does not take place in the objectivity of objects, but rather in visibility as such—that is, the event of their appearing.

Painting makes us see that which we do not ordinarily see—that which we do not see *at all*: it paints, in each case, the birth of the world in the gaze—that which has always already begun when we begin to see that which there is to see. “The coming to itself of the

visible”: the visible coming to itself, what does this mean? “The coming to itself of the visible” is nothing other than the inseparability of the “seeing” and the “seen,” the unique event through which both happen. It is nothing other than their reciprocity—and thus of their reversibility: painters, according to Merleau-Ponty, often affirm that they were being looked at by things. “The coming to itself of the visible” is this inversion by which the seeing is seen and the seen is seeing. This is the intertwining or the chiasm of the seeing and the seen, whose site is the “region.” To paint is thus to be seen by that which we see.

It is precisely this “coming to itself of the visible,” this world in its nascent state, this world with neither subject nor object that defines pictorial space and constitutes its difference from scientific, technical, or everyday space. This is why the phrase used by Merleau-Ponty to describe Cézanne’s space, “rays of space,” proclaims the eidos of pictorial space in general—the inaugural definition of pictorial space and its difference from every other space (for example, technical space). In painting *space is not extended, it beams forth*. To beam forth, to ray out is the eidos of pictorial space (its “how”). Would the putting to work of the “beaming” of space not be the sole *motif* of painting (regardless of its historical modalities)? There where the thing is left to its mode of unfolding, where space beams out, there is pictorial space, there is painting.

It is this “concentration and return to itself of the visible” in pictorial space that, in *Regard, Parole, Espace* (1973), Henri Maldiney explicates in terms of *rhythm*. “Art is the truth of the sensible, because rhythm is the truth of *aisthēsis*.” What is rhythm? Maldiney defines it in terms borrowed from the linguistics of Emile Benveniste: “rhythm is the form assumed by that which is moving, mobile, fluid.” Rhythm is thus the implication of time in space—but a “time that is not a time of the universe, but a time of presence,” the time proper to that which he names the pathic, non-objective dimension. Thus we can say that rhythm is at once form and event. As *form/event*, rhythm does not take place in space: “it implies space, it opens space,” it is the articulation of pictorial space. The constitutive notion of pictorial space is hence in no way the concept of “part,” but that of rhythmic articulation. Maldiney shows that rhythm takes place beneath physical phenomena, its founding elements—which “are neither events of the universe nor events of consciousness . . .

neither a sequence of sounds according to the laws of physics, nor successive profiles of a same thing or a same state of affairs . . . nor the lived experiences of consciousness as parts of the one and only individual flux. Hence we must eliminate a theoretical illusion, the theoretical illusion according to which all human experience is structured by the subject-object polarity” (Maldiney 1973: 164).

Painting is thus the coming to itself of rhythm in space—or rather, the becoming-rhythm of space. And this upsets the status of representation in art, above all the status of the image. We find a remarkable formulation in this regard in Maldiney: “In art, the function of the image is not to imitate but to appear.” Due precisely to the ambiguity of the image, he will have to distinguish “aesthetic vision” from “imaging vision.” “The distance that separates imaging vision, vision by objects, from aesthetic vision, which lets itself be guided by the rhythm of forms or of light, measures that which is rightly called the creative *abstraction* of the painter” (ibid.: 9). It is necessary to separate the formal and the imaging dimensions of painting. In *L’art, l’éclair de l’être* (1993), Maldiney additionally distinguishes, on the one hand, form, and on the other hand, the sign or the image. Sign and image “imply an intentional object that opens onto a gnoseological moment,” whereas form, on the contrary, “is neither intentional nor signitive.” Form, “nonetheless signifying, but otherwise than the sign, implies a pathic moment, a way of carrying itself and of relating itself to the world and to itself.” More precisely, “A form is nontransposable into another space, it instaurates a space in which it takes place” (Maldiney 1993: 359).

This is why Maldiney writes: “Cézanne’s space is not a receptacle. Its elements or formative moments are themselves events, bursts, ruptures, modulations, encounters . . . The *Montagne Sainte-Victoire* emerges. There is no *where* preceding its appearing, where we could say that it takes place. It appears in itself in the open. The two in one . . . It makes visible the invisible dimension of reality: “the y in *il y a*” (ibid.: 31–32). Hence in art, forms coincide with their taking place: they coincide with their formation and with *nothing* else—they are *no things, no beings*. This is why he dedicates his latest work, *Ouvrir le rien. L’art nu* (2000), to pictorial abstraction (Kandinsky, Delaunay, Mondrian, Nicolas de Stael, Tal Coat, etc.) and shows that all painting, even figurative painting, is “abstract.” It is not by chance that Maldiney orients his

analyses toward those of OSKAR BECKER in “Von der Hinfälligkeit des Schönen und der Abenteuerlichkeit des Künstlers” (1963). The fragile, in fact, is “that which we do not expect,” the fragile is the unexpected that is an event, the work of art is fragile because of the absolute temporal discontinuity it puts into work. But at issue are not partial events that one could enumerate. The event that is at issue in art is the event of being—what Becker calls *Getragenheit* or being carried, which would be prior to all existentiality and to all thrownness (*Geworfenheit*) in the Heideggerian sense, as well as prior to all intentionality in the Husserlian sense.

One could, at first sight, make an important objection to the phenomenology of painting: one could oppose it to a “history of painting.” For there exists a plurality of types, forms, and modalities of pictorial space, there exists a history of painting. But to gaze at a tableau *as tableau* is in no way to consider a document that one could classify in a chronology and then to *evaluate* its particularities. The tableau that we gaze at *as tableau* is incomparable and unclassifiable. The mutations and the ruptures recorded by the history of painting according to a *typology* (for example, Renaissance space, baroque space, impressionist space, cubist space, abstract space) are merely recorded by that history, not produced by it. And they are not explained by this history either. For the mutations in pictorial space are mutations in the “coming to itself of the visible,” or otherwise put, in the exercise and the ec-stasis of the gaze—or again, in the *epochal* moment where the thing is *left* to its mode of unfolding. All pictorial spaces are historical aspects of being, of being that does not *have* a history but rather *is* history. We cannot be surprised to find that a Giotto fresco or a tableau by Uccello can still put the gaze in exercise and ec-stasis, can make the “thing-in-itself” emerge in the gaze, the “phenomenon,” the appearing of that which appears.

German art historians of the early 20th century (known under the label of *Kunstwissenschaft*) understood all this quite well and this explains why such a fruitful confrontation can take place between their interpretations and those found throughout phenomenology. Let us consider Wölfflin’s opposition between *classical* (van Eyck, Leonardo, Dürer, and others) and *baroque* space (Rembrandt, Rubens, Vermeer, etc). Must we then not say that it is the *eidos* of the visible that gives itself to be seen in painting in two completely different modalities of pictorial

space and of visibility? The *eidos* of the visible is the “coming to itself of the visible” as substantialist immobilization in classical space and as an appearing that is always also a disappearing in baroque space.

We can confront this Wölfflinian opposition with the one elaborated by Merleau-Ponty in *L’œil et l’esprit* between properly figurative space and modern space. The latter is for Merleau-Ponty the space of Cézanne, as well as that of the cubists and Braque, or the abstract space of Klee or de Stael. Figurative space, which is characterized by divisibility and exteriority (the Cartesian space of “*partes extra partes*”) and is induced by vision at a distance, is opposed by Merleau-Ponty to Cézannian, abstract space, which is “a being of envelopment,” a space of inherence and latency, a space of interweaving and of chiasm. Here vision is no longer from a distance, but “in touch,” and it is proper to it to “crack the spectacle-form.” Does not the “coming to itself” of the visible always happen *between* manifestness and latency (in the Wölfflinian sense)? Regardless of the diversity of its historical modalities, pictorial space is never a portion of space: it is a mode of appearing. Birth and emergence of a world in the gaze—that of “an operating, current and actual body,” as Merleau-Ponty writes—this is the enigma of painting.

Bibliography

- Becker, Oskar. “Von der Hinfälligkeit des Schönen und der Abenteuerlichkeit des Künstlers” [1929]. In his *Dasein und Dawesen. Gesammelte philosophische Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1963, 11–40.
- Damisch, Hubert. *L’origine de la perspective*. Paris: Flammarion, 1987; *The Origin of Perspective*. Trans. John Goodman. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Francis Bacon: Logique de la sensation*. Paris: La Différance, 1981; *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith and Tom Conley. London: Continuum, 2003.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La vérité en peinture*. Paris: Flammarion, 1978; *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Ian Macleod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Didi-Huberman, Georges. *Devant l’image: Question posée aux fins d’une histoire de l’art*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1990.
- Didi-Huberman, Georges. *L’image survivante*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, Paris, 2002.
- Escoubas, Eliane. *Imago Mundi: Topologie de l’art*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1986.
- Escoubas, Eliane. *L’espace pictural*. La Versanne: Encre Marine, 1995.

- Escoubas, Eliane. *L'esthétique*. Paris: Ellipses, 2004.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Zur Farbenlehre. Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 23; *Goethe's Color Theory*. Trans. Herb Aach. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.
- Grauel, Gérard. "Sur la couleur de l'expressionisme." In his *Traditionis tradition*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973, 55–67.
- Grauel, Gérard. "Lecture de 'L'Origine.'" In his *Études*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1995, 109–136.
- Grauel, Gérard. "Le monde et son expression." In his *Études*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1995, 93–108.
- Haar, Michel. *L'œuvre d'art, essai d'ontologie des œuvres*. Paris: Hatier, 1994.
- Haar, Michel, ed. *La Part de L'Oeil* (Revue de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts de Bruxelles) Ed. Eliane Escoubas. 7 (*Art et phénoménologie*); 19–20 (*Problème de la Kunstwissenschaft*) Ed. H. Schmid.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1927; *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; "The Origin of the Work of Art." *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Die Kunst und der Raum*. St. Gallen: Erker, 1969.
- Loreau, Max. *La peinture à l'oeuvre et l'énigme du corps*. Paris: Gallimard, 1980.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Regard, parole, espace*. Lousanne: L'Âge d'homme, 1973.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Art et existence*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1985.
- Maldiney, Henri. *L'art, l'éclair de l'être*. Seyssel: Comp'act, 1993.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Ouvrir le rien. L'art nu*. La Versanne: Encre Marine, 2000.
- Marin, Louis. *Détruire la peinture*. Paris: Flammarion, 1977; *To Destroy Painting*. Trans. Mette Hjort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Marin, Louis. *Sublime Poussin*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1998; *Sublime Poussin*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. "Le doute de Cézanne." In his *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Nagel, 1948, 15–44; "Cezanne's Doubt." Trans. Michael B. Smith. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 59–75.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'oeil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Michael B. Smith. In *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993, 121–49.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964b; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Podro, Michael. *The Critical Historians of Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*. Munich: Bruckmann, 1915; *Principles of Art History*. Trans. Marie D. Hottinger. New York: Dover, 1950.

Jan Patočka (1907–1977)

Ludger Hagedorn

Patočka did not develop a systematic theory of aesthetics. However, reflections on art and literature not only constitute an important component of his philosophical work, but are integral to his overall conception of human existence and its main questions. The two volumes of the *Sebrané spisy* (Collected works) include 43 major articles written between 1935 and 1975, complemented by an almost equal amount of shorter writings and fragments. Throughout their diversity and heterogeneous origins, his aesthetic essays center quite clearly around the core issue of temporality or historicity and its meaning for artworks and their reception. Accordingly, one of the methodologically most insightful articles, a 1968 essay entitled “Umění a čas” (Art and time), lent its title to the collected aesthetic writings in Czech as well as to the corresponding selections in French and German.

Patočka’s view on art and literature has to be understood within the larger framework of his existential thinking and the conception of existence as a life in possibilities, including the ultimate possibility of a “breakthrough” to a certain kind of truth or authenticity. Art is not the only way to such a breakthrough—Patočka also traces such phenomena in philosophy, politics, religion, and science—but it is one of the most privileged ways. The “truth” that, for example, the literary figures of Dostoevsky experience, which they embody in their fates, is no *particular* truth, it is no knowledge that can be objectively communicated or formulated in the shape of a commandment or an instruction. Instead, what they live through is an existential shock, in which, paradoxically, at the very

moment when all meaning, all relative meaningfulness, appears lost, another, new meaning takes shape, an understanding of what our life is based on, an openness to being (one could also say love). This openness is, as Patočka puts it, the fundamental gift of meaning, a gift that is given free of charge and whose value cannot be estimated, a gift that stands beyond all calculation of debt and credit. The breakthrough to this heightened sense of life does not take place without or against human beings, but only with them; it is something to which we must commit, to which we must dedicate ourselves. It is nevertheless a meaning that transcends the individual, that presents the fullness of a new life, and that is not limited to the pursuit of subjective interests.

Besides the obvious inspiration by the phenomenological and existentialist tradition, it is Hegel’s concept of aesthetics that is the most important point of reference for Patočka. He explicitly shares Hegel’s conviction that art (and also every individual work of art) is subjected to and dependent on the conditions of its historical time: “The cave man of Lascaux, the citizen of Athens in front of the Parthenon, or the medieval Christian facing a Romanesque tympanum—they all did not consider these objects to be works of art” (Patočka 1987: 55). Their immediate, non-intellectualized perception of the artwork is very different from what he calls the “aesthetic” approach of modern times.

Hegel indicated this loss of the imperative and binding character of art with his formulation that art belongs to the past (“*Vergangenheitscharakter der Kunst*”). In this sense, Patočka believes that Hegel foresaw the revolutionary crisis of art at the beginning of the twentieth century. Contrary to Hegel, however, this crisis in a certain kind of art (Patočka calls it

L. Hagedorn (✉)

Czech Academy of Sciences—AV CR, Prague, Czech Republic

imitating or mimetic art) does not indicate for him the end of art as such. Leaving aside Hegel's claim for absolute knowledge and merely thinking instead "about finite truth in the form of philosophy, science, and art" (ibid.: 54), Patočka sees in this negation of imitating art an act of liberation and the opening of a new time that he calls the epoch of "style."

Patočka's references to other aesthetic theories can only be briefly indicated. Starting with the phenomenological background, his attention to ROMAN INGARDEN and his "ontology of the work of art" deserves emphasis. Although his own approach to art and literature is obviously quite different, Patočka appreciates Ingarden's discovery of the various intentional "layers" of the work of art and its "polyphonic" effect. Regarding Arnold Gehlen, he stresses the importance of reflections on the role of art in the process of anthropogenesis, but rejects biologically founded arguments for the necessity of institutions and its overall conservative character. Jakob Burckhardt's conception of the complete novelty of the Renaissance ("birth of the individual") is criticized for its one-sidedness and for missing the inherent and productive tensions of the medieval worldview. And in the case of the early aesthetic writings of the 19th century Czech historian and politician František Palacký ("father of the nation"), Patočka hints at their hidden connection to Friedrich von Schiller's 1795 *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*.

Literature in Patočka is often referred to as one of the main sources and illustrations of existential motifs. In one of his strongest essays, an article entitled "Co je existence?" (What is existence?), he almost exclusively founds his argumentation on examples taken from literature and refers in particular to William Faulkner's *Wild Palms*, to Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus*, and to novels by Dostoevsky (mainly *The Idiot*, and elsewhere, *The Brothers Karamazov*). Also very important in this context is ancient Greek tragedy, with the Sophoclean drama, and especially *Antigone*, being most intensely considered. At the same time, Greek tragedy is decisive for Patočka's concept of myth as a "question that is asked by one human being to another, coming from a depth within the human being that is prior to the logos" (Patočka 1987: 201). For the same reason, he was especially fascinated by the Faust legend and the sense of the pact with the devil in modern literature. And, not least, one should also mention his profound interpretations

of Czech and Slavic literature, the most prominent example being the essays on the outstanding romantic poet Karel Hynek Mácha, the furious Nietzschean thinker Ladislav Klíma, the expressionist writer and artist Josef Čapek, and in Russian literature, Chekhov's *Ivanov*.

Very important and insightful parts of Patočka's reflections on phenomenology and its relevance for art (especially the phenomenological conception of time and space) can also be found in his correspondence. Most remarkable are his letters to the art historian Václav Richter that have been published in the *Sebrané spisy*, including 106 letters written between 1947 and 1970, thus far not translated into any foreign language.

As for the *reception* of Patočka's aesthetic writings, the situation mirrors the political and historical circumstances of his time: since he was banned from teaching and publishing for most of his life in Communist Czechoslovakia, Patočka's influence was mainly limited to the participants of his "underground" seminars and the small circles of the *Samizdat*. It was therefore difficult to develop any profound treatment and critique of his ideas. As an exception to this in the Czech context, the names of Antonín Mokrejš and Zdeněk Mathauser have to be mentioned. Both of them are familiar with Patočka's work, but as philosophers they are at the same time quite independent in their systematic exploration of how to apply phenomenology to aesthetic questions: Mathauser uses the concrete methodological results of phenomenology for a "demarcation of basic concepts such as aesthetic value, aesthetic object, or the function of a text, a sign, or a picture," while Mokrejš examines "the proper conditions of art as a form of human existence in the world" (Blecha 2003: 161). Based on EDMUND HUSSERL's idea of eidetic variation, Mathauser develops, especially in his later writings, a theory of "rational vision" that not only tries to see the beauty of a concrete object, but also "beauty itself, the aesthetic value itself" (Mathauser 1995: 19). And for Mokrejš, who relies upon Nietzsche to a considerable extent, art is above all a creative impulse of life itself; in this sense he is not so much interested in the philosophical interpretation of a particular work of art, but rather in the question of what it is that makes art one of the fundamental forms of human activity and creativity.

A broader reception of Patočka started only in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when his writings could

first be officially published and when translations into French and German made them accessible to an international readership. Since then, there has been an increasing interest not only in the political and historical dimensions of his work, but also in its aesthetic implications.

Finally, any picture of Patočka's reflections on art and literature would not be complete without taking into account his own close relations with artists and writers, some of whom are clearly influenced by his ideas. Among others, and to mention just the most famous ones, Patočka was close to the writer Ludvík Vaculík and the poet Jaroslav Seifert (winner of the Nobel Prize for literature in 1984). After Patočka's death in 1977, Vaculík was among those who published a book in his memory in *Samizdat*.

Quite well known is Patočka's influence on the playwright Václav Havel, later president of the Czech Republic. Some characters of Havel's dramas come very close to embodying traits of Patočka's personality. And what Havel praises most in Patočka—his deep, real, and authentic language—could serve as a counterexample to his own critique of the hollowness of language and the automatic talking of people that he parodies in his plays. At the *Divadlo Na Zábradlí* (Theater on the Balustrade) that Havel worked for, Patočka also cooperated with the artistic director Ivan Vyskočil, the pioneer of open dramatic plays in Czechoslovakia (see his essay *Svět Ivana Vyskočila* [The World of Ivan Vyskočil] in Patočka 2004).

For Otomar Krejča, director of another famous Prague theater, the *Divadlo Za Branou* (Theater behind the Gate), he wrote an article on the question of truth in the Sophoclean tragedy (also in Patočka 2004). In the visual arts, the internationally renowned collage artist Jiří Kolář contributed a series of collages to an 1987 issue of the journal *Proměny* that was dedicated to Patočka on the 10th anniversary of his death. And in music, the Czech avant-garde composer Marek Kopelent conceived his *Symphony for orchestra*, written in the late 1970s and first played in Basel in 1982, as an homage to Jan Patočka.

Bibliography

- Biemel, Walter. "Remarques sur l'interprétation de l'art par Patočka." In *Les Cahiers de Philosophie* 11–12, 1990–1991, 235–48.
- Biemel, Walter. "Zu Patočkas Deutung der Kunst." In *Ästhetik—Phänomenologie—Pädagogik—Geschichts—und Politiktheorie*. Ed. Matthias Gatzemeier. Aachen: Alano, 1994, 1–14; "Quelques remarques à propos de l'interprétation de l'art chez Patočka." In *Jan Patočka*. Ed. Marc Richir and Étienne Tassin. Grenoble: Millon, 1992, 65–81.
- Blaschek-Hahn, Helga. "Die 'asubjektive phänomenale Sphäre' Patočkas. Spiel-Raum autogenetischer Kon-Kreativität?" In *Intentionalität—Werte—Kunst*. Ed. Jochen Bloss et al. Prague: Filosofia, 1995, 268–73.
- Blecha, Ivan. *Edmund Husserl a česká filosofie*. Olomouc: Nakladatelství Olomouc, 2003, esp. 161–70.
- Bloss, Jochen, Władysław Stróżewski, and Josef Zumr, eds. *Intentionalität—Werte—Kunst*. Prague: Filosofia, 1995.
- Gatzemeier, Matthias, ed. *Ästhetik—Phänomenologie—Pädagogik—Geschichts—und Politiktheorie*. Aachen: Alano, 1994.
- Hagedorn, Ludger. "Nomos—Mythos—Krisis. Jan Patočkas existentialistische Deutung der 'Antigone.'" In *Literatur als Phänomenalisierung*. Ed. Hans Rainer Sepp and Jürgen Trinks. Vienna: Turia and Kant, 2003, 169–88.
- Kohák, Erazim. *Jan Patočka. Philosophy and Selected Writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989 [includes a "Philosophical Biography"].
- Legros, Robert. "Patočka et Hegel." In *Jan Patočka*. Ed. Marc Richir and Étienne Tassin. Grenoble: Millon, 1992, 45–53.
- Mathauser, Zdeněk. *Mezi filosofií a poezií*. Prague: Filosofia 1995.
- Mathauser, Zdeněk. *Estetika racionálního zření*. Prague: Karolinum, 1999.
- Merlier, Philippe. "Proférer la première parole: L'enfant et l'écrivain." In *Revue Philosophie* 58, 1998, 38–46.
- Mokrejš, Antonín. *Filosofie a život—život a umění*. Prague: Filosofia, 1995.
- Mokrejš, Antonín. "Über die Möglichkeiten einer Phänomenologie der Kunst." In *Intentionalität—Werte—Kunst*. Ed. Jochen Bloss et al. Prague: Filosofia, 1995, 191–206.
- Patočka, Jan. *Umění a čas*. Ed. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. *Sebrané spisy*, Vols. 4, 5. Prague: OIKOYMENH, 2004; partly translated in *L'art et le temps: Essais*. Trans. Erika Abrams. Paris: P.O.L., 1990a, and *L'écrivain, son "objet": Essais*. Trans. Erika Abrams, Paris: P.O.L. 1990b; *Kunst und Zeit. Kulturphilosophische Schriften*. Ed. Klaus Nellen and Ilja Srubar. Trans. Ilja Srubar, Vera Srubar, et al. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987.
- Patočka, Jan. *Dopisy Václavu Richterovi. Sebrané spisy*, Vol. 20. Prague: OIKOYMENH, 2001.
- Patočka, Jan. *Texte—Dokumente—Bibliographie*. Ed. Ludger Hagedorn and Hans Rainer Sepp. Freiburg/Prague: Karl Alber/OIKOYMENH, 1999 [includes an essay on Roman Ingarden].
- Petříček, Miroslav. "Mytus v Patočkově filosofii." In *Reflexe* 5–6, 1992, 1–16.
- Pombo, Fátima. "Jan Patočka—Art and its Phenomenological Affiliation." In *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 29, 1998, 132–44.
- Richir, Marc, and Étienne Tassin, eds. *Jan Patočka: Philosophie, phénoménologie, politique*. Grenoble: Millon 1992.

- Srubar, Ilja. "Zur Stellung der Kunst in Patočkas Philosophie." In Jan Patočka, *Kunst und Zeit*. Ed. Klaus Nellen and Ilja Srubar. Trans. Ilja Srubar, Vera Srubar, et al. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987, 31–45; "La place de l'art dans la philosophie de Patočka." In Jan Patočka, *L'art et le temps*. Trans. Erika Abrams. Paris: P.O.L.: 1990a, 7–26.
- Vojtěch, Daniel, and Ivan Chvatik. "Ediční komentář." In Jan Patočka, *Umění a čas*. Ed. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatik. Sebrané spisy, Vol. 5. Prague: OIKOYMENH, 2004, 367–428. 2004, vol. V, 367–428.

Photography

CHEUNG Chan-Fai

Photography literally means “writing with light.” It was almost simultaneously invented by Louis Jacques Mandé Daguerre and William Henry Fox Talbot in the 1830s. Since then, photographs have become taken-for-granted facts of everyday life. According to Vilém Flusser, we have already arrived at the second most important cultural and historical stage of humankind, after the first stage of the invention of writing: the age of the technical image. We are “inhabitants of the photographic universe” (Flusser 2000: 65) in which photographs as “technical images” dominate nearly all human discourses. In *The Photographic Reader* (2003), Liz Wells defines the photograph as “a particular sort of image, one which operates through freezing a moment in time, portraying objects, people, and places as they appeared within the view of camera at that moment. Photography has thus contributed to the dislocation of time and space, enlightening and enlivening history and geography. As such, it has attracted scrutiny from philosophers concerned with its semiotic structure and its phenomenological impact” (Wells 2003: 1). Since the invention of photography, the debate over the ontological status of the photograph purporting to be the record of reality has been the focal interest of the theorists of photography.

Photography has already been around for over 50 years when phenomenology began. The early phenomenologists did not, however, pay much attention to this cultural phenomenon, and indeed, it has never been a major theme of phenomenological research. To be sure, EDMUND HUSSERL, MARTIN HEIDEGGER, and

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE mentioned photographs as an illustration in the discussion of imagination. For Husserl, the photograph is served as an example of a picture (*Bild*) represented in our imagination. In “Phantasie und Bildliche Vorstellung” (1898), the essential difference between perception and imagination lies in the different modes of consciousness, i.e., in the presentation of something present (*gegenwärtigen*) and in the re-presentation (*vergegenwärtigen*) of something nonpresent. A photograph or a painting is one moment of the complex structure of the imagining consciousness. Husserl distinguishes the photograph as the perceived physical object; the photographed object as sheer appearance (*Erscheinung*); and the subject of the photograph. The example of the photograph of his child demonstrates this essential difference (Husserl 1980: 109).

Of course, what Husserl has suggested is that the content of the photograph merely serves as the presented image of the original object. The image on the photograph does not exist. However, he does not make any distinction between the image in photography and the image in painting. The difference between photography and painting is well debated in the history of photography (Scharf 1974: 233–248). The question at stake here does not concern whether photography is an art, but the ontological status of the photographic image. In painting, the painter can create images out his/her own pure phantasy or imagination with or without any reference to the physical world. The objects in Dali’s surrealist paintings can be found nowhere. However, the objects in the photograph must be photographed from real things found in the physical world. No matter how artificial the objects seem to be, they are real things. Hence there can never be a completely fake photograph.

CHEUNG C.-F. (✉)
Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

In *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* (1929), Heidegger uses the photograph to illustrate the different meanings of the word “image” (*Bild*) as employed by Immanuel Kant. The difference between the death mask and its photograph lies in the nature of the photograph as a copy (*Nachbild*). “Now the photograph, however, can also show how something like a death mask appears in general. In turn, the death mask can show in general how something like the face of a dead human being appears. But an individual corpse itself can also show this. And similarly, the mask itself can also show how a death mask in general appears, just as the photograph shows not only how what is photographed, but also how photography in general appears” (Heidegger 1990: 64). He goes on to ask the difference between the look (*Anblicke*)—the image in the broader sense—of the corpse, the death mask, and the photograph. By asking this question, Heidegger enters into a phenomenological critique of Kant’s concept of making-sensible (*Versinnlichung*).

In *L’imaginaire* (1940), Sartre examines the phenomenon of the photograph in a way similar to Heidegger’s. A photograph is different from a mental image in that it is both the object of apprehension and an image: “a photo functions at first as an object (at least theoretically). A mental image gives itself immediately as an image Mental images, caricatures, photos are so many species of the same genus.” (Sartre 2004: 19) Yet the relationship between the object and the image has become a problem: apprehending a photograph, it has to explain how and why can the imaginative consciousness differentiate the “real” object in perception and the image shown in or on the photograph?

It is certain, then, that Husserl, Heidegger, and Sartre did take note of the phenomenon of photography. Yet even though the distinction between a photograph and a painting or another image is observed, the nature of photographic activity and photographic reality seemingly did not warrant phenomenological investigation. One of earliest phenomenological works on photography is by Hubert Damisch. In “Five Notes for a Phenomenology of the Photographic Image” (1963), he calls for a phenomenological analysis of the photographic image. The photograph is more than a picture of an external object, but a “cultural object” that is historically constituted. As such it requires an eidetic analysis. “The photographic image does not belong to the natural world. It is a product of human labor, a

cultural object whose being—in the phenomenological sense of the term—cannot be dissociated precisely from its historical meaning and from the necessarily datable project in which it originates” (Trachtenberg 1980: 288). The cluster of problems now includes not only the photograph as a piece of paper on which an image is inscribed, but the photographic activity, i.e., the interaction between the photographer, the photographing act, the camera, the production of the photograph, and the photograph itself.

One of the main issues of photography is the ontological status of the photographic image. The debate over whether photography is an art misses the ontological distinction between photograph and painting. In his classic essay on “The Ontology of the Photographic Image” (1967), André Bazin clearly states: “Originality in photography as distinct from originality in painting lies in the essentially objective character of photography. For the first time, between the originating object and its reproduction there intervenes the instrumentality of a nonliving agent. For the first time an image of the world is formed automatically, without the creative intervention of man. The personality of the photographer enters into the proceedings only in his selection of the object to be photographed and by way of the purpose he has in mind” (Trachtenberg 1980: 240–41). “Objective character” not only means the objectivity pertaining to the relationship between the image and the external world, but also points to the fact that photograph must be produced through the lens (*Objektiv* in German and *objectif* in French) of the camera. For every photograph there must be given object to be photographed. The photographer, unlike the painter, never creates the object. Photography begins with the object given. Then the photographer decides how to take the photo. As Henri Cartier-Bresson, the great French photographer, poetically remarks: “Photography is, for me, a spontaneous impulse coming from an ever-attentive eye, which captures the moment and its eternity Photography is an immediate reaction, drawing a meditation” (1999: 45). Taking a photograph depends on “the decisive moment,” and the challenge is how to capture the object and to reduce its four-dimensionality of space and time onto the two dimensions of the photographic paper.

Photography thus begins with the *Sache selbst*. In *Camera Lucida* (1980), Roland Barthes takes this ontological status of the photographic “referent” as

the “founding order of Photography” (1980: 77). He distinguishes the photographic referent from all other systems of representation. He explains: “I call ‘photographic referent’ not the *optionally* real thing to which an image or a sign refers but the necessarily real thing which has been placed before the lens, without which there would be no photograph. Painting can feign reality without having seen it. Discourse combines signs which have referents, of course, but these referents can be and are most often ‘chimeras.’ Contrary to these imitations, in Photography I can never deny that *the thing has been there*. There is a superimposition here: of reality and of the past. And since this constraint exists only for Photography, we must consider it, by reduction, as the very essence, the *noème* of Photography The name of Photography’s *noème* will therefore be: ‘That-has-been,’ or again: the Intractable” (ibid.: 76–77).

All photographs begin with the absolute givenness of things in reality. However, these things are photographed through the programmed camera into a specific frame reducing time and the three-dimensional space to the film or digital data through which the photograph is produced and multiplied. Yet the things so transferred into photographic images have been unmistakably altered. Barthes explains further: “What I see has been here, in this place which extends between infinity and the subject (*operator* or *spectator*); it has been here, and yet immediately separated; it has been absolutely, irrefutably present, and yet already deferred (ibid.). The difference between the thing photographed and the photographic referent is therefore ontological. On one hand, the referent is referred back to the original givenness of the thing; on the other hand, the referent as “*noème* ‘That-has-been’ ” (ibid.) becomes the photograph itself. The existence of the referent must be taken in the past. The photographic image on the photograph however is always in the present whenever it is re-presented (*vergegenwärtigt*). Whether the original things or human beings so photographed exist or not in the present is no longer the question. For Barthes, no writing or painting can give the certainty of photograph. As he says, “Photography never lies: or rather, it can lie as to the meaning of the thing, being by nature *tendentious*, never as to its existence Every photograph is a certificate of presence” (ibid.).

However, the “historical” existence of the photographic image is only the ontological ground of the photograph. The significance of its existence cannot

be shown. The presence of the photographic referent is to be seen and to be interpreted. To be sure, what we want to see in any photograph is not the mere existence of the thing, but the “message” from the image, which, as photographic referent, points beyond itself on the paper to a distinct past, yet re-presents itself in the present seeing. John Berger comments on this phenomenon: “A photograph arrests the flow of time in which the event photographed once existed. All photographs are of the past, yet in them an instant of the past is arrested so that, unlike a lived past, it can never lead to the present. Every photograph presents us with two messages: a message concerning the event photographed and another concerning a shock of discontinuity” (Berger and Mohr 1995: 86).

Indeed, the photograph is a record of a particular adumbration of the world in which time and space were taken as the ontological frame. In the event of photography, this aspect of the world, in which a certain event or person (or anything) is presented, is framed from a certain actual space and by a certain fragment of time. Hence like memory, a photograph preserves a moment of the world in time and space. But between the moment recorded and the moment of seeing the photograph, there is “an abyss” (ibid.), where the time and the space, so recorded, is in discontinuity. The fundamental difference between the image in memory and the photograph is, according to John Berger, that “whereas remembered images are residue of continuous experience, a photograph isolates the appearances of a disconnected instant” (ibid.: 89). When we see any photograph, we know it is about a past event, “a certain *what has been*.” The where, when, why, and how it was taken is, however, beyond this bare fact. The message of the photograph is to be seen and to be understood.

In seeing the photograph, Barthes’ distinction of *studium* and *punctum* serves as two basic but not necessarily contrary themes. The *studium* refers to a kind of general interest, “but application to a thing, taste for someone, a kind of general, enthusiastic commitment, of course, but without special acuity” (Barthes 1980: 27). On the other hand, a photograph’s *punctum* is that which pricks, stings, and is poignant to the spectator. What Barthes suggests in these two ways of seeing a photograph is to differentiate two *noetic* intentions to the photographic image. In most photographs that we encounter everyday, we see the presentational contents as a general eidos, i.e., we identify the images as human beings, as cars, as general objects in the world.

Of course, we may be pleased by the color, contrast, and the composition of the objects in the photograph. We may understand what the presentational contents mean in a general way. Yet these photographs do not arrest our attention as *punctum*, as something with a special affective effect on us.

The meaning we can read from the photographs depends on the recognition of the context of the photograph. To see the photograph is to read the photograph not simply as an image, but as a text. But to read the text requires an effort to enter the complexity of the context. As Victor Burgin insists, "The intelligibility of the photograph is no simple thing: photographs are texts inscribed in terms of what we may called 'photographic discourse,' but this discourse, like any other, engages discourses beyond itself, the 'photographic text,' like any other, is the site of a complex 'intertextuality,' an overlapping series of previous texts 'taken for granted' at a particular cultural and historical conjuncture" (Burgin 1982: 144). If seeing a photograph means not a casual looking or inspection, but a conscious and conscientious act of hermeneutical discourse between the spectator and the photograph, then this seeing is to reveal the invisible complexities and ambiguities arising from the visible images. This revelation is to enter into a series of inter-relationships between the text as image and the spectator. These may be aesthetic, cultural, social, ideological, or simply idiosyncratic. But there is never a complete reading or a total understanding of any photograph. The dialectical relationship between *studium* and *punctum* will be displayed endlessly as long as the seeing is in process.

A photograph is the product of a photographer. According to John Berger, "A photograph is a result of the photographer's decision that it is worth recording that this particular event or this particular object has been seen A photograph is already a message about the event it records At its simplest, the message, decoded, means: *I have decided that seeing this is worth recording*" (Trachtenberg 1980: 292). The fundamental distinction between photography and painting, besides the ontological difference in the givenness of their objects, lies in the means of production. All previous artwork, like painting or sculpture, is based on the hands' dexterity. But in photography, the primary act is seeing. The means of production is taken care of by the camera with all of its built-in programs. Indeed, the seeing is not directly from the eyes, but through certain lens (*Objektiv*) with a particular setting

of speed, a particular aperture, and a particular kind of film. The camera so programmed would determinate the outcome of the photograph. Hence the photograph is more the result not only of the photographer, but also of the production of the technological devices and programs of the camera. In fact, the modern camera can be programmed to take photographs automatically. The photographer is not needed to produce a photograph. In this case, however, the nature of photography is changed. If there is no photographer behind the camera, there is no photography, but only mechanical or electronic image-copying.

At its early inception, photography was considered as what Fox Talbot called a "pencil of nature," and the term "photography" signified, as mentioned, writing or drawing with light. Light is then the essential element of photography. Without light, there is no photography. But without "drawing," there is no photograph produced. "Drawing" with light is of course only a metaphor. To draw with light means to see the world through the lens of the camera. Hence the significant part of photography certainly does not concern the camera, but is a matter of how to see photographically. Edward Weston, one of the most important modern photographers, stresses the importance of this seeing. He says: "Hence the photographer's most important and likewise most difficult task is not learning to manage his camera, or to develop, or to print. It is learning to see photographically—that is, learning to see his subject matter in terms of the capacities of his tools and processes, so that he can instantaneously translate the elements and values in a scene before him into the photograph he wants to make" (Trachtenberg 1980: 173).

Photographic seeing is seeing through the viewfinder of the camera. Hence it is in essence a restricted seeing and not seeing in the natural attitude. The frame of the viewfinder determines a priori the scene of the photograph. The infinitely extended perceptual world is framed into a particular view; thus this particular adumbration of the world in its original three-dimensional space and time is transferred, or to borrow the terminology of phenomenology, "reduced" to the two-dimensional film. To see photographically is to reduce the perceptual world to a photographically framed world. This is the first step of photographic reduction. Within the reduced frame, and depending on the seeing of the photographer, the subject matter can be further reduced to itself by bracketing all of

the unnecessary elements surrounding it. The subject matter must be situated in a definite horizon. Hence the background and foreground may be altered; the contrast of light and use of color may be controlled, so that a definite composition is formed by the conscious intention of the photographer through his/her seeing. To let the subject matter show itself from the manifold of the natural lifeworld as well as to give the subject matter an order and meaning embedded in the composition is the work of photographic seeing. Things and events that are seen photographically as they appear through the reduction of camera programs can be manifested in ten thousand ways. As such, photographs are indeed *phenomena* in the phenomenological sense.

Bibliography

- Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1980.
- Berger, John, and Jean Mohr. *Another Way of Looking*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Burgen, Victor, ed. *Thinking Photography*. London: Macmillan, 1982.
- Cartier-Bresson, Henri. *The Mind's Eye*. New York: Aperture, 1999.
- Flusser, Vilém. *Towards a Philosophy of Photography*. London: Reaktion Books, 2000.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*. Bonn: F. Cohen, 1929. *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Trans. Richard Taft. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigung. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'imaginaire: Psychologie phénoménologique de l'imagination* (Paris: Gallimard, 1940). *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. Trans. Jonathan Webber. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Scharf, Aaron. *Art and Photography*. London: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Trachtenberg, Alan, ed. *Classic Essays on Photography*. New Haven, CT: Leete's Island Books, 1980.
- Wells, Liz, ed. *The Photography Reader*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Play

Cathrin Nielsen

The etymological origins of the word are murky; its initial meaning appears to be “dance” or “dancing.” Heraclitus in Fragment 52 of world-processes (*aiōn*) refers to a child at play that moves pawns back and forth and is thus in possession of a kingdom. In Plato’s later works, human beings are toys of the gods (*Laws* II 644 d; VII 803 c), whose purpose remains unclear. In accordance with what is still “best” in their nature, i.e., their sense of rhythm and harmony, and the joy associated with both, they feel compelled to play useless and beautiful games. Play is pivotal in the process of soul-formation; it takes on the role of early education, teaching children as early as possible to anticipate which laws the state will declare as binding (*Laws* II 659 d). At the same time, artistic play as the playful imitation (*mimēsis*) of the sensory components in poetry and music is seen by Plato as entering a problematic relationship with philosophy, which attempts to approximate dialectically the “things themselves” (cf. *Republic* X; on “game” in Plato, compare with Derrida 1972: II, 9).

Play and playfulness continue to be defined by illusion into the eighteenth century. *In-lusio*—being at play—means stepping into the imaginary sphere for a specific time without fully surrendering to it. Play and the illusion that emerges from it are instead seen as standing in contrast to true cognition. Kant refers to the noncommittal character of imaginative play that, he alleges, is without foundation in truth; he defines play as an activity pleasing only for its own sake (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*, § 43). The activity of playing, devoid of obligation and purpose, and its goal, free-

dom, were in one positive aspect addressed mainly by Friedrich Schiller, who expanded them into an idealistic concept of play. According to Schiller, a human being acts playfully exactly in those areas where he or she is truly human, and is only entirely human where s/he plays, “But how can we speak of *mere* play, when we know that it is precisely play and play *alone*, which of all man’s states and conditions is the one which makes him whole and unfolds both sides of his nature at once?” (Schiller 2000: 62). The connection of beauty and freedom refers to the ability of spontaneous beginnings, which contradict the laws of nature, and therefore refers to the specific range of the human ability of being free.

As early as during the romantic era, philosophers distanced themselves from the narrow view of play as an activity and creative practice of humans alone, and interpreted play instead in the sense of “world play” (*Welt-Spiel*). Friedrich Schlegel sees human play as analogous to the play of the world as a self-creating work of art (Schlegel 1968). Friedrich Nietzsche, too, speaks of the world as a “self-bearing work of art” and interprets “the playful assembly and destruction of our individual environment” (*das spielerische Aufbauen und Zertrümmern der Individualwelt*) as an “excretion of primordial *Urlust*” (*Ausfluss einer Urlust*—1988: 153). His “artists’ metaphysics,” intended to separate traditional metaphysics and its antithesis from the true and illusory world and interprets the world order according to the aesthetic order which is freely put in place and again discarded.

In a critical inquiry into Nietzsche’s metaphysics of play EUGEN FINK takes the anthropo-cosmological view of play involving a comprehensive redefinition of the basic metaphysical terms of space, time, and motion as being, truth, and world. In this

C. Nielsen (✉)
Eugen Fink Archive, Freiburg, Germany

context, “play” identifies the “game” as an ontological metaphor that expresses a relationship to the self; the human behaves at play in an exceptional manner toward his own being, which in turn refers back to the world. Play is no longer only one manner of comprehension, but rather an ontological mystery, which became hidden in the Platonic tradition of mimesis that supposedly replaced play (*Spiel*) with mirroring (*Spiegelung*). Play turns into a symbol for the cosmological paradox of the world (Fink 1960) that occurs between “heaven” as the realm of light and of outlines and “earth” as the soil and the grave of all individuated form. All is at stake in its counterplay—a game that is simultaneously “no one’s game” because “in it, someone, people, human beings, and gods come to exist.” Everything that exists “is a cosmic plaything but all players are also just being played. The appearance is a mask behind which no one and nothing is hiding” (Fink 1960: 241f.). While the adults reside in a closed time that can be dated, the child first enters into time; it is equally still in transition from the nightly cradle of *physis* into the bright day of the individuated world. Child’s play in its timelessness and lack of intent thus becomes an ontic model for the transition of the world from nothing into being. It is not merely “appearance,” but “apparition” (*Erscheinung*) in the larger sense.

For MARTIN HEIDEGGER, play appears at first as an abyss or nothing that gives *being* space for its creative impulses (possibilities). The “play of transcendence” (*Spiel der Transzendenz*) of human existence proves itself by measuring its existence against the cognitive horizon of the abyss, i.e., as a precursor to death (*Vorlaufen zum Tode*) or on the playing field of a purposeless world. From about 1930 onward, this approach is reformulated by honoring tradition as the “history of being,” yet without abandoning the originally existential approach. In contrast to other play theories that separate the ontological-transcendental principle (*play*) from the empirical-actual activity (*game*), Heidegger interprets this difference instead as *originating out of* play itself and *as* play: “Only for as long as man himself is brought into play and put at stake is he able to engage truly in play and to stay at play” (*Nur insofern der Mensch in dieses Spiel gebracht und dabei aufs Spiel gesetzt ist, vermag er wahrhaft zu spielen und im Spiel zu bleiben*—1997: 186). The late Heidegger interprets the whole of the world as having an irreducible, self-reflection of the abyss at its core, a “mirror game” (*Spiegel-Spiel*; cf.

Heidegger 2000: 181 f.) of earth and heaven, the divine and the mortal. The play has no reason and is without “why,” just as the world is world without any implicit reason, play is play because it plays.

The hermeneutics of HANS-GEORG GADAMER interprets the term “play” as an original form of understanding; it takes on the role of a guide to uncover art’s fundamental hermeneutical demand for cognition. In it, any purpose-oriented reference points of daily life become unhinged, and the playful motion ultimately refers only to itself. Further, it is not a being ruled by any one subject, it is its own “subject” in the sense that it predates any possible players that join it. Consequently, Gadamer interprets the term *symbol* as distinct from allegory. The symbolic does not simply point toward a meaning, it *is* meaning. At play, as within a work of art, its own meaningful depth is to be found specifically in the unique characteristic of its “increase in being” (*Seinszuwachs*) as encountered through self-representation (Gadamer 1977: 49, 1986: 35). Gadamer finds this same “closed circle of meaning” (Gadamer 1960: 118) that is detached from daily concerns in “celebration.” It is present in the fluidity of a playful gathering that encompasses the whole cosmos. In it, we find a connection to a specific structure of experiencing the passage of time that Gadamer characterizes in contrast to the physically “empty time” as “fulfilled time” (*erfüllte Zeit*) or “autonomous time” (Gadamer 1977: 55, 1986: 42). Games, works of art, and celebrations invite time to linger. The time spent playing, the time of art or celebration, is neither eternal nor the never-ending flow of successive moments in the here and now. It is instead an internally structured unit of time that, much like a piece of music, gains shape through a rhythm of its own.

The relationship of play and truth that, in a hermeneutical interpretation is brought to a positive point, finds its negative counterpoint in the postmodern interpretation of JACQUES DERRIDA. Liberation of language is advocated against the backdrop of Nietzsche and the deconstructive writing in which the metaphysical claims of reference to a defined object disappears in the infinite play of significant factors (Derrida 1967). It is no longer a matter of meaning, recognition, or understanding, but a matter of the transcendental play of *différance*: “*Le jeu joue toujours la différence sans référence, ou plutôt sans référent*” (Derrida 1972: 248). On the one hand, it radically alters the phenomenological approach to see the essence of a

thing in the *how* of its being that the “thing itself” or the “text” are disappearing into through the endless play of its directions. With play, no historical world emerges or is donated as with Heidegger, Fink, and Hans-Georg Gadamer; rather, it presents itself in all its shifting, mirroring, and distorting facets as a pure deconstructive motion. On the other hand, the aletheiological meaning of play becomes once again dependent on truth qua correctness—“good play” (Derrida 1992: 64 f.)—even if it appears as its negation, i.e., the subversive fact (“bad play”) that truth, also as *aletheia*, does not exist. Ruth Sonderegger (2000) spoke out against the outside definition of art by means of aletheiological as well as deconstructivist concepts, and in favor of the aesthetic object’s own meaning. Thus its “aesthetic difference” evolves out of the term “play.” Aesthetic experience is a game not *of* truth and its negation, but one that plays *with* truth.

Detaching the term “play” from its cosmological, or rather its aletheiological and phenomenological dimensions, and bringing it to a point under anthropological aspects also defines its continued development. Even within early twentieth century anthropology, the term “play” had gained meaning, primarily with regard to evolution and theory of culture. In this vein, F.J.J. Buytendijk (1933) limits play to the creaturely-biological range of the child, which is defined by unrestrained motive drive, ambivalence, and a pathic demeanor. Arnold Gehlen also attributes play to an overabundance of motive energy, whereas Gustav Bally (1945) bases the possibility of its existence on the free range in the world that arises out of the procurement of a safe living environment. Jan Huizinga (1938) points out that play itself is an elementary function of human life and its culture, in fact it is its origin. The pedagogic concepts of Hans Scheuerl (1979) and Axel Horn (1987) in part refer back to the phenomenological conceptualizations of play.

The phenomenological studies of Polish author Józef Tischner (1989) deserve mentioning as an separate idea in that they aim to uncover human existence as a “dramatic existence.” For Tischner, the existence of a dramatic being means “to experience the world as a stage within a specific time and surrounded by other human beings” (Tischner 1989, 22). In critical discussion of the monologic phenomenology of Husserl and Heidegger, Tischner designs the philosophy of a drama that uses two “openings,” that of intentionality that must be seen as the “intermediate

space of the stage” (*Zwischenbereich der Bühne*) and that of the dialogic opening to the other whose chasmic “in between” takes precedence, as Tischner emphasizes in reference to Levinas, over all other relational constructs.

Play has operated as a social or societal category primarily since the 1950s (Bateson 1973), especially in light of its interactive, structural, and experimental features. To a much greater extent than phenomenology, structuralism and system theory define the understanding of play in twentieth century art (Bätzner 2005). Following the dissolution of the mimetic representational principle and the focal point, the avant-garde pursues the fundamental destruction of the inherited concept of art in favor of an experimental dissolution of boundaries and a reinterpretation of the rules. The nonintentionality based on random principle marks an open structural principle in this instance. Thus, as Umberto Eco (1962) notes, the modern work of art appears programmatically as fragmentized with, again, an open goal of encouraging the viewer to acts of conscious freedom. It does not merely rest on its own objective structure, but puts itself as a structure of open receptive relations at risk.

If we were to take one look at the current spectrum of meaning of the term “play,” we notice both its inflationary as well as its indifferent usage. Rendered through structuralism, system theory, and postmodernism, the term “play” loses its decidedly human as well as its ontologic-cosmologic contour in favor of a vague universal definition of a model of society and nature that can be formalized. In the name of play, sociological, aesthetic, scientific, and humanistic discussions become fused and often with the intent of a “playful” redefinition of culture (Künsting 1990). So it is that we hear more and more often of a “ludenic age” (Combs 2000) or even of a transition from “homo ludens to ludo globi” (Rötzer 1995). From the phenomenological viewpoint, it can be critically asserted that under close observation, a mathematical-economic play theory is dominant that subjects the “universe,” which as a whole is supposedly at play, including its world of life, to a scientific method that attempts systematically to integrate randomness as a calculating factor into its set of tools (von Neumann and Morgenstern 1944; Eigen and Ruthild 1990). Contrary to the phenomenological interpretation of play, with its human commitment to a cosmic, chasmic transcendence, the strategic self-reference of scientific play

theory seems more concerned with once more casually controlling the world of nature and society as a whole.

Bibliography

- Bally, Gustav. *Vom Ursprung und von den Grenzen der Freiheit: Eine Deutung des Spiels bei Tier und Mensch*. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1945.
- Bateson, Gregory. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution and Epistemology*. St. Albans: Paladin, 1973.
- Bätzner, Nike (eds.). *Faites vos jeux! Kunst und Spiel seit Dada*. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2005.
- Buytendijk, F.J.J. *Wesen und Sinn des Spiels. Das Spielen des Menschen und der Tiere als Erscheinungsform der Lebenstriebe*. Berlin: Kurt Wolff/Der neue Geist, 1933.
- Callois, Roger. *Les jeux et les hommes. (Le masque et le vertige)*. Paris: Gallimard, 1958; *Man, Play, and Games*. Trans. Meyer Barash. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
- Combs, James E. *Play World: The Emergence of the New Ludenic Age*. Westport, CN: Praeger, 2000.
- Derrida, Jacques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1967; *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La dissemination*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972; *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbra Johnson. London: Athlone, 1981.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Acts of Literature*. Derek Attridge (ed.). New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Dunand, Alain. *L'espace du jeu*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978.
- Eco, Umberto. *Opera aperta*. Ed. Valentino Bompiani. Milano: Casa, 1962; *The Open Work*. Trans. Anna Cancogni. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Eigen, Manfred, and Winkler Ruthild. *Das Spiel. Naturgesetze steuern den Zufall*. Munich: Piper 1990; *Laws of the Game: How the Principles of Nature Govern Chance*. Trans. Robert and Rita Kember. London: Allen Lane, 1982.
- Fink, Eugen. *Spiel als Weltsymbol*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960; *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1975.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Die Aktualität des Schönen. Kunst als Spiel, Symbol und Fest*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1977; *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays*. Ed. Robert Bernasconi. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens 1910–1976*. Ed. Hermann Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe* 13. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1983.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Der Satz vom Grund*. Ed. Petra Jaeger. *Gesamtausgabe* 10. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1997; *The Principle of Reason*. Trans. Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. *Gesamtausgabe* 7. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000.
- Horn, Axel. *Spielen lernen. Spielen als ek-sistenziales Grundphänomen und Möglichkeiten einer Spielerziehung im Sportunterricht*. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1987.
- Huizinga, Jan. *Homo ludens. Proeve eener bepaling van het speelelement der cultuur*. Groningen: Wolters-Nordhoff 1938; *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*. London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1970.
- Jünger, Friedrich Georg. *Die Spiele. Ein Schlüssel zu ihrer Bedeutung*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1953.
- Kane, Patrick. *The Play Ethic: A Manifesto for a Different Play of Living*. London: Pan, 2005.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Ed. Karl Vorländer. Hamburg, 1993; *The Critique of Judgment*. Trans. J.H. Bernard. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2000.
- Künsting, Wilhelm. *Spiel und Wissenschaft. Versuch einer Synthese naturwissenschaftlicher und geisteswissenschaftlicher Anschauungen zur Funktion des Spiels*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag Richarz, 1990.
- Neuenfeld, Jörg. *Alles ist Spiel. Zur Geschichte der Auseinandersetzung mit einer Utopie der Moderne*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Die Geburt der Tragödie* [1871]. In *Friedrich Nietzsche: Kritische Studienausgabe*. Eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988; *The Birth of Tragedy*. Trans. Douglas Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Plato. *Platonis opera*. Ed. Ioannes Burnet. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1900.
- Roesner, Martina. *Metaphysica ludens. Das Spiel als phänomenologische Grundfigur im Denken Martin Heideggers*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- Rötzer, Florian. "Konturen der ludischen Gesellschaft im Computerzeitalter. Vom Homo ludens zum ludo globi." In *Schöne neue Welten? Auf dem Weg zu einer neuen Spielkultur*. München: Boer, 1995, 171–216.
- Scheuerl, Hans. *Das Spiel. Untersuchungen über sein Wesen, seine pädagogischen Möglichkeiten und Grenzen*. Weinheim: Benz, 1979.
- Schiller, Friedrich. *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen*. Ed. Klaus L. Berghahn. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2000; *On the Aesthetic Education of Man: In a Series of Letters*. Eds. and Trans. Elizabeth M. Wilkinson and L.A. Willoughby. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. *Gespräch über die Poesie* [1800]. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1968.
- Sonderegger, Ruth. *Für eine Ästhetik des Spiels. Hermeneutik, Dekonstruktion und der Eigensinn der Kunst*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000.
- Tischner, Józef. *Das menschliche Drama. Phänomenologische Studien zur Philosophie des Dramas*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1989.
- von Neumann, John, and Oskar Morgenstern. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944.

Political Culture

Helmut Kohlenberger

Through the central placement of the magic word “phenomenon,” EDMUND HUSSERL was able to open new perspectives that would lead out of the sterile deadlock into which the philosophical schools vying for recognition in the nineteenth century had fallen. This is true despite the word’s unclarified status and seductive power, of which Husserl (1921: 244) himself was fully aware. He openly admits that the word was an invitation to make reference to experiences and the objects of appearance and to commingle them. This especially applies to the “images of productive phantasy” (he mentions paintings, statues, poems), which exist as acts with their intentional content, while the experienced color and formal content are genuine, and not merely supposed “really intrinsic elements” of consciousness. With the breaking of the opposition between empiricism and variations of “idealism”, the problems present themselves anew, freed from the entangling of methods in these positions themselves. The intertwining of the passivity of circumstance and the “intrusiveness” of active self-manifestation allows that which is carefully described in distanced observation to become clear in the describing. In contrast to the “true world” of mathematical formalization seen as a “technical artwork,” the “lifeworld” appears in the “universal research mission of transcendental reduction,” along with its essential forms, but also in forms of actuality of things in self-conscious communities (Blumenberg 2002: 169ff.).

The relations with the political in the figures of the phenomenological tradition stemming from Husserl

can best be seen in connection with convergent reflections from other European thinkers. Friedrich Nietzsche’s work stretches out like a long shadow over the twentieth century and beyond. His maxim that existence is only eternally justified as an aesthetic phenomenon set the theme of Europe’s future (1969: I, 40). He understood Wagner’s attempt to found a religion based in the spirit of music and subjected it to scathing critique. The primacy of aesthetics can be traced through all phases of Nietzsche’s thought. In his late works (1969: III, 753), the aesthetic condition is *par excellence* “the highpoint of communicativeness and transferability between living beings—it is the source of the languages”—including acoustic, gestural, and visual languages. World War I is the focus of an atmosphere of aestheticization precipitously expressing itself in cinema and other forms of technological presentation. In addition to MAX SCHELER, to whom the dictum “He who wants to look should go to the cinema” is frequently attributed, primarily Franz Kafka, Walter Benjamin, and Siegfried Kracauer are among the first who were able to account for this.

That film, the new art form in the twentieth Century, “adjusted” people to technology was instantly seen by Benjamin (1974: 503ff.). In a self-alienation heightened to the maximum, the film actor becomes “himself” in his acting. Benjamin even speaks of a general right to reproduction. Film speaks to a mode of reception anchored in the dissipations of the everyday—it functions through shock and creates masses—leading to an atmosphere of hypnosis in the emptiness following the World War I. He saw the perfect aestheticization of politics in Fascism, which rapes the masses by mobilizing them and driving them into war, as was paradigmatically formulated in Marinetti’s manifesto. The denunciation of total war in Picasso’s *Guernica*

H. Kohlenberger (✉)
University of Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria,
Translated by Christopher Barber

also participated in the aestheticization of the political. The avant-garde carried out the politicization of aesthetics in Communism, acting under the spell of the emptiness of the symbolic, which was paradigmatically manifested in Malevich's *Black Square*.

And yet the supremacist movement was nothing more than an undirected aesthetic excitation (Ingold 1994). Art becomes the playing field of the technical-economic world that peaks in the *Gesamtkunstwerk Stalin* (Groys 1988), which sought to cause a new world to arise from nothingness. In Vienna during the 1930s, Hermann Broch and Elias Canetti began to analyze the death drive as it manifests itself in organized mass insanity. While Canetti depicted the formation of masses in flight from the order to kill, Broch (in *Der Tod des Vergil*) put the poet's nearness to death under the jurisdiction of the court of truth, which obliged him to write against totalitarian madness. Against this backdrop, MARTIN HEIDEGGER's view of the artwork seems like a translation from being coopted by technology back into premodernity actually legitimizing technology. It is not until JAN PATOČKA that this view is cast in a dimension that does justice to the age of the world wars.

Let us now turn back to the phenomenological movement in particular: with aesthetic and also sociological intentions, Scheler speaks of a correlation and partial identity of the elements of phantasy images (*Erscheinungsverhalte*) and "perceptual content." In contrast, ROMAN INGARDEN remains strictly grounded in logical structural analysis, which differentiates layers of intentional objectification in literature (phonological forms, meaning, sense, object, views) and emphasizes the "quasijudgmental," whose uncertainty provokes various concretizations as "value answers." His analyses are primarily intended to make the difference between such an approach and the literary criticism that emerges from "aesthetic experience" accessible to literary scholarship.

In France, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE took up the phenomenological direction Husserl had opened. Here the dominant question is that of how the image in the sense of a reflective outlook, understood as an indubitable psychic reality that cannot be reduced to the sensuous, is different from the perceived image. The background of this question is the ability of consciousness to hold the real at a distance. The idea is for him a world negatively focussed from a clearly defined point of view. It is not a general negation that is at issue, but

a very certain one that is analyzed in the context of Heidegger's "being-in-the-world." Actuality is transgressed with a view to the imaginary. In the work of art, the imaginary is not realized, but rather becomes an object. The pleasure of beauty is without interest in that it applies to the unreal; beauty is marked by the *Nichten der Welt* (tendency toward annihilation in the world). For MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY, the question of perceiving, seeing, and thinking comes to a head in the issue of the general affiliation of the human with the world. On the level of unprocessed sensory experience, the devouring eye lets the objects arise within us. In the "imaginary fabric of reality" (1964: 320), the things are given to us in the view of which we recognize ourselves. Here the "zero point of being" shows itself—the junction where the multifarious entrances into the world intersect (1964: 314).

The link between aesthetics and politics is established beyond doubt with the Heideggerian turn of the phenomenological question to the historical world of the human being and it is only in comparison with Husserl's approach that Heidegger's has the advantage of "descriptive diversity" (Blumenberg 2002: 178) with regard to the negation grounded in the openness to being, which is a fundamental character of Dasein. In digging deeper than the Cartesian reduction, that which has yet received little attention comes to light: silence, listening, rhythm, light. In all of these the "*im Logos wesende Eine*" comes into view. Heidegger locates the work of art in the occurrence of truth, in the primal struggle of the world standing out in the open with the protective and enclosing earth. Art is thus "truth's setting itself into the work" in the context of the original gift, founding, and instigation. From the endowing gift of the poet's speech springs truth. It opens a horizon of thought in which premodernity reaches over into modernity. At the same time, the consequences of modern reductionism are manifested in the objectification of art, where the aesthetic experience becomes the determining source of art creation and appreciation. "Everything is experience (*Erlebnis*). And yet maybe experience is the element in which art dies" (Heidegger 1950: 66).

EUGEN FINK sees the primordial dimension of the human being in "world play" (*Welt-Spiel*), which shows itself in love, death, work, and struggle. In play as "*ekstasis* of the human to the world," the fundamental trait of the world, its "alien and puzzling purposelessness," becomes apparent and Fink

sees the cosmological meaning of nihilism therein (Fink 1960).

Heidegger's relation of the artwork to the event of truth inspired Jan Patočka's conception of art. He points to a fundamental difference between premodern art and modern art. At one time the intention of the work of art was oriented toward the essence of all things; in art the infinite was reconciled with the finite. In contrast, it becomes clear in connection with Hegel's teaching of passing away of art that the present receives a past character through modern art, that art becomes an aesthetic enjoyment and experience that provides motivation for study and collection. And yet art also becomes an absolute game that surges into appearance—and thus points beyond itself: therein Being itself becomes an event; freedom becomes possible, but so does nameless suffering. It is from here that the aesthetic dimension of the political events of the twentieth century comes into view, which Patočka deals with in relation to what took place at the front during the World War I. Here the "zero-point of human aspiration" becomes clear, and the question arises as to "whether the historical human being still wants to avow his relationship to history" (Patočka 1988: 145).

With art we remain attached to the cold gleam and silence of the façade, as Emmanuel Levinas shows. In the dominance of aesthetic enjoyment as an attitude toward life he sees a return to the elemental and the uncertainty it entails, which lies in the uncertainty of the future. It corresponds to the characteristic of "phenomenon," which for him is reality that "is still infinitely far away from its Being" (Levinas 1980: 156). This conclusion is also manifested in, for example, JACQUES DERRIDA's twisted reflection on the "remainder" in painting. That the remainder can discharge itself in violence is a realization that is now emerging in the academic field as well, albeit in relative disconnection from the general phenomenization in modernity (Seel 2000: 295ff.).

That nothing is self-evident anymore and that it is impossible to simulate undamaged life in art was already the point of departure for Theodor Adorno's thought on aesthetics, which was highly influential for a long period following World War II. That in a false life (damaged by totalitarian discourse and its political consequences) no true life is possible was a verdict for aesthetic consciousness. The student revolts of 1968, which were also characterized by surreal motifs and the "power of imagination," were born under this sign.

To this day, this ambiguity determines the "floating" atmosphere that can be seen more and more clearly in the West. But we are far from a condition in which "body and picture space so deeply interpenetrate" that a new form of life arises that owes its existence to a revolutionary eruption (Benjamin 1977: 310). Of course, a complete aestheticization of the lifeworld "could not be distinguished from terror" (Boehm 1993: 358).

The (post)modern cultural atmosphere is determined by the reflexivity that is co-constitutive in artistic work, which takes in everything with a technically focusing gaze. Already in the baroque era, the alienation achieved using technologized painting techniques became evident in art that depicts that which cannot possibly exist (Polanyi 1970). We see ourselves and the world in "profane enlightenment" (Benjamin 1977: 310), in the "city lights" standing in contrast to the "dark ground of nature" (Henry 1989), in that we ourselves are formatted by film, television etc., by these "mental automatons" (Deleuze 1983, 1985). The demarcation of the boundary between the real, the symbolic, and the imaginary discussed by Jacques Lacan leads to the (evil) eye captured by *fascinum*, in which the artist seeks to spellbind us. The evil eye is tamed in the image. This shows itself in the depictions of violence in art, which are fundamentally different from those of terror or pornography (Seel 2000: 316ff.). The paradox of our intermediate position entails the fact that in our lifestyle shaped by art (Ziehe 1993), only art itself seems to be able to provoke us to "truth." If all aspects of life understand themselves from the perspective of art and play, then art becomes a relic from bygone times—then the matter at hand is primarily the overlooked, the unseen, and the anti-fiction (Marquard 1989: 113ff.).

Thus it becomes necessary to differentiate a "science of images" from general semiotics—corresponding to the distance between art and philosophy (Boehm 1993: 355ff.). The entire bandwidth, from the mirror game to the disappointment of the gaze in modernity (in Duchamp, for instance), must be seen anew in context of the aestheticization that is taking place. Taking Plato's critique of art as a point of departure, Eugen Fink (1960: 83ff.) examined the pictorial in contexts ranging from reflection in water to depiction and poetry. Today the locus of poetry, for Heidegger the locus of foundation (*Stiftung*), has become questionable. What is always emphasized is the "remainder" that cannot be translated from the

image into the word. The self-evident narcissistic disposition found in the technical reproduction of art lets the beholder become a “locus of images” (Belting and Haustein 1998: 34ff.).

Now the position of photography and film in the collective memory (and its politics) is determined. Benjamin already stated that photography is an aspect of the historical process—and not only in the sense of evidence in a court proceeding. A film like *Schindler's List* raises the fundamental question of the “truthfulness” of a cinematic presentation. Here the events of the Holocaust are treated like current war reporting from Bosnia, without being touched by the events of a war. The memory of survivors is put in an aesthetic frame. Verbally stated memories are integrated into a quasi-ritual presentation that sounds like artistic-religious self-salvation in the tradition of Wagner's *Parsifal* (Beiweis 1995). Thus the aesthetic lifeworld becomes an interior space that seems unbridgeable—even in view of the events of the Holocaust, which are considered unrepresentable. Significantly, Peter Eisenmann's Holocaust monument stele project in Berlin contradicts a symbolic-political expiation, virtually becoming an “image for the prohibition of images” (cf. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, December 18–19, 2004).

In any case, one would be drawing too hasty a conclusion in taking the atmosphere (of the aestheticized lifeworld) as the self-evident point of departure for critique, as Böhme (1995) proposes. This may be valid for that which mediates “between” individuals and “society” and enters the discussion in intercultural dialogue. That which mediates must find its expression in language—in the sense of Picasso's dictum: “I do not search; I am finding.”

Boehm (1993) stresses the “iconic difference” experienced in the unexpected, which draws the beholder of art beyond aesthetics into fundamental philosophical questions in the sense of the old “rescue of the phenomena” that is in danger of being lost in the aesthetic-narcissistic inner space, especially since this inner space is governed by a seemingly uncontrollable technologically instrumentalized biopolitical network, to which already the designer babies belong. Here the revolutionary state of emergency in modernism has become the rule. The prevailing cynicism would like human life to be sacred, but at the same time it is legally possible to be killed right away (Agamben 2003). Benjamin (1977: 201ff.) clarifies this open contradiction: he sees the “dogma of the sacredness of life

as the last aberration of the weakened Western tradition.” He sees the open contrast to the old mythical traditions, in which mere life is the bearer of guilt. However, he says, this is put in question by divine law.

The floating of aesthetics, a theme already dealt with by Søren Kierkegaard, is discussed by Levinas in its significant temporariness—as a path from the phenomenon to that which is not yet known. A pure phenomenalization remains in danger of overlooking the violence inherent in the aesthetic dimension. The phenomenological view, of course, belongs to this “mythical tradition” (of our political thinking) denounced by Benjamin. Its transcendence by divine law (Benjamin) might become an open question in intercultural discourse.

Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Stato di eccezione*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 2003.
- Beiweis, Werner. *Zur Realität des Imaginären. Steven Spielbergs Film “Schindlers Liste.”* Vienna: Sonderzahl, 1995.
- Belting, Hans, and Lydia Haustein, eds. *Das Erbe der Bilder. Kunst und moderne Medien in den Kulturen der Welt*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1998.
- Benjamin, Walter. “Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit” [1935]. In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser. Vol 1/2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974, 471–508.
- Benjamin, Walter. “Der Sürrealismus.” In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser. Vol 2/1. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977, 295–310.
- Blumenberg, Hans. *Zu den Sachen und zurück*. Ed. Manfred Sommer. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2002.
- Boehm, Gottfried. “Der erste Blick. Kunstwerk—Ästhetik—Philosophie.” In *Die Aktualität des Ästhetischen*. Ed. Wolfgang Welsch. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1993.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Atmosphäre. Essays zur neuen Ästhetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995.
- Clair, Jean. *La responsabilité de l'artiste. Les avant-gardes entre terreur et raison*. Paris: Gallimard, 1997.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinéma I: L'image-mouvement*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1983; *Cinema I. The Movement-Image*. London: Athlone Press, 1986.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinéma II: L'image-temps*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1985; *Cinema II, The Time-Image*. London: Athlone Press, 1989.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La vérité en peinture*. Paris: Flammarion, 1978; *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Ian Macleod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Fink, Eugen. *Spiel als Weltsymbol*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Groys, Boris. *Gesamtkunstwerk Stalin. Die gespaltene Kultur in der Sowjetunion*. Munich: Hanser, 1988.

- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; "The Origin of the Work of Art." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Henry, Michel. "La vie et la république." In *Enseignement Philosophique* 3, 1989, 148–160.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen Zweiter Band. Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis. II. Teil. Elemente einer phänomenologischen Aufklärung der Erkenntnis*. 2nd, rev. ed. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1921; *Logical Investigations*. 2 vols Trans. J. N. Findlay. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie* [1936]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 6. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962; *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk. Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931; *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. Trans. G. G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Ingold, Felix Philipp. "Welt und Bild." In *Was ist ein Bild?* Ed. Gottfried Boehm and K. Stierle. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1994, 366–410.
- Kohlenberger, Helmut. "Religion, Kunstreligion, Weltspiel." In *Von der Romantik zur ästhetischen Religion*. Ed. Michael Ley and Leander Kaiser. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2004, 61–70.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totalité et infini: Essai sur l'extériorité*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.
- Marquard, Odo. *Aesthetica und Anaesthetica*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1989.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Werke*. Ed. K. Schlechta. Munich: Hanser, 6th ed. 1969.
- Ogawa, Tadashi, et al., eds. *Interkulturelle Philosophie und Phänomenologie in Japan*. Munich: Iudicium, 1998.
- Patočka, Jan. *Ketzerische Essays zur Philosophie der Geschichte und ergänzende Schriften*, Ed. Klaus Nellen and Jiří Němec. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1988.
- Polanyi, Michael. "What is a Painting?" In *The American Scholar* 39, 1970, 655–669.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'Imaginaire*. Paris: Gallimard, 1940; *The Imaginary*. Trans. Jonathan Webber. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Seel, Martin. *Ästhetik des Erscheinens*. Munich: Hanser, 2000.
- Ziehe, Thomas. "Vom Lebensstandard zum Lebensstil". In *Die Aktualität des Ästhetischen*. Ed. Wolfgang Welsch. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1993.

Religion

Bálázs M. Mezei

Art and religion in phenomenology may be compared to two intersecting circles. The exact range of the intersection varies in the works of different authors. Philosophers like MARTIN HEIDEGGER and/or MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY offer phenomenologies in which the range of intersection is relatively wide; for others, like MAX SCHELER and/or EDMUND HUSSERL, the intersection of the two circles is either minor or unperceivable. Phenomenology has contributed to the theory of art and religion in important ways, but a common phenomenology of art and religion has not been developed in a systematic way.

The fundamental problem for an organized treatment of art and religion is the multifaceted meaning of the terms involved. The Latin “*ars*” functioned in many ways as the translation of the Greek “*technē*,” the meaning of which is skill or cunning of hand in the production of certain useful, sometimes artistic objects. The “liberal arts” of the Middle Ages—grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music—were understood as highly developed skills without any explicit aesthetic dimension. The aesthetic dimension of the arts became expressed emphatically for the first time in Charles Batteux’s term “*les beaux arts*” in 1747. These “fine arts” were painting, sculpture, music, poetry, dance, architecture, and rhetoric. While defining the autonomy of the sublime and the beautiful, Immanuel Kant emphasized the important role of rules that is the character of arts as skills. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel’s systematization of arts into architecture, epic, sculpture, painting, music, and, most importantly, poetry reflected the classical approach to the branches of

art. Although Martin Heidegger also understood poetry as the highest form of art, painting possesses a theoretically more important place than the forms of literature in contemporary theories of art (Tatarkiewicz 1980).

The term “religion,” a unique development of Western cultural history, cannot be precisely equated either with ancient Greek conceptions or with similar conceptions in the Chinese or Indian cultures. Signifying not only a world order, but also a moral attitude, not only a subjective form, but also an objective arrangement of individual and collective actions, “religion” has gone through significant changes of meaning, while not losing the most important dimensions of the earlier stages of its development. Conveying originally a notion similar to that of “taboo,” “religion” became the expression of the peculiarly subjective connection between God and human beings in St. Augustine, medieval mysticism, and Protestant spirituality. Simultaneously, “religion” retained its objective meaning, which became emphasized during the political rivalries among various confessions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In spite of the ingenious writings of Friedrich Schleiermacher, the word “religion,” as Ludwig Feuerbach put it, became identical with “politics” in the nineteenth century. Hegel’s theory of religion signifies the climax of a long development in which the various meanings are summarized and systematically ordered. In contemporary theories of religion, the many-sided meaning of the term is expressed in all of the ways in which religious phenomena, society, individual, culture, and human biology are subject to ever more specialized investigations (Woodhead and Heelas 2000).

If art is understood as “*technē*,” then its relationship to religion is not intrinsic or related to the essence of religion. “Religion” is fundamentally not

B.M. Mezei (✉)

P. P. Hungarian Catholic University, Piliscsaba, Hungary

representation, but rather that which is represented in various ways. If art is understood as representation of some sort, then it cannot be related to religion intrinsically. For art to be intrinsically related to religion, representation and what is represented should be symmetrically interdependent. But it belongs to every important conception of religion that religion precedes and surpasses any possible representation. Religion, either in its historical or its contemporary forms, remains the name of a mystery that cannot be entirely represented. If art is understood in terms of aesthetic experience, then religion and art are related in a more important way inasmuch as some form of religiosity may play a role in aesthetic experience. If works of art have religious meaning, then aesthetic experience is related to religion intrinsically, but even in experiences of natural beauty there can be moments very close to the essence of religion, such as the experience of the sublime (Kant 1956: V, §27f.) or the experience of the face of another person, as Emmanuel Levinas points out (Levinas 1982: 86). Still, religion as such is not merely an experience caused by an external object, aesthetic or otherwise. Religion is always an organically united whole in which the various external, internal, objective, subjective, and historical dimensions are arranged into a unity. In such a conception, art—understood in terms of aesthetic experience—is linked to religion in a non-intrinsic, although significant way.

Phenomenology has produced a number of detailed accounts of art (Ingarden 1931, Heidegger 1950, Dufrenne 1953, Kaufmann 1960, Merleau-Ponty 1964a, Henry 1988, etc.) and of religion (Scheler 1933b, Van der Leeuw 1933, Walther 1955, Duméry 1957, Otto 1958, etc.), but only in some cases do we have the outlines of a phenomenological theory of art *and* religion. Among such theories we find two basic kinds. The first kind emphasizes the connection between art and religion, artistic and religious experience, and again a phenomenology of art and a phenomenology of religion, but refuses to consider them to be intrinsically connected. The second kind accepts the opposing view and stresses the intrinsic connection between art and religion, artistic and religious experience, and thus the phenomenology of art and religion.

In some cases the overlapping circles of art and religion are obtained by defining religion as some sort of art or by defining art as intrinsically religious. In other

cases the intrinsic relationship between art and religion is a consequence of a radical, as opposed to a conventional, understanding of the important terms involved. According to the conventional conception, art is given first of all in a physically distinct work of art; similarly, religion is a well-formed complexity of historically determined patterns of behavior. According to the radical conception, however, art is, above all, that which is opened up in aesthetic experience, and religion is the fundamental disclosure of reality that can be perceived in forms close to or sometimes identical with forms of artistic experience.

Some of the earlier notions of art and religion in the phenomenological movement fit in with the first kind of theory. Husserl considers works of art as belonging to the same group of cultural objects as those of religion; their real existence is thus bracketed at the beginning of the process of performing various reductions. On the other hand, Husserl emphasizes that the reduction carried out in aesthetic experience is similar to the phenomenological reduction (Husserl 1976: 122, 252, cf. Kaufmann 1960: 198).

Rudolf Otto's phenomenology of the Holy, following to some extent the Husserlian method, offers various connections to a phenomenology of religious art, especially poetry. For Otto, religious art is a central expression of the Holy. For Scheler, art and religion are different realms of reality inasmuch as art is about the "production" of a particular work of art, while religion is "to will, to love, and to know in God" (Scheler 1979: 36, 218). Gerardus Van der Leeuw points out that the close connection between religion and art is based on the need of religion to reveal and hide God at the same time; he emphasizes, however, the difference between a phenomenology of religion and that of art (van der Leeuw 1933, § 65, 3).

In FRITZ KAUFMANN's words, artistic and religious "revelations" can be thus termed because both offer intuition into what may be called the ultimate ground of reality. An artistic revelation becomes religious as soon as revelation is not considered to be merely objective without subjective relevance, but rather as vitally important for the receiving subject. There is moreover a fundamental difference between artists and saints inasmuch as the latter consider their experiences as ineffable as opposed to the former. Religion is expressed in art and art is rooted in religion, but they are not intrinsically connected (Kaufmann 1960: 181, 186, 191).

Heidegger's "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" (1935–36) exemplifies the second kind of theory. While he writes on the problem of the origin of the work of art, he in fact proposes a metaphysical view in accordance with or even going beyond the perspective given in *Sein und Zeit* (1927). The work of art is understood as possessing an ontological significance with regard to the recognition of the essence of being. Art, in Heidegger's words, is the "*Ins-Werk-Setzen der Wahrheit*," the coming to pass of truth. In the course of explaining the precise meaning and theoretical consequences of this formula, he not only introduces a long list of new terms (like Earth and World) instead of the vocabulary of Platonic-Aristotelian origin, but also offers a perspicuous interpretation of one of Van Gogh's paintings, C. F. Meyer's poem, "The Roman Fountain," and an ancient Greek temple.

The work of art is not only the framework in which truth functions, but above all an instance in which truth originally opens up. A world becomes created in the disclosure of truth where various specifications of the original truth can be realized. Heidegger also points out here the paramount importance of poetry understood both as a literary genre and as the original "*poiēsis*" or "*Dichtung*" in which truth becomes manifest. As he indicates in the appendix to the text, his writing on the origin of the work of art is ultimately about the essence of being as such. "Art is not a realm of cultural achievements, not even an appearance of the spirit; it belongs rather to the Act of Being (*Ereignis*), on the basis of which the meaning of being (see *Being and Time*) is first of all defined" (Heidegger 1950: 73). Such expressions as "being" or "Act of Being" are unmistakably meant to substitute, in a revised form, for the central conceptions of the traditional theism of religion.

Various phenomenological conceptions of art and religion have emerged in the wake of Heidegger's theory of art. I will consider only two examples here. MICHEL HENRY's radical philosophy of life is, in the last analysis, a phenomenology of religion in which "religion" is understood as the fundamental self-disclosure (*auto-révélation*) of reality or, with Henry's characteristic term, "life." A work of art cannot be understood in terms of its material constituents, but only in terms of its artistic significance that is expressed in, but not constituted by, the physical existence of a given artwork. Explaining Kandinsky's thesis to the effect that the nature of a work of art lies in its

sensuous character, Henry offers a phenomenological analysis of human sensation. Sensation is understood as the human expression of "life," the exploration of which is realized in artistic experience in general and in the work of art in particular. Inasmuch as art is understood in such terms, genuine art can be preserved. But if the various scientific means of the new "barbarism" of technology are used to maintain and to restore works of art—by "restoration" Henry means both the sophisticated process of material restoration and the process of producing something secondary instead of the original—then the consequence is the loss of genuine art. Art, in accordance with Kandinsky's view, is an expression of the inner resonances of life in the "abyssal subjectivity of being," a response given by life itself to its own inexhaustible inner dynamism or "self-affection" (Henry 1988: *passim*).

In JEAN-LUC MARION's view, painting offers not only an interesting but possibly optional example of the phenomenological method of reduction—as Husserl writes (Husserl 1976: 252)—but radically accomplishes phenomenology. Thus painting as a branch of art becomes unified with phenomenology. Marion's analyses of art present examples of how art can be considered the realization of phenomenology in general and of the phenomenological method in particular. The phenomenology of the "idol" as an instance of total visibility in a world permeated with instances of invisibility is indeed a characteristic way in which Marion points out the phenomenological difference between the visible and the invisible. The icon, however, does not offer total visibility; it points rather to the ultimate icon, to the "living icon of charity," who is the second person of the Christian Trinity.

The antagonism between the idol and the icon, between a "work of art" and the image of God, is not a category of conventional aesthetics; it is much more a self-disclosure of reality itself, the revelation of religion in the radical sense of the word. It is through this antagonism that the true nature of religion is expressed. The contemporary disaster of the image—in the age of "audiovisual civilization"—is only a particular aspect of the barbarism of technology. This barbarism, however, has its ultimate meaning in the redemptive economy of religion (Marion 2002: 54, Marion 2004: 80).

The close theoretical and historical connection between art and religion was most systematically

developed in Hegel's *Aesthetics*. This work, as Heidegger points out, is the most encompassing reflection on the essence of art we have so far. For Hegel, art, religion, and philosophy are modes of the expression of the absolute concept; art and religion are closely, although not intrinsically, connected. While art is the expression of spirit in a concrete empirical form, religion is an expression as an idea and philosophy is an expression of "free thought." Philosophy is the unity of art and religion, inasmuch as the objectivity of art and the subjectivity of religion are merged in the freedom of thought. On a historical scale, art belongs to antiquity, where it was the highest expression of the spirit; religion similarly belongs to an age already passed away in the "age of philosophy." Hegel's thesis concerning the past character of art comes from this historical understanding, but also from his notion of art as the empirical expression of spirit in the form of beauty (Hegel 1970: XIII, 127).

Heidegger accepts Hegel's thesis, but his text on the origin of the work of art has a different message. Here the work of art is characterized as belonging to the Act of Being (*Ereignis*) in such a way that it is through the work of art—in the final analysis, through reality as a work of art—that the truth of being is implemented. The difference between Hegel's and Heidegger's understanding is rooted in their differing conceptions of art. For Hegel, art with its sensual form is the lowest level of the expression of the spirit; for Heidegger, however, it is not the sensual existence of a work of art that is essential, but rather its disclosure of truth in a concrete form. When Heidegger emphasizes that art is in its essence "*poiēsis*" (*Dichtung*), then he does not consider the empirical form of a concretely existing poem, but rather its poetical meaning as expressing the original dynamism of being.

As opposed to Hegel, Merleau-Ponty suggests that it is art that belongs to the present and perhaps to the future. In contrast, religion belongs definitely to the past of which two thousand years were dominated by religious themes (Merleau-Ponty 1964a: 13, Merleau-Ponty 1953: 157). One such theme—incarnation—is, however, the central topic of Merleau-Ponty's thought in which the theory of art has its own particular importance. Art has primacy over science, but it is in philosophy that this hierarchy becomes visible. On the other hand, art—especially painting—shows the importance of the central theme of incarnation. Just as art needs bodily action, philosophy, too, leaving behind

the Husserlian world of the epochē, needs to return to the bodily world (Merleau-Ponty 1964a: 16). It is the objectivity of painting—an objectivity that looks at everything without being obliged to appraise what it sees (cf. Merleau-Ponty 1964a: 161)—that makes the invisible visible. Philosophy is similarly obliged to be objective without rejecting the importance of religion as "one of the most important expressions of the central phenomenon of reality" (Merleau-Ponty 1953: 48). Philosophy not only discovers the importance of painting for its own theoretical use, but also "relocates and redefines the Holy" (Merleau-Ponty 1953: 49). Merleau-Ponty clearly understood his phenomenology, especially in the final period of *Le visible et l'invisible* (Merleau-Ponty 1964c), as an attempt to give a new definition of or at least a new approach to what had been considered the Holy of religion.

The reason why the phenomenologies of art and religion become amalgamated in the works of Heidegger, Marion, Henry, and to some extent, Merleau-Ponty is ultimately their radical understanding of phenomenology. Scheler distinguishes his "phenomenology of act" from Husserl's "phenomenology of essences" by pointing out that only acts, but not essences, can be put into phenomenological brackets (Scheler 1933a: 80). But he did not notice that Husserl's phenomenology of essences expresses a radical philosophy hardly present in Western philosophy previously. The total reduction of reality to the transcendental ego is a radical step that has characterized phenomenology in its most important achievements. Although Heidegger changed some of the most important emphases of Husserlian phenomenology, he deepened its radical character. We find this character in various forms in the phenomenological tradition properly so called up to the "radical phenomenology of life" of Michel Henry. It is this character that explains the fact that a phenomenology of art can be at the same time a phenomenology of religion.

It may be critically observed that a radical phenomenology of art and religion is not able to account for the differences already pointed out by Kaufmann between an artist and a saint. An artist is interested in some sort of appearance; the saint, however, is interested in being united with a reality that infinitely transcends any kind of appearance. Even if their ways may cross at certain points, they proceed in opposing directions: the artist wants to realize works of art of some kind; the saint wants, however, to withdraw from the

realm of appearances. Religion in the historical sense is certainly more than its mystical tendencies, but without such tendencies we cannot speak of religion even in a minimal sense. On the other hand, art displays, especially in aesthetic experience, something similar to mystical experiences (James 1958: 225, Marion 2000: 195). If, however, we do not make the necessary distinctions, we risk losing the characteristic features of both art and religion.

As a description of the relationship between art and religion, Merleau-Ponty's expressions "intertwining" and "chiasm" seem to be particularly useful (Merleau-Ponty 1964b: 172). Art is about making the invisible visible; religion, however, is much more about making the visible invisible. Art and religion are intertwined in various ways, and their common occurrence in religious art, for instance, can be seen as a kind of "filigree" (Merleau-Ponty 1964b: 269). The common effect of art and religion, just like the visual effect of filigree, is something unique as compared to the effects of the separate existence of the parts. In this common existence, a chiasm is revealed between art and religion inasmuch as their movements are grasped in a dynamic unity of opposition and parallelism, conflict and agreement, disharmony and harmony.

While emphasizing the opposing directions of the movements of art and religion, we may recall the two ways, one ascending, and the other descending, in Plato's simile of the cave. One way leads to the unity of light, the other leads to the realm of the appearances. The cave is thus the realm of intertwining and chiasm. Ways therein intersect, split, and merge; parallelisms and oppositions are built, changed, and destroyed. What counts as being visible in one perspective becomes invisible from another and vice versa. And while the description of the cave seems to be just a simile, it is in fact a philosophical, religious, and artistic metaphor that, in the understanding of Heidegger, has proved to be the most influential model of truth in the history of Western thought. For him, the central message of the cave is that it is the place of "*Bildung*" or formation. Nevertheless, formation—didactic, artistic, or any other kind—reveals and hides at the same time the ultimate source of truth that is beyond any appearance (Heidegger 1976: 203). In this ultimate asymmetry between appearance and reality, expression and truth, or art and religion, we may be given an insight into what is called by Merleau-Ponty "brute being" (*être brut*) or "wild being" (*être*

sauvage)—a possible candidate for the Holy relocated and redefined.

Bibliography

- Batteux, Charles. *Les beaux arts réduits à un même principe*. Paris: Durand 1747.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La vérité en peinture*. Paris: Flammarion, 1978; *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Duméry, Henry. *Critique et Religion*. Paris: Sedes, 1957.
- Feuerbach, Ludwig. *Das Wesen der Religion*. Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1913; *The Essence of Religion*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2004.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik I–III. Werke*, Vol. 13–15. Ed. Eva Moldhauer and Karl Markus Michel. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970; *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Trans. T. M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; "The Origin of the Work of Art." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit" [1931/32, 1940]. In his *Wegmarken*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976, 203–239; "Pathmarks." Trans. William McNeil. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1998, 155–183.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1927; *Being and Time*. Trans. Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Henry, Michel. *Voir l'invisible: Sur Kandinsky*. Paris: François Bourin, 1988.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch: Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie* [1913]. Ed. Karl Schuhmann. *Husserliana* 3/1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931; *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: New American Library, 1958.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Werke in sechs Bänden*. Ed. Wilhelm Weischedel. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. *Das Reich des Schönen. Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.

- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Ethique et infini*. Paris: Fayard, 1982.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *De surcroît: Études sur les phénomènes saturés*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 2001; *In Excess: Studies of Saturated Phenomena*. Trans. Robyn Horner and Vincent Berraud. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *La Croisée du visible*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1996; *The Crossing of the Visible*. Trans. James K. A. Smith. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. "Le phénomène saturé." In *Phénoménologie et théologie*. Ed. Jean-François Courtine. Paris: Criterion, 1992, 79–128; "The Saturated Phenomenon." Trans. Thomas A. Carlson. In Dominique Janicard et al., *Phenomenology and the "Theological Turn": The French Debate*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Éloge de la philosophie*. Paris: Gallimard, 1953; *In Praise of Philosophy*. Trans. John Wild and James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'œil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964a; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964b, 159–90.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964c; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Otto, Rudolf. *Das Heilige*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1987; *The Idea of the Holy*. Trans. John W. Harvey. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Scheler, Max. "Vom Wesen der Philosophie." In his *Vom Ewigen im Menschen*. Berlin: Der neue Geist, 1933a, 59–124; "The Essence of Philosophy." In his *On the Eternal in Man*. Trans. Bernard Noble. New York: Harper, 1961a, 45–132.
- Scheler, Max. "Probleme der Religion." In his *Vom Ewigen im Menschen*. Berlin: Der neue Geist, 1933b, 279–707; Problems of Religion, In his *On the Eternal in Man*. Trans. Bernard Noble. New York: Harper, 1961b, 265–644.
- Scheler, Max. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. II. *Schriften aus dem Nachlass*. 2: *Erkenntnis und Metaphysik*. Ed. Manfred S. Frings, Bern: Francke, 1979.
- Schleiermacher, Daniel Friedrich. *Über die Religion. Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911; *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*. Ed. and Trans. Richard Crouter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Tatarkiewicz, Wladislaw. *A History of Six Ideas. An Essay in Aesthetics*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980.
- Van der Leeuw, Gerardus. *Phänomenologie der Religion*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933; *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*. Trans. J. E. Turner. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Walther, Gerda. *Phänomenologie der Mystik*. Freiburg: Walter, 1955. Woodhead, Linda, and Paul Heelas. *Religion in Modern Times: An Interpretive Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

Representation

John B. Brough

Mimesis has played a key role in aesthetics since Plato and Aristotle. Earlier philosophers tended to defend the view that art is mimetic, while thinkers in the modern and postmodern periods have largely rejected it. Much depends, of course, on how mimesis is understood. Those who have rejected mimetic theories have often taken mimesis to mean a literal imitating or copying, resulting in a work of art capable of fooling the eye and tempting the spectator to mistake the work for what it depicts. A more sophisticated version of the mimetic theory held that the work copied the essence or idea of an object rather than its sensuous appearance. If the term is taken in a broader and more flexible sense, however, then mimetic theories—or to use a term more palatable to their defenders, “representation” theories—have by no means vanished from the aesthetic landscape, and certainly not from phenomenology. Generally, the issue for aestheticians in the phenomenological tradition is not whether artworks depict or represent objects from the perceptual world. They will grant that they often do. Their position is rather that representation properly understood is not mimesis in the sense of copying. If it is taken instead to mean the representation of a world within the work of art, which may or may not have a relation to the larger world beyond the work, then virtually all phenomenological aestheticians have representational theories of art.

EDMUND HUSSERL, for example, criticizes literal imitation of sensuous appearances as an adequate account of what happens in art, but gives every indication of embracing a richer notion of representation.

Husserl views the work of art as a complex object consisting of a physical support, an image grounded on the physical support, and a subject. The image is what one actually sees when one experiences the work, and it can represent within itself objects from the perceived world. Husserl suggests that one recognizes what the image represents thanks to its resemblance to the object, but this resemblance merely lets one identify what is represented in the image and does not turn the image into a work of art. Furthermore, Husserl observes that resemblance is ordinarily strictly limited in the sense that the colors, sizes, and shapes of the forms appearing in the image will depart more or less radically from those of the original. Indeed, for purposes of recognition, the bare outline of an object with no color at all will usually suffice. The image will also include areas of stopgap that do not depict anything in the object at all. Finally, even if all of these limitations to the resemblance between image and reality were to be overcome and one were tricked into thinking that one is perceiving a real thing, as might happen during a visit to a wax museum, this would still not nudge the imitation into the realm of art. From Husserl’s perspective, if the goal of art were to copy sensuous appearances, then in truth its goal would be to replace image-consciousness with sensory deception. But since art for Husserl necessarily involves conscious imaging, to imitate successfully in that sense would be to leave art altogether. In fact, Husserl thinks that the effect of *trompe l’oeil* art is coarse and crude, the very opposite of genuine aesthetic experience. “Aesthetic effects are not the effects of annual fairs” (Husserl 1980: 44).

Husserl, then, is no more enamored of literal depiction than Plato is. He argues that the image, resisting integration into the real space and time of its

J.B. Brough (✉)
Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

surroundings, secures its image-being through its conflict with the real. Precisely what it must not do, if it is to be an image, is fool the eye and masquerade as an actual thing. The image may rightly be said to be an “illusion,” but not a sensory illusion. It fools no one. It is a “show” (*Schein*) or “fiction,” and known to be such.

Husserl does not deny that certain images are intended to be copies. Small photographs in a catalogue advertising handsome reproductions of paintings would be examples, but in such cases the image serves to provide information and is not itself taken to be a work of art. An original picture by Titian, on the other hand, does not have the function of copying something else, and it is taken to be art.

What makes Titian’s image a work of art, according to Husserl, is that the artist has so structured it that it constitutes an ideal world of its own in whose presence a spectator can experience aesthetic delight. Aesthetic consciousness is directed toward the appearance of the object in the image and is not interested in the object’s existence outside the work, which means that accuracy of depiction is not essential to the work’s aesthetic appeal. Hence not only can a highly realistic photograph possess aesthetic qualities and thereby enjoy the status of art, but the inevitable passages in an image that depict nothing at all can also have aesthetic, and therefore artistic, value. Husserl’s conception of art as representational emerges in his notion that a work holds a world within itself, with its own space and time, which may or may not refer to a particular external subject. The subject of the work is represented within the world of the work, a closed domain of sheer appearance that is not taken as actual, but as something that exists only for sight or hearing. In the case of Shakespeare’s *Richard III*, for example, an actual historical figure is represented, but the accuracy of its portrayal is not the point. It is the “show,” Richard simply as he appears in the drama, that counts artistically and aesthetically. A play can also be about completely fictional characters and events. In that case, the actors and props do not signify anything beyond the roles they play and whatever meaning the artist has embodied in them. Even if reality does enter into the fictional world, it does not do so in a way that involves a comparison between copy and original. A real chair may be present on stage as a prop, but it will not imitate a throne; it will appear *as* the king’s throne, not in reality but in the mode of representation, just as the actor will represent

Richard III or some purely fictional ruler by becoming him in the world of the work. The props and actors do not imitate a world distinct from the play, but create the world belonging to the play itself—a world not of external signification, but of internal representation.

Husserl’s student ROMAN INGARDEN developed key themes in the former’s aesthetic theory, among them Husserl’s views about art’s relation to mimesis and representation. Ingarden subscribes to the Husserlian idea that the work of art is a complex object consisting of a physical stratum supporting an image with aesthetic qualities. One can see situations and objects in the work of art. These may or may not enjoy an existence transcendent to the image itself, but even if they do, Ingarden argues, the image does not literally copy them. There are profound differences, for example, between the ways in which we experience a picture and an ordinary thing. One cannot actually touch or smell the fruit and flowers appearing in a painting, and one cannot move around to the back of the painting in hopes of obtaining a new perspective on what it represents. If a work does depict something definite, as a portrait does, the physical resemblance of the image to the original is not necessarily its defining feature; the vital element may instead be spiritual similarity. In some cases, we may know that the work is a portrait but know nothing about its model, and so be unable to determine whether the image is similar either physically or spiritually to the original. Since we nonetheless take the work to be art and to be aesthetically valuable, we may say that similarity is not essential to the picture as a work of art.

Although Ingarden does not think that a work of art must resemble something else in order to be art, he acknowledges that certain pictures do depict, and that this depiction is a kind of copying or imitating based on similarity. He follows Husserl, however, in insisting that the similarity is not between two things of the same ontic type, but between an image, which depicts but never becomes or embodies all the determinations of what it depicts, and something real. The image pretends or plays at being its model, but never actually becomes it for the perceiver.

When, on the other hand, depiction is not a stratum of the work and the work is a “pure picture,” there is no issue of similarity between what appears pictorially and objects in the real world. Of course, if the work is to present recognizable things—human beings, trees, and so on—the image must show a certain consistency

in its portrayal of the objects. Using painterly means, the artist reconstructs in the work aspects of a thing in such a way that we see the thing in the picture. These “reconstructed aspects” represent or render present features of an object—a human eyebrow, for example. These reconstructions can be complex or simple, and the artist may vary them freely in order to achieve artistic or aesthetic effects. Such reconstructed aspects are never exhausted by whatever imitative function they may have, since artistic motives also come into play, and it is these, not the mimetic features, that move the image into the domain of art.

This means that for Ingarden, as for Husserl and other phenomenological aestheticians, to bring reality into a work of art does not necessarily signal an intention to copy or imitate reality. The fact that something is recognizable in a picture does not entail that the work is an imitation of what is recognized. The artist reconstructs aspects of perceived reality in the picture in order to create a world within the work, one that is unique to the work and purely intentional, not real. The glow of the world created within the work may indeed illuminate the world beyond its boundaries, but that is not to copy it.

Ingarden observes that the realistic or naturalistic tendency in art is to present in the work objects that are modeled after, or imitate as closely as possible, objects present in the natural world. Those who adhere to this position are apt to take thoroughness of imitation to be the condition for the value of the work. Hence every departure from imitative fidelity to the original would be viewed negatively. The opposite tendency, with which Ingarden sides, rejects the idea that exact depiction of what is present in nature is a necessary condition of artistic or aesthetic value. The artist is therefore perfectly prepared to accept deformations in the cause of creating aesthetic value. On this view, the artist seeks to establish an artistically valuable gestalt quality in the work, a unitary style and organization, for which departures from strict imitation will be inevitable. The artist seeks an aesthetically valuable work with a qualitative, harmonious unity, not a precise copy of some natural phenomenon. Escaping bondage to nature, the artist creates a unique work with a world of its own.

MARTIN HEIDEGGER claims that the tradition of Western art, at least until recently, has been mimetic in character, understanding by mimesis the imitation either of the sensuous appearances of natural things or

of the essences of those things. In that sense, he holds that Western art and aesthetic theory have mirrored the Western tradition of metaphysics with its infatuation with beings, whether natural or supernatural, and its forgetfulness of Being.

In his effort to uncover the essence of art, Heidegger argues that the artwork is not a mere thing, but has its being in its “work,” which is not mimetic. Heidegger addresses the issue of imitation in terms of two competing conceptions of truth. One is the notion of truth as correspondence or agreement, to which he ties the mimetic theory; the other is the idea of truth as unconcealment or disclosure. In the case of a painting of a peasant’s shoes by van Gogh, Heidegger argues that it would miss the point of the work, and the point of art itself, to take the work as a copy of the appearance of a particular pair of shoes that the artist happened to come across in his encounters with the world of everyday things. The criterion for the work’s success in that case would be how well image and original agreed. But that is not true of van Gogh’s painting. The painting speaks, Heidegger says, and what it utters is not a copy of shoes but a revelation of what the shoes are in truth; it discloses both their being as equipment and the world of the peasant woman who wears them in her toil. It does not correspond to a world, but opens up a world, unconceals it. Truth happens or sets itself to work in the painting, disclosing the Being of beings. Heidegger offers a Greek temple as an even more vivid illustration of what a work of art does and why it cannot properly be understood as an imitation. A Greek temple copies nothing, imitating neither some particular sensible thing in the world nor an essence, for it is altogether unclear with what thing or with what essence the temple could be said to agree. Instead, the temple discloses the world of a particular culture, not copying but establishing and centering it. “The temple, in its standing there, first gives to things their look and to men their outlook on themselves” (Heidegger 1971: 43). The temple sets up the world of the community that built it and sets forth the earth that grounds the community’s world. This is also true of the statue of the god in the temple. The statue is not a copy intended to give an idea of what the god looks like. Rather, it is the revelation, the coming to presence, of the god itself. In all of these cases, art is truth, in the sense of unconcealment, setting itself to work.

If art were simply a matter of imitation, Heidegger holds, it would stand outside history. He thinks this is

how aesthetics in the West, with its stress on mimesis and beauty, has traditionally viewed art. Heidegger's rejection of the mimetic theory obviously does not mean that he takes art to be detached from the world; instead, he replaces the notion of the copying of a ready-made world with the idea of the constitutive disclosing of the world of a historical community. Such worlds will inevitably perish, and when they do, the artworks that opened them up will cease to work. The truth of a world will no longer happen in them, even if they remain present at hand. It is then that the Greek temple becomes a site for tourists and scholars rather than worshippers, or a painting migrates from the church for which it was made to the museum, where connoisseurs admire it for its beauty and have private aesthetic experiences in its presence or assess whether it agrees with some reputed original, whether real or ideal. Object-being has then replaced the work-being that distinguishes art from things.

If Martin Heidegger focuses on the disclosure of Being through the artwork, MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY, whose aesthetic theory shows the influence of both Husserl and Heidegger, is concerned above all with painting as the art that renders visible the phenomenon of visibility itself. No other phenomenological aesthetician ties his views as closely to perception and the re-creation of perception in painting as Merleau-Ponty does.

Merleau-Ponty rejects Cartesian dualism and argues for the primacy of an embodied subject in whose primordial perceptual experience, preceding all objective thought, the world first organizes itself. This anti-Cartesian stance immediately suggests that Merleau-Ponty would no more interpret a painting as a copy of an object in nature than he would follow Descartes in maintaining that knowledge of what exists depends on connecting opaque ideas or mental images with things outside the mind. The painting does not copy the sensuous appearances of things—instead it makes visible the very process of seeing itself.

The artist, far from imitating the world, in effect transforms it in painting, and does so by lending his/her body to the world. Seeing and moving, which *are* the body as lived in perceptual experience, blend for Merleau-Ponty in life and in painting. The painter constitutes the painting in the same way as the perceiver constitutes the visible world. In perception, there is no pure mind containing ideas that serve as internal

pictures of an external and unseen world, and in painting pictures are not seen objects copying a world beyond them. A painter such as Cézanne creates a work in which others can recognize their own process of engaging the world perceptually. Something visible of the second power appears, an icon of a primordial making-visible. This icon, however, is not a more or less successful copy of an original. What occurs is not representation in the sense of one thing copying a second thing “outside” it, but a re-enactment of the living body's perceptual engagement with its world. Paintings are thus “the inside of the outside and the outside of the inside” (Merleau-Ponty 1964c: 164).

With Husserl and Ingarden, Merleau-Ponty affirms that there can be resemblances between work and world, but the resemblance is not a matter of documentary copying. Citing Giacometti, Merleau-Ponty argues that the resemblance characterizing art lets one discover more of the world, which a sheer imitative device would not do. The painter's world is a purely visible world. The visible lets us possess things, and this is what painting, as visible, does. It does not make visible by copying what is otherwise visible; rather, it makes visible what “profane” vision misses. There is a kind of dialectic between painting and world through the painter's “fleshly eyes,” which see the inadequacies that keep the world from being a painting and a painting from being the world. The painting opens up or makes visible a texture of being in which one dwells as in a house, which means that one does not stand outside the painting and judge how well it agrees with another thing that it is supposed to imitate. The world becomes visible in the painting, and hence the work is at once a world within itself and a revelation of the becoming visible of the world. The painter does not create an image, a thing, that mirrors another thing. Rather, the painting is the child of the marriage of painter and world, and in it one sees its parents, not as distinct elements, but as perfectly blended in a new creation.

Painters achieve their goal, not by imitating, but by interrogating and unveiling the visible means—light, shadows, reflections, color—by which an object makes itself into an object before our eyes. The painter makes visible that first play of appearances out of which things emerge and that we ordinarily go straight through to get to the objects themselves, which is what a literal imitation would do. Art in that sense

has affinities with phenomenology itself, making visible the spectacle that we live in but overlook in the natural attitude. To look toward these ways of making something visible is to look toward a “secret and feverish genesis of things in our body” (Merleau-Ponty 1964c: 167). Painting is not a matter of Cartesian objective thought. A painting is not a series of signs, like a text, intended to lead us to think of what it represents. The painter is not concerned with color as representational or imitative, but with color as creating identities, differences, textures, the stuff at the heart of the visible. Line and color do not imitate the visible; they render visible, enabling the painting, through the eyes and hands of an artist such as Cézanne, to capture the object in the very act of appearing as it organizes itself before us. The painting breaks through the “skin of things” to reveal how, in our perception, things become things and the world becomes world. The imitation theory, on the other hand, takes the object as already organized and claims that the artwork only offers a replica of it. Painting, however, confuses all such categories. The painted smile of a long-dead king, Merleau-Ponty observes, is no mere image of something past; it is there as itself, alive in the work. Painting does not replicate things; it embodies the living perception of things.

HANS-GEORG GADAMER devotes significant effort to uncovering the original sense of mimesis, arguing that it is present not only in the visual arts, but pre-eminently in poetry. He develops a conception of representation that captures, he claims, the authentic Greek understanding of mimesis, which is by no means exhausted by the notion of imitation.

Gadamer argues that “mimesis” means simply letting something be there or present. Mimetic representation is genuinely itself when what it represents is “*emphatically there*.” When this occurs, what is represented is known in the sense of being recognized as what it is essentially, which agrees with Husserl’s notion that art is a form of re-presentation rather than presentation, or with Heidegger’s claim that the statue of the god discloses the god. This act of recognition does not entail a distinction between a copy and an original, which, Gadamer argues, fails as an appropriate account of the real ontological meaning of mimesis. The recognizing is more aptly described as an act of identification. In the case of imitative representation, then, comparing or judging the extent to which a work

of art agrees with what it is taken to imitate may be possible, but it is always secondary. When one takes a work as art, one rests in it as a representation and does not go beyond it.

The fact that the consciousness of what is represented is recognition implies a relation of the work to the world, even if it is not one of copying. In original experience, things are given in specific and never repeatable spatial and temporal circumstances. When something is represented in the work of art, however, it has undergone liberation from the contingent conditions of its original encounter, and yet is recognized as the same. It is neither lost nor merely imitated by the work; it is there in the work. It is this identification with what is represented, rather than any distinction between representation and original, that constitutes the true nature of mimesis. In the identification, the distance between the representation and what is represented vanishes. A kind of “aesthetic non-differentiation” between representation and original marks the work of art.

MIKEL DUFRENNE’S richly developed phenomenology of aesthetic experience owes much to the positions of Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty, and, like the latter, rejects the notion that the work of art is essentially mimetic in character, if mimesis is understood to be an imitating of a reality outside the work. He accordingly refuses to identify the value of a work with the degree of accuracy with which it represents something else. Works of art do possess and disclose truth, but their truth does not consist in the verisimilitude of copy to original, as the liberty that visual artists take with appearances amply attests. This is not to deny that aesthetic objects can and do signify, but their signifying does not have the function of providing information to the viewer or offering a substitute for the original. The signifying character simply indicates that something is represented in the work, that it has a subject, even if the subject is not some definite and identifiable person or thing. Indeed, the aesthetic object can only emerge when the signifying function of the work along with the question of similarity disappear. It is then that the aesthetic object comes forward as “the source of a world which is its own” (Dufrenne 1973: 167)—a formulation that may also serve as an apt description of what phenomenological aestheticians have generally taken the essence of representation to be.

Bibliography

- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Die Aktualität des Schönen*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1977; *Kleine Schriften*, Vols. 2, 4. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1967, 1977; selections from both in his *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays*. Ed. Robert Bernasconi. Trans. Nicholas Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; "The Origin of the Work of Art." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1962; *Ontology of the Work of Art*. Trans. Raymond Meyer with John T. Goldthwait. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1989.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Nagel 1948; *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Patricia A. Dreyfus. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964a.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'oeil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964b; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964c, 159–90.

Marc Richir (1943–)

Jürgen Trinks

Richir describes the vitality involved in creating and perceiving a work of art. Its vitality is maintained by phantasy (in the Greek sense of *phantasia*), which differs from a clear, determined, and repeatable mental picture of imagination or perception. He adopts the characteristics of phantasy that EDMUND HUSSERL worked out in *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen* (1898–1925), but, distinguishing it from imagination, he insists on its special mode of time and lack of intentionality. The time of phantasy does not concede priority to the moments of present time on which *their* protentions and retentions will depend. In opposition to the time of perception, the time of phantasy takes place before any actualization in recognizable and distinguishable points of present time. Living in this irregular kind of time before any institution of present time, phantasy must be considered the most archaic register of consciousness. The transformation of non-intentional appearances of phantasy to intentional fictions must not suspend phantasy's vitality.

Accordingly, “perceptual phantasy” becomes Richir's most important concept for describing the work of art and the specific mode of aesthetic experiences moving between fiction und reality: consciousness of fiction means, on the one hand, reduction of reality-consciousness and liberation from habitual experiences, and on the other hand, it may consider even the real as fictional—characteristics in common with child's play in the sense of Donald

W. Winnicott. It is called perceptual phantasy insofar as this apperception by phantasy needs realities, but only in a non-positional way, i.e., passively and unfinished, which transforms them into aesthetic appearances. In theater, for example, the real (the actors, the objects on stage) is not perceived as actual and identifiable persons or objects; they are not even pictures representing real objects or events. On stage and in all the other aesthetic contexts, real objects lose their character of reality; they change their function in becoming constituents of fiction, and are now phantasy-objects like the transitional objects in the play of children. Thus the transitional space of perceptive phantasy is experienced as potential, and aesthetic experience not subjected to any kind of rigid determination. As in unregulated play, the self of aesthetic experiences forgets its habits in order to open itself totally to adventure. The aesthetic pleasure of this non-positional self consists largely in enjoying a free, unregulated play opened to incalculable possibilities without the necessity of representing itself by imagination within the work of art. Nevertheless, the non-positional self feels itself, but with affections exclusively related to the aesthetic process.

Aesthetic consciousness cannot be reduced to consciousness of the appearance of the appearing, i.e., to phenomena *of something*, for as MORITZ GEIGER pointed out, it consists of non-conceptual reflection on the modes of appearances within appearance itself. Aesthetic enjoyment consequently does not concern subjective needs that are directed toward objects of satisfaction. Instead of subjecting itself to desire and its stimulating objects, aesthetic reception opens itself to unpredictable and inexhaustible possibilities.

J. Trinks (✉)
Österreichische Gesellschaft für philosophischen
Ost-West-Dialog, Vienna, Austria

The self-reflecting aesthetic experience is constituted by its distance from the object and equally from any preconceptions of the ego, whether imaginative, affective, or conceptual. This distance creates the free space that allows the self-reflection of reception, as well as the delight of exceeding ordinary sensation. This enjoyment of abundance—and of the subject's capacity to receive it—is characteristic for the exposure of the subject (whether artist or public) to the sublime in the sense of Immanuel Kant. In this situation it is not the ego that receives the object; on the contrary, the immeasurable object submerges the subject that reemerges afterwards as a new and an enriched one. This pulsation corresponds to the unceasing phenomenalization of the essentially undetermined phenomenon as it is conceived by Richir. Exceeding the consciousness of only given objects, the sublime gives us an impression of the phenomenal in its infinite variety. Aesthetic enjoyment in this sense takes pleasure in phenomenalization and the phenomenon. The pleasure of pulsation between appearances and movements of phantasy elevates us beyond all ordinary experiences.

This experience cannot be conceived without the *Leiblichkeit* that essentially includes phantasy and affectivity. Artists create out of their *Leiblichkeit*, but this *Leiblichkeit* itself cannot be represented voluntarily and directly. It remains in its undefined vagueness and may only be felt during its unintentional activity, characteristics that in the German tradition were concentrated in the notion of grace (*Anmut*). Therefore, artistic creation and aesthetic reception never come to their end and the inconceivable *Leiblichkeit* does not cease to challenge their activities, although they know that they will never be satisfied by any accomplishment. Artistic creation does not have its telos either in convincing illusions (recognizable and confirming fictions) or in rhetorical effects, but in opening our minds for the unconceivable: its telos lies in activating non-intentional phantasy and as yet unshaped affectivity.

Far from seeing the work of art as a structure of significations, but following his meditations on the phenomenology of language, Richir describes it as a composition of germs of sense that are not yet defined and thus allow a free development of sense. The beauty of a work of art consists in a harmonious composition or pleasing associations of these germs of sense, which advance each other without being forced

into a unilateral signification. Art is looking for sense in unknown regions, and thus inspires phantasy to develop sense that is not subjected to any convention or institution. Along this line, Richir considers music as a phenomenon of language, one characterized by a specific temporality and a total absence of conventional significations. On the one hand, it consists in a distribution of intensities and durations of tones measured by regular rhythms, but it would be mechanical without other rhythms that are found neither in the printed notation nor in the normal stream of time. They are created out of the musician's *Leiblichkeit*, intimately connected with phantasy and affectivity, which never express themselves by conventional signs and therefore allow for a never-ending variety of interpretations. Music gives form to affectivity. By a mutual harmonization of impulses, music composes affects that are not related to common interests or emotions. Music and other kinds of art do not reveal their implication at one stroke; painting, for example, gets its vivacity by the multiple temporalizations of looks. A beautiful work of art consists in the pleasurable association of these movements.

Art has an outstanding social significance in making us conscious by aesthetic experience in public that the primary dimension of intersubjective communication is lived when we meet and accept each other on the basis of undetermined interests or aims, rules, or institutions, i.e., reactivating free phantasy.

Concerning the pre-phenomenological tradition, Marc Richir is influenced by Plato and Kant. His reflections on theater take into consideration Diderot and his conception of perceptual phantasy, as well as being inspired by Winnicott. Husserl and Geiger are the most important phenomenological authors he refers to. Considering the classical tradition of aesthetics, comparisons between Richir's theory and the aesthetic reflections of Friedrich von Schiller and Heinrich von Kleist would be very fruitful. Referring to contemporary non-phenomenological aesthetics, the most promising results would be produced by discussing correspondences and differences between him and Theodor W. Adorno. He shares with the latter an appreciation for the sublime in art, but the most important difference must be seen in Adorno's preference for the intellectualization of art, whereas Richir insists on *Leiblichkeit* and phantasy as its essential characteristics.

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973; *Aesthetic Theory*. Trans. R. Hullot-Kentnor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–684.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Kerszberg, Pierre. "Éléments pour une phénoménologie de la musique." In *Annales de Phénoménologie* 2002. Ed. Association pour la Promotion de la Phénoménologie. Beauvais, 2002, 11–36.
- Lanciani, Albino. "Musique et silence." In *Annales de phénoménologie* 2004. Ed. Association pour la Promotion de la Phénoménologie. Beauvais, 2004, 119–153.
- Richir, Marc. "Pour une cosmologie de l'hourloupe." In *Critiques* 298, 1972, 225–53.
- Richir, Marc. "L'orée du monde. Maurice Wyckaert." In *La Part de L'oeil* 1, 1985, 139–48.
- Richir, Marc. *Méditations phénoménologiques*. Grenoble: Millon, 1992.
- Richir, Marc. *Melville, les assises du monde*. Paris: Hachette, 1996.
- Richir, Marc. *Phénoménologie en esquisses: Nouvelles fondations*. Grenoble: Millon, 2000.
- Richir, Marc. "Art et artefact." *Utopia* 3. Ed. C. G. Bruni. Paris: GERMS, 2002, 62–75.
- Richir, Marc. "Préface: Pour une architectonique phénoménologique de l'affectivité." In Moritz Geiger, *Sur la phénoménologie de la jouissance esthétique*. Trans. J.-F. Pestureau. Beauvais: Association pour la Promotion de la Phénoménologie, 2002, 7–26.
- Richir, Marc. "Du rôle de la phantasia au théâtre et le roman." In *Littérature* 132, 2003, 24–33.
- Richir, Marc. *Phantasia, imagination, affectivité*. Grenoble: Millon, 2004.
- Trinks, Jürgen. "Sinnbildung in Paul Celans Gedichten—Sprachphänomenologische Interpretationen." In *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 122, 2003, 600–17; "Phénoménologie et poésie chez Paul Celan." In *Annales de phénoménologie* 2003. Ed. Association pour la Promotion de la Phénoménologie. Beauvais, 2003, 143–158.
- Trinks, Jürgen. "Zur Identitätsproblematik in Paul Celans Dichtung—Eine sprachphänomenologische Untersuchung." In *Person, Community, and Identity*. Ed. Ion Copoeru, Mădălina Diaconu, Delia Popa. Cluj-Napoca: House of the Book of Science, 2003, 302–15.
- Trinks, Jürgen. "Phänomenologische Nachklänge von Elias Canettis 'Die Stimmen von Marrakesch.'" In *Literatur als Phänomenalisierung*. Ed. Hans Rainer Sepp and Jürgen Trinks. *Mesotes*. Wien: Turia + Kant, 2003, 232–56.
- Trinks, Jürgen. "Auf der Suche nach Leiblichkeit. Arnulf Rainers Face Farces." In *Phänomenalität der Kunst. Phänomenologische Interpretationen*. Ed. Hans Rainer Sepp and Jürgen Trinks. *Mesotes*. Wien: Turia und Kant, 2006, 81–108.
- Winnicott, Donald W. *Playing and Reality*. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Paul Ricoeur (1913–2005)

Yvanka B. Raynova

Ricoeur is a hermeneutical phenomenologist who continues the reflective tradition by questioning the self. His aesthetics constitutes a moment of reflection that tries to understand the various experiences of the subject in their unity: the experiences of perception and volition, of intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic insight, and of ethical and political engagement. Since this feature is a specific trait of Ricoeur's thought, the problem of the intersection of aesthetic theory with other areas of hermeneutical phenomenology should be especially articulated, as well as the mediation between phenomenological and non-phenomenological accounts.

Unlike MIKEL DUFRENNE, Ricoeur has not published books on aesthetics. Nevertheless, there are fundamental elements of an aesthetic theory. In an interview, he remarks that he develops the aesthetic in the perspective of narrative (Ricoeur 1995: 259). But one should not forget that in his first works—influenced by EDMUND HUSSERL as well as by Marcel, Jaspers, and Freud—he approaches aesthetics in relation to the will, freedom, and transcendence. It is therefore very important to trace his aesthetic views through his gradual development. In this way we will see how Ricoeur's aesthetics emerges and is based on poetics.

In his first philosophical works, Ricoeur pays special attention to the relation between aesthetics and metaphysics (Ricoeur 1948: 392–425). In *Le volontaire et l'involontaire* he defines poetry as “the art to conjure the world of creation” (Ricoeur 1950: 32). The order of creation discloses the illusion according to which the subject is the center around whom

the world is organized. Husserl stresses the transcendental subject and disregards the poetic dimension, but this abstraction from incarnation, which forms a kind of “primary reflection” (Marcel), is necessary for the development of an eidetic theory of the voluntary and the involuntary. According to Ricoeur, in a “second reflection” phenomenology should, by a “poetics of freedom,” restore the mystery of the incarnation that constitutes the living bond between the voluntary and the involuntary. This poetics includes the decentralization of the cogito and the assertion of the transcendence that makes it possible to imagine the delivery of freedom in an eschatological process (ibid: 33). Admiration of nature alone can lead to alienation. Only a poetry that causes conversion can deliver and purify us (ibid: 448–49). This approach, also called the “poetics of will,” should have been developed in the third volume of *La philosophie de la volonté* (ibid: 35), which was never written; however, such a poetics was partly elaborated in Ricoeur's theories of imagination and metaphor (Ricoeur 1986: 213–236).

In *L'homme faillible* and *La symbolique du mal*, Ricoeur shows that self-consciousness is constituted in its depth by a symbolic system grounding myths and knowledge. The symbol is the structure of a multiform significance where a direct, primary, and literal meaning indicates by a surplus another indirect, secondary, and figurative meaning that can be understood only in connection with the primary meaning (Ricoeur 1969: 16). Each authentic symbol unites three dimensions: *cosmic*, indicating the signs of the sacred; *oneiric*, indicating the archaic symbols of the unconscious, and *poetic*, i.e., the rising-up in language of the sacred and the oneiric (Ricoeur 1960b: 17–21). The structure of the poetic image is that of the dream drawing from our past a prophecy for our future, and also

Y.B. Raynova (✉)

Institute for Philosophical Research at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; Institut für Axiologische Forschungen, Vienna, Austria

that of the hierophanies, which manifest the sacred in cosmic images. A hermeneutical approach should therefore relate the poetic theory of Bachelard that shows how the poetic image leads to the origin of language and symbolic creation with psychoanalysis (Freud, Jung), with the phenomenology of religion (Van der Leeuw, Eliade), and with the *kerygmatic exegesis* of Barth and Bultmann (Ricoeur 1965: 549). He further explains that poetics can not only be used as source for a hermeneutical philosophy, but can also lead to a “poetics of freedom” exceeding the possibilities of philosophical anthropology, which itself is unable to clarify the genesis of divine life. In this new form, poetics would open the doors of “Christology” (Ricoeur 1960b: 304–305).

In his Freud studies (Ricoeur 1965: 174–89, 537–47, Ricoeur 1969: 19–207), Ricoeur shows that in psychoanalysis, art is conceived as the non-neurotic form of substituted satisfaction. Just as in a dream, poetry is produced by a dissatisfied person, who seeks to realize a desire by the phantasm. But the fiction and creative imagination used in artistic production differ from the purely unconscious phantasm that aims for something absent. Fictional creativity masks the selfish element of the daydream by providing suitable tangents and veils so that we can enjoy our own phantasms without scruple or shame. The artwork creates meanings and aesthetic values that did not previously exist. It contributes to self-knowledge because it projects not only the conflicts of the artist, but also his/her solutions. Aesthetics is therefore *Bildung* in both senses of the word: the construction of images (*Bilder*) and the rebuilding of human nature through education.

The conception of poetics as semantic innovation and live redescription of reality is developed by Ricoeur in his “twin works”: *La métaphore vive* and *Temps et récit*. His concept of the “live metaphor” constitutes a hermeneutical alternative that exceeds the fragmentary explanations of the rhetorical (Aristotle), the structural (Ulmann), and the semantic (I. A. Richards, Max Black, Monroe Beardsley) conceptions. Unlike these accounts, he brings forth a new issue that is no longer based upon the *form* of the metaphor as a figure of speech, nor even just the *sense* of the metaphor as a founding of a new semantic pertinence, but the *reference* of the metaphorical statement as the power to “redescribe” reality (Ricoeur 1975: 10). In this sense, the metaphor is “a strategy of discourse that,

while preserving and developing the creative power of language, preserves and develops the *heuristic* power wielded by *fiction*” (ibid.). The poetic work is an ordered, generic, and singular *totality* that should be understood in the same way as that of heuristic fiction and redescription in the theory of models. There is a lyric redescription where the *mood* created by the poem is a sort of model for “seeing as” and “feeling as,” so poetic feeling develops an experience of reality in which invention and discovery cease to be in opposition and where creation and revelation coincide (ibid.: 309–10). Poetic discourse as semantic innovation is therefore constituted by “lively” metaphors: it is “a *lively* expression of existence as *alive*” (ibid.: 61, 391) and a breakthrough of ordinary language—i.e., of dead metaphors in literal meaning.

In *Temps et récit* Ricoeur stresses that the poetic sphere incorporates metaphorical discourse as well as narrative speech, which have a similar referential function: if the metaphorical statement redescribes a reality inaccessible to direct description, the mimetic function of the plot applies the metaphorical reference to the sphere of human *action*. Because the plot is the *mimēsis* (representation) of an action (Aristotle), the notion of *mimēsis* is close to *mythos* (narration). The mimesis-mythos pairing forms the “melody cell” of poetics, where poetics is defined as the art of composing plots, i.e., “emplotment” (1983: 69). The plot is a synthesis: it gathers goals, causes, circumstances, and opportunities under the temporal unity of a complete action. Ricoeur relates time and narrative such that time becomes human to the extent that it is articulated through a narrative and such that the plot reaches its full significance when it becomes a condition of temporal existence (ibid: 105). The mediation between time and narrative is explored by means of the three-fold mimesis: *mimēsis* 1 is the pre-comprehension that we have about the order of the world and the order of the action; *mimēsis* 2 is the configuration of the text in a completed work of fiction; and *mimēsis* 3 is reconfiguration by the reading of the text and the plot of the pre-understood order of action. Hermeneutics should reconstruct the entire arc of operations by which experience provides itself with works, authors, and readers.

Ricoeur characterizes *mimēsis* 2 by its *mediating* central function: the textual configuration mediates between the prefiguration of the practical field and its refiguration through the reception of the work. He

shows that the reader is the operator *par excellence* who takes up through the act of reading the unity of the transition from *mimēsis* 1 to *mimēsis* 3 by way of *mimēsis* 2 (ibid.: 106–7). “Emplotment” is produced by judgment and productive imagination as a conjoined work of the text and its reader. It is only at the intersection of the world projected by the text and the lifeworld of the reader that the text becomes a literary work. This conception opens the possibility of a new aesthetics able to ground two different approaches to the object-subject problematic: the phenomenology of reading (ROMAN INGARDEN, Iser) and the dialogical theory of reception (Jauss) (ibid: 146, Ricoeur 1985: 303–28). Ricoeur shows how both approaches intersect by (re)defining aesthetics as *aisthēsis* (perception, sensation) through the key concept of reading: aesthetics is the exploration of how a work affects a reader. The reader as an active subject implies the dialectic between the *reception* of the text and the *action* of reading. This also clarifies the complex relation between poetics, ethics, and politics. Poetic invention is not real action, but by depicting the different characters as being noble or vile, good or bad, etc., the narrator introduces an ethical criterion and a hierarchy of values (Ricoeur 1983: 74, 116).

The reception of Ricoeur’s aesthetics occurs principally through his narrative hermeneutics, which not only influenced literary theorists, but found applications in history, sociology, ethnography, and theology. Most of the objections to his theory concern the nature of “aesthetic” perception, the role of narrative, *mimēsis*, and metaphorical truth. Eugene Kaelin criticizes Ricoeur for treating “catharsis as if it were a purely intellectual phenomenon” and for reducing poetic pleasure and the liberation of feelings to mere learning and a purified intellectual understanding (Kaelin 1995: 242–43). In a similar way, Julia Kristeva challenges Ricoeur’s thesis that fiction is an “apprenticeship of signs” by claiming that it is transubstantiation, i.e., the transferal of the author’s body and world over to the narrative, opening therewith the field of emotions, compulsions, and desires (Kristeva 2004: 148). David Carr scrutinizes Ricoeur’s thesis that time becomes human to the extent that it is articulated through a narrative mode. He asks if this means that peoples with no history or literature are not fully human, since humanity depends on narrative (Carr 1986: 61, cf. Wood 1991: 181). While Wolfgang Iser suggests, with Theodor Adorno, that performance

turns against fiction and interrupts the mimetic circle (Iser 1991: 492–95), JACQUES DERRIDA describes metaphor as a virtuality that has to “retreat” in order that the truth of Being can appear (Derrida 1978).

Ricoeur’s narrative theory is received positively by, e.g., Richard Kearney, who considers the link between aesthetics and ethics in the theory of imagination an issue for the postmodern crisis of consciousness (Kearney 1991: 371, 199), and Hayden White, who declares *Temps et récit* the most important synthesis in the twentieth century between the theories of literature and history (White 1987). Finally, Vera Frankl’s video installation, . . . *from the Transit Bar*, is a productive reception of Ricoeur’s narrative hermeneutics in the arts (Frenkel 1994).

Bibliography

- Carr, David. *Time, Narrative, and History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Derrida, Jacques. “Le retrait de la métaphore.” In *Poésie* 7, 1978, 103–26; “The Retreat of Metaphor.” In *Enclitic* 2, 1978, 5–33.
- Frenkel, Vera. . . . *from the Transit Bar*. Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada, 1994.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Das Fiktive und das Imaginäre. Perspektiven literarischer Anthropologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991.
- Kaelin, Eugene F. “Paul Ricoeur’s Aesthetics: On How to Read Metaphor.” In *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Ed. Lewis Hahn. Chicago: Open Court, 1995, 237–55.
- Kearney, Richard. “L’imagination herméneutique et le postmoderne.” In *Paul Ricoeur: Les métamorphoses de la raison herméneutique*. Ed. Jean Greisch and Richard Kearney. Paris: Cerf, 1991, 357–71.
- Kristeva, Julia. “La narration en psychanalyse: Des symboles à la chair.” In *Ricoeur*. Ed. Myriam Revault d’Allonnes and François Azouvi. Paris: L’Herne, 2004, 140–55.
- Messori, Rita. “Paul Ricoeur et les paradoxes de l’esthétique.” In *Vor dem Text. Hermeneutik und Phänomenologie im Denken Paul Ricoeurs*. Ed. Stefan Orth and Andris Breitling. Berlin: Technische Universität, 2002, 217–35.
- Pellauer, David. “Paul Ricoeur and Literary Hermeneutics.” In *Between Suspicion and Sympathy*. Ed. Andrew Wieganski. Toronto: Hermeneutic Press, 2003, 370–78.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Gabriel Marcel et Karl Jaspers. Philosophie du mystère et philosophie du paradoxe*. Paris: Temps Présent, 1948.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Le volontaire et l’involontaire*. Paris: Aubier, 1950; *Freedom and Nature: The Voluntary and the Involuntary*. Trans. Erazim V. Kohák. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1966.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *L’homme faillible*. Paris: Aubier, 1960a; *Fallible Man*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1965.

- Ricoeur, Paul. *La symbolique du mal*. Paris: Aubier, 1960; *The Symbolism of Evil*. Trans. E. Buchanan. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *De l'interprétation: Essai sur Freud*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969; *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Trans. Denis Savage. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Le conflit des interprétations*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969; *The Conflict of Interpretation. Essays in Hermeneutics*. Trans. Willis Domingo, Kathleen McLaughlin, and Robert Sweeney. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1974.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *La métaphore vive*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1975; *The Rule of Metaphor*. Trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Temps et récit*. 3 vols. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983, 1984, 1985; *Time and Narrative*. 3 vols. Trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984–1988.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1986; *From Text to Action. Essays in Hermeneutics*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson, London: Athlone Press, 1991.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Soi-même comme un autre*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1990; *Oneself as Another*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *La critique et la conviction: Entretien avec François Azouvi et Marc de Launay*. Paris: Seuil, 1995; *Critique and Conviction: Conversations with Francois Azouvi and Marc De Launay*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Jugement esthétique et jugement politique selon Hannah Arendt." In his *Le Juste*. Paris: Seuil, 1995, 143–61; *The Just*. Trans. David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Arts, Language and Hermeneutic Aesthetics." Interview with Paul Ricoeur conducted by Jean-Marie Brohm and Magali Uhl. Paris, September 20, 1996. Trans. Robert D. Sweeney. <http://www.philagora.net/philofac/ricoeur-e.htm>.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2000; *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Trans. David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "All That Gives Us to Think. Conversations with Paul Ricoeur." Realized by Yvanka B. Raynova. In *Between Suspicion and Sympathy: Paul Ricoeur's Unstable Equilibrium*. Ed. Andrew Wieganski. Toronto: Hermeneutic Press, 2003, 670–96.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Faire intrigue, faire question: Sur la littérature et la philosophie." Conversation with Bruno Clément. In *Ricoeur*. Ed. Myriam Revault d'Allonnes and François Azouvi. Paris: L'Herne, 2004, 191–204.
- Ricoeur, Paul, and Mikel Dufrenne. *Karl Jaspers et la philosophie de l'Existence*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1947.
- Valdés, Mario J. "Paul Ricoeur and Literary Theory." In *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Ed. Lewis Hahn. Chicago: Open Court, 1995, 259–80.
- Valdés, Mario J. "Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutics of Painting." In *Between Suspicion and Sympathy: Paul Ricoeur's Unstable Equilibrium*. Ed. Andrzej Wieganski. Toronto: Hermeneutic Press, 2003, 469–75.
- White, Hayden. "The Metaphysics of Narrativity: Time and Symbol in Ricoeur's Philosophy of History." In his *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- Wood, David, Ed. *On Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and Interpretation*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Heinrich Rombach (1923–2004)

Georg Stenger

Having grown up in the Freiburg school of phenomenology, the philosopher Heinrich Rombach developed a “structural thinking” that goes beyond fundamental ontological and phenomenological questions, calling forth a “thinking of movement” and “genesis.” He studied philosophy with MARTIN HEIDEGGER, EUGEN FINK, Wilhelm Szilasi, and Max Müller, and was able to make fruitful philosophical use of his scientific inclinations (studies of mathematics and physics), together with his interests in history, art, and anthropology (studies of history and art history, psychology, and education). Rombach’s philosophy of the human creative faculty is embedded in his “structural thinking” and “philosophical hermetics.” Thus both the conception of “concreativity” developed by the “structural ontology” and the theory of hermetics as an alternative to hermeneutical understanding are of immediate relevance for his aesthetics.

Rombach’s “structural thinking” is, on the one hand, clearly distinguished from “structuralism,” which still carries many systematic implications, while on the other hand, it is related to “poststructuralist” aspects that he did not discuss. It is an attempt to bring together “substance” and “system” on a new level. *Strukturontologie* (1971) has the significant subtitle “A Phenomenology of Freedom,” and is the fundamental “systematic” and “methodical” work of this approach (see also Rombach 1994b).

Rombach focused on dimensional “structure” in terms of its structure-phenomenological implications, at the same time elaborating the intrinsic creative fundamental quality of everything that happens.

The “structural state” passes over into “structural dynamics”—which can also be found by all means in the “system”—in order to be transformed into “structural genesis.” It is the basic form of the “genetic curve” that depicts not only human existence but all living structures, i.e., life as a whole. In “structural genetic” thinking, “becoming” and “emergence” take over the vital position formerly held by “being,” “subject,” and “system,” to mention only a few of the most important traditions of thinking (see 1988: 361f.).

This emergence is an “event of freedom” that Rombach calls “autogenesis.” This “genetic curve” has the shape of a “meander”: it starts from the zero-point, rises, curls into itself again at the top, the peak (*Akme*), taking itself back into itself, so as to rise again from the zero point, from the “source,” “*ab ovo*” (see 1994b: 138ff., especially 148).

What the “early Rombach” still discussed under the notion of “freedom” (Rombach 1971) increasingly gave way to the “con-creative event” (Rombach 1994b). By and by, the neologism *con-creativity* advances to the key notion of his thinking. With it, he wants to make clear how something emerges from a shared event in such a way that it only then becomes what it is, or rather becomes what it is known as in a substantiated form, starting from the way in which one normally conceives it. The phenomenon of an artistic event receives its philosophical and ontological consecration here, insofar as both the artwork and the artist come into being together and from each other, which also means that they are led beyond their hitherto existing self-conception. The human being no longer stands opposite the world, but actively participates in the creation of the emergence of humankind and world (Rombach 1994b: 25f., 133f.; 1994a: 153–61, 1996: 117ff.; 1987: 127ff., 1983: 146–50).

G. Stenger (✉)
University of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany

The con-creative viewpoint means, for example, that one moves toward the other in such a manner that within this encounter, the respective world-feature is triggered toward its emergence. This means that the accompanying value-ground itself may be ready to be at the disposal for the events, which means nothing less than that it *too* emerges *from* the encounter and *from* this event. It is only in the con-creative event itself that the very conditions of the event emerge in the first place. Thus the focus is on comprehending the other not only within this other's world, but moreover—or previously—on helping the other into this world and on looking into it. A new, common world then emerges, a world from which both arise, rather than both participating in such a world to begin with.

Rombach perceives in this *con-creative* moment the decisive basic characteristic of every event, insofar as one starts here *before* any achievement of the subject and condition of the object, *before* any priority on the part of the human being or of reality. This again has consequences for the overall position of humankind. Human beings do not stand opposite nature, but rather understand themselves as part of a more inclusive nature. Humanity and nature have always replied to each other in a con-creative event, at the same time leading beyond their momentary possibilities. The “exceptional position of humankind” turns out to be a metaphysical notion that can no longer be held because nature already emerges from itself as a process of self-birth and self-creation (Rombach 1994b: 87–109, 2003: 143–46, 1990: 237–50).

Besides structural thinking, Rombach has also developed a “picture philosophy” that not only calls on other traditions, but also understands itself as an approach that starts *before* every concept. For Rombach, a “picture” is the “presentation of a whole” that can be “seen” and that actually, enables the world presented here to become visible only through this “seeing,” “emerging” in its references. All that is spoken can at best speak from and into the picture, but remains a mere mentioning of what comes into beholding here. Just as Cézanne spoke of painting as being a “parallel to nature,” language could be understood as the attempt at a parallel equivalent of the picture.

Rombach has presented innumerable interpretations of pictures, from artifacts of art history to images of everyday life and everyday tools from cultural history and the environment. In the pictures he finds a more direct approach to the cultural worlds, discovering their

genuine “fundamental philosophy” that appears at best as rudiments in texts—even in philosophical ones. The *active* life of humanity has been preserved much better in modes of building and living, in mythologies, religions, and rituals, in works of art, and in the tools of daily life. All of these are “pictorially” before us, but they nevertheless want to be “seen.” Insofar as such a language of pictures can take a more fundamental approach than all theoretical evaluation, this picture philosophy is most closely related with his concept of “fundamental history” (Rombach: 1977, 1983, 1991, especially 124–41, 1994b: 15–24, 74ff., and on Japanese culture 1996: 37–89).

The explosive force of “seeing pictures” especially emerges at the foundation sequence of historical understanding, which is a matter of the deep structures of existence. In all events of exchange and relationship with one another, Rombach nevertheless perceives different dimensions of motivation in terms of history and historicity. If the “current life” perceives itself as being integrated into “social conditions,” which again are encompassed by “epochal consciousness” and are clearly preserved by means of the history of ideas and concepts, such a history of the concept is held up by the “history of being” (Heidegger), which no longer speaks via concepts, but in “fundamental words” that are something like coagulated kernels, giving an era its meaning. Even “deeper” goes the approach of “fundamental history,” which, beyond both concept and word, lets the “picture” talk, which brings before us a world in innumerable ways there are visual presentations, not representations. On this note, temples and churches are pictures of a world, a defined world, as are gardens or cities, cars or the newspaper.

With “philosophical hermetics,” Rombach set yet a third approach in motion, one that fed by the two previous ones, but follows a different course in crucial aspects (Rombach 1983, 1991). There are a number of constellations of phenomena—and if one looks closely, one notes that it is especially those phenomena that are close to, and vital for, life—that remain hidden and withdraw from every attempt at grasping them from the outside. Indeed they withdraw precisely to the extent to which they want to be grasped, comprehended, and understood. This becomes especially obvious when looking at phenomena of sensuality, intimacy, art, religion, and so forth, where gazes from the outside not only miss but remove exactly what is most decisive for the hermetic experience. Hermetic

phenomena generate their own “world” into which one must find the way in order to perceive their luminosity from the inside. Only then do they “speak” at all.

Rombach speaks of the “hermetical stroke” that befalls one and that is not at anybody’s disposal; however, it means that something completely new, unthinkable, breaks in. The great founders of religions, and the artists who have broken into the hermetics of their world and thus speak only from that world, show us in an exemplary way that something unfolds its own space—a space that can only speak from and to the inside—and that something happens there that is experienced as a gift, as a copious present, as a happening of an opening that can neither judged nor be talked about, at least not in an adequate way. In this way every artist tends toward hermetics.

Bibliography

- Becke, Andreas. *Weg der Phänomenologie. Husserl, Heidegger, Rombach*. Hamburg: Kovacs, 1999.
- Blaschek-Hahn, Helga, and Hans Rainer Sepp, eds. *Heinrich Rombach. Strukturontologie—Bildphilosophie—Hermetik*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2009.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Strukturontologie. Eine Phänomenologie der Freiheit*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1971; 2nd unaltered ed. with epilogue (360–73), 1988.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Leben des Geistes. Ein Buch der Bilder zur Fundamentalgeschichte der Menschheit*. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Welt und Gegenwelt. Umdenken über die Wirklichkeit. Die philosophische Hermetik*. Basel: Herder, 1983.
- Rombach, Heinrich. “Die sechs Schritte vom Einen zum Nicht-andern.” In *Philosophy Yearbook* 94, 1987, 225–45; rpt. in his *Die Welt als lebendige Struktur*. Freiburg: Rombach, 2003, 97–122.
- Rombach, Heinrich. “Philosophie des Gartens.” In *Wieviele Gärten braucht der Mensch?* Würzburg: Ergon, 1990, 237–50.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der kommende Gott. Hermetik—eine neue Weltsicht*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1991.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Phänomenologie des sozialen Lebens. Grundzüge einer phänomenologischen Soziologie*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1994a.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der Ursprung. Philosophie der Konkrektivität von Mensch und Natur*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1994b.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der Drachenkampf. Der philosophische Hintergrund der blutigen Bürgerkriege und die brennenden Zeitfragen*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1996.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Die Welt als lebendige Struktur. Probleme und Lösungen der Strukturontologie*. Freiburg: Rombach, 2003.
- Stenger, Georg. “Heinrich Rombach. Ein Portrait.” In *Information Philosophie* 2, 2001, 36–42.
- Stenger, Georg. “Heinrich Rombach.” In *Enciclopedia de obras de filosofía (Großes Weltlexikon der Philosophie)*. Ed. Franco Volpi and Antonio Martínez-Riu. Barcelona: Herder, 2005.
- Stenger, Georg. *Philosophie der Interkulturalität—Erfahrung und Welten. Eine phänomenologische Studie*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2006.
- Stenger, Georg, and Margarete Röhrig, eds. *Philosophie der Struktur—“Fahrzeug” der Zukunft? Für Heinrich Rombach*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1995 [includes a bibliography of Rombach’s writings through 1995].
- Weidtmann, Niels. *Der Weltcharakter der Kulturen in der interkulturellen Welt. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Hermeneutik und Strukturphänomenologie am Beispiel Afrika*. Würzburg: Unipress, 1998.

Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980)

Philippe Cabestan

Sartre is probably more famous as a writer than as a philosopher. Everyone knows novels such as *La nausée* (1938) or *Les chemins de la liberté* (1945–1949), as well as the short stories collected in *Le mur* (1939); his contributions to theater are also important and titles such as *Huis clos* and *Le diable et le bon Dieu* are really well-known even today. Even if the films are now relatively forgotten, we can also mention Sartre's screenplays such as *Les jeux sont faits* (1947) and *Les sorcières de Salem* (1957). But many think that Sartre was first of all a philosopher who was deeply influenced by phenomenology, particularly by EDMUND HUSSERL and MARTIN HEIDEGGER, and who wrote an essay on phenomenological ontology, *L'être et le néant* (1943). His aesthetics is therefore the product of a philosopher who is at the same time a writer. He not only knows what he is talking about, but he has the intellectual tools to understand it. And his aesthetic thought does not only concern literature. He also wrote also about music (he was quite fond of music and played the piano remarkably well), about painting and painters like Tintoretto, Lapoujade, and Masson; and about sculpture and sculptors like Giacometti, as well as about theater and poetry, even though he never wrote poetry himself.

Sartre did not actually take time to develop his aesthetics, but it is possible to assemble a sketch from the different texts he devoted to this question. From this point of view, two books, *L'imaginaire* (1940) and *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* (1948), are important. At the end of the first one, Sartre describes the contemplation of a work of art phenomenologically

and maintains that aesthetic consciousness belongs to what he calls (rejecting the old faculty-psychology) image-consciousness (*conscience d'image*). In order to understand this, we have to remember Husserl's investigations of imagination. According to the founder of phenomenology, there are differences of kind, and not merely of degree, between what we imagine and what we perceive, between imagination and perception, which are not merely two modes of "objectivating" in which the appearance of an object occurs. The crucial differences are differences in modes of consciousness. While perceptual consciousness gives its content as real and actually there, imagining consciousness gives it as non-actual, as merely represented. In the first case we speak about presentation (*Gegenwärtigung*), in the second about re-presentation (*Vergegenwärtigung*).

In *L'imaginaire*, Sartre also keeps perception and imagination rigorously separate, but merges acts of pure "phantasy" (*Phantasie*)—i.e., pure image, usually regarded as a "mental image"—and acts of image-consciousness (*Bildbewusstsein*), i.e., external images based on a "bearer," which both belong to the same "image family"—into one continuous experience. In fact, each type of image needs either a psychic or a physical medium, or a mixture of material and psychic media. From this point of view, it is wrong to say that we "perceive" a painting, a symphony, or a tragedy, because we imagine them by grasping the physical thing as an *analogon* for a purely imagined object. For example, the actor's body, gestures, costume, and expressions serve as material or physical media that allow spectators to *imagine* Hamlet, Ophelia, or King Lear. In the same way, the sounds produced by the orchestra are the basis for imagining the symphony as a purely imagined object. At the same time, we understand that what matters most is not the medium

P. Cabestan (✉)
Lycée Janson de Sailly, Paris, France

of imagining, much less its objects (Hamlet), but the precise attitude of consciousness or intentional stance (*Einstellung*) that we take up. Thus it is possible either to imagine Hamlet speaking to the ghost of his father, or—especially when the play is boring, to perceive Laurence Olivier and the scenery. We also understand that imagination opens a kind of de-realized “anti-world” with unreal objects in an unreal space and time unconnected with our real spatiotemporal world. This anti-world is the “world” of image-consciousness and the “world” of art.

Sartre’s aesthetics also has roots in his phenomenological ontology. According to *L’être et le néant*, the human being is cast into the world in an ontological situation of radical and unconditioned freedom. Existence precedes essence. Human existence is therefore burdened with a total responsibility to choose itself and simultaneously the world, and the decision to write, for example, represents the project of expressing one’s situation through the creation of literary works. Since literature originates in response to the basic condition of freedom, the problem of freedom also provides the authentic theme for literary expression. From this, we can understand Sartre’s call for a literature of “engagement.” Writing is both a personal action and a political action. One writes not only for oneself, but also for the sake of others. What is decisive in a literature of engagement is the extent to which the issue of freedom is presented as a problem. If the act of writing is to succeed as an authentic appropriation of freedom, then it must result in works that engage the reader’s attention to his/her own situation as a radical responsibility to choose. It must also call attention to the alienation of human freedom that results from humanity’s situatedness in political and social orders of enslavement. From this point of view, Sartre’s theater is, in contrast to the traditional psychological theater, a *theater of situations* that presents a free human being in a particular social environment in which s/he makes an irrevocable choice. This conception commands Sartre’s dramatic aesthetic. He writes, “Our plays are violent and brief, centered around one single event; there are few players and the story is compressed within a short space of time, sometimes only a few hours. As a result they obey a kind of rule of the three unities that has been only a little bit rejuvenated and modified” (1973, 19).

Sartre presents and expounds the main features of his aesthetics in *Qu’est-ce que la littérature?* This

includes the distinction between art and literature, i.e., between music, painting, sculpture, and dance, on the one hand, and theater, movie, novel, short story, and opera, on the other hand. It is based on the role of language in each case. According to him, music, painting, and sculpture are totally independent of language and have no meaning. The music that accompanies a text in a song, an opera, or a hymn gains meaning in this way, but this depends only on the words, and a musical note is in itself meaningless. Sartre therefore refuses to class colors, gestures, or notes as linguistic signs—otherwise it would be possible, in listening to a piece of music, for example, to understand its meaning as if we were reading a text. On the contrary, there is absolutely nothing to understand in a painting or in a symphony. As for imagination and perception, we find again Sartre’s tendency to make sharp dichotomies about art and literature. However, the fact that a work of art is meaningless does not imply that it is senseless. If a color has no meaning, it still has a sense, but the sense, unlike the meaning, lies in the color or in the different colors of the painting and is not distinct from it. Colors or notes do not refer to something else, but refer to themselves, while words in the case of literature do express distinct meanings. The case of poetry is ambiguous because the poet uses words more like a musician uses notes, while the writer does not write to write, but first of all to say something.

If we compare Sartre’s aesthetics with other phenomenological reflections on art and artworks, we can first recognize his distance both from Husserl and from the Polish phenomenologist ROMAN INGARDEN. As we have seen, the artwork obviously does not exist by itself, but is for Sartre a product of image-consciousness, while aesthetic contemplation is for Husserl fundamentally based on perception. About Dürer’s engraving *Knight, Death, and the Devil*, Husserl distinguishes, in *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie* (1913), normal perception and picture-consciousness. The former grasps the engraving as a physical thing, while the latter focuses on the figures, “knight on horseback,” “devil,” and “death.” Husserl emphasizes that the perceptive consciousness of the engraved figures is a “neutrality modification” of the initial perception of the material work of art. Thus although the latter is posited as a really existing thing, the pictorial object itself is given neither

as existing nor as not existing. For Ingarden, picture-consciousness remains a perception. But the conception expressed in his *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst* (1962) is slightly different insofar as picture-consciousness is in fact a “near perception” (*ein quasi-wahrnehmungsmäßiges Erfassen*) and Ingarden also objects to Husserl’s theory of neutrality modification.

We can also compare Sartre’s aesthetics and Heidegger’s reflection on art. In his famous essay, “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” (1935–36), Heidegger is concerned with the coming-to-pass of truth in the work of art. The artwork is a privileged site in which the understanding of Being of an epoch is disclosed; the work has the power to gather a world and Being comes to unconcealment in it. Despite the way in which Sartre follows Heidegger in giving phenomenology an existential turn, their problematics are different. Sartre insists on the absolute freedom of consciousness, and this freedom is the only proper theme of art. Thus Heidegger’s focus on the coming-to-pass of the truth of Being, which is certainly not a function of Dasein’s action or decision, is replaced by an emphasis on unconditioned human choice and by the call for engagement.

Throughout his career, Sartre’s aesthetics fights against the same enemy, i.e., Théophile Gautier and his theory of art for art’s sake (“*l’art pour l’art*”). For Sartre this theory represents the most absurd conception about art. But his conviction does not mean, as it is often said, that the work of art has to be useful and to serve a political aim as if it were a propaganda work. He certainly did not want to be considered as a follower of Andreï Alexandrovitch Jdanov. For Sartre, the artist as being-in-the-world is condemned to express his epoch and committed to the enhancement of humanity’s self-realization of freedom.

Bibliography

- Cabestan, Philippe *L’être et la conscience. Recherches sur la psychologie et l’ontologie sartriennes*. Brussels: Ousia, 2005.
- Embree, Lester, et al., ed. *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- Husserl, Edmund *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie* [1913] Ed. Karl Schuhmann. *Husserliana* 3/1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book. General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Heidegger, Martin. “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” [1935–36]. In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1950, 7–68; “The Origin of the Work of Art.” In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Ingarden, Roman *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1962.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. “Le langage indirect et les voix du silence.” In his *Signes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1960, 49–104; “Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence.” In his *Signs*. Trans. Richard C. McCleary. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 39–83.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul *L’imaginaire: Psychologie phénoménologique de l’imagination*. Paris, Gallimard, 1940; *The Psychology of Imagination*. Trans. Bernard Frechtman. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948; newly trans. as *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. Trans. Jonathan Webber. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul *L’être et le néant: Essai d’ontologie phénoménologique*. Paris, Gallimard, 1943; *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul *Qu’est-ce que la littérature?* Paris: Gallimard, 1948; *What is Literature?* Trans. Bernard Frechtman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul *Un théâtre de situations*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973; *Sartre on Theater*. Trans. Frank Jellinek. New York: Random House, 1976.
- Sartre et les arts. Revue *Obliques*, numéro dirigé par M. Sicard (1981).

Max Scheler (1874–1928)

Wolfhart Henckmann

Scheler never published a book or article on aesthetics, but he was very much interested in questions of aesthetics and the philosophy of art, and this throughout his life. Many of his writings contain shorter or longer reflections on various aesthetic problems, which delineate almost a whole system of aesthetics. The latter consists of three loosely connected main parts: (1) a theory of aesthetic values, (2) an aesthetics of nature, and (3) a philosophy of art. His aesthetics extends not only horizontally over a vast field of problems, but also vertically through several levels of reflection—namely, a fundamental level of principal problems, mainly understood as a phenomenology of aesthetic value and of the basic conceptions of art; an anthropological-hermeneutical level of individual and cultural experiences; and a level of metaphysical problems of value and art in the evolutionary dialectics of spirit (*Geist*) and life-drive (impulsion, *Lebensdrang*).

Methodologically, Scheler's aesthetics is neither inductive nor deductive; moreover, it is not always intuitive, as MORITZ GEIGER characterizes phenomenological aesthetics, but rather follows an anthropological hermeneutics, by which he also differs from the ontological aesthetics of ROMAN INGARDEN. Scheler's later phenomenological and metaphysical aesthetics leaves behind his early conception of aesthetics as a normative science in the neo-Kantian sense given to it by Wilhelm Windelband and Heinrich Rickert. His later aesthetics follows the movement of objectivity, which Max Dessoir pronounced early in the twentieth century, by which the subjective

movement, commonly traced back to Immanuel Kant, was to be overcome. The aesthetic attitude, i.e., disinterested contemplative appreciation, which is a fundamental concept in subjective aesthetics, is in Scheler's view of art nothing but a sign of the decadence of modern art and art appreciation (2000b: 329f.), but with respect to the sphere of aesthetic phenomena, it is nevertheless constitutive (1976a: 30).

(1) In his main work, *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik* (1913/1916), Scheler outlines a hierarchy of five value-ranks, reaching from the rank of (a) sensuous and pleasurable values through the ranks of (b) pragmatic (useful, instrumental values), (c) psychic (sad, gay), and (d) spiritual (just, beautiful, true) values up to (e) the rank of religious values (holy, profane). Aesthetic values are essentially spiritual values. Therefore, Scheler denies that the pleasurable belongs among aesthetic values in the strict sense, though in his later years he adopted a somewhat Platonic view whereby with the pleasurable the human mind begins to open up for the higher spiritual and religious values (2000a: 230). All values correlate with specifically receptive and active potentialities of the human being, which come into function when it meets with specific value qualities. Aesthetic values in the strict sense correspond to the "intentional feeling," by which a specific value-quality and its objectivity is experienced ("*erlebt*"). The quality of a higher- or lower-ranking value-quality is experienced by the intentional feeling of preferring or the feeling of a given value-degree being lower than expected, i.e., the feeling of an objective disappointment. Compared to ethical values, which are founded in personal acts, aesthetic values are founded in objects. These need not be real, but may be fictitious; they are characterized by a plastic spiritual clearness ("*anschauliche*

W. Henckmann (✉)
University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Bildhaftigkeit”—2000a: 103f.), which is not to be mistaken for sensuous visibility.

All spiritual acts, including aesthetic acts, are founded in a fundamental spiritual openness and desire to come into contact with what is given, with the world in its immanent value profile. Scheler defines the fundamental openness and value-aspiring drive rather ambiguously as “love.” Love is prior to all acts of the human mind (“*Geist*”); it is the answering act to the love by which God has created and loves the universe. In the 1920s, when Scheler distanced himself from the Christian concept of a Trinitarian God, he withdrew some of the Catholic implications of his concept of love, but never gave up this term to denote the basic universal openness and affirmative attitude of the human mind with respect to the value-profile of the world; this basic attitude he calls also “world-love” (“*Weltliebe*”—2000b: 307ff.). All aesthetic phenomena belong to a realm of spiritually bright appearances transcending the sphere of daily life and natural reality. And the negative aesthetic values (ugly, horrible, etc.) also belong to this aesthetic realm.

(2) In harmony with his objectivism, Scheler opposes the modern concept of natural beauty as a projection of subjective human experiences by his concept (which is not exactly that of EDMUND HUSSERL) of the correlativity of objects and acts, in which the objects are prior to the acts in so far as they evoke the human mind to respond in correspondingly specified acts (1976a: 39). In *Vom Ewigen im Menschen* (1921), he calls this process of forming and expanding the human mind within the evolution of the universe the “functionalization [*Funktionalisierung*] of the human mind” (198ff.). Since it is evident that nature displays many kinds of beauty in landscapes, animals, plants, minerals, etc., it is necessary to develop a general philosophy of nature (which is the least known part of his philosophy) that accounts for the possibility of natural beauty.

For Scheler, who had read Henri Bergson’s philosophy extensively, all the different spheres of nature and their objects are, ontologically, “images” (“*Bilder*,” *natura naturata*). They are set into being by the creative power of nature (*natura naturans*). He calls this power the image phantasy of nature (“*Bildphantasie der Natur*”). As a consequence of this concept of nature as a cosmic and universal artist and of his phenomenological thesis of correlation, he declares that

there are also prehuman forms of experience of natural beauties, i.e., forms of aesthetic attraction between flowers and insects, male and female animals, etc. (2000b: 431f.). And to a certain degree, there are also different aesthetic qualities produced and experienced in the prehuman spheres of nature, namely, in all cases of a suggestive “precise shape”; in accordance with Austrian Gestalt theory, he speaks of “*prägnante Gestalt*” (1987: 199). The artistic and aesthetic power of nature produces at last in its highest possibilities the different races of humankind, the generic and individual schemes of the natural appearance of human beings in the different stages, and the corresponding customs of their lives. It is not clear enough in Scheler’s writings if a precise shape is sufficient to account for the beauty of natural objects, or if it is only one of the necessary conditions of natural beauty.

(3) Scheler distinguishes—as did Conrad Fiedler, Max Dessoir, Emil Utitz, Richard Hamann, and others—between aesthetics as philosophy of aesthetic value and philosophy of art: aesthetic values can also be experienced outside the arts, and not only in nature, but also in science, social life, and religion, while art can be authentic art without being beautiful (2000b: 332). While modern philosophy of aesthetic art tends to look at the arts from the angle of recipients—suggesting along with Theodor Lipps, for instance, that artists also strive to create nothing but beautiful works—Scheler learned from Fiedler’s famous essay on the origin of artistic activity (1887) to reconstruct the processes of representation and expression as special forms of cognition.

Scheler mainly discusses the concept of art in three aspects: as a monopoly of the human spirit, in contrast to the artistic activities of certain animals, which are carried out by instinct; with respect to the structure of human existence, and with respect to the (meta-physical) process of becoming of the absolute *Ens a se*. With respect to the structure of human existence, art is based first on love, second on transvital values perceived in an emotionally permeated vision, third on the perception of an idea, and fourth on the function of representation “*Darstellungsfunktion*,”—(1987: 199). Therefore, the work of art is not a representation of anything outside the artwork playing its double, but develops its special character and content of representation only in the process of creation itself. By the creative act of the artist, which Scheler

distinguishes from rational work and from creation by God, the value-aspect of something represented comes into an emotionally impressive and suggestive appearance. This coming-into-appearance originates in a certain “conception” by which the genius—the highest, paradigmatic type of artistic creation—is driven to find an equivalent form for it in order to free him/herself from its obsessive power. Thus Scheler’s philosophy of art is mainly a philosophy of the creative process, a “production aesthetics,” as Nietzsche has called it, that is conceived as being prior to an aesthetics of the produced work and to the subsequent appreciation of works of art by any recipients. Relying on Nietzsche’s aesthetics, Scheler conceives of the work of art as a dynamic harmony of Dionysian and Platonic, i.e., Apollonian formative powers (2000b: 331).

In essence, art can only be one and the same, as Scheler claims against Wilhelm Worringer. In *Abstraktion und Einfühlung* (1908), Worringer distinguishes two kinds of art: art is based either on empathy or on abstraction. For Scheler, however, the realm of art is differentiated by the different materials forming the medium of the creative process and allowing the artistic expression to be perceived by others (1976a: 35f.). He accordingly accepts the common distinction between visual, auditory, and “haptic” arts, and he does not object against all possible forms of their cooperation—he was enthusiastic about theater, opera, and the newly established art of film.

Scheler is convinced that although art is based on transvital values and spiritual creativity, it is an essentially historical phenomenon. Originating in time, a work of art is subject to the dominating style of artistic creation (“*Kunstwollen*,” Alois Riegl). Therefore, there cannot be progress in the creation of art, but rather an inner growth of a culture with art as one of its essential organic parts. The center of art history is the change in style-feeling (“*Stilgefühl*”) brought about by the geniuses, who create the paradigmatic models that inspire their followers, not the changes in taste and art appreciation (1976a: 40). There are different sets of realistic factors (race and gender, economic, technical, political factors), which, in cooperation with the ideal factors (religion, moral systems, hierarchy of value systems, the changes of the feeling of style), bring about the development of art within the growth of cultures. By a slowly growing intercultural exchange of artworks, the artistic potentialities

of cultures are inspired to develop, and all cultures, none of them replaceable by any other, are necessary for the expression of the artistic potentiality of humankind.

Metaphysically, Scheler is convinced that the creative process of the artist is a representation and symbol of the creative process of nature or even of God (2000b: 330), and ultimately, a representation of the struggle between spirit and life drive in God. Therefore, the art of the human race is an essential medium for the realization of God himself. His inner struggle is executed in the evolutionary process of the present universe, which is only one of the innumerable worlds that may or even will evolve from God’s eternal struggle (and entirely different worlds might have already existed). All creative processes tend to find an equilibrium (“*Ausgleich*”) in which antagonistic energies build up a significant configuration that symbolizes the possibility of the harmony and reconciliation of God and his creation, a harmony that the artistic creativity of humankind helps develop.

Bibliography

- Dessoir, Max. *Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1906.
- Dessoir, Max. “Objektivismus in der Ästhetik” [1910]. In his *Beiträge zur allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1929, 20–33.
- Fiedler, Conrad. *Über den Ursprung der künstlerischen Tätigkeit*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1887.
- Geiger, Moritz. “Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses.” In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–684.
- Henckmann, Wolfhart. “Grundlinien der nicht ausgeführten Ästhetik Max Schelers.” In *Axiomathes* 1–2, 1998, 131–68.
- Scheler, Max. *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik* [1913/1916]. In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 2. 7th ed. Ed. Manfred S. Frings. Bonn: Bouvier, 2000a.
- Scheler, Max. “Der Genius” [ca 1921]. In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 10. 4th ed. Ed. Manfred S. Frings. Bonn: Bouvier, 2000b, 288–311, 329–37.
- Scheler, Max. *Vom Ewigen im Menschen* [1921]. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 5. 5th ed. Ed. Maria Scheler, Bern/Munich: Francke, 1968.
- Scheler, Max. “Metaphysik und Kunst” [1923]. In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 11. Ed. Manfred S. Frings. Bonn: Bouvier, 1976a, 28–45.
- Scheler, Max. “Der Mensch im Weltalter des Ausgleichs” [1928]. In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 9. Ed. Manfred S. Frings. Bern: Francke, 1976b, 145–70.

- Scheler, Max. "Mensch: Ausdruck und Darstellung" [ca. 1924]. In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 12. Ed. Manfred S. Frings. Bonn: Bouvier, 1987, 199.
- Spader, Peter H. "Aesthetics, Morals, and Max Scheler's Non-formal Values." In *British Journal of Aesthetics* 16, 1976, 230–36.
- Utz, Emil. *Grundlegung der allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft* [1914/1920]. Ed. Wolfhart Henckmann. Munich: Fink, 1972.
- Worringer, Wilhelm. *Abstraktion und Einfühlung. Ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie* [1908]. New ed. Munich: Piper, 1959.

Hermann Schmitz (1928–)

Anna Blume

Hermann Schmitz is the founder of the New Phenomenology. Between 1964 and 1980, he published his ten-volume *System of Philosophy*, in which he discloses and describes the broad field of involuntary experiences by means of a method that diverges considerably from classical phenomenology. The theoretical core of his work is the body (*Leib*) or bodily experience; its scrutiny in the New Phenomenology is important for many other areas, including the phenomenology of aesthetic experience. The concept of *Leib* must therefore be discussed first in what follows.

Schmitz distinguishes *Leib* (personal body or flesh, corporeality) from the concept of *Körper* (physical body) in a more nuanced manner than do EDMUND HUSSERL and MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY. A *Körper* is a visible and palpable object, and ultimately also the abstract, atomized object of the natural sciences. By contrast, a *Leib* is the stratum of involuntary and immediate feelings (*Verspürungen*) that everyone, Schmitz assumes, has independently of perceptual or tactile experiences in the sphere of his or her *Körper*. According to Schmitz, the fundamental categories of bodily feeling include: narrowness, broadness, tension, swelling, intensity, rhythm, direction, and their corresponding derivations (cf. Schmitz 1966: 19–36). On the basis of these categories, “bodily stirrings” (*Regungen*) such as desire, pain, fatigue, or vigor, and spatially or atmospherically situated “emotions” (*Gefühle*), such as joy, sadness, love, hate, and shame, can be differentiated, classified, and newly determined phenomenologically. Thus, for example, anxiety-laden emotions are as a rule “narrowing or constricting,” whereas happy emotions are “broadening or expansive.”

The phenomenological method operative in this approach is no longer transcendental-egological, as

it was for Husserl. While Schmitz did begin with Husserl’s method, he modified and simplified it considerably; indeed, as Günter Schulte (2001: 151) has noted, Schmitz freed that method from its exaggerated claims and artificial features (absolute insight into truth and essence, restriction to immediate self-experience, starting from a so-called lifeworld, and the dogma of consciousness as intentional).

Schmitz is closer to Merleau-Ponty’s approach, though he finds that the latter lacks a consistent, discussable theory. If we compare Schmitz with Merleau-Ponty, we find, for example, that the latter does not precisely define his central concept of *le corps* anywhere in his *Phénoménologie de la perception* (1945); its meaning comes into view only in the course of the book by a process of elimination. If one examines the relevant passages, it becomes clear that *le corps* is a kind of hybrid of *Leib* and *Körper*; and the clear, conceptual differentiation of both phenomena, which Schmitz was the first to achieve, is lacking there. *Le corps* is the sensuous *Körper* that is accessible to eyes and hands, where “fingernails,” “ears,” and “lungs” also belong to *Körper* (cf. Merleau-Ponty 1945: 492–93). He does not mean the objective *Körper* of the natural sciences that is treated in physiology textbooks (cf. *ibid.*: 403–4), which he regards as an extract from *le corps* deriving from an impoverishment of the primary phenomenon (cf. *ibid.*). Thus *le corps* is by no means equivalent to Schmitz’s concept of *Leib*, for as Merleau-Ponty says: “Neither *le corps* nor existence can be regarded as the original of being human, since they presuppose each other, and because *le corps* is solidified or generalized existence, and existence a perpetual incarnation” (*ibid.*, 194). *Le corps* seems to be something in or to which intimate existence “surrenders” judgment by general

standards, whereas *Leib*—from the standpoint of the New Phenomenology—is the locus of being-affected, including subjectivity (i.e., one's involvement in such being affected), that is to say, as the “epicenter” of all resonance and initiative, *Leib* is existence *from the very beginning*. In express contrast to the doctrines of Merleau-Ponty, Husserl, and MARTIN HEIDEGGER, Schmitz discusses the interconnections between corporeality, subjectivity, and existence in his works *Was ist Neue Phänomenologie?* (2003) and *Husserl und Heidegger* (1996). His aesthetic theory is based on his understanding of these interconnections.

Prior to grounding his theory in the *Leib*, Schmitz addressed the array of aesthetic theories that to this day are taught uncritically in universities. In his 1980 essay “Herkunft und Schicksal der Ästhetik,” for example, he says that “aesthetics” is, strictly speaking, what has been synthesized under this concept in the nineteenth century after Hegel, namely, (1) the arts (poetry, music, architecture, the fine arts, and dance) with their works, production (artists), and reception (public); (2) the aesthetic attitude, that is, the multifariously differentiable modes of approaching works of art, in particular the modes of approaching, and attitudes toward the beautiful and the sublime; (3) the objects disclosed in the aesthetic attitude that are not “works” of art, especially natural beauty; and (4) “Beauty itself, the capstone in the arch of bourgeois aesthetics” (cf. Schmitz 1980: 397ff., 1990: 455ff.).

While today, according to Schmitz, these disciplines are by no means obsolete, their synthesis—with which the nearly century-long domination of aesthetics in high bourgeois culture began—disintegrated at the dawn of the twentieth century, and did so in such a way that especially two fundamental tendencies in particular—tendencies that had led to the synthesis of those disciplines—once again became visible in their difference: “idealistic” and “rhetorical” proto-aesthetics, as Schmitz calls them. Schmitz defines idealistic proto-aesthetics as the demand made, since Plato, Cicero, and Plotinus, on the fine arts that they integrate the idea of the beautiful into the sensuous material; he defines rhetorical proto-aesthetics as the task given to the arts of managing the affects, a task modeled on rhetoric (cf. Schmitz 1980: 390ff.). His own theory of the aesthetic and thus also of art is—as antimetaphysical and anti-idealistic—closest to rhetorical proto-aesthetics, albeit with a radically new aspect. For Schmitz does not regard affects as states of the soul

(“there is no soul”: Schmitz 1990: 199f.), but rather as bodily sensed atmospheres that are present in the surroundings. Thus corporeality is the medium in which to “have” *atmospheres* as emotions.

Leib and emotion determine Schmitz's aesthetic theory insofar as art—differently than, say, the cultural system of science—is a vehicle for counteracting the overpowering of emotional forces by reification. From the perspective of the phenomenology of the *Leib*, the meaning of cultural systems in general consists in just such a possibility of distancing oneself from emotion. In contrast to the reductive and abstract procedures of science, art makes it possible to permit emotions, namely, to organize them into works of art, and through these works to make them enduring, aesthetically experienceable, and perhaps enjoyable. Art makes possible “distance in (emotional) affectedness,” as Schmitz (1990: 459) puts it. In view of the foregoing, we note that the traditional categories of aesthetics, particularly the beautiful and its opposite, the ugly, assume a completely different significance in the context of the dynamic between *Leib* and emotion: with the aid of the corporeal categories noted above, Schmitz describes the beautiful as a “privative broadening” (i.e., a broadening or expansion that is in most respects freed of narrowing or constriction; a “tensionlessness”); by contrast, the ugly is said to be a “privative narrowing” (cf. Schmitz 1977: 662ff.). This suggests Kant's formula of “disinterested pleasure” taken in the beautiful. However, insofar as the tensionless beautiful is merely relieved of emotions instead of conveying emotional demands in aesthetic distance, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for art or aesthetic objects from the perspective of the New Phenomenology; at best, it represents an epiphenomenon. Aesthetics, says Schmitz, “makes do without considering the beautiful.”

In view of a “progressive aestheticization of reality,” of everyday life, politics, and the economy, and in view of the question concerning nature compelled by environmental problems, Gernot Böhme extends the phenomenal field of aesthetics, conceived along the conceptual lines of the New Phenomenology, far beyond the scope of the experience of art. He does so based on the insight that a fixation of aesthetic theory on art is obsolete due to art's rapid development. “Distance in being affected” by atmospheres thus would also be required in the wider field of aesthetic demands and impositions. With his books

Atmosphäre. Essays zur neuen Ästhetik (1995) and *Für eine ökologische Naturästhetik* (1989), Böhme makes strides towards a new aesthetics whose basic theme, “finding oneself in envining worlds” (Böhme 1989: 9), is simultaneously intended as part of a new philosophy of nature. Here, too, Böhme refers expressly to a key sentence in Schmitz, who defines philosophy as “man’s reflection on his finding himself in his surroundings” (Schmitz 1990: 3). In addition, the atmospheric, in its abbreviated form as “sphere,” is a vivid and powerful concept in Peter Sloterdijk’s three-volume theory and critique of culture (Sloterdijk 1998, 1999, 2004). Thus one is justified in claiming that Hermann Schmitz’s New Phenomenology has given new impulses and inspiration to other important theoretical approaches.

Bibliography

- Blume, Anna. *Scham und Selbstbewußtsein. Zur Phänomenologie konkreter Subjektivität bei Hermann Schmitz*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2003.
- Blume, Anna. Ed. *Zur Phänomenologie der ästhetischen Erfahrung*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2005.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Für eine ökologische Naturästhetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Atmosphäre. Essays zur neuen Ästhetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962; rpt., with trans. revisions by Forrest Williams and Daniel Guerrière, 1989.
- Schmitz, Hermann. *Der Leib im Spiegel der Kunst (System der Philosophie II/2)*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1966.
- Schmitz, Hermann. “Die Kunst.” In his: *Das Göttliche und der Raum (System der Philosophie III/4)*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1977, 613–85.
- Schmitz, Hermann. “Herkunft und Schicksal der Ästhetik.” In *Kulturwissenschaften. Festgabe für Wilhelm Perpeet*. Ed. Heinrich Lützel in cooperation with Gerhard Pfaffert and Eckart Strohmaier, Bonn: Bouvier, 1980, 388–413.
- Schmitz, Hermann. “Ästhetik.” In his *Der unerschöpfliche Gegenstand. Grundzüge der Philosophie*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1990, 455–97.
- Schmitz, Hermann. “Leib und Gefühl in der Kunst”. In *Leib und Gefühl. Beiträge zur Anthropologie*. Michael Grossheim. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995, 7–25.
- Schmitz, Hermann. *Husserl und Heidegger*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1996.
- Schmitz, Hermann. *Was ist Neue Phänomenologie?* Rostock: Ingo Koch, 2003.
- Schmitz, Hermann. “Über das Machen von Atmosphären”. In *Zur Phänomenologie der ästhetischen Erfahrung*. Ed. Anna Blume. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2005, 26–43.
- Schulte, Günter. “Hermann Schmitz.” In his *Schnellkurs Philosophie*. Köln: Dumont, 2001, 151.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. *Sphären*. 3 Vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1998, 1999, 2004.
- Soentgen, Jens. *Die verdeckte Wirklichkeit. Einführung in die Neue Phänomenologie von Hermann Schmitz*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1998.

Alfred Schutz (1899–1959)

Andreas Georg Stascheit

Contributions to aesthetics were not a primary goal for Schutz. Likewise, it was not his concern to develop studies dedicated to specific genres of art. But he does reflect on human experiences of the aesthetic dimensions of the world in the sense of a frame of reference for understanding sociality.

Thoughts about aesthetic phenomena remain largely implicit. Except for the two widely known essays (Schutz 1951, 1956), most of Schutz's studies on music and literature were left as preparatory notes. But the Schutz Papers include a clipping that announces his Peabody Conservatory lecture "Mozart and the Philosophers" and contains the most concise précis of his self-defined intentions: "His principal fields of endeavor are philosophical interpretations of the social world through language and the arts, especially music" (Schutz Papers: 13019). Schutz archived this clipping as the first page of a collection of notes on music, and the same article gives definite information about the project these notes were dedicated to: "The speaker is preparing a scholarly study of 'The Phenomenology of Musical Experience.'" Schutz started working on this project at Lake Placid in 1944 (Schutz 1976), planned to continue it in 1945 (Schutz and Voegelin 2004: 261), touched on it in "Making Music Together" (1951), and took it up again after completing "Mozart and the Philosophers." The 101-page documentation of this last phase is being published in the *Alfred Schütz Werkausgabe VII*, along with notes for lecture courses that provide clues to his reception of Henri Bergson, William James, and Ernst Cassirer.

Work on the *Nachlass* on music and literature and the exploration of the relation to Schutz's publications began with Fred Kersten (Schutz 1976) and Ilja Srubar (Schutz 1981). It continued with Lester Embree on Schutz's approach to literature from the standpoint of sociology (Schutz 1998), and has been recently followed with analyses of the relevance of aesthetics for the phenomenology of the social (Stascheit 2003, 2007, 2008). The reinterpretation of Schutz from the standpoint of aesthetics was already encouraged by Emanuel Winternitz: "Alfred Schutz's concern with the phenomenon of music deeply influenced his philosophy. It will be a task for his philosopher friends to explore this connection and to continue his work" (Winternitz 1970: 271).

The *Leitfaden* for the exploration of Schutz's oeuvre as "philosophical interpretations of the social world through language and the arts, especially music" can be established via the analysis of correlations between Schutz's musical practice and theoretical positions, and by tracing the influences of the Nietzsche-Wagner and the Bergson-Einstein debates within the *cantus firmus* of his work: the nexus of time, action, and the plurality of rationality. The crucial "through" in Schutz's self-interpretation can best be understood if music and literature are considered the source of *operative questions* and, with *counterpoint* for one example, *operative concepts* (Fink 1957). Schutz himself expressed the core relevance of his musical roots in a letter to Gurwitsch: "A difference—and I hope not an opposition between us—lies in the fact that you take perception or mathematics as the point of departure and model in all of your works, whereas I like to think through phenomenological problems in terms of the states of affairs of music and of human action in the social sphere" (Schutz and Gurwitsch 1985: 306).

A.G. Stascheit (✉)
Dortmund University of Applied Sciences and Arts,
Dortmund, Germany

The meaning of music for Schutz was shaped by *making music*, his piano-based perspective being complemented by extensive practice in chamber music. His musical scope was formed by the ubiquitous presence of music in the Vienna of 1900–1930 and qualified by forty years of weekly four-handed piano sessions with Emanuel Winternitz and regular chamber music rehearsals; by a good reputation as a *prima vista* player (sight-reader) in spite of “little technique” at the piano (Winternitz 1970: 270); by the ability to read not only piano music, but entire orchestral scores (Barber 2004: 151); by integrating piano practice into daily life in spite of being overloaded with professional duties (Schutz Papers: 13020ff.); and by acquaintance, out of a beholder’s perspective, with a remarkable variety of music performed by world famous artists in Vienna’s concert halls and state opera.

How far Schutz is from simply taking music as a “model” for social relationship becomes obvious, however, when he writes that with regard to the author-listener relationship, poetry is an “Autarlogique Art, the loneliest after music” (Schutz 1998: 4). The difference between musical processes and social interactions is also marked in “Making Music Together” when Schutz specifies as his central topic social interactions *connected* with the musical process (Schutz 1964: 159), and consequently adds: “It is by no means our thesis that a work of music (or of art in general) cannot be understood except by reference to its individual author or to the circumstances—biographical or other—in which he created this particular work” (ibid.: 169). The emphasis on the difference between musical processes and social interactions reveals that the author-beholder relationship is relevant for Schutz not with regard to the constitution of the work of art, but because it transposes the fundamental question of any *verstehende Soziologie* into the fields of literature and music.

Owing to the lack of a “conceptual scheme” (Schutz 1964: 159), reflection on music is synonymous with reflection on the pre-predicative dimensions of experience. But simultaneously, music as “a meaningful context” (ibid.) raises the questions of a hermeneutics of music, and more radically, of a *hermeneutics of the pre-predicative* sphere. The Mozart essay dedicated to the amalgam of music and drama (Schutz 1956) is designed to sound the depth of this difficult scenario rendered by a virtuoso performance

on the keyboard of the history of philosophy. This performance already starts with the essay’s title, an allusion to Schopenhauer’s metaphysical variation on Leibniz: “Musica est exercitium metaphysices occultum nescientis se philosophari animi” (Schopenhauer 1859: 332). This late essay takes up discussions Schutz had been engaged in since his early manuscripts (Schutz 1981): Bergson’s critical attitude toward language, Nietzsche’s questioning of the primacy of the word, and the controversy between Wagner and Nietzsche (cf. Zeeb 2004) can be traced through the whole text. Interpreted against this background and read along with “Sign and Symbol,” a lecture presented while the essay was being prepared, “Mozart and the Philosophers” reveals its relevance with regard to a Schutzian genealogy of meaning. It further suggests the task of exploring how Nietzsche’s thoughts on music and the musical dimensions of language (cf. Ungeheuer 1990) have migrated into the sociology of knowledge (Berger and Luckmann 1967: 17) via the Schutzian analysis of “communication in the life-world” (Schutz and Luckmann 1989: 148ff.).

Concerning the relationship between language and music, Schutz probes the phenomenon of rhythm as a potential anchorage and turns to the Greek conception of *mousikē* (cf. Georgiades 1955; Schutz Papers 13082ff.) and to the studies of rhythm by Aristotle’s student Aristoxenos (1883), who provoked an epistemological revolution in musicology by claiming that specific *musical* qualities rather than numerical ratios are essential to music. Rhythm also represents the conceptual hinge with regard to Schutz’s pivotal thesis: the principal relevance of temporal structures for the genesis and understanding of social relationships. The focal concepts of simultaneity, tension, polythetic articulation, and synchronization are not adequately interpreted if regarded as mere adaptations of concepts of temporality from Henri Bergson, Edmund Husserl, and William James, but as challenges, manifest, for example, when Schutz discussed Husserl’s notion of the synthesis of identification with regard to the auditory realm (Schutz 1976: 50ff., cf. Kersten 1976, Stascheit 2003). Schutz’s temporal concepts epitomize the results of a dialogue nourished by phenomenological reflection on the experience of music from the standpoint of the practicing musician. This dialogue is initiated by two cardinal issues: the

problem of the coherence of a multiplicity of *distinct* streams, and the question of the constitution of an intersubjectively, mutually shared (or at least compatible) temporal articulation.

The coherence of a multiplicity of *distinct* simultaneous streams is a problem for the practicing pianist, programmatically demonstrated by Bach's *Das Wohltemperierte Klavier* and by his *Goldberg Variationen*, 31 variations of an *aria* that Schutz knew by heart (Winternitz 1970: 270). With the fundamental *independence of the hands*, the piano opens up a challenging experience of polyphony and its specific variant, counterpoint, for the *moving* animate body, modeled by the piano's physical and instrumental structure and typicalities of sound-production.

A first idea concerning the significance of this *independence of the hands* might be acquired via a simple experiment while listening to a piece of music built upon the most elementary form of polyphony, *dyaphonia*. The experiment consists in taking up a musician's perspective by focusing alternately on one of the two parts: what was experienced as a unity in "naïve" listening now appears as *different* meaningful processes, either part being experienced as *moving* in a different manner, exhibiting correspondingly different temporal qualities. Evoking a conceptualization of this experiment's quintessence, Bergson says: "I call two flows "contemporaneous" when they are equally one or two for my consciousness, the latter perceiving them together as a single flowing if it sees fit to engage in an undivided act of attention, and, on the other hand, separating them throughout if it prefers to divide its attention between them, even doing both at one and the same time if it decides to divide its attention and yet not cut it in two" (Bergson 1999: 35).

It is in this "same precise sense" (Schutz 1962: 173) that Schutz uses the term simultaneity, following Bergson's distinction of quantitative and qualitative multiplicity (cf. Bergson 1970: 56ff.). Within the context of Bergson's idea of simultaneity, the concepts of *polyphony* and *counterpoint*, taken in a twofold sense from a phenomenological and musicological point of view, reveal their relevance as *operative concepts* in Schutz's understanding of sociality: "The problem of simultaneity, taken not merely as a common Now in objective time but also as a community of two inner flows of time seems to me to be of the greatest significance for the problem of intersubjectivity, and that not

only in regard to transcendental but also to mundane intersubjectivity" (Schutz 1966: 88).

An exemplary situation for the analysis of the constitution of an intersubjectively, mutually shared (or at least compatible) temporal articulation is provided by the chamber ensemble, as the requirement of *beginning with* and *maintaining* a *shared tempo* pertains to the fundamentals of ensemble performance (similarly to marching, dancing, and making love, to cite other Schutzian examples).

This *synchronization* of tempo is neither established nor maintained simply *with* the flux of music. Its precondition can be specified as commonly *shared tension*, as the level of tension determines the density of the intervals by which the ongoing flux is structured in what Schutz, alluding to the bodily metaphor of the natural stride, calls "steps." He frequently discusses this topic with reference to the Husserlian distinction between polythetic and monothetic constitution, claiming that polythetic formations are exclusively in play where the nonlinguistic forms of expression are concerned. But the straightforwardness of this opposition is questioned by Schutz himself in a late meditation on the reproductive acts underlying larger musical structures: "*Re-produktion als abgelaufen, quasi-monothetisch möglich, Antizipation (statt Protention). Es ist der Rhythmus der größeren Formen, Perioden, Strophen. . .*" (Re-production quasi-monothetic possible, anticipation (instead of protention). It is the rhythm of the larger forms, periods, verses. . .—Schutz Papers: 13068).

The accomplishment of a synchronized tempo is finally founded upon an *active orientation* ("tuning-in") toward a mutually shared quality of tension; in chamber music performances, this becomes evident, including via expressive movements, in the phase *before* the first sound is produced. Schutz considered this *tuning-in relationship* (or in his own translation, *Einstellungsbeziehung*)—a "relationship" not pertaining to the same dimension as the relationship of ego and alter ego—to be the constitutive origin of the *We*. While in his drafts for "Making Music Together" he still recognizes a "problem which has to be investigated: Is the communicative process really at the origin of social relationship or is there a preceding layer?" (Schutz Papers: 3090), the primacy of *tuning-in* has become definite in the Seeligberger Notizbuch: "*Nicht erörtert bisher: Einstellungsbeziehung, die der*

Etablierung aller sozialen Beziehungen, auch Sprache, vorhergehen muß" (ibid.: 2035; Schutz and Luckmann 1984: 286) "Not discussed so far: The attitudinal relationship that must precede the establishment of all social relationships, including language" (Schutz and Luckmann 1989: 226). The conceptual nexus of *simultaneity*, *tension*, and *tempo* in conjunction with the notion of an active *orientation* derived from the Husserlian concept of attitude is what constitutes the phenomenological heart of the *Einstellungsbeziehung* or *tuning-in relationship*, thus forming the fundamental theorem of Schutz's phenomenology of the *We*.

Bibliography

- Aristoxenus Tarentinus. *Melik und Rhythmik des Classischen Hellenentums*. 2 vols. Trans. R. Westphal. Leipzig, 1883; *Elementa Rhythmica: The Fragment of Book II and the Additional Evidence for Aristoxenean Rhythmic Theory*. Ed. and Trans. Lionel Pearson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Barber, Michael D. *The Participating Citizen: A Biography of Alfred Schutz*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1967.
- Bergson, Henri. *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience* [1888]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970; *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Trans. F. L. Pogson. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1910.
- Bergson, Henri. *Durée et simultanéité: à propos de la théorie d'Einstein*. 2nd enl. ed. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1923; *Duration and Simultaneity: Bergson and the Einsteinian Universe*. Ed. Robin Durie. Trans. Leon Jacobson, with supplementary material trans. Mark Lewis. Manchester: Clinamen Press, 1999.
- Fink, Eugen. "Operative Begriffe in Husserls Phänomenologie." In *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 11, 1957, 321–37; "Operative Concepts in his Phenomenology." Trans. William McKenna. In *Apriori and World: European Contributions to Husserlian Phenomenology*. Ed. William McKenna et al. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981, 56–70.
- Georgiades, Thrasybulos G. *Greek Music, Verse, and Dance*. New York: Merlin Press, 1955.
- Kersten, Frederick I. "Preface" to Alfred Schutz, "Fragments on the Phenomenology of Music." Ed. Fred Kersten. In *Music and Man* 2 (1976), 6–22.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. Vol.1. 3rd enl. ed. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1859.
- Schutz, Alfred. Papers. General Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- Schutz, Alfred. "Making Music Together: A Study in Social Relationship." In *Social Research* 18, 1951, 76–97; rpt. in his *Collected Paper II*. Ed. Arvid Brodersen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964, 159–78.
- Schutz, Alfred. "Mozart and the Philosophers." In *Social Research* 23, 1956, 219–42; rpt. in his *Collected Papers II*. Ed. Arvid Brodersen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964a, 179–200.
- Schutz, Alfred. *Collected Papers II. Studies in Social Theory*. Ed. Arvid Brodersen, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964b.
- Schutz, Alfred. *Collected Papers I. The Problem of Social Reality*. Ed. Maurice Natanson. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.
- Schutz, Alfred. *Collected Papers III. Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy*. Ed. Ilse Schutz. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966.
- Schutz, Alfred. "Fragments on the Phenomenology of Music." [1944] Ed. Fred Kersten. In *Music and Man* 2, 1976, 5–71; rpt. In *Search of Musical Method*. Ed. F. Joseph Smith. London: Gordon & Breach, 1976, 5–72; rpt. as "Fragments Toward a Phenomenology of Music." In his *Collected Papers IV*. Ed. Helmut Wagner and George Psathas with Fred Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996, 243–75.
- Schutz, Alfred. *Theorie der Lebensformen. Frühe Manuskripte aus der Bergson-Periode*. Ed. Ilja Srubar. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981; *Life Forms and Meaning Structure*. Trans. Helmut R. Wagner. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Schutz, Alfred. "A 'Construction of Sociological Aspect of Literature.'" In Alfred Schutz, "Sociological Aspect of Literature": *Construction and Complementary Essays*. Ed. Lester Embree. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998, 1–71.
- Schutz, Alfred. *Alfred Schütz Werkausgabe*. Ed. Richard Grathoff, Hans-Georg Soeffner, and Ilja Srubar. 9 vols.. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz, 2003.
- Schutz, Alfred, and Thomas Luckmann. *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*. Vol.1. Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1975; *The Structures of the Lifeworld*. Vol.1. Trans. Richard M. Zaner and H. Tristram Engelhardt. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Schutz, Alfred, and Aron Gurwitsch. *Briefwechsel 1939–1959*. Ed. Richard Grathoff. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1985; *Philosophers in Exile: The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Aron Gurwitsch, 1939–1959*. Trans. J. Claude Evans. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Schutz, Alfred, and Thomas Luckmann. *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*. Vol.2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984; *The Structures of the Lifeworld*. Vol. 2. Trans. Richard M. Zaner and David J. Parent. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1989.
- Schutz, Alfred, and Eric Voegelin. *Eine Freundschaft, die ein Leben ausgehalten hat. Briefwechsel 1938–1959*. Ed. Gerhard Wagner and Gilbert Weiss. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz, 2004.
- Stascheit, Andreas Georg. "Doppelgriffe. Phänomenologische Motive vom Gesichtspunkt der Musikarbeit." In *Phänomenologie und soziale Wirklichkeit: Entwicklungen und Arbeitsweisen*. Ed. Ilja Srubar and Steven Vaitkus. Opladen: Leske & Budrich, 2003, 215–38.
- Stascheit, Andreas Georg. "Polyphonie und Kontrapunkt im Kontext einer Phänomenologie der sozialen Welt." In *Modell Zauberflöte: Der Kredit des Möglichen. Kulturgeschichtliche Spiegelungen erfundener Wahrheiten*. Ed. Mathias Mayer. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2007, 97–113.

- Stascheit, Andreas Georg. "Béla Bartók und die Milman Parry Collection der Harvard University—Volksliedforschung im amerikanischen Exil." In *Komponisten im Exil: 16 Künstlerschicksale des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. Ferdinand Zehentreiter. Leipzig: Henschel, 2008, 155–64.
- Ungeheuer, Gerold. "Nietzsche über Sprache und Sprechen, über Wahrheit und Traum." In *Kommunikationstheoretische Schriften II. Symbolische Erkenntnis und Kommunikation*. Ed. H. Walter Schmitz. Aachen: Alano, 1990, 288–386.
- Winternitz, Emanuel. "The Role of Music in Leonardo's Paragone." In *Phenomenology and Social Reality: Essays in Memory of Alfred Schutz*. Ed. Maurice Natanson. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970, 270–96.
- Zeeb, Tanja. "Die Wirkung Nietzsches auf die deutsche Gesellschaft der Jahrhundertwende im Spiegel der Tagespresse." In *Nietzsche-Studien* 33, 2004, 278–305.

Secondary Senses

Mădălina Diaconu

In opposition to the “theoretical senses” (Hegel) of sight and hearing, the secondary senses are touch, smell, and taste. “Secondary” refers to the minor importance these senses have held in philosophy and phenomenology, even if genetically they should be rather considered as “primary.” Leaving aside the vagueness of tactility, which is often intermingled with the sense of movement, force, and kinaesthesia, phenomenologists have mainly investigated touch from three perspectives (albeit rarely in an aesthetic context): (1) touching objects and moving; (2) apprehending tactile qualities; and (3) touching persons.

EDMUND HUSSERL distinguishes the perception of touching (*Tastwahrnehmung*) from its feeling (*Berührungsempfindung*). In touching, the subject concentrates on the impressions that emerge from objects; in feeling, one pays attention to one’s own kinaesthesia. Both impressions merge together in joining one’s own hands. In addition, self-touching is the beginning of the constitution of space through both movement in place and locomotion. Touch is for Husserl the sense of corporeal activity, motility, reality, and presence, whereas Erwin Straus stresses the absence out of which each touched object comes and into which it falls back again. MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY defines visuality itself as a palpation at a distance and describes the I-world relation according to a tactile model (Irigaray), as a chiasm in which the clear Husserlian distribution of the passive and active roles becomes ambiguous and is replaced by a universal reversibility. For Straus and MICHEL HENRY, there is no touch without movement. Henry develops Husserl’s principle of “I can” into

a fundamental mobility of the subject; this “ability-to-move-oneself” (*pouvoir-se-mouvoir*) is not merely empirical, but is an immanent force of life and of transcendental affectivity.

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE reinterprets tactile reciprocity as the existential-traumatic mood of nausea, in which the subject experiences the feeling of being touched by inanimate objects. Sartre’s and Gaston Bachelard’s dialectics of softness and hardness analyze in detail and with literary examples the feelings of consistency, depth, and resistance of matter. However, whereas Sartre is obsessed with negative tactile qualities (stickiness, mud) that—despite an apparent “obedience”—take the subject into possession, like some sort of revenge of the thing “in itself” (*en soi*) against the subject’s “for itself” (*pour soi*), Bachelard converts the tactile qualities from signifiers of a muscular force into positive symbols of intimacy and a happy regression to infancy.

Emmanuel Levinas, Henry, and JEAN-LUC MARION consider touch the key experience for differentiating things and humans. Still, in contrast to Levinas (for whom caresses have neither intention nor meaning inside of a horizon), for Marion touching people is overloaded with meaning (*geste saturé de sens*): namely, it transforms the passive body (*corps*) into living flesh (*chair*), and is therefore dematerializing. In its highest, Christian forms, touch loves and heals at the same time. Both Marion and Luce Irigaray suggest the possibility of religious knowledge through touching and being touched by God. Irigaray also grounds irreducible gender difference on a tactile experience; she focuses on the organic mucous substance (*le muqueux*), which is expandable but innumerable, tangible but invisible, and which multiplies the chiasms inside the female body.

M. Diaconu (✉)
Institute of Philosophy, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Phenomenology has taken smell and taste into consideration rather infrequently and incidentally, such as in Sartre's *L'être et le néant*, where taste and digestion exemplify the general dialectic of *en soi* and *pour soi*. Systematic analyses of these two sensory modalities are carried out by Hubert Tellenbach in his phenomenology of the oral sense (comprising smell and taste) and by HERMANN SCHMITZ with his theory of atmospheres. The sense of smell can be intransitive-emanative or receptive-transitive; the latter is further divided by Tellenbach into an aesthetic smell that provides pleasure and a theoretical smell that warns of dangers. Schmitz and Tellenbach conceive of "atmospheres" as the unity of the presence and the sense of an experienced reality. Atmospheres inspire confidence or distrust, are apprehended only if one "enters" them, and cannot be fully grasped by concepts. Feeling them spontaneously homogenizes the subject's mood and attunes it (Tellenbach: *einstimmen*) to the environment, even if one can to some extent maintain an inward distance from atmospheres and describe them.

Any attempt to work out an aesthetics of art forms apprehended by the secondary senses is rendered difficult by their ephemerality, synaesthetic inclination, embeddedness in the sociocultural field, and strongly hedonistic and vital character, as well as by terminological poverty, the immediacy of their effect on the perceiver, their loose structures, etc. Still, artistic and technical developments in the last decades—e.g., intersensorial installations and performances that address the body as a whole, Land Art, Eat Art, the "haptic-organic" or "weak" architecture that has rediscovered the tactile and olfactory dimensions of buildings and sites (Kenneth Frampton, Juhani Pallasmaa, Marc Crunelle), the awakening of a theoretical-aesthetic consciousness among perfumers (Edmond Roudnitska, Groupe Colisée), as well as the present Information Technology research on the secondary senses—indicate a vast, almost unclassifiable area of artistic and quasi-aesthetic phenomena awaiting an aesthetic theory. Such phenomena blur the original distinction between fine and applied arts, between beauty and "mere" pleasantness (MORITZ GEIGER), and render futile the search for a "pure" aesthetic consciousness and an isolated aesthetic value.

Instead of that, coming from a phenomenological perspective, Gernot Böhme has applied the concept of atmosphere to aesthetics and raised the possibility of modifying or deliberately creating "characters"

(moods) through an "aesthetic work" (in theater, design, gardening, architecture and urbanism, make-up, etc.). Issues similar to those of a phenomenological aesthetics of the secondary senses are also discussed in environmental and cultural aesthetics (Arnold Berleant), in Martin Seel's *Ästhetik des Erscheinens*, in ecological aesthetics, etc.

But above all, a phenomenological aesthetics that takes into account manifestations of all the senses and thus rehabilitates the "lower" senses (yet without seeking to reverse the former hierarchy of senses) would be related to the program of *Aisthētik*, which demands a return to aesthetics as the theory of sensory perception (Wolfgang Iser, Gernot Böhme). More precisely, such a phenomenological aesthetics would be grounded on a theory of the experience specific to each sense. For example, unlike sight and only partially like hearing, the secondary senses produce fragmentary or incomplete representations. Their subject is extremely active kinaesthetically, yet affectively more vulnerable than the seer. The traces left by such a subject (fingerprints, body smell) are at the same time strictly personal and impersonal, collective and involuntary. Beyond all differences between sensory modalities, their object (environment) is articulated as a map ("smellscape," etc.) that is like a dynamic field of attractive/repellent forces, or as a receptacle in which the subject is immersed and which can be filled or emptied. Time is essential for the secondary senses, particularly a time flowing slowly, in long processes of accumulation. Accordingly, their aesthetic apprehension requires a fine sense for differences and nuances; sensibility represents the primary condition of an aesthetics of the secondary senses.

Exemplary in this respect are the phenomena of patina, atmosphere, and aroma, which are originally related to the secondary senses, but may also be understood in a broader sense, as general aesthetic values. (1) Signifying the sensible modifications of artifacts caused by human touching or by weather, patina appears in all those art forms that use degradable materials, and often embodies time as a positive aesthetic factor. The aesthetic character emerges gradually through the "*cristallisation*" (Merleau-Ponty) or poetic condensation (*Verdichtung*) of infinitesimal traces left by anonymous agents, and conceals a history of the object. (2) The atmospheres emanated by certain places also literally condense the smells of

inhabitants, materials, and actions; metaphorically, the “air” refers to pervading, yet only vaguely describable moods. (3) Aroma circumscribes the infinitesimal details (*para micron*) of the aesthetic form, the “grain of salt” of a rhetorical-literary discourse, and the subtle deviation from standard—in brief, the aesthetic difference. In other words, following MIKEL DUFRENNE and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, aesthetic character is to be considered, structurally and dynamically, as a diacritical difference within a definite cultural field and as a quality that pervades and metamorphizes its environment. The aesthetics of the secondary senses, then, requires a “soft” hermeneutics, a contextual and complex interpretation, due to the sociocultural implications of these senses and to the “applied” character of their art forms. Finally, a theory of the secondary senses cannot completely avoid metaphorical language, and will have a particular and justifiable predilection for narratives and anecdotes.

Bibliography

- Bachelard, Gaston. *La terre et les rêveries de la volonté: Essai sur l'imagination de la force*. Paris: José Corti, 1948; *Earth and Reveries of Will: An Essay on the Imagination of Forces*. Trans. Liliana Zancu. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1975.
- Blayn, Jean François, et al., ed. *Questions de parfumerie*. Paris: Corpman, 1988.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Asthetik. Vorlesungen über Ästhetik als allgemeine Wahrnehmungslehre*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2001.
- Berleant, Arnold. *The Aesthetic Field: A Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas, 1970.
- Crunelle, Marc. *Toucher, audition et odorat en architecture*. Lanrodec: Scripta, 2001.
- Diaconu, Mădălina. “The Rebellion of the ‘Lower’ Senses: A Phenomenological Aesthetics of Touch, Smell, and Taste.” In *Essays in Celebration of the Founding of the Organization of Phenomenological Organizations*. Ed. CHEUNG Chan-Fai, Ivan Chvatik, Ion Copoeru, Lester Embree, Julia Iribarne, and Hans Rainer Sepp. Web-published at www.o-p-o.net, 2003.
- Diaconu, Mădălina. *Tasten, Riechen, Schmecken. Eine Ästhetik der anästhesierten Sinne*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005a.
- Diaconu, Mădălina. “Illusionary Touch, and Touching Illusions.” In *Analecta Husserliana LXXXVII. Human Reality Between Reality and Illusion*. Ed. Anna-Theresa Tymieniecka. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2005b, 115–26.
- Diaconu, Mădălina. “Patina—Atmosphere—Aroma: Towards an Aesthetics of Fine Differences.” In *Analecta Husserliana XCII. Logos of Phenomenology and Phenomenology of the Logos. The Creative Logos. Aesthetic Ciphering in Fine Arts, Literature and Aesthetics*. Ed. Anna-Theresa Tymieniecka. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2006, 131–48.
- Didi-Huberman, Georges. *L’empreinte*. Paris: Éditions du Centre Pompidou, 1997.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *L’œil et l’oreille*. Paris: Jean-Michel Place, 1991.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität. Texte aus dem Nachlass. Zweiter Teil: 1921–1928*. Ed. Iso Kern. *Husserliana* 14. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- Henry, Michel. *Incarnation: Une philosophie de la chair*. Paris: Seuil, 2000.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Éthique de la différence sexuelle*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1984; *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*. Trans. Carolyn Burke, Gillian C. Gill. London: Athlone Press, 1993.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totalité et infini: Essai sur l’extériorité*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1961, 286–99; *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. “Le dernier toucher.” In *Le toucher*. Ed. François-Bernard Michel, Marie-Christine Alquié, and Gilles Greck. Montpellier: Conseil Général de l’Hérault, 1993, 87–96.
- Pallasmaa, Juhani. *The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses*. London: Academy, 1996.
- Révész, G[éza]. *Die Formenwelt des Tastsinnes*. 2 vols. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1938; *Psychology and the Art of the Blind*. London: Longmans, Green, 1950.
- Roudnitska, Edmond. *L’esthétique en question*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L’être et le néant: Essai d’ontologie phénoménologique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1943; *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Schmitz, Hermann. *Der Gefühlsraum (System der Philosophie III/2)*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1969.
- Seel, Martin. *Ästhetik des Erscheinens*. Munich: Carl Hanser, 2000.
- Straus, Erwin. *Vom Sinn der Sinne. Ein Beitrag zur Grundlegung der Psychologie* [1935]. 2nd ed. Berlin: Springer, 1956; *The Primary World of Senses: A Vindication of Sensory Experience*. Trans. Jacob Needleman. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Tellenbach, Hubert. *Geschmack und Atmosphäre. Medien menschlichen Elementarkontaktes*. Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1968.

Gustav Gustavovich Špet (1879–1937)

Tatyana Schedrina

The term “phenomenological aesthetics” was never used by Špet. Yet his approach to aesthetic problems must be defined as phenomenological. As both an analysis of his published works and a historical reconstruction of his manuscripts in the archive show, his treatment of consciousness remained phenomenological throughout his creative work. It was particularly so in his hermeneutical turn toward objects of the cultural sciences, such as linguistics, history, philology, psychology, and aesthetics. Thus his version of phenomenological aesthetics might best be illustrated by his most significant and model works in this field, namely the *Эстетические фрагменты* (*Ehsteticheskie fragmenty*; *Aesthetic fragments*, 1922–1923), as well as his article “Проблемы современной эстетики” (“*Problemy sovremennoj ehstetiki*”; *Problems of contemporary aesthetics*, 1923).

Špet is an advocate of a philosophically grounded aesthetics that is not reduced to a mere psychology of aesthetic experience. Philosophical aesthetics should study aesthetic consciousness, both in its actual structure and in its relation to other kinds of consciousness. The subject matter of phenomenological aesthetics is to be found in the borderline sphere between the aesthetic object (*Gegenstandsphänomenologie*) and constitutive acts (*Aktphänomenologie*). Hence aesthetics is a “doctrine of aesthetic consciousness correlative to an ontological doctrine of the aesthetic object” (Špet 1989: 410–11), something that seems akin to ROMAN INGARDEN’s phenomenological aesthetics. The aesthetic object is a correlate to aesthetic consciousness,

which is one aspect among other aspects of cultural and historical consciousness as a whole.

This approach conforms to Špet’s general philosophical principles, which find their expression in three problematic: (1) problems of meaning and of the corresponding act of conceiving a meaning or sense; (2) problems of the socially and historically given being conceived as culture; and (3) problems of logic as a science of the word. Each of these three problematic is treated in the *Ehsteticheskie fragmenty* as well as in the “*Problemy sovremennoj ehstetiki*” and in Špet’s other works of the 1920s. But the fundamental approach or institution that determined his subsequent interpretation of aesthetic phenomena is already revealed in his early works.

While discussing EDMUND HUSSERL’s *Ideen I* (1913) in *Явление и смысл* (*Javlenie i smysl*; *Appearance and Sense*, 1914), Špet poses the problem of apprehending social being that can only be grasped through a verbal expression. The latter is given historically, and consequently demands an interpretation of its sense. A sense is not an abstract form, and is not given from outside. It is hidden in the depths of an object. “Understanding” as an immediate comprehension of sense constitutes the core of the logical contents of an act of thinking. This *posing a problem* leads him to an elaboration of hermeneutical principles, or, as he put it himself, principles of the “dialectical interpretation” of concepts expressed in a verbal form.

In the *Ehsteticheskie fragmenty* Špet defines the sphere of problems. In opposition to Husserl, who worked within the epistemological dimension of phenomenological problems, Špet seeks to develop phenomenology within the concrete problems of the social and cultural sciences. He seems to have actually introduced a new object of phenomenological research

T. Schedrina (✉)
Moscow Pedagogical State University, Moscow, Russia

in the context of the social world, i.e., the aesthetic, including the aesthetic attitude. Fundamental clarifications of the nature of the aesthetic object are given in the “Problemy sovremennoj ehstetiki,” and he discusses specific features of the aesthetic object while defining its ontological status. One specific particularity, as compared to the scientific, is its direction or tendency to become an object of fiction and detachment, i.e., an object outside the system of ideal relations and empirical reality. The aesthetic object is real, but it is a reality of a specific mode. He analyzes aesthetic consciousness as an object of social being. He defines aesthetic reality as a “quasi-reality” or “fictive reality” that is at the same time in correlation to empirical reality.

In his treatment of the aesthetic object, Špet moves away from the traditional way of posing the problem of the aesthetic as such in its relation to the problem of art. He immerses this problem in a hermeneutical context and proposes an analysis of the linguistic structure, which is where the real aesthetic object can only in fact be found. This also means that the most effective way of understanding the aesthetic object expressed in a word seems to be through a fundamental analysis of its verbal structure as a concrete whole. Separate thematic parts of this integral whole can more or less be developed, but they must be there, at least potentially, unless the whole falls apart. Therefore, in the second volume of the *Ehsteticheskie fragmenty*, he analyzes verbal structure in its relation to an aesthetic context, i.e., he reveals ontological layers hidden within the verbal structure itself; these ontological layers seem to have aesthetic significance. The phenomenological tendency of the research method directed toward the aesthetic object leads him to a revision of the problem of a correlation between form and content. It is not the form-content dichotomy as such taken in a purely theoretical approach that matters. What is at stake here is the problem of *understanding* this dichotomy in a concrete investigation. Within the phenomenological approach, the “form-content” problem is removed because the content of the aesthetic object given in a word is only possible within a system of forms and aesthetic content, and as such, is disposed according the stages of *inner forms* founding each other.

The concept of the “inner form of the word” is of major importance in Špet’s phenomenological aesthetics. He uses it to designate fundamental meaningful connections and relations. Under inner form he conceives stable algorithms of language, i.e., laws of

word formation. These forms are inherent not in language as such (as in Wilhelm von Humboldt), but rather in a word as a concrete object of the sociohistorical science of language. Špet does not accept the idea of an inner form of *language* as a ground for studying an aesthetic object, because he is quite aware of the fact that language as a phenomenon (as a whole) cannot be taken as a *unit* for an analysis of aesthetic phenomena. Some other “part” (i.e., a word) is needed here, for if we study an aesthetic object without a word, language loses its meaning or sense, as well as its major significant function as a context. In fact, while giving reasons for making a “word” the fundamental element for an analysis of aesthetic consciousness, he emphasizes the following indications. In the first place, a word is a “separate word,” i.e., “some final, indivisible part of language, an element of speech” (Špet 1996: 82). But then he clarifies that this separate word has a definite meaning or sense in every particular context. It is this relation, “word/sense” that becomes a fundamental element predetermining the subsequent course of his manner of posing aesthetic problems. The difficulty here is that a “word” has an additional meaning, namely, “a word is used in the meaning of entire speech, both oral and written.” This also means that the relation “word/sense” can be interpreted as a relation of “language (speech)/sense.” Thus a word is no mere reflection of some “preestablished order of being,” nor is it an instrument for constructing the whole world of being. A word is *dialectical* by nature. It is in this point that Špet’s hermeneutics and Hegel’s dialectics converge methodologically.

For Špet, the dialectical quality of a word acquires peculiar significance in the process of the formation of the concept of the “inner form of the word,” conceived as a system of relations providing a basis for a complex verbal structure wherein the very concepts of form and content, form and matter, wind up blending or interweaving, and in the end, losing their absolute character: the one becomes the other. The inner form is the law, and the path of its development is a movement contained in a word; it is a dynamic power that reflects the dynamic character inherent in the thought and activities of the human spirit. The inner form seems to be the creative element and to possess a great variety of different strategies: intensity of a sound, a morphological form, etc. Špet distinguishes between the logical and the poetic inner form. The logical form seems to be a law of forming a particular concept; it strives to

exhaust its sense and to explain all the possible ways in which it can be used. But it is the poetic inner form that actually bears aesthetic functions in a full sense, for it is this inner form that extracts a sense or a meaning from objective relations and includes it in other connections that are subordinated not to logic, but to phantasy. Thus inner poetic form can be motivated by the logical form without losing its primordial creative character. Where there is one logical form, there might be more than one inner form, e.g. “the earth is covered by snow,” “under snowy shrouds,” “under a blanket of snow,” i.e., diverse poetic forms are “threaded” on one logical form.

While analyzing inner poetic forms, Špet comes to the conclusion that it is necessary to distinguish an aesthetic sense of the word from its emotional concentration. Expressive nuances or shades of expressions do not, strictly speaking, contain in themselves an aesthetic sense, though they are present in artworks. Emotional concentration within a word or an expression corresponds to a cognitive act that Špet defies as “sympathetic understanding.” Expressiveness seems to be given in emotionally concentrated contacts; it presupposes a common context, i.e., a context of understanding. This “sphere of conversation” is a kind of metaphorical construction, which seems to allow him to specify a problem of communicative space in which more takes place than understanding and an interpretation of the word as a sign; in this communicative space or sphere the “I” itself, as a “social thing,” becomes the product of that space. Yet neither an investigation of “sympathetic understanding” nor the question of the significance of emotional effects of the work of art prevails in Špet’s aesthetic conception, for they are presented in a “scheme of further possibilities” of the development of aesthetic problems.

Špet’s aesthetic ideas invoked genuine interest in the Russian humanitarian community of the 1920s and 1930s and won a great number of followers. His semi-otic approach to phenomena of social being actually formed a basis for the methodological constructions of some prominent linguists and theoreticians in the field of poetic language (Grigoriy Vinokur, Boris Gornung, Rosaliya Shor, Roman Jakobson). At the same time, Špet’s project of the phenomenological investigation of artistic elements in art was taken up and developed by the Moscow phenomenological school “The Quartet” (Nikolay Volkov, Nikolay Zhinkin, et al.).

But due to objective reasons, further development of research in the field of phenomenological aesthetics in Russia was violently interrupted. Špet’s project of investigating aesthetic phenomena as “word signs”—a project he could not completely realize—was long buried in oblivion. Current interest today seems to be not only in Špet’s substantive analyses and in comparative analyses, but also in producing new research in the field of phenomenological aesthetics.

Bibliography

- Haardt, Alexander. “Gustav Shpet’s Aesthetic Fragments and Roman Ingarden’s Literary Theory: Two Designs for a Phenomenological Aesthetics.” In *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 27, 1991, 17–31.
- Haardt, Alexander. *Husserl in Rußland. Kunst- und Sprachphänomenologie bei Gustav Špet und Aleksej Losev*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink 1993.
- Гидини М.К. “Специфика эстетического предмета: отрешенное бытие у Шпета и у Бахтина.” In *Творческое наследие Густава Густавовича Шпета в контексте философских проблем формирования историко-культурного сознания (междисциплинарный аспект)*. Томск: Издательство Томского университета, 2003, 370–78.
- Кузнецов В.Г. *Герменевтика и гуманитарное познание*. М.: Издательство МГУ, 1991.
- Анонимous. “Об ‘эстетических фрагментах’ Г.Г. Шпета.” In *Начала* 1 (1992), 70–88.
- Шпет Г. Г. *Явление и смысл*. М.: Гермес, 1914.; *Gustav Shpet. Appearance and Sense: Phenomenology as the Fundamental Science and its Problems*. Trans. Thomas Nemeth, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- Шпет Г. Г. *Герменевтика и ее проблемы* In *Контекст. Литературнотеоретические исследования*. М., 1989–92.; *Gustav Špet Die Hermeneutik und ihre Probleme* [1918]. Ed. A. Haardt and R. DaubeSchackat. Trans. E. Freiburger and A. Haardt. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1993.
- Шпет Г. Г. *Эстетические фрагменты*. Вып. III. Пг.: Колос, 1922–1923.; *Сочинения*. М.: Издательство “Правда,” 1989, 345–472.
- Шпет Г. Г. “Проблемы современной эстетики.” In *Искусство* 1 (1923), 43–78.
- Шпет Г. Г. *Внутренняя форма слова: Этюды и вариации на темы Гумбольдта*. М.: ГАХН, 1927.
- Шпет Г. Г. *Язык и смысл*. *Логос* 7 (1996); *Логос* 1 (1998).
- Шпет Г. Г. *Язык и смысл*, Ч. I. Гл. VII. Вопросы философии 12 (2002).
- Шедрина Т. Г. “Я пишу как эхо другого...”: *Очерки интеллектуальной биографии Густава Шпета*. М.: Прогресс-Традиция, 2004.

Style

Andrea Pinotti

The theory of style was out of fashion for a while—for example, in *The Shape of Time* (1962), George Kubler requests that we avoid both the term and the concept—but in recent decades has come back to the center of the discussions within cultural studies (Gumbrecht-Pfeiffer 1986) and has become a major instrument of philosophical and scientific discourse (Frank 1992, Heinz 1986).

The history of the idea of style is quite ancient. There was a progressive generalization from the *stilus*, the stick for writing on wax tablets, to the *ductus*, the physical movement of handwriting, and finally to the way of writing, including writing on poetic and aesthetic issues (Sauerländer 1983). Already in the eighteenth century Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1789) opposed style to mimesis as a mere imitation of what is pregiven. He vindicated it as a cognitive category and it was extended to embrace a general anthropological modality, as is synthesized by the Count de Buffon's maxim "*Le style est l'homme même*" (1753). With Friedrich Nietzsche (1873, 1874) style refers to the artistic and cultural unity of all of the manifestations of a people.

The golden age of theorizing about style dates from the mid-nineteenth century. In 1860–1863 the architect Gottfried Semper published *Der Stil*, which was to become the term of comparison for the German-speaking *Kunstwissenschaft* around the turn of the century, an age of fruitful innovations for the so-called critical art historiography (Podro 1982) that exerted a remarkable influence much beyond its disciplinary field (Feyerabend 1983–1984). Semper's often misunderstood "materialistic" approach aims at emphasizing

the conditioning of materials and techniques on the development of styles, provoking theorists such as Heinrich Wölfflin and Alois Riegl to privilege a more "spiritual" reading of the phenomena of style. Still, all share a reference to anonymous bodily practices (vision and touch, hand and eye) operating at the base of figural representations.

Employing in a historical sense the descriptive categories adapted by the sculptor Adolf von Hildebrand (1893) from Hermann von Helmholtz's *Optik* (tactile vision related to a near image vs. optical vision related to a distant image), Riegl (1901) interprets ancient Egyptian art as tactile or haptic (*haptomai*, to touch) representation, based on the clear silhouette, as opposed to late Roman art, which is more optical and impressionistic, and is based on chiaroscuro effects. Similarly, Wölfflin (1888, 1915) distinguishes between a linear-tactile Renaissance and a pictorial-optical baroque period. But how should one understand the relation between bodily gestures and historical styles? Wölfflin was quite cautious. He recognized the variation of artistic representations as fact and declared himself doubtful as to the constancy of perceptive representation. *Kunstwissenschaft* thus *ascertains* a plurality of figurative styles and *suspects* that in their aesthetic nature such styles are correlated to perceptual styles, namely, tactile and optical.

Such an *aesthetic* question found opposed solutions in Erwin Panofsky and Walter Benjamin. Interpreting "aesthetic" in the sense of purely "artistic" and following neoKantianism, the former (1915) denies that the eye involved in Wölfflin's and Riegl's discourses is the physically perceptive eye. It is rather a metaphor hinting at cultural and historical stylizations, whereas the bodily eye in its physiological neutrality remains constant. Accepting an aisthesiological meaning of

A. Pinotti (✉)
Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano, Italy

“aesthetic,” the latter (1936) argues that during long historical periods what changes is not only figurative expression, but also perception. Both solutions are highly problematic. Panofsky seems to accept a dualism of nature vs. culture and a questionable physiological neutrality “before” any symbolization; Benjamin is not clear with regard to the changes of the sense organs and risks omitting the differences between perception and figurative representation.

Does phenomenology have anything to say about such an impasse? It is well known that EDMUND HUSSERL did not take much interest in aesthetics as a philosophy of art, nor was he much involved in artistic discussions. But starting from the main two Kantian axes of time (*Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins*, 1893–1917) and space (*Ding und Raum*, 1907), and also considering their relation with imagination and phantasy (see *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung*, 1980), Husserl was certainly deeply concerned with transcendental aesthetics as a theory of the conditions of possibility of sensuous experience. It is therefore important that in 1898 (see Husserl 1980: 120–23) he read von Hildebrand’s *Das Problem der Form in der bildenden Kunst* (1893), which emphasizes the necessity to consider in their essential correlation the *aesthetic* issues of artistic representation, on one hand, and on the other hand, the *aisthetic* issues of perception. This reading did not stimulate Husserl to develop a theory of art, but it certainly contributed to his reflection on the nature of the modifications of the positing of the world within artistic imagination and the artistic representation, which—as we know from his 1907 letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal—he conceived as closely similar to the phenomenological reduction because of the common suspension of positings of reality.

These circumstances are sufficient to make the following question legitimate: what does Husserl mean when he employs the term *Stil* in his writings? Is it a mere alternative to “modality” or “way,” which are often used in daily language as well, or does it assume the peculiar meaning of a *terminus technicus*? And if so, then in what sense? Certainly not in the sense of stylistics as a branch of linguistics or of the theory of literature and the visual arts. MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY (1969: 56) was sure of its peculiarity when he stated that “Husserl introduced the notion of *style* to translate our original relation to the world.”

Merleau-Ponty connects Husserl’s meaning of style to another fundamental concept, that of *Typik* or

typical scheme, a theme of infinite possible variations. The ultimate theme is the world insofar as we know it as a unity, although we always only perceive parts of it (Husserl 1931: §21), and this theme has its correlate, the body, in its typical identity: “the Body, throughout all the changes it undergoes, still remains within the compass of an *identity of type*” (Husserl 1952: §18c). Husserl therefore also designates as “style” the relation between world and body, as is expressed by the concept of attitude (*Einstellung*) in the following passage in the Vienna lecture:

Attitude, generally speaking, means a habitually fixed *style* of willing life comprising directions of the will or interests that are prescribed by this *style*, comprising the ultimate ends, the cultural accomplishments whose total *style* is thereby determined. The individual life determined by it runs its course with this persisting *style* as its norm. The concrete contents of culture change according to a relatively closed historical process. Humanity (or a closed community such as a nation, tribe, etc.), in its historical situation, always lives under some attitude or other. Its life always has its norm-*style* and, in reference to this, a constant historicity or development. . . . Universally considering the historicity of human existence in all its communal forms and in its historical stages, we now see that a certain attitude is essentially and in itself the first, i.e., that a certain norm-*style* of human existence (speaking in formal generality) signifies a first [type of] historicity within which particular factual norm-*style* of culture-creating remain formally the same in spite of all rising, falling, or stagnating. We speak in this connection of the natural primordial attitude, of the attitude of original natural life, of the first originally natural form of cultures, whether higher or lower, whether developing uninhibitedly or stagnating. All other attitudes are accordingly related back to this natural attitude as reorientations [of it]. (Husserl 1954: §1, italics added)

Quite similarly, Merleau-Ponty (1962: 327) has recourse to the concepts of style and typical scheme in order to characterize the whole body as a theme of all perceptual variations and the natural world as a typical structure of all intersensorial relations:

“The natural world . . . is the schema [*la typique*] of intersensory relations. . . . I experience the unity of the world as I recognize a style”; moreover, “The natural world is the horizon of all horizons, the style of all possible styles, which guarantees for my experiences a given, not a willed, unity underlying all the disruptions of my personal and historical life. Its counterpart within me is the given, general and pre-personal existence of my sensory functions in which we have discovered the definition of the body” (1962: 330).

The later work of Merleau-Ponty also keeps faith with the central role of the concept of style: “I am a

field of experience where there is only sketched out the family of material things and other families and the world as their common style, the family of things said and the world of speech as their common style, and finally the abstract and fleshless style of something in general" (1968: 110 f.). Its complex density was able to hint to him of the intertwining of the realm of ideas and the flesh of the world: "As the nervure bears the leaf from within, from the depths of its flesh, the ideas are the texture of experience, its style, first mute, then uttered. Like every style, they are elaborated within the thickness of being and, not only in fact but also by right, could not be detached from it, to be spread out on display under the gaze" (1968: 119).

Does such a phenomenological-aesthesiological meaning of style have any connection to style as it is understood in aesthetics as a philosophical reflection on art? It is necessary here to address Husserl's meditation on the theory of spatiality in its whole range: it embraces a wide temporal and thematic spectrum, from the preparatory notes taken for the publication of a *Raumbuch* (which his first arithmetic investigations had to develop), through the lecture course of 1907 collected under the title *Ding und Raum*, to the late phase of the 1930s examining a possible overturning ("*Umsturz*") of the Copernican doctrine in a text whose genesis and themes are close to the famous *Beilage III* of the *Krisis* devoted to the origin of geometry (1936). Yet throughout this complex path, Husserl certainly never focused on the link between the "natural" experience of space and its figurative rendering.

What attracted his descriptive attention was rather the relation between the constitutive processes of spatiality as developed within the context of the lived kinaesthetic body (*Leib*), on the one hand, and on the other hand, the objectivating rationalization of space as conceptualized in the natural sciences. The core of his discourse in the *Philosophische Versuche über den Raum* of the 1890s was the comparison between intuitive and geometrical space, both Euclidean and non-Euclidean (Husserl 1983: 262–310), while in the manuscript of the "*Umsturz*" (1934), the focus moves on to the relation between the irresistible inclination to geocentrism proper to our naive and natural intercourse with the spatial world, and the objectivating heliocentric correction performed by Copernicanism as a scientific truth.

Through forty years, in spite of this thematic shift, Husserl's effort remains constant in examining how scientific rationalization is prepared on the pre-categorical ground of the natural attitude, which is to be grasped not as a historical-chronological *terminus a quo* surpassed by the progressive processes of conceptualization, but rather as the genetic ground of sense to which we return again and again (*immer wieder*), reactivating it, as to an inevitable anchorage (*Ankergrund*) for the constitutive originarity of experience rooted in the *Leib*. Any modification of the natural attitude, any "new representation of the world" (included the scientific and theoretical one), must be verified in its legitimacy through a consideration of its genetic relation to this genetic ground.

Developing such indications offered by Husserl toward a phenomenological theory of style would hence mean understanding by "new representation of the world" not the *Weltanschauung* of the geometrical and natural sciences, but rather the *Weltanschauungen* of the figurative styles, i.e., of the different declinations of figurative space that followed one upon the other in the course of art history. Such a development would open a horizon of possible descriptions that could focus on each figurative style in such a way as to grasp its intimate correlation with the operative praxis of the lived body (as is somehow already suggested, although within a psychophysiological frame, by von Hildebrand, Riegl, and Wölfflin). Such a correlation between representation and figuration would therefore appear as a *variation* of that "solid style" (1934) in which—according to Husserl—the world is *immer wieder* constituted.

The comprehension of figurative style would hence be possible starting from the comprehension of the style of my vital processes (*Lebensstil*), a style that I am familiar with in its approximate typical scheme (*ungefähre Typik*—Husserl 1931: §54) beginning with those investigations into the perceptual world that could be collected under the title of "*transcendental aesthetics*" in a much wider sense than the Kantian one (*ibid.*: §61).

Husserl examines how geometrical spatiality (which in itself is never given as an object of intuition, but only of thought) is rooted in the intuitive experience of space (which in the concrete perceptual praxis is never given in its totality, but always in the dialectic of core and adumbration, of *Kern* and *Abschattung*,

promising and at the same time always indefinitely postponing a total intuition). And in the notes for the *Raumbuch*, he interprets geometry in its Euclidean version as the most direct idealization of natural spatiality, distinguishing it from the non-Euclidean geometries, which may be possible in a mathematico-formal sense, but lack a correlation to the prescientific experience of space.

In addition, Husserl argues in the *Prolegomena zur reinen Logik* (1900: §70) that if we call space the usual form of order of the world, it is naturally absurd to talk of spaces in which the axiom of the parallels is not valid. And equally absurd would be to talk of different geometries, since geometry is defined as the science of the space of the phenomenal world. But if we mean by space the *categorical form* of the world-space and by geometry, correlatively, the categorical form of the theory of geometry taken in the common sense, then space is subordinated to a genus, to be defined according to laws of variation determined in a purely categorical way. If we admit geometries of spatial varieties different from the Euclidean one, according to Husserl in the *Logische Untersuchungen*, this is possible only if their justification is based on an exclusively formal and categorical level.

Nonetheless, in a crucial letter to Paul Natorp (September 7, 1901), Husserl seems to remove such a limitation: "I admit (against my preceding opinion) the possibility of other intuitions of space that would lead to other idealized geometrical spaces" (Husserl 1983: 399). Here multiplicity and variety would involve not only the domain of pure categorical formalizations in the sense of ideal geometries, but also the ground of the concrete experience of spatiality as announced in the intuitive modalities of the constitution of the external world, a ground that Husserl subsequently called the *Lebenswelt* (lifeworld).

Transposed into the perspective of the phenomenology of style, such a project might consist in the attempt genetically to correlate the variety of figurative styles to the variety of the intuitive forms of spatiality. The history of the eye-categories (Wölfflin) or of the visual modalities (Riegl) should avoid the exclusive polarization between tactile and optical in order to embrace the wide spectrum of the operations of the lived body in its synaesthetic and kinaesthetic complexity (e.g., as suggested, with direct reference to Husserl's and MAX SCHELER's phenomenological analyses, by the art historian August Schmarsow in 1919).

The history of the artistic configurations related to the history of spatial experiences should be strictly linked to the theory of the general experience of space, both in its ortho-aesthetic and in its pathological structures, as was attempted in the 1930s, e.g., by Erwin Straus (1930, 1935). This is a direction that has been followed by HENRI MALDINEY. Elaborating on the phenomenologies of Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, and Straus—and also including MARTIN HEIDEGGER's ontological approach, on the one hand, and the suggestions of critical historians of art on the other—Maldiney (1967) aims at outlining a philosophy of style in terms of a theory of the rhythmic appearance of phenomena, resulting in an ontology of style. German *Kunstwissenschaft* entered the domain of contemporary French philosophical aesthetics, both phenomenological—cf. MIKEL DUFRENNE (1987)—and non-phenomenological (Deleuze 1981), thanks to Maldiney's writings.

In this way the oscillation that characterized Wölfflin's prudence would find a solution in the context of a historical-genetic investigation of style (both of the art-world and of the lifeworld), a solution that presents the task of infinite descriptions of ascending degrees of typical schemes, from the primary stage of the *Typik* regarding the simple perception of a sensible object, to the individual *Typik* of my *Lebensstil*, to the intersubjective and macrocultural *Typik* (including the domain of artistic styles), and finally to the style of humanity as a whole. And all of these levels are rooted in the pre-categorical and prescientific ground of the aesthetic *Typik*, of the style in which our bodies live on the earth, theme of infinite variations, of "coherent deformations" or "systems of equivalence" (Merleau-Ponty 1973: 61), of an *Ur-Stil* that is never given in itself, but always in perspective. And in fact Husserl explicitly talks of a "*perspektivischer Stil*" (perspectival style) and of "*der konkrete Erscheinungsstil*" (the concrete style of appearance) of the present lived world (1950 324).

This might be the task of a phenomenology of style, among whose most fruitful consequences we would have the obliteration of the rigid alternative between aesthetics as a theory of art and aesthetics as a theory of perception, since—as Merleau-Ponty (1973: 60; cf. 1952) very appropriately emphasizes—"perception already stylizes, that is, it affects all the elements of a body or behavior with a certain common deviation with respect to some familiar norm that I have behind me."

Bibliography

- Benjamin, Walter. "L'oeuvre d'art à l'époque de sa reproduction mécanisée" [1935]. Trans. Pierre Klossowski. In *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 5, 1936, 40–66; *Gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schwepenhäuser. Vol. 1/2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974, 709–39; "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." Trans. Harry Zorn. In his *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968, 217–51.
- Buffon, Georges-Louis Leclerc. Count of. *Discours sur le style* [1753]. In *Histoire naturelle générale et particulière*, Vol. 32/4 ("Suppléments à l'histoire naturelle de l'homme"). Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1777.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Francis Bacon: Logique de la sensation*, Paris: La Différence, 1981; *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith and Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *L'oeil et l'oreille*. Montreal: Éditions de l'Hexagone, 1987.
- Feyerabend, Paul K. "Science as Art." In *Art & Text* 12–13, Summer 1983–Autumn 1984, 16–46.
- Frank, Manfred. *Stil in der Philosophie*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1992; "Style in Philosophy." Trans. Julia Jansen and Michael K. Shim. *Metaphilosophy* 30 (1999), 145–67, 264–301.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. "Einfache Nachahmung der Natur, Manier, Stil." In *Der Teutsche Merkur*, February 1789; *Goethes Werke*, Vol. 12 Hamburg: Ch. Wegner, 1953, rpt. 1965, 30–4; "Simple Imitation, Manner, Style." Trans. Ellen von Nardroff and Ernest H. von Nardroff. In *Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. by John Gearey. *Collected Works*, Vol. 3. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Gumbrecht, Hans U., and Karl Ludwig Pfeiffer, eds. *Stil. Geschichten und Funktionen eines kulturwissenschaftlichen Diskurselements*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.
- Heinz, Rudolf. *Stil als geisteswissenschaftliche Kategorie. Problemgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Stilbegriff im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1986.
- Helmholtz, Hermann von. *Handbuch der physiologischen Optik*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Voss, 1856, 1860, 1867; 3rd ed., 1910; *Treatise on Physiological Optics*. Trans. James P. C. Southall. New York: Dover, 1962.
- Hildebrand, Adolf von. *Das Problem der Form in der bildenden Kunst*. Strasbourg: Heitz & Mündel, 1893; *The Problem of Form in the Fine Arts*. Trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikononou. In *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics 1873–1893*. Ed. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikononou. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994, 227–79.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Méditations cartésiennes*. Trans. Emmanuel Lévinas and Gabrielle Pfeiffer. Paris: Colin, 1931; *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge*. Ed. Stephan Strasser. *Husserliana* 1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950; *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*. Trans. Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1960.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch. Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Konstitution*. Ed. Marly Biemel. *Husserliana* 4. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1952; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Second Book. Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins (1893–1917)*. Ed. Rudolf Boehm. *Husserliana* 10. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966; *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*. Trans. John Barnett Brough. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ding und Raum. Vorlesungen 1907*. Ed. Ulrich Claesges. *Husserliana* 16. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973; *Thing and Space: Lectures of 1907*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen. Erster Band. Prolegomena zur reinen Logik* [1900]. Ed. Elmar Holenstein. *Husserliana* 18. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975; *Logical Investigations*. 2 vols. Trans. J. N. Findlay. New York: Humanities Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Studien zur Arithmetik und Geometrie. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1886–1901)*. Ed. Ingeborg Strohmeier. *Husserliana* 21. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Husserl, Edmund. "Die Welt der lebendigen Gegenwart und die Konstitution der ausserleiblichen Umwelt" [1931]. Ed. Alfred Schutz. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 6, 1946, 323–43; "The World of the Living Present and the Constitution of the Surrounding World External to the Organism." Trans. Frederick A. Elliston and Lenore Langsdorf. In *Husserl: Shorter Works*. Ed. Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981, 238–50.
- Husserl, Edmund. "Grundlegende Untersuchungen zum phänomenologischen Ursprung der Räumlichkeit der Natur Umsturz der kopernikanischen Lehre in der gewöhnlichen weltanschaulichen Interpretation" [1934]. In *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*. Ed. Marvin Farber. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968, 307–25; "Foundational Investigations of the Phenomenological Origin of the Spatiality of Nature." Trans. Fred Kersten. In *Husserl: Shorter Works*. Ed. Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981, 222–33.
- Husserl, Edmund. "Die Philosophie in der Krisis der europäischen Menschheit" [1935]. [Retitled "Die Krisis des europäischen Menschentums und die Philosophie."] In *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie*. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 6. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954, 314–48; "Philosophy and the Crisis of European Humanity." In his *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. An*

- Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970, 269–99.
- Husserl, Edmund. Letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal (December 12, 1907). In his *Briefwechsel*. Ed. Karl Schuhmann and Elisabeth Schuhmann. Vol. 7. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994, 133–36.
- Kubler, George. *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1962.
- Maldiney, Henri. “L’esthétique des rythmes” [1967]. In his *Regard, Parole, Espace*. Lausanne: L’Âge d’Homme, 1973, 147–72.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Ed. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. “Le langage indirect et les voix du silence” [1952]. In his *Signes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1960, 49–104; “Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence.” Trans. Richard C. McCleary. In his *Signs*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 39–83.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l’invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. “Le langage indirect.” In his *La prose du monde*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1969; “The Indirect Language.” In his *The Prose of the World*. Trans. John O’Neill. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973, 47–113.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen* (I. “David Strauss, der Bekenner und Schriftsteller” [1873]; II. “Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben” [1874]). In his *Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Studienausgabe*. Ed. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1988; “David Strauss, the Confessor and the Writer” and “On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life.” Trans. Reginald John Hollingdale. In his *Untimely Meditations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, 1–56, 57–124.
- Panofsky, Erwin. “Das Problem des Stils in der bildenden Kunst.” In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 10, 1915, 460–67; rpt. in his *Deutschsprachige Aufsätze*. 2 vols. Ed. Karen Michels and Martin Warnke. Berlin: Akademie, 1998, Vol. 2, 1009–18.
- Podro, Michael. *The Critical Historians of Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Riegl, Alois. *Die spätromische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn*. Vienna: Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1901; *Late Roman Art Industry*. Trans. Rolf Winkes. Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1985.
- Sauerländer, Willibald. “From Stylus to Style: Reflections on the Fate of a Notion.” *Art History* 6, 1983, 253–70.
- Schmarsow, August. “Kunstwissenschaft und Kulturphilosophie mit gemeinsamen Grundbegriffen.” In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 13, 1919, 165–90, 225–58.
- Semper, Gottfried. *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten, oder praktische Ästhetik* (1860–1863). Ed. Friedrich Piel. Mittenwald: Mäander, 1977; *Style: Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts, or, Practical Aesthetics*. Trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2004.
- Straus, Erwin. “Die Formen des Räumlichen.” In *Der Nervenarzt* 3, 1930, 633–56; “The Forms of Spatiality.” Trans. Erling Eng. In his *Phenomenological Psychology*. London: Tavistock, 1966, 3–37.
- Straus, Erwin. *Vom Sinn der Sinne. Ein Beitrag zur Grundlegung der Psychologie*. Berlin: Springer 1935, 2nd ed. 1956; *The Primary World of Senses. A Vindication of Sensory Experience*. Trans. Jacob Needleman. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1963.
- Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Renaissance und Barock. Eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien*. Munich: Ackermann, 1888; *Renaissance and Baroque*. Trans. Kathrin Simon. London: Collins, 1964, rpt. 1984.
- Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst*. Munich: Bruckmann, 1915; *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art*. Trans. Marie D. Hottinger. New York: Dover, 1950.

Theater

NUKI Shigeto

In order to clarify the fundamental condition for theater to be realized, phenomenology of theater analyzes how a theatrical performance is concretized with the words and bodies of actors. This mode of analysis is different from traditional philosophy or literary studies that identify theater with drama and focus almost exclusively on its structure. Aristotle even said that actors are not essential for drama. Contrary to the traditional view, phenomenology distinguishes theater from drama and analyzes the stage performance per se, which proves to be quite useful since “post-drama theater,” theater without drama, has been present in the development of modern theater since the beginning of the twentieth century.

After surveying some traditional theory of theater, the phenomenology of theater developed by ROMAN INGARDEN and Stanton Garner will be examined. In the context of modernism, the advantage of a phenomenological approach will be demonstrated for the basic (“transcendental”) structure of theater.

A dictionary of aesthetics characterizes theater in its multilayered structure. (1) Theater presents or represents drama, a dynamic flow of human events (or their description) dominated by destiny. (2) Drama is represented by means of the dialogue or monologue of actors on stage. (3) Theater is concretized by living human bodies. And (4) a theater piece is realized as a spatiotemporal construct presented for the audience. The first feature describes a theater piece as a kind of literary work, while the other features, especially the third and the fourth, can lead to a view of theater performance as a kind of plastic art.

It is not surprising, therefore, that literary studies stress the first feature, and traditional philosophy of theater differs little in this respect. In his theory of tragedy, Aristotle regards drama as a temporally structured unity with “beginning, middle, and end.” Drama consists of the actions of characters, while characters are shaped only through a story in which they are embedded. Tragedy terminates in discovery (*peripetēia*) that illuminates the weakness of human beings overcome by their fate, and the audience experiences ecstasy (*catharsis*) in the discovery. When the king of Thebes cries, “It was I who killed the former king!” in the tragedy of Oedipus, for example, the audience discovers the awful destiny involving the royal family, and, feeling deep sorrow with them, experiences ecstasy.

It is useful to see the phenomenological or existential views on theater in the work of JAN PATOČKA and JEAN-PAUL SARTRE in this context. According to Patočka, European philosophers from Aristotle to Hegel understood tragedy or drama in the light of the epos, which it grounds on objective morality (*Sittlichkeit*—Patočka 1987: 85 f.). Drama depicts a dark side of human being according to Hegel. Aristotle characterizes tragedy by catharsis instead of objective morality. In the modern age, especially since the beginning of the twentieth century, however, the objectivity of the epos loses its validity and, paradoxically enough, subjectivity has been regarded as the only ground of objectivity, as is observed, for example, in the novels of Dostoevsky.

While Aristotle suggests a static concept of drama in which the characters are determined by the story and involved in an overwhelming destiny, Sartre urges a dynamic concept of theater: the theater of situation. In the theater of situation, the individuals on

NUKI Sh. (✉)
Senshu University, Tokyo, Japan

stage are always forced to make a choice or decision after their own deliberation and finally to form themselves in a given situation, while the audience is required to commit itself to the choice presented on stage. Mirroring Sartre's philosophical claim that existence precedes essence, his theatrical works are called existential theater.

After existentialism declined, the text-oriented analytic method appeared in the 1970s. It is worth noticing that Aristotle's analysis can also be seen as the precursor of the formalist or structuralist text analyses of Vladimir Propp, Tzvetan Todorov, Claude Lévi-Strauss, or Algirdas Julien Greimas and others, on the one hand, and of the hermeneutics of HANS-GEORG GADAMER and PAUL RICOEUR, on the other hand. Greimas, for example, analyzes the narrative text as a construct with various contrasts of presupposition/conclusion or deficiency/satisfaction, while the hermeneuticists focus their attention on the mechanism by which the audience interprets the meaning of a work.

Since Aristotle, text analyses have certainly been useful in capturing the complexity of actions appearing one after another. We miss, however, the analysis of the performative aspect of theater. A theater piece is not completed with its textual meaning, but with its performance on stage realized through the voices and bodies of living actors. As Bert O. States (1985) says, those who are interested only in the meaning of the story of *Macbeth* can stay home and read the text.

States shows quite intuitively the use of phenomenology for understanding the formal structure of theater performance. Child actors in *Hercules and his Load*, for example, enjoyed a great success, but they owed their success to the phenomenological structure of "double vision" by the audience, which enabled them to *see* the non-identity of the characters represented and the appearance of actors representing them (States 1985: 31–2). The same also holds with a dog on stage that barks or yawns independently of the serious story played by human actors (*ibid.*: 33). According to States, semiotics, which regards the objects on stage solely as *signifiant*, should be complemented by phenomenology (*ibid.*: 6).

As the dictionary of aesthetics indicates, the theater piece as performance is concretized by means of the words and/or bodies of actors, which were analyzed phenomenologically by Ingarden and Garner respectively. For Ingarden, theater differs from other sorts

of stage performances, such as abstract dance, in that the world a theater piece produces exceeds the perceived objects on stage by means of the function of words. According to him, the world of theater consists of three dimensions: the actions or the appearances of actors and the objects that are *perceived* by the audience; a condition or a mental state of persons that are *perceived and mentioned by words* at the same time; and persons or events that are *only mentioned* but never appear on stage. In the case of Oedipus, the surprised face of the king is perceived visually, and his despair is indicated by his bodily expression and his words, while the situation in which the previous king was killed is only referred to by the words of Jocasta.

After determining the world of a piece in this widest range, Ingarden sorts out various functions of words inside and outside this world. *Inside* the world, words have four kinds of function. Words uttered by persons can be used to *present* something to another person, to *express* their state of emotion or thought, to *communicate* to each other, or to *influence* a person represented. The above-mentioned words of Oedipus can, namely, present an accident that occurred many years ago to another person on the stage, express the deep despair of the king, and thereby convey his emotion to his wife or daughters (communication), in order to alter the vision of his family members about the whole situation (influence). All these utterances, combined with each other, are regarded as actions comprising the sequence of a piece: every single utterance works as a step of communication or debate; even monologue can have its consequence, for example, in the self-influence involved in developing a person as a mature citizen.

The most important result of Ingarden's analysis is that all the functions mentioned of words have completely different effects on the audience, which, being *outside* the world of the piece in an aesthetic attitude, participates in the piece without taking any active action. No matter if the piece is open for the audience, as in ancient Greek tragedy or Shakespeare, or closed as in modern naturalistic works, where the audience and the stage are said to be separated by the "fourth wall," words used in theater pieces are organized to draw attention of the audience and control its emotion. The audience must accept the world as reality in unreality, must be led to be sympathetic with the person represented or the course of events, and finally, must be moved strongly by destiny, which involves the person represented, or at least moved to see harmony in

the course of the sequence, such as in the case of the pseudo-classical pieces of the eighteenth century.

In his general theory of literary works, Ingarden regards all words as multilayered: they have strata of sounds or higher phonetic formations, of meaning units, of schematized aspects of represented objects, and of represented objects. The four strata must work together so that a dramatic world is produced on stage appropriately: a word must be uttered in the right tone, for example, to avoid contradiction or inconsistency with the personality or mental state of the person represented, which is already established by the course of actions and utterances of the actor who represents it, because it is the tone that makes the sense (*"C'est le ton qui fait la chanson!"*).

This "anatomy" of theater allows us to evaluate theater works ontologically. Ingarden regards literary arts—including theater—that are constituted in the multilayered structure as an intentional objectivity in the most appropriate sense. According to him, both real and the ideal objectivity are autonomous, while the literary work is heteronymous, being dependent on human activity or creativity.

Though he is seen as producing the classic of phenomenological theater analysis, Ingarden himself regards theater as the "borderline case of literary works" (Ingarden 1965: 325), and lacks a serious analysis of theater as performance. But Stanton Garner characterizes theater as "bodied space," a space constituted and articulated by the bodies both of actors and audience, and also seeks to avoid the objection of deconstructionism against phenomenology. According to him, because the bodies of actors are involved in the duality of actual, physical bodies and of illusionary bodies, as Suzanne Langer maintained (1953: 44), their bodies are inevitably involved in different kinds of ambiguity.

For example, the actors' bodies on stage are not only the objects of the audience's observation, but are also habitual bodies, centers of a "ready-to-hand" nexus (*Zusammenhang des Zuhandenen*) in the sense of MARTIN HEIDEGGER (Garner 1994: 47), and centers furthermore of orientation in the sense of EDMUND HUSSERL's "*Kinästhesie*" or of MERLEAU-PONTY's "bodily existence" (*existence corporelle*), so that with the entry of an actor onto the hitherto empty, flat space of the stage, this space is oriented and articulated according to the habitual horizon projected by the body (ibid.: 46). Furthermore, the articulation

formed by an actor's body can be modified or doubled with the entry of another actor. The visible order presented for the audience can be disturbed when the actor looks at the audience, or the ambiguity of the actor's body can be stressed when the audience's gaze is made explicit. With all these structures, a peculiar ambiguity or oscillation around actors' bodies emerges (ibid.: 51).

Not only the phenomenology of a "normal" body, but also that of an "abnormal" body can aid our understanding of an avant-garde piece. The phenomenological description of a disordered body, e.g., Merleau-Ponty's description of the effects of mescaline, resembles the deformation of body and space on the stage of Samuel Beckett (ibid.: 34).

Beyond all these subtle analyses, the fundamental structure of theater is also clarified by analyses of bodies. Representing a character, the actors' actual bodies on stage are hidden from the audience, which watches only the character represented (ibid.: 44), while the bodies of the audience are not present for themselves either. Theatrical presentation is made possible by this structure of twofold nonpresence. In this, the phenomenology of theater can avoid the criticism of JACQUES DERRIDA in *La voix et le phénomène* (1967), where he claims phenomenology is a metaphysics of presence insofar as it tries to ground everything on the basis of presence.

Garner's analysis has the further merit of covering not only the classical theater pieces treated by Ingarden, but also the contemporary theater that begins in the 1960s. To see how phenomenological analyses of theater are useful to capture the development of theatrical activities since the end of the last century, however, a general view in a wider context is necessary: the transformation that the theatrical activities have undergone in these several decades can be observed as a branch of the wider development of art in general, namely the modernism movement.

To put it differently, the post-drama theater that appeared at the end of the twentieth century as the successor to the avant-garde movement prevalent since the beginning of the century is characterized by an apparent rupture with its predecessor. While not only the classical theater but also the avant-garde theater continued to focus on the drama or text as the essence of theater, the post-drama theater regards the text but as one of the components of the stage, which also include not only the words or the bodily movement of actors,

but also lighting, costume, stage setting, and so on (Lehman 1999). As a result, while the classical modern theater uses the words or the bodies of actors as the medium to represent or to express a drama in narrative form, post-drama theater sheds light on the medium, which no longer has a representing function.

Through a slow-motion body in beautiful scenography, Robert Wilson has shown scenes with dramatic density or sometimes even with a “hypnotic” effect (Levin 1975–1976) without appealing to any narrative story. Ariane Mnouchkin of *Théâtre du Soleil* has stressed dramatic density with strong ensemble movements. Tadeusz Kantor has presented personal history with statue-like figures carried by each actor. The movement of “drama reading” brings the voice articulated by words to the fore. And we cannot omit the metatheater of Heiner Müller, etc. Post-drama theater is, in short, a theater that got rid of narratives. On the one hand, this secession from narrative is parallel to the “end of great narrative” in the postmodern situation; on the other hand, however, it has been accelerated by another great movement, the modernism movement, as mentioned above.

It is Clement Greenburg (1966, 1970) who developed the discourse of modernism in the field of fine art. According to him, the history of the fine arts since the end of the nineteenth century can be regarded as the process where the ideal of modernism was sharpened. Referring to Kant, he maintains that the ideal of modernity lies in self-criticism: In the field of art, self-criticism took the form of reflection to find the essence of each art genre. The “essence” of a genre means something that is indispensable to the genre concerned that, however, is not to be found in any other art genre. Because works of different genres can easily share a theme or subject, the pursuit of essence cannot but lie in the purification of the medium used to represent the subject. As a result, modernist arts led to a reflection on the medium that characterizes each art genre. On the other hand, modernity was the time when people were obsessed with the continual search for something new, as Jürgen Habermas (1985) has said. These two motors of the modern accelerated the modernism movement in every art genre.

In the fine arts, which since impressionism have rejected sharp-edged contour and display light and shadow as conditions of perception, various new styles appeared one after another that unceasingly denied the canons held by the former generations as orthodoxy

and sought to discover the medium of painting in a more purified way than in the earlier phases of development. Cubists such as Georges Braque, who wrote alphabet letters on canvas, have made the tension visible between three-dimensional space represented by the surface and the two-dimensional surface representing the space. Abstract expressionists such as Kandinsky gave up drawing three-dimensional things and presented the contrast or the harmony of shape and color on the two-dimensional surface of canvas. Finally, minimalists such as Barnett Newman have presented only huge monochromatic surfaces.

David Michael Levin has applied Greenburg’s idea to dance. According to him, modernism in dance is represented by the formalism of George Balanchine: Balanchine’s pieces, such as *Serenade* or *Symphony in C*, make a strong contrast with those of classical ballet, such as *Swan Lake*, or of modern dance, such as Martha Graham’s *Night Journey*, which use bodily movement represent something outside the stage. The formalistic pieces of Balanchine, which are said to be “visible music, acoustic movement,” are modernist in the sense that the medium of dance is presented in its purest form, namely, the forms built by dancers’ bodies and the dynamics of their movement. Because audiences see the full-blooded bodies of dancers as well, there exists a peculiar ambiguity of illusion and living body on stage, which Levin regards as the medium of dance.

It is not surprising, therefore, that post-drama theater such as the works mentioned by Wilson, Kantor, or Mnouchkin, which emphasize the medium of theater, appeared in the 1990s. This is to be considered as the realization of the modernist movement in the field of theater.

Now we come to the clarification of the development of theatrical activities with phenomenological instruments. In the situation where post-drama theater has appeared, for theater to be theater, what is important is neither what it represents, nor how it represents something, but the fact of presentation itself. The mechanism of the presentation cannot be analyzed with the philosophical traditional since Aristotle, but only with the phenomenological method of Edmund Husserl, which can clarify the diversity of post-drama theater as well.

It is noticeable that both Ingarden’s analysis, which discovers the different functions of the same words inside and outside the world of a piece, and Garner’s

analysis of bodies as objects and centers of orientation are both based on the duplication of words or bodies. The mechanism of duplication and its significance for artworks can be clarified with Husserl's help.

The phenomenological analysis of the work of art in terms of the theory of image-consciousness (*Bildbewusstsein*), is the only type of analysis that has been mentioned in the phenomenological literature. Yet by about 1918, Husserl had developed another analysis that can be called the theory of "perceptive fiction" (*perzeptive Fiktion*—Husserl 1980: 515). While the old theory applies only to traditional pictures, which depict something outside the canvas in three-dimensional space, his new theory has the advantage of covering paintings without a subject (*Bildsujet*), such as abstract expressionism or minimalism, and also of being relevant for literature and theater pieces.

When we observe a painting of a landscape, the figures of mountains or woods are surely perceived, but they do not exist in the museum room. They are only in this room as a perceived fiction. Perceptive fiction is constituted through a "consistent unity" (ibid.: 587), a "unitary formation" (ibid.: 524), or a synthesis of appearance that is cut off from the ordinary course of perception with kinaesthetic synthesis and restricted within a frame (*Rahmen*) of a piece (ibid.: 588). A perceptive fiction is surely awakened (*erregt*) by a physical condition, but the perceptual content of physical objects is concealed (*verdeckt*) by perceptive fiction (ibid.: 516–17). We have double perceptual apprehensions (ibid.: 519), but because the physical perception has only the function of awakening perceptive fiction and is to be concealed, we are shifted (*versetzt*) into a perceptive fiction or "artistic illusion" (ibid.: 516).

In the case of theater pieces, like *Richard II* or *Wallenstein*, the gesture, the mime, and the appearance of actors produce (*erzeugen*) a tragicomic course of events, so that audiences are shifted into artistic illusion, which conceals the content of physical perception concerning the actors or stage setting. The theater building works as the "frame" to avoid any confusion of actual perception with the perception awakened through the stage performance. Thus Husserl writes, "when we visit a theater, we understand the intention completely, so that we can only enjoy performances and aesthetic satisfaction" (ibid.: 518).

Put in the context of modernism and the further development of theater activities, Husserl's analysis can account not only for the diverse evolution of

theater, but also for its transfiguration. For this purpose, however, it is illuminating to compare different sorts of stage performance in the light of this phenomenological instrument.

The structure that Husserl calls perceptive fiction can also be observed in the mechanism that Levin has discovered in the case of dance: theater and dance share the same mechanism of perceptive fiction or illusion awakened by bodily activities of performers, but the structure of the illusion differs in each case.

Illusion or perceptive fiction in ballet can be regarded as a *perceptual* gestalt. A gestalt is a consistent figure that emerges from within the relationship between elements yet exceeds the total sum of elements and makes a clear contour thanks to the figure-ground relationship with its surroundings. In the case of the *arabesque* in ballet, for example, the figure made by the arced line from the raised foot through the curved back to the stretched arm and the foot piercing the floor forms a perceptive gestalt, where a new dimension of illusion emerges.

Physical human bodies play the same role as triggers of illusion in the case of theater as in dance, which is concealed by the gestalt or perceptual fiction as well. However, the Gestalt produced by actors is not a perceptive, but a *narrative* gestalt formed by the story that obeys the principle of three unities or the condition of the pregnancy of narrative analyzed by Greimas. Phenomenologically seen, the narrative gestalt is not a representation that depicts (*abbilden*) an event or a person already existing outside the stage, but is formed (*erzeugt*) and presented by the words or the actions of actors, and experienced by the audience.

It is often said that the semiotic difference between the objects on stage as *signifiant* and the events or the person represented as *signifié* is essential for theater, but does not hold for dance. Phenomenologically seen, however, the double vision awakened by bodily movement can be observed in both dance and theater, and even the narrative gestalt has its function in several pieces of dance, such as a number of works in classic ballet or modern dance. Narrative dance pieces and theater pieces are structured both by perceptual gestalts and by narrative gestalts, but the two sorts of gestalts are located in different places within the figure-ground structure of the stage. In narrative dance pieces, the perceptive gestalt formed by the dancers's bodies works as figure, while in theatrical pieces the narrative gestalt appears as the figure. The semiotic

difference, which characterizes theater in contrast to dance, is formulated only after this phenomenological structure sets to work.

Now Husserl's analysis leads to a radical transfiguration of our view of theatrical performance. Theatrical performance was traditionally understood as a realization of drama with actors, where drama or text plays a role of "ideal essence," as if theater performance were its "concrete individualization," or at best with a "medium/subject" model, where words or bodies were regarded only as the medium to represent a world of drama as signified. In light of Husserl's analysis, however, theater can be understood as a structural whole in which narrative, words, bodies, or other stage components such as costume, lightning, or setting are embedded. In this structure, the words, bodies, and other components work as the physical triggers that produce the duality of perception. It is no surprise, then, that in the course of the modernist movement, instead of narrative as represented, other components have been brought to the fore to show the "essence" of theater in its purified form. And the movement has accordingly led to the countless variations of style in post-drama theater, where bodies, words, scenography, or the existence of actors are adopted one after another to awaken in each case different sorts of illusion or perceptive fiction.

If it is correct to regard theater as a structural whole with narrative, words, bodies, and other elements, then the course of the "development" of theater from classical or modern theater via avant-garde theater to post-drama theater can be regarded as a process of the transfiguration of structural constellations, where some components are emphasized one after another while others are withdrawn in a different manner in each case. The movement itself, however, proves to be a spontaneous transformation in consistency, as Merleau-Ponty would say, so that in the 1990s even a theater without illusion appeared—which was possible, however, only against the background of a long history of theater with illusion.

Paradoxically enough, the more the "essence" of a genre was pursued, the less distinct the borders of each genre became. Because everything, including lighting or setting, can be the trigger of illusion, a theatrical performance can come quite close to plastic art or dance. In this contemporary situation, the borders between genres are relevant only in the institutional sense.

The phenomenology of theater shows us the dimension where the traditionally accepted separation of various genres loses its legitimacy and many hidden paths from one genre to another come to light. Hence it enables us to perceive the horizon for the coming theater to develop. To see the possibility of a phenomenological analysis of theater in its full-fledged form, however, we must analyze each performance or author concretely to find the phenomenologically relevant structures (see Tymieniecka 1982, 1984), which remains a task to be done.

Bibliography

- Derrida, Jacques. *La voix et le phénomène*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967; *Speech and Phenomena*. Trans. David Allison. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Garner, Stanton B. Jr. *Bodied Space: Phenomenology and Performance in Contemporary Drama*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Greenberg, Clement. "Modernist Painting" [1966]. In *Modern Art and Modernism: A Critical Anthology*. Ed. Francis Francina and Charles Harrison. London: Open University Press, 1982, 85–93.
- Greenberg, Clement. "After Abstract Expressionism" [1970]. In *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism*, Vol. 4. Ed. John O'Brian. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, 121–34.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass 1898–1925*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk. Mit einem Anhang von den Funktionen der Sprache im Theaterschauspiel*. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1965; *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks* [1937]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1968; *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Langer, Susanne K. *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953.
- Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatisches Theater*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Autoren, 1999.
- Levin, David M. "The Embodiment of Performance." In *Salmagundi* 31–32, 1975–1976, 120–142.
- Merleau-Ponty. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.

- Patočka, Jan. "Das Epische und das Dramatische, Epos und Drama" [1966]. In his *Kunst und Zeit. Kulturphilosophische Schriften*. Ed. Klaus Nellen and Ilja Srubar. Trans. Ilya Srubar, Vera Srubar, et al. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987, 85–98.
- Pavis, Patrice. *L'analyse des spectacles*. Paris: Éditions Nathan, 1996.
- Rayner, Alice. *To Act, To Do, To Perform: Drama and the Phenomenology of Action*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Roselt, Jens. *Phänomenologie des Theaters*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2008.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Un théâtre de situations*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973; *Sartre on Theater*. Trans. Frank Jellinek. New York: Random House, 1976.
- Schechner, Richard. *Performance Theory*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Smith, Jadwiga S. "A Theory of Drama and Theater: A Continuing Investigation of the Aesthetics of Roman Ingarden." In *Analecta Husserliana* 33. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991, 3–62.
- States, Bert O. *Great Reckonings in Little Rooms: On the Phenomenology of Theater*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa. "The Spectacle of Life upon the Stage of the World." In *Analecta Husserliana* 73. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 2001, xii–xxii.
- Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa., ed. *The Philosophical Reflection of Man in Literature*. *Analecta Husserliana* 12. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1982.
- Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa., ed. *The Existential Coordinates of the Human Condition: Poetic, Epic, Tragic*. *Analecta Husserliana* 18. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1984.

France Veber (1890–1975)

Dean Komel

Veber's major work in the field of aesthetics, which is believed to be his most important philosophical work, was published in 1925 under the title *Estetika: Psihološki in normativni temelji estetske pameti* (Aesthetics: Psychological and normative grounds of aesthetic reason). According to him, this work follows systematically from his *Etika. Prvi poskus eksaktne nagonске pameti* (Ethics: The first attempt of the exact instinctive reason, 1923). In *Estetika*, as in all his works of 1921–1925, he first critically develops the philosophical doctrine of his Graz teacher Alexis Meinong, the establisher of the so-called "*Gegenstandstheorie*" (object theory), which represents the Austrian strand of phenomenology. In this respect the main stress is put on the systematically developed theory of the irreal gestalt (Sajama: 2005).

The work consists of the "Introduction" and four parts, "Psychology of Basic Aesthetic Experience," "Psychology of Complex Aesthetic Experience," "Normative Aesthetics," and "Art." The introduction follows a foreword in which Veber already responds to the reviews of critics who were able to read the book in advance, among them Alma Sodnik, Veber's assistant at the University of Ljubljana. He was the first to present Veber's aesthetics abroad, and at the same time developed Veber's views on aesthetics further.

Veber analyzes aesthetic experience as grounded in aesthetic emotion, with representation being its indispensable psychological foundation, while it is at the same time directed to what representation objectively represents as basic. The basis is the appropriated

object of the aesthetic emotion, whereas its own object coincides with aesthetic value as represented through emotion. The representational bases can be material, figurative, and relational, but only gestalts can form appropriated aesthetic objects. Their facticity is independent of the facticity of the lowest object base, that is to say, their genuine representation does not demand the genuine representation of the lowest psychological bases.

The irreal gestalt theory forms the core of all Veber's further analyses of aesthetic phenomena, such as basic aesthetic gestalts, aesthetic categories, the relationship between the aesthetic and the non-aesthetic, and the classification of the arts. *Basic aesthetic gestalts* are classified according to the quality of the indispensable object grounds. *Aesthetic categories* are always given together with complex gestalts, while their disposition depends on the way the gestalt rests on object bases. In this context, he establishes *analytic relationships* between aesthetic and other types of emotions and the corresponding desires (hedonistic, logical, axiological, eleutheric, and hagiological), which can all form the basis for aesthetic emotions. There is an empirical associative link between aesthetic and other emotions precisely where the aesthetic emotion does not reveal values in the irreal gestalt itself, but rather in the phenomena outside the gestalt, which he terms "parallel feeling." On this ground, he can clearly distinguish between the aesthetic and the extra-aesthetic field of experience. And he advocates the universality of aesthetic objects in that any phenomenon can become the basis for an irreal gestalt.

After elaborating these psychological-analytic theses, Veber moves on to the normative side of aesthetics with aesthetic judgment as the first issue. He writes in favor of the nonpsychological notion of beauty, which

D. Komel (✉)

Department of Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

is not tied solely to emotionally subjective experience. Beauty is a phenomenon of its own; the relationship between beauty and the irreal gestalt is the relationship between a higher- and a lower-level object. In this respect, he criticizes the psychological notion of the correctness and incorrectness of aesthetic judgment. Here he introduces into the field of aesthetics his theory of the autonomy and heteronomy of rational experience. The autonomy or correctness of the representation of the irreal gestalt implies that its genuineness stems from the facticity of the irreal gestalt, whereas incorrectness and heteronomy imply that its genuineness stems from secondary psychological factors. And the same applies for aesthetic emotion itself.

His advocacy of the objective criterion for aesthetic judgment and values leads Veber into the realm of the "logic of aesthetic reason," by which he has in mind the disposition for inner autonomous and genuine aesthetic feeling, analogous to cognition. Just like logic, which provides the ground for reason, aesthetics is supposed to provide in its normative aspect the basic axioms of aesthetic reason. Its axioms rest on the distinction between autonomous (correct) and heteronymous (incorrect) aesthetic feeling.

In the last and least developed part of the *Estetika*, Veber concentrates on general issues, introducing among other things his critique of Bergson's theory of laughter, and devotes special attention to the structure of artistic creation and the function of art. He attributes a triple function to art: (1) an aesthetic function, in that art realizes irreal gestalts; (2) a biological function, in that it ennobles human beings by liberating them from confinement in emotions and passions; and (3) the function of bridging the gap between science and religion. Here Veber introduces his notion of transcendence as the fundamental mystery of the universe. In contrast to religion and science, which approach transcendence in a correctly differentiating manner, art strives for transcendence in a correctly indifferent manner, and by doing so functions as the mediator between science and religion. The claim that artistic creation is a realization of the bases of the irreal figure gestalt implies that it is genuine only if transcendence dwells in the bases of the irreal gestalt as the unrecognizable ground of all actuality. Art can reach this realm insofar it has no cognitive interest in it; it reaches it in its disinterestedness.

In her work *Zgodovinski razvoj estetskih problemov* (Historical development of aesthetic issues, 1928),

Veber's student Alma Sodnik undertakes a broader interpretation of his theory of aesthetics, including the historical context that to a great extent is missing in Veber. Individual treatises lay particular stress on Veber's theory of the irreal gestalt, placing it within the context of the extant theories of the gestalt, especially in gestalt psychology. After Veber's forced retirement in 1945, interest in his phenomenological aesthetics declined.

Interest was finally reawakened in the beginning of the 1970s by the literary theorist and philosopher Dušan Pirjevec, renowned for his original theory of the European novel (Pirjevec: 1979), where he related MARTIN HEIDEGGER's thinking of Being to Hegel's aesthetics and to contemporary phenomenological theory of art in ROMAN INGARDEN, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE, and MIKEL DUFRENNE, as well as to structuralist critics. This is where his interest in the reactualization of Veber's aesthetics in the direction of "overcoming aesthetics itself" stems from (Pirjevec 2004), insofar as the basic concepts of aesthetics are rooted in Western metaphysics itself. He saw the opportunity for this in Veber's concept of transcendence as related to a hagiological feeling of the fundamental mystery of the entire universe, which is presupposed by philosophy and evoked by art. According to Pirjevec, this forms the analogy with Heidegger's conception of ontological difference and with the possibility of grasping beauty from the experience of Being as such, understood as *aisthēsis* in the original pre-aesthetic and premetaphysical sense. In this context he reinterprets aesthetic disinterestedness as the disclosure of Being.

In his notes to Pirjevec's study of Veber's *Estetika* in 1989, Ivan Urbančič emphasizes that Pirjevec brought Veber's aesthetics to the ultimate articulation of its possibilities, and simultaneously criticizes Pirjevec's understanding of Veber's notion of transcendence in relation to the Heideggerian concept of ontological difference—and with it, the possibility of transcending the metaphysical framework of aesthetics, where, in his opinion, the emphasis on the irreal gestalt renders the experience of beauty as the disclosure of Being impossible (Urbančič: 2004).

In his reception of Veber's and Pirjevec's aesthetic thought, Tine Hribar points to the necessity of distinguishing between the aesthetic object and the work of art, which essentially implies the dimension of the "holy play of the world" (Hribar 1990). His insights into the structure of the work of art were further

developed in his interpretations of Slovene literature and of the painting of Janez Bernik (Hribar 2002).

Dean Komel discusses Veber's aesthetics within the context of the artistic revolutions of the twentieth century, bearing witness to the crisis and overthrow of humanity in general (Komel: 2003). He draws attention to the element of destruction, which is characteristic both of poetic approaches to twentieth century art and of the method of phenomenological philosophy. Despite destruction, however, contemporary art still manages to preserve the mysterious character of existence, thus acquiring the existential form of the labyrinth.

Despite Pirjevec's attempt at the reactualization of Veber's aesthetics, which drew attention to its key issues, there remains the question of whether it is at all capable, in its subjectivist starting point, to bear witness to art as the event. In Veber's time, this question was raised particularly due to the advent of avant-garde movements. In 1924, Ljubljana saw the constructivist exhibition, which Veber's *Estetika* explicitly mentions. Srečko Kosovel, the leading avant-garde poet, attended Veber's lectures. The relevance of the question became evident in the 1960s, with the advent of neo-avant-gardes, when Dušan Pirjevec felt the need to reactualize Veber's aesthetics. Here we can bear in mind the congeniality of Veber's approach with the hermeneutical transformation of philosophical aesthetics as evinced by HANS-GEORG GADAMER in his *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960); with the semi-otic theory of art (Umberto Eco, Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva); and with the sociocritical theory of avant-gardes (Peter Berger), which all open up the possibilities for postmodern views of art. Obviously, the problem is rooted in the very philosophical presuppositions of the formation of the aesthetic theory of art (Kante 2001), so that our path of thinking eventually leads back to Hegel's aesthetics.

The attempts at freeing aesthetics from a philosophical framework and placing it in an independent position can be traced particularly in the phenomenological and structuralist theories of aesthetics (Lotman, Mukařovský). On the other hand, these attempts are, in their postmodernist variant, closely related to the aesthetization of life forms, which can be the subject of philosophical and social criticism. The second question in this context is the relationship between artistic creation and technological production of art, which cannot be solved within the field of psychology or

sociology of creativity; rather, this takes us back to the question of the meaning of humanity in general.

Bibliography

- Barthes, Roland. *Le degré zéro de l'écriture*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972; *Writing Degree Zero*. Trans. by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill & Wang, 1977.
- Berger, Peter. *Theorie der Avantgarde*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974; *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Trans. by Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Eco, Umberto. *Opera aperta*. Milan: Bompiani, 1962; *The Open Work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Hribar, Tine. *Sveta igra sveta: Umetnost v post-moderni dobi*. Ljubljana: Slovenska Matica, 1990.
- Hribar, Tine. "Die Freundschaft mit der Einsamkeit." In *Einsamkeiten. Janez Bernik*. Ljubljana: Nova Revija, 2002, 47–59.
- Kante, Božidar. *Filozofija umetnosti*. Ljubljana: Jutro, 2001.
- Komel, Dean. "Fenomenologie, umění a krize evropského lidství." In *Fenomenologie v pohybu*. Ed. Ivan Blecha. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2003, 69–2.
- Komel, Dean., ed. *Kunst und Sein. Beiträge zur Phänomenologischen Ästhetik und Aletheiologie*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2004.
- Lotman, Jurij. *Struktura hudožestvennogo teksta*. Moskva: Iskusstvo, 1972; *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Trans. Ronald Vroom. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977.
- Mukařovský, Jan. *Estetická funkce, norma a hodnota jako sociální fakty*. Prague: Borovy, 1936; *Aesthetic Function, Norm, and Value as Social Facts*. Trans. by Mark E. Suino. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1970; rpt. 1979.
- Pirjevec, Dušan. *Evropski roman*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba, 1979.
- Pirjevec, Dušan. "Ein Schritt über die Grenze der Veberschen Ästhetik und Ästhetik überhaupt." In *Kunst und Sein. Beiträge zur Phänomenologischen Ästhetik und Aletheiologie*. Ed. Dean Komel, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2004, 107–16.
- Sajama, Seppo. "Veber's Concept of Unreal Gestalt." In *Anthropos* 1/4, 2005, 13–20.
- Sodnik, Alma. "Vebrov estetski sistem v luči tradicijskih estetskih teorij." *Ljubljanski Zvon* 40, 1926, 124–30, 198–211.
- Sodnik, Alma. *Zgodovinski razvoj estetskih problemov*. Ljubljana: Znanstveno Društvo za Humanistične Vede, 1928.
- Sodnik, Alma. "Franz Webers System der Ästhetik." In *Archiv für systematische Philosophie und Soziologie* 34, 1930, 230–66.
- Urbančič, Ivan. "Die Frage der Ästhetik." In *Kunst und Sein. Beiträge zur Phänomenologischen Ästhetik und Aletheiologie*. Ed. Dean Komel, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2004, 117–32.
- Veber, France. *Estetika: Psihološki in normativni temelji estetske pameti*. Ljubljana: Zvezna Tiskarna in Knjigarna, 1925; 2nd ed. Slovenska Matica, 1985.

Virtual Reality

Christian Rabanus

Since virtual reality already plays a role (and can be expected in future to play an ever larger one) in art and several other domains of public interest, it needs to be understood by aestheticians. The goal of this article is to provide such a basic understanding.

The adjective “virtual” is derived from the Latin “*virtualis*,” an adjective of “*virtus*” that means “manhood,” “strength,” and “virtue.” Thomas Aquinas used “*virtualiter*” in his writings about causality to designate one kind of “being contained in” in opposition to “*essentialiter*,” “*materialiter*,” and “*actualiter*.” From the French “*virtuel*,” the word “virtual” was formed as a loan-word. Since the fourteenth century, the Latin “*virtualiter*” and then the English “virtual” were often used synonymously with “implicit.” According to *Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary*, “virtual” means “being such in essence or effect though not formally recognized or admitted.”

The adjective “real” is borrowed from the medieval Latin “*realis*,” which signifies “essential,” and which itself is derived from “*res*,” which signifies “thing,” “object,” or “being.” John Duns Scotus coined the meaning of “*realitas*” as a set of properties that constitute the essence of a thing (the German “*Sachhaltigkeit*,” sometimes translated as “substantiality”). For him, the “*realitates*” did not have an independent existence, but added elements to the complete determination (“*quidditas*”) of a thing as “*realitates rei*.” This meaning has all but disappeared in modern English. The adjective “real” is nowadays often used in opposition to “artificial,” “fraudulent,” “illusory,” or “apparent,” and means something like “occurring in

fact.” “Reality” as a noun formed from “real” means—as the *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* puts it—“the quality or state of being real.” The words “reality” and “actuality” are often used synonymously.

Putting the meanings of “virtual” and “reality” together, virtual reality appears to be “an event or entity that is real in effect but not in fact, not actual”—but this is not very enlightening. Returning to the Scholastic meaning of “*virtualiter*” and “*realitas*” enables a better understanding: in this context, “virtual reality” means “being an essence or a quidditas in effect but not in fact, not actual.” To avoid misunderstandings, here in this article the word “reality” is used synonymously with the Scotist “*quidditas*.” Otherwise, if “reality” in the sense of “being in fact” is meant, the word “actuality” is used.

The first known usage of the term “virtual reality” was by the French artist and theater theorist Antonin Artaud. In an essay written in 1932, he used “virtual” in opposition to “material” and mentioned the “*virtual reality* of theater” (Artaud 1994: 28). He advocated theater as an intellectual stand-in for material reality. For today’s usage of the term “virtual reality,” the context of computer technology and science is relevant. In this context, the first usage of “virtual” occurred in the late 1950s in the term “virtual memory.” “Virtual memory” means the main memory of a computer, which is assembled from a combination of the fast, expensive, and small random access memory (RAM) and the slower, but cheaper and larger other types of memory (normally hard disk space). RAM and the other types of memory are fused using a single unique address-space. In this way, the virtual memory simulates one memory consisting of different hardware components. This usage of “virtual” is very common nowadays in computer technology: terms like “virtual machine”

C. Rabanus (✉)
Institut für Phänopraxie, Wiesbaden, Germany

or “virtual storage” denote entities that do not fulfill all criteria of entities of a certain kind, but simulate them.

The term “virtual reality” first appeared in English in 1987 as the title of a paper by Yaakov Garb. From Garb’s point of view, virtual reality is the ability to represent portions of the world with visual symbols. According to him, representation and substitution of the world by means of virtual reality form a certain kind of simulation: because of the representing system of symbols, it is possible to handle even temporally and spatially distant events and things very easily. Virtual reality in Garb’s sense is not immediately given, but built out of imaginative acts of a subject based upon the presented symbols that refer to something different. In contrast, in computer technology, “virtual” means something immediately given.

In relation to computers, the term “virtual reality” stands for a special technology. According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica’s Premium Service*, it is a “computer modeling and simulation to enable a person to interact with an artificial three-dimensional visual or other sensory environment.” This meaning was coined by the computer scientist Jaron Lanier. In an interview in 1989, he referred to the “virtual” as something that exists only as an electronic image without any material existence. He called “virtual reality” the technology that enables the experience of a reality consisting only of such an electronic concreteness.

Immersion and options for interaction are the two aspects that distinguish virtual reality from ordinary modes of visual or audiovisual presentation of events and facts such as pictures and movies. Immersion means that an observer or an agent sees, hears, and even senses the presented reality. In an immersive environment, the observer or agent finds him/herself inside the presented world. Options for interaction are given when the observer is able not only to observe, but also to act. Thus it is possible for the agent to affect the evolution of things in the virtual world—and vice versa: the evolution of things in the virtual world also affects his/her representation in the virtual world.

The level of immersion is a good criterion to divide virtual reality systems into two classes. First there are Window-on-World systems (WoW). These are the most simple and most common systems for generating virtual reality: they open an insight into a virtual world. To create such a type of virtual reality, an ordinary

computer monitor connected to a computer that generates virtual reality is sufficient. Such computers could be personal computers on which a MUD (multi-user dungeon) or a MOO (MUD object-oriented) or similar applications run. On the one hand, the frame around the virtual reality allows a clear differentiation between virtual reality and actual reality, and on the other hand, it causes a very low level of immersion, which may be improved by applying any one of a number of three-dimensional techniques and shutter-glasses or the like.

There is only one perspective possible on such a presented virtual reality, namely, the perspective on the presenting display. It is possible to change what happens on the display, i.e., inside the presented world (common interfaces are joysticks, keyboards, and mice), but it is not possible to explore the virtual reality by bodily movements and correlative perceptions, i.e., by acts with what EDMUND HUSSERL calls “kinaestheses.” Every change of perspective caused by a bodily movement results in a shift of the visual field and a corresponding exit from the virtual world.

Second, there are “Immersive Systems.” These are virtual reality systems that immerse the perceptual field of an observer or agent in the virtual world by using such devices as head-mounted displays or data gloves; the pioneer in developing such devices was Ivan Sutherland. If a sufficient reproductive fidelity is provided, a user of an immersive system has many more difficulties differentiating between virtual reality and actual reality than an observer or agent who uses a Window on the World (WoW)—even if the immersive system serves only the visual and the aural senses and, with certain limitations, the sense of touch. Via several sensors, the immersive system transfers bodily movements inside actual reality into virtual reality and so simulates kinaestheses.

A version of an immersive system that is nowadays quite commonly used, especially for testing and training purposes, is a closed room, the windows of which are actually displays. On these displays virtual reality is presented—modern flight simulators, for example, belong to this class of systems. Such a room is called a “Cave” (an acronym for “CAVE Automatic Virtual Environment,” an allusion to Plato’s allegory of the cave) when four, five, or six inner surfaces of the room act as displays for presenting virtual reality.

Paul Milgram and Fumio Kishino propose the notion of a continuum of “Mixed Reality” between the two poles of pure virtual reality and pure actual reality. Systems that present mixed reality are, for example, special helmets for pilots with half-silvered visors. The pilot has a direct view onto actual reality that may be augmented by additional information projected onto his visor. In the television and film industry, video mapping methods like the Blue Screen or Chroma Key techniques are often used. Mixed reality is also commonly used to visualize a possible world, i.e., to act as a model of the world given a certain set of conditions.

In all kinds of virtual reality, telepresence plays an important or even an essential role. Telepresence means that a person can—usually with technical mediation—act and perceive in a remote place in virtual (or actual) reality as if s/he were there. Telepresence is called “transparent” when the presentation of the remote reality is absolutely immersive.

There are two classes of systems that provide telepresence: the first involves both perceptions and actions, the second only perceptions. An example of the first class is a robotic device controlled remotely, which accesses macroscopic and microscopic areas otherwise inaccessible. As long as such systems are used for a specific scientific or technical purpose, they are not designed to create transparent telepresence. The awareness of the difference between the actual here and now, on the one hand, and the remote site where the robotic device acts, on the other hand, enables the proper fulfillment of the coordinated tasks. If the telepresence takes place in pure virtual reality, e.g., in MUDs and MOOs, the goal of the vendors of coordinated systems is transparent telepresence. In MUDs and MOOs, human players create virtual identities that are their representatives in the virtual world, the so-called “avatars.”

The most common system that enables only perceptual telepresence is television. The agent is reduced to an observer and experiences the presented reality. Television and movies work perfectly as long as the observer forgets about his/her not being where the presented plot takes place. A critical analysis of the power of such systems of telepresence, which are increasingly becoming a part of everyday life and penetrate the actual perception of every human being, has been provided by Neil Postman, Vilém Flusser, Paul

Virilio, and Jean Baudrillard; according to Baudrillard, we are confronted with a “perfect crime,” which is the “murder of reality” (Baudrillard 1996: preface). According to him, the continuity of reality is ensured by simulacra, which conceal the fact that there is no truth.

If one speaks of avatars, normally one also speaks of cyberspace. The term “cyberspace” was coined by William Gibson and popularized in his novel *Neuromancer*. Gibson characterizes cyberspace as “consensual hallucination experienced daily by billions of legitimate agents, in every nation” and as a “graphic representation of data abstracted from the banks of every computer in the human system,” one endowed with “unthinkable complexity” (Gibson 1984: 51).

At the time Gibson wrote his novel, the World Wide Web (WWW) had not been developed, but his characterization of cyberspace reads like a description of the WWW. Nowadays, “cyberspace” means a virtual reality that is generated in a large computer network like the Internet. Although “cyberspace” and “Internet” or “WWW” are often used synonymously, this is erroneous: “cyberspace” is a metaphorical denotation for the spatial aspects of virtual reality while “Internet” stands for a physical network and the “World Wide Web” is the name of a service provided by programs running on the machines that together form the Internet.

Certain kinds of virtual reality devices—namely, immersive systems—are directly capable of enabling the experience of actuality. Experiencing actuality means that one believes in the objective existence of the experienced. According to Husserl, every perception and every belief in the objective existence of the perceived things is based upon an intuitive presentation that is accompanied by a complex system of active and passive syntheses. In these syntheses, the perception of a thing, as determined in a certain way, occurs. He points out that each thing is given in a horizon belonging to the perception of the thing. Connected with all such perceptions and accompanying horizons are, on the one hand, expectations of further experiences of the thing and, on the other hand, possible operations on the thing. Since the perceiving and acting subject (together with other subjects) is in a situation, every perception raises the expectation that the situation will evolve in a certain way.

From a phenomenological point of view, actuality is the continuum of sense that results from a subjective constitution based on perceptual material that is given by original intuition. By definition, there is only one actuality for every subject. But there may be different realities that constitute this unique actuality. As soon as intuitive material of a certain kind forms a system, it is possible to call this a reality.

What kind of material the directly experienced actuality consists of, and whether the constituted objective meaning proves itself in further experience, only becomes clear in retrospect. Therefore the determination of a reality as virtual reality is also only possible in an act of deliberation in retrospect—and it must be possible to contrast the virtual world with a non-virtual one. The term “virtual reality” turns out to be a concept arising in reflection.

Husserl did not analyze virtual reality, of course, but he examined perception and the consciousness of images. It was important to him to understand why we are conscious of a pictured object as part of the image and not in the mode of itself-presence. According to him, the reason for this is a twofold conflict: on the one hand, he points out a conflict of the pictured things with respect to continuity of time and space, and on the other hand, he recognizes empirical conflict, e.g., the fact that human beings in photographic colors do not exist. This twofold conflict is not the result of deliberation; instead, it is immediately experienced.

Perceiving an image involves a twofold objectivation. In the first, the image is perceived as an image object in the mode of itself-presence; in the second, the pictured subject is “viewed into” the image-object, as Husserl puts it, resulting in a re-presentation (*Vergegenwärtigung*) of the pictured thing. The prerequisite for this twofold conflict, and hence for the consciousness of images, is the fundamental supposition of continuity and consistency of perception—and this involves yet a third sense, namely, regarding the behavior of the perceived thing in a situation.

A device that is able to generate a reality suitable for being experienced as immediate actuality must be capable of guaranteeing consistency and continuity of perception in the threefold sense mentioned: The reality generated must show consistency with regard to content (note that this does not mean that this reality must stick to the social rules of everyday life, or even to the laws of nature), it must fit into a continuous

progress of perception, and it must preserve this consistency and continuity in further perceptions, actions, and interactions.

Generating virtual reality with complete immersion is not possible with today's technology. The immersion of virtual reality is ultimately broken when the observer or agent performs bodily actions in such a way that the device generating the virtual reality cannot reproduce them in virtual reality. The character of his/her living body chains an observer to the commonly experienced world of everyday life with all of its immediately experienced reality—including the neediness of the living body. As long as there is no possibility of digitizing a human body, it will remain impossible to create virtual worlds as all-embracing lifeworlds. If it were possible, then such a world would no longer be virtual for its inhabitants; as soon as a reality is all embracing, the property of being virtual disappears for the observer. Therefore the assumption that a virtual world is a kind of parallel world or parallel actuality—Philippe Quéau, for example, argues in this way—is erroneous. This misunderstanding results from disregarding the fact that it is one and the same subject who experiences material from different realities and constitutes its unique actuality based upon this. Without a new kind of actuality, it is neither necessary nor reasonable to postulate a new ontology of virtual reality or to speak, as Michael Heim does, of an “ontological shift” (Heim 1998: 50). It is possible to develop an ontology of virtual worlds within the already existing framework of phenomenology. From a phenomenological point of view, virtual reality is—as Stefan Münker puts it—a kind of aesthetic reality that may act-alongside of other kinds of reality—as an ontic fundament of the ontological category “actuality.”

As a totally immersive and interactive system, virtual reality transcends reality presented by images or windows on the world by presenting not a reality in the world, but a world itself. Immersion in such a virtual world means the (normally unconscious) extension of the general thesis of the natural attitude to the presented virtual reality. As Sybille Krämer points out, this means a shift of the role of the observer or agent (Krämer 1995: 135). While the observer of an image, for example, or the agent in a virtually augmented actuality is external to what is presented, s/he becomes an internal observer or agent in the immersive and interactive virtual reality. According to Baudrillard, the

agent or observer is then able “to ‘enter’ the image” (Baudrillard 1995: 92). While the common image is an appearance in the world, the immersive, interactive virtual reality is an entire world as an appearance. As mentioned earlier, he is convinced that in the Postmodern world the ongoing process of virtualization results in a complete disappearance of the real. He argues that representation gives way to simulation, reality shifts to hyperreality, and “an age of simulacra and simulation [is inaugurated], in which there is no longer ... any last judgment to separate truth from fiction” (Baudrillard 2001: 173 f.). Actuality based only on virtual reality refers to nothing else outside itself, he continues, and the simulacra mask the fact that there is actually nothing.

This point of view is not really convincing. With Krämer, it seems to be better to talk of a disappearance not of the real, but of “the border between the real and the purely imaginary” (Krämer 1998: 241). Mixed reality gets more and more involved in our actuality. But despite all the virtualization of everyday life, the living body chains everyone unconditionally to an actuality in which every human being “is a person, who is able and liable to account” (Krämer 1998: 241).

The artificiality of the world based upon virtual reality nevertheless has consequences that do indeed separate the virtual world from the non-virtual in retrospective deliberation.

- (1) The world of everyday life is a world of intuited data. The virtual world is in contrast a world of artificially produced entities. Speaking with Vilém Flusser, it is a world of *facta*—even more, taking Baudrillard’s analysis into account, it is a world of simulacra appearing as *facta*. This world enables new options for perception and interaction, in particular the possibility of changing one’s identity. Because it is a world of *facta*, everything is possible in the virtual world.
- (2) The common laws of time and space in particular are suspended. As Quéau points out, “virtual space is never stable,” hence “it is no location, no *topos*” (Quéau 1995: 64). Although time and space are forms of sensible intuition, even in a virtual world, these forms are subject to human disposal: In the virtual world we are where we act, observe, and think. He therefore speaks of a shift from a spatial and local conception of being to an intentional or transcendental one. The same is true

regarding time: time also loses its irreversible and a priori structure; we are when we act, observe, and think.

- (3) Because of the new concept of time and space in the virtual world, the meaning of kinaesthesia changes. Again, while even in the virtual world perception without kinaesthesis is not possible, movement in the virtual world does not mean that the observer or agent him/herself moves. Rather, the horizons move and align themselves regarding the observer or agent. Paul Virilio calls this “an invention of mobility *on the spot*” (cf. Virilio 1990). Husserl’s dictum of the body as the “zero-point for all orientation” (Husserl 1952: 158) gains a literal meaning.
- (4) Because agents in the virtual world have no bodies, temporality and spatiality in the virtual world depend on human arbitrariness. The virtual world itself is artificial and the humans in it are, in short, omnipotent: because the virtual world is a simulation without bodily risks, responsibilities, and illocutionary aspects of face-to-face communication, all acting and interacting in the virtual world is, as Krämer points out, a kind of game.

A special reflection analogous to the phenomenological *epochē* and reduction is necessary to discover the character of a world as virtual and to describe the properties of the virtually presented material as well as of the structure of the virtual world. This reflection is much easier to perform than are the transcendental deliberations Husserl employed to describe the nature of our common understanding of the world. This is because human beings are not committed to a virtual world in the same way that they are to the world of everyday life. There is no “*Geworfenheit*” into the virtual world in the sense meant by MARTIN HEIDEGGER—not even regarding the ongoing penetration of everyday experience with aspects of virtual reality. All these aspects are parts of the natural world, but they do not form a complete new world. Therefore the performance of a specific *epochē* in order to determine the character of a virtual world as a virtual one is not hindered by the resistances one is faced with while attempting to bracket the general thesis of the natural attitude. Quite the contrary, getting into cyberspace and not getting pushed out of it is still sometimes a technical problem. On the other hand, stopping a simulation is normally done by a mouse click—and if this does

not work, pulling the power plug will terminate any computer generated virtual reality.

Bibliography

- Artaud, Antonin. *Le théâtre et son double*. Paris: Gallimard, 1938; *The Theater and its Double*. Trans. Mary C. Richards. New York: Grove Press, 1994.
- Baudrillard, Jean. "Illusion, Desillusion, Ästhetik." In *Illusion und Simulation*. Ed. Stefan Iglhaut et al. Ostfildern: Cantz, 1995, 90–101; *Encyclopaedia Britannica Premium Service*. <http://www.britannica.com> (accessed 4 October 2004).
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Le crime parfait*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1995; *The Perfect Crime*. Trans. Chris Turner. London: Verso, 1996.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. Mark Poster. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Flusser, Vilém. "Digitaler Schein." In *Digitaler Schein. Ästhetik der elektronischen Medien*. Ed. Florian Rötzer. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991, 147–59.
- Flusser, Vilém. *Lob der Oberflächlichkeit. Für eine Phänomenologie der Medien*. Mannheim: Bollmann, 1993.
- Garb, Yaakov. "Virtual Reality." In *Whole Earth Review*, 57, Winter 1987, 118–20.
- Gibson, William. *Neuromancer*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1984.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit. Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, 8, 1927, 1–439; *Being and Time*. Trans. Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Heim, Michael. *The Metaphysics of Virtual Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Heim, Michael. *Virtual Realism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1 (1913), 1–323; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch. Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Konstitution*. Ed. Marly Biemel. *Husserliana* 4. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1952; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Second Book: Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie* [1936]. Ed. Walter Biemel. *Husserliana* 6. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954; *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Holz, Hans-Heinz. "Realität." In *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe*. Ed. Karlheinz Barck et al. Vol. 5. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2003, 197–227.
- Iglhaut, Stefan, Florian Rötzer, and Elisabeth Schweeger, eds. *Illusion und Simulation*. Ostfildern: Cantz, 1995.
- Isdale, Jerry. *What is Virtual Reality? A Web-Based Introduction*. <http://VR.isdale.com/WhatIsVR.html> (accessed 4 October 2004).
- Kelly, Kevin, Adam Heilbrun, and Barbara Stacks. "Virtual Reality: An Interview with Jaron Lanier." In *Whole Earth Review*, 64, Fall 1989, 108–19.
- Krämer, Sybille. "Vom Trugbild zum Topos. Über fiktive Realitäten." In *Illusion und Simulation*. Ed. Stefan Iglhaut et al. Ostfildern: Cantz, 1995, 130–37.
- Krämer, Sybille. "Zentralperspektive, Kalkül, Virtuelle Realität: Sieben Thesen über die Weltbildimplikationen symbolischer Formen." In *Medien—Welten—Wirklichkeiten*. Ed. Gianni Vattimo and Wolfgang Welsch. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1998, 27–37.
- Lavington, Simon H. *A History of Manchester Computers*. Manchester: National Computing Centre, 1975.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: New American Library, 1964. *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. <http://www.m-w.com> (accessed 4 October 2004).
- Milgram, Paul, and Fumio Kishino. "A Taxonomy of Mixed Reality Visual Display" In *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, E77-D(12), December 1994, 1321–29.
- Münker, Stefan, and Florian Roetzer, eds. *Mythos Internet*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997a.
- Münker, Stefan, and Florian Roetzer, eds. "Was heißt eigentlich: 'Virtuelle Realität'?", In *Mythos Internet*. Ed. Stefan Münke and Florian Rützer. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997b, 108–27.
- Postman, Neil. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*. New York: Viking Press, 1985.
- Quéau, Philippe. "Die virtuellen Orte. Hybridisierung und Konfusion der virtuellen Räume." In *Stadt am Netz. Ansichten von Telepolis*. Ed. Stefan Iglhaut, Armin Medosch, and Florian Rötzer. Mannheim: Bollmann, 1996, 289–95.
- Quéau, Philippe. "Die virtuelle Simulation. Illusion oder Allusion?" In *Illusion und Simulation*. Ed. Stefan Iglhaut et al. Ostfildern: Cantz, 1995, 61–70.
- Rheingold, Howard. *Virtual Reality*. New York: Summit, 1991.
- Rötzer, Florian, ed. *Digitaler Schein. Ästhetik der elektronischen Medien*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991.
- Schröter, Jens. *Das Netz und die virtuelle Realität*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2004.
- Simpson, John A., and Edmund S. C. Weiner, eds. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Sutherland, Ivan E. "The Ultimate Display." In *Proceedings of the International Federation of Information Processing Congress 1965*. Ed. Wayne Kalenich. Vol. 2. Washington: Spartan, 1966, 506–8.

- Turkle, Sherry. *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Vattimo, Gianni, and Wolfgang Welsch, eds. *Medien—Welten—Wirklichkeiten*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1998.
- Virilio, Paul. *L'inertie polaire*. Paris: Christian Bourgois, 1990; *Polar Inertia*. Trans. Patrick Camiller. London: Thousand Oaks, 2000.
- Waffender, Manfred, ed. *Cyberspace. Ausflüge in virtuelle Wirklichkeiten*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: RoRoRo, 1991.
- Whittaker, Jason. *The Cyberspace Handbook*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Woolley, Benjamin. *Virtual Worlds: A Journey in Hype and Hyperreality*. Oxford: Penguin, 1992.

Work of Art

Cathrin Nielsen

EDMUND HUSSERL addressed the artwork or, more specifically, its aesthetics only tangentially. His work on aesthetics compiled in the folder *Ästhetik und Phänomenologie* is a slim collection comprised of several texts written between 1906 and 1908 (Husserl 1980; cf. Scaramuzza and Schuhmann 1990). His criticism of the psychologistic or naturalistic approach, as we find it in *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901), leads methodically, even in the aesthetic sphere, to the demand to view the essence of a work of art in the most general manner. At the same time, a painting is an image only to the image-constituting consciousness which, upon seeing a primary and perceivably apparent object, attributes “validity” or “significance” to the image only through its imaginative apperception (Husserl 1984: 423). Phenomenological aesthetics up to ROMAN INGARDEN takes a similar approach (Fischer 1907, Conrad 1908, Odebrecht 1929): the focus is neither on the random subjective experience nor on empirical facts, but on the immanent regularity of the aesthetic object and its constitution.

The transition from any common thing perceived as a sensuous datum to the aesthetic object occurs through a collaboration of the subjective approach and the complex structural layers of the thing. Rudolf Odebrecht (1929) and MORITZ GEIGER had already distinguished between the aesthetic and the non-aesthetic approach; the latter, borrowing from Kant’s *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, identified aesthetic concentration as “disinterested interest” (*uninteressiertes Interesse*—Geiger 1913: 647). He rejects pure “inner concentration” as simply a merely pseudo-aesthetic pleasure

in the work of art. Thus he stresses the aesthetic category of the work itself, but his approach occurs primarily through subjective experience, focusing on an empirical rather than a transcendental subject. It is no random assembly of psychic data, but an *insight* into the general essence, arrived at through “intuitive” methodology. The observant subject and the material object in this case—as in phenomenological aesthetics as a whole—form a tensed relationship of intentional dependency: on the one hand, the viewer needs to stay open to what the thing provides; on the other hand, it is evidently not the thing in question, but the type of approach that determines whether or not any aesthetic pleasure is derived from it (cf. *ibid.*: 632 ff.).

Yet the central problem of constitution remains. How is the material thing, in this case of the work of art, constituted beyond the subjective grasp as it is being perceived? To what extent do we see colors, shapes, and sounds as those of a *material thing*? Which are the moments that allow us to distinguish between the aesthetic and the common object? While Geiger in some way circumvents the question of constitution, it becomes the main focus in the work of Roman Ingarden, a Polish student of Husserl. *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931) is considered the pinnacle of theory during the first phase of phenomenology stemming from Husserl’s *Logische Untersuchungen*. Contrary to Husserl’s transcendental idealism, which attempts to view the real world and its elements as purely intentional actualities, Ingarden focuses primarily on ontological questions of principle, i.e., the *representational* moments of sensation, and thus on the “multiple layers” of the artwork. The work of art originates, on the one hand, from the intentional acts of the creative consciousness and, on the other hand, from the “actualities” of ideal concepts and substantiality.

C. Nielsen (✉)
Eugen Fink Archive, Freiburg, Germany

But it must also be taken in real phonetic or descriptive terms—in other words, as a material thing. Each work of art is an autonomous entity. Its space and time differ from “real” space or “objective” time (1972: §§34 ff.).

He thus differentiates the represented space both from the orientational space necessary for material things to be perceived and from homogeneous physical space, as well as from intellectual space. While the represented space is structured similarly to all other types of space, to “have” this space requires an enactment that has to be brought forth specifically through the medium of orientational space. And the appropriate center of orientation is based in the representational realm. We must therefore put ourselves in its place imaginatively and to some extent forget our own “real” center of orientation, achieving a certain necessary detachment from the world. Likewise, the circumstances and material items represented are located in their own represented time, which is identical neither with the objective time of the real world nor with the subjective time of an absolute subject in consciousness (cf. Husserl 1966).

Roman Ingarden characterizes even the structure of represented time as “an analogon, a modification” of real time (1972: 248). In experiencing a work of art, the peculiar present that is called *in actu esse*, which determines past and future from then on, corresponds with the autonomous order of the artwork, and is therefore only a “quasi-real” or “feigned present” in relation to our actual time experience (Ibid.: 250). The phenomenon of temporal perspective takes on a key role in the concretization of the work of art (cf. Ingarden 1968: §17, 1972: §36). It becomes an analogon to spatial perspective inasmuch as shifts and transformations in the “views” occur in both cases as and when perceptual circumstances shift. In this way, time presents itself in phenomenal extension; its length and brevity cannot be objectively measured. Instead, it gains its extension in its qualitative alteration. The dynamic character of this occurrence develops during its formative process and is directly experienced as such, while the same appears in its condensed, specifically shaped quality when viewed in memory. The structural laws emerging in the static-dynamic play of represented time form an organically whole and integral structure.

Thus the claim that the work of art can be captured in a time of “now” containing all phases and layers contradicts the nature of the artwork. Even

after the constitution has been completed, the work itself remains *transcendent* (Ingarden 1968: 150) to the conscious processes. A type of ontological difference exists between it and the aesthetic thing that has emerged in the process of concretization. This ontological basis significantly differentiates Ingarden from any one-sided focus on psychological acts or aesthetic experience. Simultaneously, the question of the status of the being of the aesthetic item becomes more pressing: the real, material thing is placed in parentheses (*eingeklammert*) during the shifting aesthetic approach. What is being viewed is a *purely* intentional thing with a concrete *meaning* not corresponding to anything in reality. As a matter of principle, objectivity remains the same; even purely intentional representational art opens a view to a *world* toward which we are geared. Even if the circumstances have been proposed as “real,” they are not intended to be seen as “really existing.” What is missing is their moment of “existential positionality.” Everything is therefore conditional on the “quasi” (Ingarden 1972: 169 ff.). The “quasi” that liberates the poetic fiction from the pressure of factuality is for Ingarden exactly the mysterious effect of the work of art.

DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND also focuses on the *ontological* nature of the artwork, i.e., the relationship of the work as a spiritual reality to its material basis. In his study, he separates the spirituality contained in the artwork both from personal conscious spirituality and from the existential form of general entities. The work of art is an individual “quasi-substance” (von Hildebrand 1984: 20); it lacks the wealth of being of a fully realized substance, yet without sliding into the accidental. At the same time, he rejects the opinion that the artwork objectifies the artist’s personality and is therefore based in the artist’s personal experience. While a spiritual person is a prerequisite for the spirituality of artwork, the “inner logos” (Ibid.: 27) of the work is impersonal and independent. In the tradition of Hegel, Schelling, and Schopenhauer, he engages in a comprehensive analysis of the various forms of art, starting with architecture and sculpture as spatial art and culminating in music as the temporal, non-imitative, and therefore most spiritual art. He also devotes much attention to the inherent problem of painting and literature as being the “representation of *something*” that von Hildebrand defines as a “rendition” (*Wiedergabe*) of likeness, a replica copy, or a reproduction (Ibid.: 187 ff.).

Aside from the decidedly Husserlian aesthetic phenomenology of Donald Brinkmann (1938) and the posthumously published *Ästhetik* (1953) of NICOLAI HARTMANN, the tradition of phenomenological aesthetics, which had reached a high point with Ingarden, takes a sharp downturn in Germany during the 1930s. It next becomes established in France, where it develops its own path.

In 1940, JEAN-PAUL SARTRE introduced *L'imaginaire*, a work in phenomenological psychology that is based in large part on examples from the arts and closes with a chapter about the work of art. Sartre sees the artwork as a result of a conscious act: it has to be brought forth simultaneously out of the real material thing and into existence through the imagination. A radical conversion is pivotal in this regard: the aesthetic object emerges precisely at the moment of conversion, i.e., when the real temporal-spatial world has been negated and the imaginative world of consciousness has been constituted. The aesthetic item emerging out of such a negation of the world, and its resulting consciously immanent constitution—is accordingly something utterly unreal (*l'oeuvre d'art est un irreal*—1940: 239), and the imaginative act a type of magic act. As in Theodor Lipps's psychological aesthetics (1903/1906), the aesthetically bound receptivity alone is responsible for the aesthetic moment.

But how does Sartre explain the difference arising between the real artwork and the aesthetic object of consciousness? The material work of art serves as a mediator between the spheres of the real and the imaginary. It is merely the silent material basis that requires imagination in order not to remain “empty.” The material thing (*la chose*) only presents itself as an aesthetic object by means of the imaginative efforts of consciousness that merge and synthesize the psychic and physical materialities and infuse them with life. To some extent, Sartre concurs in this instance with Husserl's differentiation of the sensory *hylē* from the intentional *morphē*, which adds an “animating” layer *conveying meaning* onto those sensory moments (Husserl 1976: 172). While MARTIN HEIDEGGER in particular criticized and fundamentally redefined the interpretation of the artwork in terms of material and form, Sartre's harsh separation between objective realism and the imaginary—a separation that leads to a reduced definition of reality—primarily met with criticism from MAURICE MERLEAU-PONTY.

In 1953, MIKEL DUFRENNE published his *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique* as a follow-up of sorts to Sartre. He views the correlation characteristic of phenomenological aesthetics between aesthetic object and aesthetic experience as the original methodological problem. The primary goal ought to be to break the correlation by confronting the aesthetic object (*objet, en tant qu'esthétiquement perçu*) with the real artwork (*chose objectivement connue ou produite*—Dufrenne 1953: 9). They differ in that the aesthetic effect of the artwork is only a potential, while it is imperative in the aesthetic object. The work of art “appeals” to its viewer to awaken it as an aesthetic object. But what exactly differentiates the work of art from any common item in daily life? The substance or aesthetic structure of the work of art is, according to Dufrenne, first its *sensuously* accessible truth or beauty. It requires a certain richness (*plénitude*) immanent to the material structure. The sensuous layer of the work is guided by the artistic expression, which during the twentieth century moved away from its replicating function and into itself (1953: 168).

Notably close in thought to Merleau-Ponty—except that here the relationship of word and material item is no longer only of being symbolically entwined, but one of evocative and actually experienced resemblance—Dufrenne defines the authentic artwork as an original word (*parole originale*) that is much more likely to evoke a feeling and simultaneously conjure up a presence than it is to divulge a conceptual meaning (1953: 184). The observer participates in conjuring up this presence by his/her empathetic understanding (*sentiment*) of the internal organization of the work. And despite his analytical concentration on the object, this participation in the awakening of the artwork into an aesthetic object is the central focus. He also describes the aesthetic experience as a type of “imitative dance” and “departing dance” of the motion captured inside the work (1953: 174).

The question of art plays a role in Martin Heidegger's thought as well, beginning in the 1930s. Of particular interest is his essay “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” (1935–1936), which explicitly defines the essence of art through the “work” of art. The initial task is to overcome the neo-Kantianism that had split the artwork into two spheres, a material substructure and an aesthetic superstructure. Heidegger disagrees by saying that material things never present

themselves phenomenologically as “existing objects”; this scientific perspective is a derivative mode of an originally more extensive revelation. How can the tangible quality of the material thing be captured in its unspoiled, original form without scientific encroachment? To answer this question, Heidegger takes as an example a visual image, the 1886 painting “Boots with Laces” by van Gogh. The peasant shoes do not stand as a pair of things in a room that subjects them to its own rules. Instead, the room—in this case the environment of peasantry—rises out of the artistically created work and its truth. The work of art is nothing but this type of evocation. It is not an object divisible into matter and form, substructure and superstructure, but stands by itself and is therefore open to an independent existence of its own.

At the same time, Heidegger interprets the opening of such a world as a passage into the concealment or seclusion (*Verborgenheit*) of the “earth” because only in its earthbound existence does the shape gain its character of a self-contained world. The tension or “struggle between world and earth” encompasses the tumultuous, inscrutably meaningful nature of the work of art. It is therefore ontologically embodied neither in material existence nor in the subject’s experience; the peculiar impulse it represents with regard to itself and to all common actualities makes it more like a “clearing” (*Lichtung*) in its own world, a world without precedent. This also means that the nature of art is not mimetic, but original and open to the present. Heidegger also calls it an epiphany. In Heidegger’s study of Klee’s art (cf. Seubold 1993) he focuses on the terms “revealing” (*Sichtbarmachung*) and “showing” (*Sehenlassen*), in accordance with Klee’s dictum that art does not reproduce the visible; rather, it makes us see. These considerations should be seen in connection with the new definitions of actuality and non-actuality, temporality and spatiality, stemming from the artistic initiation experience of “chaos” and “void” or “nothing.”

Martin Heidegger later assigns to every thing the characteristic of a space- and time-expanding composition of a world within. For Heidegger—in contrast, for example, with Ingarden—the artwork does not represent a privative modification of reality or a presence subject to the “quasi.” Instead, “reality” appears as a decaying form or a derivative mode in light of the eventful character of the artwork: what occurs in the work of art makes up the essence of its being and of

truth in general. He developed his thoughts on the original character of art primarily in his study of poetics (Hölderlin, Trakl, Rilke, George) where the work of language brings the nature of art as naming and founding to light in exceptional fashion. In *Die Kunst und der Raum* (1969), he discusses the artistic relationship between place (*Ort*) and space (*Raum*) in distinction from the physical-technical paradigm. While indifferent and “empty” homogeneous space is seen negatively on account of its absence of material, or as an encompassing hollow space or gap between different objects, artistic space has to be viewed positively in its essence as a release of space (*freigebende Einräumung*) or as a release of places (*Freigabe von Orten*). The revealed “emptiness” of space appears in this case as a gathering process of capture and release, and can therefore be regarded as having its own definitive quality. In sculpture, motion oscillates with release; it is motion in a standing position. Numerous scholars see such withdrawal from the representational character so significant in Western art as an approximation to East Asian art. And this is further supported by Heidegger’s views on speech, which increasingly base the act of speaking on quietness and silence.

The question of spatial depth in the work of art as well as of the “release of the invisible” is also at the center of Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s investigation. His examination of art should be seen in direct connection with his attempt at an indirect ontology of the (in)visible. For him, relativity encompasses the entire field of intersubjectivity and corporeality. And he too sees the paintings of Cézanne in particular as an excellent case in point. In contrast to anatomizing an image into a relationship of essence and replica, Merleau-Ponty is more concerned with the original and ongoing “birth” of seeing and being seen in the emerging dimensions of space, time, light, and color that in daily life fade until they become inconspicuous. By retreating, it is they who let the object and its space emerge. According to Merleau-Ponty, this new concept of spatial depth can no longer be captured in a specific, measurable ratio of dimensions as defined in the sciences. It is instead the experience of a place-based dimension that implies unmeasurable height, width, and distance, a type of “non-extensive extensiveness” that is expressed in the “being-there (*être-là*)” of an object (cf. Merleau-Ponty 1964b). Following Heidegger’s assertion of truth as an reciprocal dependency of presence and absence, Merleau-Ponty takes

the approach—central to subsequent phenomenological aesthetics—that each presence is threaded with absence, and that each “same” in its identity simultaneously remains the other. This approach is directed at the “invisible” of the world that defies objectification and that gives structure to all visible elements in their fissures, indentations, and absences (Merleau-Ponty 1964b).

If one were to summarize the analyses sketched above, essentially three separate areas relating to the work of art warrant further discussion. Aside from the problem of aesthetic constitution discussed in early phenomenology, these areas are (1) the question of the work in contrast to the ordinary material thing, (2) the question of the relationship between the visible and the invisible, and (3) the question of the interplay between time, space, and motion.

(1) The quest for visual qualities in the work of art, so characteristic of phenomenological aesthetics, and the assumption contained therein that the thing itself demonstrates the artistic status of the object, fundamentally need to address the prominent twentieth century trend toward the disintegration of the traditional term “artwork.” The focus on formal or visual qualities and thus the visibility of art is rendered *ad absurdum* by the programmatic attention paid to Duchamps’s “ready-mades” or “*objets trouvés*.” From that point on, art is no longer a characteristic of an art object, but the result of a contextual constellation. Not only can anything function as a work of art at a specific point in time and at not other times, but its character is no longer tied to its corporeal presence and instead functions exclusively, and finds meaning, as a “symbol” (Goodman 1978). In trying to escape from the “things themselves,” art in the twentieth century almost appears to be a “counter-movement to phenomenology” (Wiesing 2000: 134). On the other hand, to reduce the artistic object to its symbolic character would be to lose sight of the suspension of the opposing forces of materialism and idealism so characteristic of phenomenology.

A phenomenologically based aesthetic approach today describes the current potential as evolving from this type of tension: the point is not that the work of art represents something it is not, but instead that it does contain what is being referred to. Inasmuch as the artwork does not represent something “*by-something-else*,” but renders visible “*something-as-something*,” it has its own presence and obligation. Strictly speaking,

it is no different in its character of “*something-as-something*” from any other phenomenon. And this raises the question of whether phenomenology views the world as a work of art, and has always done so, which would mean that phenomenology is nothing but an aesthetic theory (Ibid.: 146). The coincidence of artwork and common object in this regard leads to a “transfiguration of the common” (Danto 1981), which can be interpreted on multiple levels.

(2) In response to Heidegger’s consideration of the actual kernel of truth in art, HANS-GEORG GADAMER’s hermeneutics attempts to liberate this kernel from the dualism of “beauty in being” and “practical reality” so prevalent in German idealism, and to restore an original way of comprehending it (Gadamer 1960: 84 ff.). Insight into the specifically recognitive character of art is not only intended to transcend the subjectification of aesthetics, but simultaneously aims at the hermeneutical conclusion that every encounter with art is an encounter with an incomplete event and in itself part of the event, bringing about not only a mnemosynic recognition, but a healing reunification. In expanding the ontology of artwork, he uses the term “play.” Its essential enactment is the insubstantial and aimless movement of “to and fro,” and play’s specific framework grows out of this. The order forming from play’s motion creates the time and space of play; it has no purpose other than itself and refers to nothing but itself. The work of art therefore finds its being and its obligation exclusively in its representation of itself. For a temporal interpretation of the artwork, this means that artwork expresses no “idea” of a supertemporal present, but instead expresses its own temporality—a point that Gadamer makes in distinction to the art historian Hans Sedlmayr’s interpretation of temporality in the work of art.

Hans Sedlmayr distinguishes between a historical, an existential, and a superhistorical, “incorruptible” temporality. The artwork participates in both forms of time, but is able to refer to historical time as a *modus deficiens* of “true time.” In its attained equilibrium, the artwork is part of *ousia a-idios*. However, in order to reach the “real present time,” the observer needs to recreate it in his/her mind. In the event of such an encounter, the observer experiences a temporary invasion of incorruptible time into the historical present. An epiphany of the artwork can therefore not be forced and is not continuous (cf. Sedlmayr 1958: 140 ff.). It is in this discontinuous moment of epiphany

that Gadamer detects the perplexities of aesthetic consciousness. He elucidates the temporal structure of the artwork based on the “celebration” (*Fest*) characterized by the specific present which he calls a while (*Weile*) (cf. Gadamer 1977: 29 ff.).

We find the beginning of a phenomenologically based, thoroughly traditionally rendered discussion of the relationship between the visible and the invisible in the work of Georges Didi-Hubermann (1990). He rejects the academic attempt to subject the image to the “tyranny of legibility” and simultaneously to forget the mysterious immediacy of its first encounter. The aim ought instead to be to let oneself be captured by the sensuous uniqueness of the image. The point is the work’s activity that intersects with the observer’s existing knowledge. As such, it provides a fissure-like window of opportunity to gain insight into its pre-representational character. This insight eludes translation, but opens up an infinite realm of interpretation. It is exactly the genesis of the visible rising out of the thought process of the image that could simultaneously evoke a type of “opening to logic,” because (referring back to Heidegger) traditional logic is too derivative in this context. Instead of focusing on the labor of the concept (*Arbeit des Begriffs*), as Hegel demanded, Didi-Hubermann calls for the “work of the negative,” which shreds the visible, or for the “*materia informis*,” which marks the shape with depth of color and renders it visible for the first time.

(3) The question of the interplay of time, space, and motion touches on the question of rank and location as well as on the question of the work’s inner structure. While the trend has increasingly been toward a thematic weaving of art into the social context as we saw in the tradition of performance art during the 1960s and the installation and locale-based art of the 1970s and 1980s, art itself has noticeably developed toward its own temporality and spatiality. The concept has found expression in, for example, the insistence on a pure, abstract, nonmaterial, timeless, non-spatial, unchanging, unreferenced, and disinterested image (Reinhardt 1992), whose only appropriate location is inside the “white cube” of the museum.

The interactive tendencies of space, time, and motion in “kinetic art” aim primarily at disassociating motion and rhythm from their natural circumstances and bringing their own aesthetic impact to the forefront. Adding time as a fourth dimension to the three spatial dimensions plays a central theoretical role in

this context. Space by itself and time by itself dissipate into mere shadow; instead, the term “space-time” (*Raum-Zeit*) gains importance. The reach of rhythmically perceived time in each instance could be seen as a gauge for measuring the spatial properties of the kinetic structure. The term “vibration” or “oscillation” enables the implication of a more profound reference to kinetics: the transition from quietness in motion that defines modern art is particularly evident in relation to the material thing or the transition from replica to *réalisation*. And even in impressionist art, the present time had already appeared as a momentary gathering in which the material thing dissolves into a potentially infinite number of circumstances.

The successive dematerialization of inanimate objects (bodies/forms) gains further significance in the evolving role of light and color. Color no longer is seen as quality, as it had been for centuries, but is demoted to the status of substance. Its specific vibration precedes any actual spatial item, structuring and gathering it, and thus becomes a sculptural base element. Even painters such as Kandinsky and Klee were already on the track of the motion of release. According to Klee, it is in particular the (straight) line in comparison with other sculptural elements that, using itself as an example, is able to illustrate the evolution from motion. He speaks (1956) of “active lines” to indicate that this genesis occurs without a material precedent. It is always the image-immanent decisions that are without precedent, these evocative means that enable the leap out of chaos into order. The work of art never falls back on a preexisting order; it begins beyond any dependence on the familiar, static form of daily life.

Heinrich Rombach (1994) sets the artwork apart precisely on account of this abrupt opening of a new *dimension*; contrary to mere creation, creativity is actively engaged wherever the focus is not only on the event, but on the emergence of an entire vital dimension. “Con-creativity’s” breakthrough can accordingly be traced back neither to the subject nor to the object itself.

Bibliography

- Brinkmann, Donald. *Natur und Kunst. Zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Gegenstandes*. Zürich: Rascher, 1938.
- Conrad, Waldemar. “Der ästhetische Gegenstand. Eine phänomenologische Studie.” In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3, 1908, 71–118.

- Danto, Arthur C. *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Didi-Hubermann, Georges. *Devant l'image: Question posée aux fins d'une histoire de l'art*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1990.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953; *Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Fischer, Aloys. *Zur Bestimmung des ästhetischen Gegenstandes*. Munich: Stein, 1907.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960; *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1975.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Die Aktualität des Schönen. Kunst als Spiel, Symbol und Fest*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1977; *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays*. Ed. Robert Bernasconi. Trans. Nicholas Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–684.
- Goodman, Nelson. *Ways of Worldmaking*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1978.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" (1935–1936). In his *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, 1950, 7–68; rpt. in *Holzwege. Gesamtausgabe* 5. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977, 1–74; "The Origin of the Work of Art." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Die Kunst und der Raum*. St. Gallen: Erker, 1969.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Ästhetik*, 2, *Über das Wesen des Kunstwerkes und der Künste. Nachgelassenes Werk. Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 6. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch. Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie*. Ed. Karl Schuhmann. *Husserliana* 3/1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976; *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book. General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Trans. Fred Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins (1893–1917)*. Ed. Rudolf Boehm. *Husserliana* 10. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966; *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*. Trans. John Barnett Brough. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band. Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*. Ed. Ursula Panzer. 2 Teil. *Husserliana* 19/2. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984; *Logical Investigations*. 2 vols. Trans. J. N. Finlay. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. *Husserliana* 23. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk* [1931]. Halle: Max Niemeyer 1972.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks* [1937]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1968; *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Klee, Paul. *Das bildnerische Denken. Form- und Gestaltungslehre*. Vol. 1. Ed. Jürg Spiller. Basel: Benno Schwab, 1956.
- Lipps, Theodor. *Ästhetik. Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst*. Vols. 2. Hamburg: Voss, 1903–06.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'oeil et l'esprit* [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964a, 159–90.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Le visible et l'invisible*. Ed. Claude Lefort. Paris: Gallimard, 1964b; *The Visible and the Invisible*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Odebrecht, Rudolf. *Gefühl und schöpferische Gestaltung. Leitgedanken zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1929.
- Reinhardt, Ad. "Art as Art." In *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*. Ed. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992, 806–9.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der Ursprung. Philosophie der Konkreativität von Mensch und Natur*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1994.
- Rubin, William, ed., *Cézanne: The Late Work, Essays*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1977.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'imaginaire: Psychologie phénoménologique de l'imagination*. Paris: Gallimard, 1940; *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. Trans. Jonathan Webber. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* Paris: Gallimard, 1948; *What is Literature?* Trans. Bernard Frechtman. London: Methuen, 1967.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele, and Karl Schuhmann. "Ein Husserlmanuskript über Ästhetik." In *Husserl Studies* 7, 1990, 165–77.
- Sedlmayr, Hans. *Kunst und Wahrheit. Zur Theorie und Methode der Kunstgeschichte*. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1958.
- Seubold, Günter. "Heideggers nachgelassene Klee-Notizen." In *Heidegger Studies* 9, 1993, 5–12.
- Wiesing, Lambert. "Phänomenologie und die Frage 'Was ist Kunst?'" In *Phänomenologie der Kunst. Wiener Tagungen zur Phänomenologie* 1999. Ed. Günther Pöltner. Bern: Lang, 2000, 131–51.

The Core of Phenomenological Aesthetics: A Suggested Bibliography

- Anceschi, Luciano. *Autonomia ed eteronomia dell'arte: Sviluppo e teoria di un problema estetico*. Florence: Sansoni, 1936; rpt. Milan: Garzanti, 1992.
- Anceschi, Luciano. *Progetto di una sistematica dell'arte*. Milan: Mursia, 1962. rpt. Modena: Mucchi, 1983.
- Anders, Günther. *Kafka pro und contra*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1951.
- Anders, Günther. *George Grosz*. Zürich: Arche, 1961.
- Ansermet, Ernest. *Les fondements de la musique dans la conscience humaine*. Neuchâtel: Éditions de la Baconnière, 1961.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Reflections on Literature and Culture*. Ed. Susannah Young-Ah Gottlieb. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Banfi, Antonio. *Vita dell'arte: Scritti di estetica e filosofia dell'arte*. E. Mattioli and Gabriele Scaramuzza with Luciano Anceschi and Dino Formaggio. Reggio nell'Emilia: Istituto Antonio Banfi, 1988.
- Barilli, Renato. *Per un'estetica mondana*. Bologna: IL Mulino, 1964, 271–98, 323–328.
- Barilli, Renato. *Scienza della cultura e fenomenologia degli stili*. Bologna: IL Mulino, 1991.
- Beauvoir, Simone. "Littérature et métaphysique." In *Les Temps Modernes* 1, 1946, 1153–63; rpt. in her *Existentialisme et la sagesse des Nations*. Paris: Nagel, 1948; "Literature and metaphysics." Trans. Veronique Zaytzeff. In Beauvoir's *Philosophical Writings*. Ed. Margaret A. Simons with Marybeth Timmermann and Mary Beth Mader. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004, 269–77.
- Beck, Maximilian. *Wesen und Wert. Grundlegung einer Philosophie des Daseins*. Vols. 2, Berlin: Konrad Grethlein, 1925.
- Becker, Oscar. *Dasein und Dawesen*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1963.
- Berleant, Arnold. *The Aesthetic Field: A Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas, 1970.
- Berleant, Arnold. *Art and Engagement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.
- Berleant, Arnold. *The Aesthetics of Environment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.
- Biemel, Walter. *Philosophische Analysen zur Kunst der Gegenwart*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.
- Biemel, Walter. *Zeitigung und Romanstruktur. Philosophische Analysen zum modernen Roman*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1986.
- Blaustein, Leopold. *Przedstawienia imaginatywne. Studium z pogranicza psychologii i estetyki*. L'vov: PTF, 1930.
- Boehm, Gottfried. *Wie Bilder Sinn erzeugen. Die Macht des Zeigens*. Berlin: University Press, 2007.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Atmosphäre. Essays zur neuen Ästhetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995.
- Böhme, Gernot. *Ästhetik. Vorlesungen über Ästhetik als allgemeine Wahrnehmungslehre*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2001.
- Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." In *Performing Feminisms*. Ed. Sue-Ellen Case. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990, 270–82.
- Casebier, Allan. *Film and Phenomenology: Toward a Realist Theory of Cinematic Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Casey, Edwards. *Imagining: A Phenomenological Study*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.
- Casey, Edwards. *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

- CHO Kah Kyung. "Die Idee der Unvollkommenheit in der taoistischen Ästhetik." In his *Bewusstsein und Natursein*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1987, 313–44.
- Chretien, Jean-Louis. *L'effroi du beau*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987.
- Chretien, Jean-Louis. *L'arche de la parole*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998.
- Chretien, Jean-Louis. *Corps à corps: À l'écoute de l'oeuvre d'art*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1997; *Hand to Hand: Listening to the Work of Art*. Trans. Stephen E. Lewis. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.
- Clifton, Thomas. *Music as Heard: A Study in Applied Phenomenology*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Conrad, Theodor. *Definition und Forschungsgehalt der Ästhetik*. Doctoral thesis, Munich, 1908.
- Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand. Eine phänomenologische Studie." In *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3, 1908, 71–118, 469–511; 4, 1909, 400–455.
- Conrad-Martius, Hedwig. "Die Irrealität des Kunstwerks." In her *Schriften zur Philosophie*, Vol. 3, Ed. Eberhard Avé-Lallemant. Munich: Kösel, 1965, 249–60.
- Därmann, Iris. *Tod und Bild. Eine phänomenologische Mediengeschichte*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1995.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La dissémination*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972.
- Derrida, Jacques. *La vérité en peinture*. Paris: Flammarion; *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Ian Macleod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Diaconu, Mădălina. *Tasten, Riechen, Schmecken. Eine Ästhetik der anästhesierten Sinne*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005.
- Dieste, Rafael. *El alma y el espero. Textos e crítica de arte*. Madrid: Alianza, 1981; rpt. Vigo, 1995.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*. Vols. 2, [1953]. 2nd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967; *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Trans. Edward S. Casey et al. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Esthétique et philosophie I–III*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1967, 1976, 1981.
- Dufrenne, Mikel. *Art et politique*. Paris: Presses de la Cité, 1974.
- Escoubas, Eliane. *L'espace pictural*. La Versanne: Encre Marine, 1995.
- Escoubas, Eliane. *L'esthétique*. Paris: Ellipses, 2004.
- Fink, Eugen. "Vergegenwärtigung und Bild" [1930]. In his *Studien zur Phänomenologie 1930–1939*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966, 1–78.
- Fink, Eugen. *Mode—ein verführerisches Spiel*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1969.
- Fink, Eugen. *Epiloge zur Dichtung*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1971.
- Fischer, Aloys. *Zur Bestimmung des ästhetischen Gegenstandes*. Munich: Stein, 1907.
- Flusser, Vilém. *Lob der Oberflächlichkeit. Für eine Phänomenologie der Medien*. Mannheim: Bollmann, 1993.
- Flusser, Vilém. *Towards a Philosophy of Photography*. London: Reaktion Books, 2000.
- Formaggio, Dino. *Fenomenologia della tecnica artistica*. Milan: Nuvoletti, 1953; rpt. Pratiche, 1979.
- Formaggio, Dino. *L'idea di artisticità*. Milan: Ceschina, 1962.
- Formaggio, Dino. *Arte*. Milan: Isedi, 1973.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Die Aktualität des Schönen. Kunst als Spiel, Symbol und Fest*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1977; *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays*. Ed. Robert Bernasconi. Trans. Nicholas Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Ästhetik und Poetik*, Vols. 1–2, *Gesammelte Werke*, Vols. 8–9, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1993.
- Galecki, Jerzy. *Problematyka estetyki*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1962.
- Garner, Stanton B. Jr. *Bodied Space: Phenomenology and Performance in Contemporary Drama*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1, 1913, 567–684.
- Geiger, Moritz. *Die Bedeutung der Kunst. Zugänge zu einer materialen Wertästhetik*. Ed. Klaus Berger and Wolfhart Henckmann, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976; *The Significance of Art: A Phenomenological Approach to Aesthetics*. Trans. Klaus Berger.

- Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1986.
- Giesz, Ludwig. *Phänomenologie des Kitsches*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971; 1st complete ed. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1994.
- Golaszewska, Maria. *Zarys estetyki: Problematyka, metody, teorie*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1973.
- Haar, Michel. *L'oeuvre d'art: Essai sur l'ontologie des oeuvres*, Paris: Hatier, 1994.
- Habasque, Guy. "Cubisme et Phénoménologie." In *Revue d'Esthétique* 2, 1949, 151–161.
- Hamburger, Käte. *Die Logik der Dichtung*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1957.
- Harries, Karsten. *The Ethical Function of Architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997.
- Hartmann, Nicolai. *Ästhetik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953; *Estética*. México City: UNAM, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" [1935–1936]. In his *Holzwege*. Ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. *Gesamtausgabe* 5. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977, 1–74; "The Origin of the Work of Art." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 15–87.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Erläuterungen zu Hölderlins Dichtung* [1938–1968]. 6th ed. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Bauen Wohnen Denken." In his *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1954, 145–62; "Building Dwelling Thinking." In his *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 143–61.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Unterwegs zur Sprache*. Pfullingen: Neske, 1959; *On the Way to Language*. Trans. Peter D. Hertz. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Die Kunst und der Raum*. St Gallen: Erker, 1969.
- Henry, Michel. *Voir l'invisible: Sur Kandinsky*. Paris: François Bourin, 1988.
- Henry, Michel. "Art et phénoménologie de la vie" [1996]. In his *Auto-donation. Entretiens et conférences*. Montpellier: Prétentaine, 2002, 147–72.
- Héring, Jean. "Concerning Image, Idea, and Dream." In *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 8, 1947, 188–205.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von, *Ästhetik*. Vol. 1, *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 5, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1977.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von, *Ästhetik*. Vol. 2, *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 6, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984.
- Hribar, Tine. *Sveta igra sveta: Umetnost v post-moderni dobi*. Ljubljana: Slovenska Matica, 1990.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung. Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1898–1925)*. Ed. Eduard Marbach, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980; *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory (1898–1925)*. Trans. John B. Brough. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ding und Raum. Vorlesungen 1907*. Ed. Ulrich Claesges. *Husserliana* 16. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973; *Thing and space: Lectures of 1907*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- Husserl, Edmund. Letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal [1907]. In his *Briefwechsel*. Ed. Karl Schuhmann and Elisabeth Schuhmann. Vol. 7, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994, 133–6.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1931; *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Erlebnis, Kunstwerk und Wert. Vorträge zur Ästhetik 1937–1967*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1969.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks* [1937]. *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 13, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1997; *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Studia z estetyki*. Vols. 3, Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1957b, 1958, 1970.
- Ingarden, Roman. *Untersuchungen zur Ontologie der Kunst. Musikwerk, Bild, Architektur*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1962; *Ontology of the Work of Art: The Musical Work, the Picture, the Architectural Work, the Film*. Trans. Raymond Meyer with John T. Goldthwait. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1989.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976; *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978.

- Jauss, Hans R. *Toward an Aesthetic Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Jonas, Hans. "Homo Pictor. Von der Freiheit des Bildens." In *Was ist ein Bild?* Ed. Gottfried Boehm. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1994, 105–24.
- Kaelin, Eugene Francis. *An Existentialist Aesthetic*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962, 35–385.
- Kaelin, Eugene Francis. *Art and Existence: A Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1970.
- Kaelin, Eugene Francis. *An Aesthetics for Art Educators*. New York: Teacher's College Papers, 1989.
- Kaelin, Eugene Francis. *Texts on Texts and Textuality: A Phenomenology of Literary Art*. Ed. E. J. Burns. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.
- Kaufmann, Fritz. *Das Reich des Schönen. Bausteine zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Kerszberg, Pierre. "Éléments pour une phénoménologie de la musique." In *Annales de Phénoménologie 2002*. Ed. Association pour la Promotion de la Phénoménologie. Beauvais, 2002, 11–36.
- Klein, Robert. "Peinture moderne et phénoménologie" [1963]. In *La forme et l'intelligible*. Paris: Gallimard, 1970, 411–429; "Modern Painting and Phenomenology". In *Form and Meaning*. Trans. M. Jay and L. Wieselstier. New York: Viking Press, 1979.
- Kracauer, Siegfried. *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Kühn, Rolf. *Ästhetische Existenz heute. Zum Verhältnis von Leben und Kunst. Seele, Existenz und Leben*, Vol. 4, Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2007.
- KUKI Shūzō. "Iki" no kōzō [1929]. In *KUKI Shūzō zenshū* [The complete works of KUKI Shūzō]. Vol 1, Tokyo 1981, 1–86.
- Lewicki, Bolesław. *Budowa dzieła filmowego* [1935]; *O filmie. Wybór pism*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1995.
- Lewin, David. "Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception," In *Music Perception* 3, 1986, 327–92.
- Lipps, Theodor. *Ästhetik. Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst*. 2, Vols. Hamburg: Voss, 1903–1906.
- Lissa, Zofia. *Muzyka i film*, L'vov: Ossolineum, 1937.
- Losev, Alexei. *Dialektika chudozestvennoj formy*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1983.
- Löwith, Karl. "Paul Valéry. Grundzüge seines philosophischen Denkens" 1971. In his *Gott, Mensch und Welt—G. B. Vico—Paul Valéry. Sämtliche Schriften*, Vol. 9. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1986, 229–400.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Regard, Parole, Espace*. Lausanne: L'Âge d'Homme, 1973.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Art et existence*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1985.
- Maldiney, Henri. *L'art, l'éclair de l'être*. Seyssel: Comp'act, 1993.
- Maldiney, Henri. *Ouvrir le rien: L'art nu*. La Versanne: Encre Marine, 2000.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *L'idole et la distance*, Paris: Grasset, 1977; *The Idol and Distance: Five Studies*. Trans. Thomas A. Carlson New York: Fordham University Press, 2001.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *La croisée du visible*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996; *The Crossing of the Visible*. Trans. James K. A. Smith. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Martini, Miro. *La deformazione estetica*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1955.
- Mathauser, Zdeněk. *Mezi filosofii a poezií*. Prague: Filosofia 1995.
- Mathauser, Zdeněk. *Báseň na dosah eidosu. Ke stopám fenomenologie v ruské literatuře a literární vědě*. Prague: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, 2005.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phénoménologie de la perception*, Paris: Gallimard, 1945; *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962; rpt., with trans. revisions by Forrest Williams and Daniel Guerrière, 1989.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Sens et non-sens*. Paris: Nagel, 1948; *Sense and Non-Sense*. Trans. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Patricia A. Dreyfus. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *L'Oeil et l'Esprit*. [1961]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964; "Eye and Mind." Trans. Carleton Dallery. In his *The Primacy of Perception and Other Essays*. Ed. James M. Edie. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964, 159–90.
- MIKI Kiyoshi. 構想力の論理 [Kosoryoku no ronri; Logic of imagination]. Tokyo: Iwanami-Shoten Publishers, 1946.
- Mokrejš, Antonín. *Filosofie a život—život a umění*. Prague: Filosofia, 1995.
- Morley, John. "The Private Theater: A Phenomenological Investigation of Daydreaming," In *Journal*

- of *Phenomenological Psychology*, 29, 1998, 116–134.
- Mugerauer, Robert. *Interpretations on Behalf of Place: Environmental Displacements and Alternative Responses*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Au fond des images*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 2003.
- Natanson, Maurice. *Literature, Philosophy, and the Social Sciences*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.
- Natanson, Maurice. *The Erotic Bird: Phenomenology in Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Neri, Guido. *Il sensibile, la storia, l'arte. Scritti 1957–2001*. Verona: Ombre Corte, 2003.
- NISHIDA Kitarō. 西田幾多郎全集、全19巻 [Nishida Kitarō zenshū; Complete works with letters and diary]. Vols. 19, 4th ed. Tokyo: Iwanami-Shoten Publishers, 1987–89.
- Norberg-Schulz, Christian. *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli, 1985.
- Oberti, Elisa. *Estetica. Teoria dell'oggetto artistico come presenza evidenziata*. Milan: Marzorati, 1962; 2nd ed. Celuc, 1974.
- Oberti, Elisa. *Estetica: Teoria dell'oggetto artistico come presenza evidenziata*. Milan: Marzorati, 1962; 2nd ed. Celuc, 1974.
- Odebrecht, Rudolf. *Gefühl und schöpferische Gestaltung. Leitgedanken zu einer Philosophie der Kunst*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1929.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *The Dehumanization of Art and Other Essays on Art, Culture, and Literature*. Trans. Helene Well et al. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968 [includes “Notes on the Novel” and “On the Point of View in the Arts”].
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *Meditaciones sobre la literatura y el arte: la manera española de ver las cosas*. Madrid: Ed. E. Inman Fox. Madrid: Castalia, 1988.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *El sentimiento estético de la vida (Antología)*. Ed. J. L. Molinuevo. Madrid: Tecnos, 1995.
- Otto, M. A. C. *Das Fest. Zu einer Phänomenologie der Ausnahme*. Freiburg: Karl Alber, 2000.
- Paci, Enzo. *Relazioni e significati*, Vol. 2, *Kierkegaard e Thomas Mann*. Milan Lampugnani Nigri, 1965; rpt. Bompiani, 1991.
- Papi, Fulvio. *La parola incantata e altri saggi di filosofia dell'arte* [1930]. Milan: Guerini, 1992.
- Pareyson, Luigi. *Estetica: Teoria della formatività*. Florence: Sansoni, 1954; rpt. Milan: Bompiani 2002.
- Pareyson, Luigi. *Teoria dell'arte*. Milan: V. Mursia, 1965.
- Parviainen, Jaana. *Bodies Moving and Moved: A Phenomenological Analysis of the Dancing Subject and the Cognitive and Ethical Values of Dance Art*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 1988.
- Patočka, Jan. *Umění a čas*. Ed. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. *Sebrané spisy*, Vols. 4, 5. Prague: OIKOYMENH, 2004; partly translated in *L'art et le temps: Essais*. Trans. Erika Abrams. Paris: P.O.L., 1990a, and *L'écrivain, son “objet”: Essais*. Trans. Erika Abrams, Paris: P.O.L. 1990b; *Kunst und Zeit. Kulturphilosophische Schriften*. Ed. Klaus Nellen and Ilja Srubar. Trans. Ilja Srubar, Vera Srubar, et al. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987.
- Pfänder, Alexander. “Malerei und Zeichnung.” Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Pfänderiana* E III 1.
- Pfänder, Alexander. “Zum Problem des Stils.” Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Pfänderiana* E III 2.
- Pfänder, Alexander. “Materialien zur Ästhetik.” Unpublished manuscript, Bavarian State Library, Munich, *Pfänderiana* E V.
- Piana, Giovanni. *Filosofia della musica*. Milan: Guerini, 1991.
- Pirjevec, Dušan. *Evropski roman*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba, 1979.
- Rayner, Alice. *To Act, To Do, To Perform: Drama and the Phenomenology of Action*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Richir, Marc. *Melville, les assises du monde*. Paris: Hachette, 1996.
- Richir, Marc. “Art et artifact.” In *Utopia 3*. Ed. C. G. Bruni. Paris: GERMS, 2002, 62–75.
- Richir, Marc. “Du rôle de la phantasia au théâtre et le roman.” In *Littérature*, 132, 2003, 24–33.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *La métaphore vive*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1975; *The Rule of Metaphor*. Trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Temps et récit*. Vols. 3, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983, 1984, 1985; *Time and narrative*. Vols. 3, Trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984–1988.

- Rombach, Heinrich. *Leben des Geistes. Ein Buch der Bilder zur Fundamentalgeschichte der Menschheit*. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.
- Rombach, Heinrich. *Der Ursprung. Philosophie der Konkreativität von Mensch und Natur*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1994.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'imagination. Étude critique*. Paris: Alcan 1936.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'imaginaire: Psychologie phénoménologique de l'imagination*. Paris, Gallimard, 1940; *The Psychology of Imagination*. Trans. Bernard Frechtman. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948; newly trans. as *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. Trans. Jonathan Webber. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* Paris: Gallimard, 1948; *What is Literature?* Trans. Bernard Frechtman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Un théâtre de situations*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973; *Sartre on Theater*. Trans. Frank Jellinek. New York: Random House, 1976.
- Scaramuzza, Gabriele, and Karl Schuhmann, eds. "Ein Husserlmanuskript über Ästhetik." In *Husserl Studies* 7, 1990, 165–77.
- Schaeffer, Pierre. *Traité des objets musicaux*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966.
- Schapp, Wilhelm. *Beiträge zur Philosophie der Wahrnehmung* [1910]. New ed. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1981.
- Scheler, Max. "Metaphysik und Kunst." In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 11, *Schriften aus dem Nachlass*, 2: *Erkenntnislehre und Metaphysik*. Ed. Manfred S. Frings. Bern: Francke, 1979, 28–45.
- Schmitz, Hermann. *Der Leib im Spiegel der Kunst (System der Philosophie II/2)*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1966.
- Schmitz, Hermann. "Die Kunst." In his.: *Das Göttliche und der Raum (System der Philosophie III/4)*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1977, 613–85.
- Schutz, Alfred. "Making Music Together: A Study in Social Relationship." In *Social Research* 18, 1951, 76–97; rpt. in his *Collected Paper II*. Ed. Arvid Brodersen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964, 159–78.
- Schutz, Alfred. "A 'Construction of Sociological Aspect of Literature.'" Ed. Lester Embree. In Alfred Schutz, "*Sociological Aspect of Literature*": *Construction and Complementary Essays*. Ed. Lester Embree. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998, 1–71.
- Sepp, Hans Rainer. *Bild. Phänomenologie der Epoche I*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2010.
- Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. *The Phenomenology of Dance*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.
- Smith, F. Joseph. *The Experiencing of Musical Sound*. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1979.
- Sobchack, Vivian. *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Sobchack, Vivian. *Carnal Thoughts: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004; description of *Carnal Thoughts* by anonymous University of California Press editor, <http://ucpress.edu/books/pages/10172.html>.
- Špet, Gustav Gustavovich. *Явление и смысл*. Moscow: ГЕРмес, 1914.; Gustav Shpet. *Appearance and Sense: Phenomenology as the Fundamental Science and its Problems*. Trans. Thomas Nemeth, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.

About the Authors

Daniela Angelucci (Ph.D. at University of Palermo, 2002) is Researcher at University of Roma Tre. She is interested in phenomenological aesthetics, in particular the structural analysis of the aesthetic object, and in philosophy of film. She teaches Aesthetics in the Department of philosophy of Roma Tre and Aesthetics and theory of film at University of Calabria. Author of *Il visibile e l'irreale. L'oggetto estetico nel pensiero di Nicolai Hartmann* (1999) and *L'oggetto poetico. Conrad, Ingarden, Hartmann* (2004), she has edited the collective volume *Arte e daimon* (2002) and the anthology *Estetica e cinema* (2009).

Michael D. Barber is Hotfelter Professor of Philosophy at St. Louis University. He is the author of numerous articles and five books, including *Social Typifications and the Elusive Other: The Place of Sociology of Knowledge in Alfred Schutz's Phenomenology* (1988), *Guardian of Dialogue: Max Scheler's Phenomenology, Sociology of Knowledge, and Philosophy of Love* (1993); *Ethical Hermeneutics: Rationality in Enrique Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation* (1998); *Equality and Diversity: Phenomenological Investigations of Prejudice and Discrimination* (2001); and *The Participating Citizen: A Biography of Alfred Schutz* (2004). At present he is working on a book on phenomenology and the Pittsburgh Neo-Hegelians and editing a volume on Schutz's literary writings.

Anna Blume (1967–2008) taught at the Universities of Hamburg, Potsdam, and Lüneburg and at the *Hochschule für bildende Künste Hamburg* (College of Fine Arts in Hamburg). While she had a post-doctoral stipend from the University of Macerata (Italy), she worked on her habilitation project,

“Subjectivity—Art—Space.” She was primarily interested in aesthetics and phenomenology, particularly in working critically with the approach to the phenomenology of Hermann Schmitz. She is author of *Scham und Selbstbewusstsein. Zur Phänomenologie konkreter Subjektivität bei Hermann Schmitz* (2003), and editor of *Zur Phänomenologie der ästhetischen Erfahrung* (2005) and *Was bleibt von Gott? Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des Heiligen und der Religion* (2007).

John B. Brough is Professor in the Department of Philosophy at Georgetown University. He has translated Edmund Husserl's *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness Internal Time* (1991) and Husserl's *Phantasy, Image Consciousness, and Memory* (2005), and is the coeditor of *The Many Faces of Time* (2000). He has written several essays on Husserl's phenomenology of time, as well as a number of essays on phenomenological aesthetics, focusing particularly on such issues as Husserl's account of depiction, the nature of artistic images, the possibility of picturing the spiritual, and time and the visual arts.

Jagna Brudzińska (Ph.D. at the University of Cologne, 2005) is an Assistant Professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Polish Academy of Sciences and Assistant at the Cologne Husserl-Archive. Her area of specialization is the philosophy of Edmund Husserl, especially his late genetic phenomenology. She deals with the systematic questions of phenomenological method and the theory of phenomenological experience as well the interdisciplinary potentiality of modern phenomenology and the relationship between phenomenology and psychology specifically in the area of psychoanalysis. In

her doctoral thesis (*Assoziation, Imaginäres, Trieb. Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Genesis der Subjektivität bei Husserl und Freud*, 2005) she referred to the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud. She is the author of a number of articles about phenomenology and psychoanalysis.

Philippe Cabestan is Professor in philosophy at Janson de Sailly (Paris). He has published many articles in French on Jean-Paul Sartre, phenomenology, and psychiatry. He wrote a book, *L'Etre et la conscience. Recherches sur la psychologie et l'ontologie sartriennes* (2004) and recently translated (with Françoise Dastur) Medard Boss's *Daseinsanalyse und Psychoanalyse* (2008). He is also president of the Ecole Française de Daseinsanalyse.

Edward S. Casey is Distinguished Professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, where he was chairman of the philosophy department from 1991 to 2001. In earlier work, he concentrated on such areas as aesthetics, imagination, psychoanalytic theory, memory, and place/space. His present research interests focus on the nature of emotions, the role of the glance in human perception, and the character of borders and boundaries as kinds of edge. His books include the following: *Imagining: A Phenomenological Study*; *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study* (2000); *Getting Back into Place* (1993); *The Fate of Place* (1998); *Representing Place in Landscape Painting and Maps* (2002); *Earth-Mapping: Artists Reshaping Landscape* (2005); and *The World at a Glance* (2005).

Timothy K. Casey (Duquesne University, 1986) teaches philosophy at the University of Scranton. His interests include philosophy of technology, environmental philosophy, and the philosophy of architecture. He is coeditor of *Is Human Nature Obsolete? Genetics, Bioengineering, and the Future of the Human Condition* (2005) and *Lifeworld and Technology* (1990).

CHEN Zhiyuan is associate professor of philosophy at the department of philosophy of Sichuan University. He has written several articles on Kant's transcendental idealism and Husserl's phenomenology, particularly on their theories of intuition. At present he is working

on a new book to be entitled *The Origin of Husserl's Concept of Intuition*.

CHEUNG Chan-Fai received his Dr. Phil. from Freiburg University, Germany. He is currently professor in the philosophy department, director of University General Education, and director of the Research Centre for Phenomenology and the Human Sciences at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. His publications include: *Der anfängliche Boden der Phänomenologie* (1983), *The Humanities and General Education* (in Chinese 1995), *Heidegger and Husserl's Phenomenology* (in Chinese 1995), *Phenomenology of Interculturality and Life-world* (coedited with Ernst Wolfgang Orth, 1998), and *Memory and Oblivion* (coauthored with Julie Chiu, 2003). He has had five solo exhibitions on photography and the book *Photographs and Seals: Collected Works of Cheung Chan Fai* (1992).

John F. Crosby (Ph.D. from University of Salzburg, 1970) has taught at the University of Dallas and held a chair of philosophy at the International Academy of Philosophy in Liechtenstein. Since 1990 he has been professor of philosophy at Franciscan University. His work centers around issues in personalist philosophy. His main books are *The Selfhood of the Human Person* (1996) and *Personalist Papers* (2004). He has edited and contributed to a special issue of the *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* on the thought of Max Scheler (2005). He has also written studies of Scheler, Dietrich von Hildebrand, Karol Wojtyla, Adolf Reinach, and John Henry Newman.

Françoise Dastur is honorary professor in philosophy. She has been teaching at Paris I (Sorbonne), Paris XII, and Nice. She is attached to the Husserl Archives of Paris, a research unit affiliated to the French National Center for Research (CNRS), and is the honorary President of the École Française de Daseinsanalyse, of which she was the founder in 1993. She has published many articles in French, English, and German on Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Ricoeur, Derrida, etc. She is the author of several books in French, three of which have been translated into English: *Heidegger and the Question of Time* (1998), *Telling Time. Sketch of a Phenomenological Chronology* (2000), and *Death. An Essay on Finitude* (1996). Her latest publications are *Heidegger et la question anthropologique* (2003),

La phénoménologie en questions: Langage, altérité, temporalité, finitude (2004), *Philosophie et différence* (2004), *Heidegger, la question du logos* (2007), and *La mort. Essai sur la finitude* (enlarged version 2007).

Natalie Depraz is Professor at Rouen and defended a Habilitation at the University of Poitiers in December 2004 “Phenomenology and Practice.” She published *Transcendance et incarnation. L’intersubjectivité comme altérité à soi dans la philosophie de E. Husserl* (1995), *Lucidité du corps. De l’empirisme transcendantal en phénoménologie* (2001), *La conscience: des classiques aux sciences cognitives* (2001), *On Becoming Aware. An Experiential Pragmatics* (with F. J. Varela & P. Vermersch, 2003), *Phenomenology as a Practice* (with A. Colin 2006), *Lire Husserl en phénoménologie* (2008), and *Le corps glorieux. Phénoménologie pratique de la Philocalie des Pères du desert et des Pères de l’Eglise* (2008).

Mădălina Diaconu (Ph.D. Bucharest 1996, Ph.D. Vienna 1998, Habilitation Vienna 2006) is docent at the University of Vienna. She is currently managing an interuniversity research project on haptic and olfactory design. Her Habilitation thesis deals with the aesthetics of touch, smell, and taste (*Tasten, Riechen, Schmecken. Eine Ästhetik der anästhesierten Sinne*, 2005). Other publications include: *On the Edge of the Precipice. Søren Kierkegaard and the Nihilism of the 19th Century* (in Romanian; 1996), *The Ontology of the Work of Art in the Light of the Principle of Identity* (in Romanian; 2000), *Blickumkehr. Mit Martin Heidegger zu einer relationalen Ästhetik* (2000), etc. She edited *Kunst und Wahrheit. Festschrift für Walter Biemel zum 85. Geburtstag* (2003) and co-edited with Ion Copoeru and Delia Popa *Person, Community, and Identity* (2003). She is a member of the Editorial Board of *Studia Phänomenologica*. Her current fields of interest include aesthetics, environmental perception, sensory design, philosophy of architecture, and urban space.

Lester Embree (New School for Social Research, 1972) studied with Edward G. Ballard, Dorion Cairns, and Aron Gurwitsch. He has taught at Northern Illinois University, Duquesne University, and Florida Atlantic University, where he is currently the William F. Dietrich Eminent Scholar in Philosophy. From 1985 to 2005 he was president of the Center

for Advanced Research in Phenomenology, Inc. www.phenomenologycenter.org and he led the founding and early development of the Organization of Phenomenological Organizations www.o-p-o.net. He has translated works of Suzanne Bachelard and Paul Ricoeur; edited work of Cairns, Gurwitsch, and Alfred Schutz and also various collective volumes, the *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology* (1997) included; and authored a number of essays and three books, *Reflective Analysis* (2006), *Fenomenología Continuada* (2007), and *Environment, Technology, Justification* (2008) that are in and on constitutive phenomenology. His deepest interest is in the theory of the cultural disciplines, the theory of American theoretical archaeology in particular.

Eliane Escoubas is professor of philosophy in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Paris XII-Val de Marne. She is interested in the history of German philosophy since Kant, German and French phenomenology, and the philosophy of art (painting and poetry). She is the author of many articles. Among her books are *Imago mundi—Topologie de l’art* (1986), *L’espace pictural* (1995), and *L’esthétique* (2003). She is the translator of Edmund Husserl’s *Recherches phénoménologiques pour la constitution (Ideen II)* (1982) and the translator of Theodor Adorno’s *Kierkegaard. Construction de l’esthétique* (1995). She has edited several collective Volumes: *Art et Phénoménologie: “La Part de l’œil,”* n° 7 (1991), *Problème de la Kunstwissenschaft: “La part de l’œil,”* n° 15–16 (with Holger Schmid, 1999–2000), *Phénoménologie française et phénoménologie allemande. Deutsche und Französische Phänomenologie* (with Bernhard Waldenfels, 2000), and *Affekt und Affektivität in der neuzeitlichen Philosophie und der Phänomenologie* (with Laszlo Tengelyi 2008). She is member of the Comité de rédaction of “La part de l’œil” (Académie des Beaux-Arts de Bruxelles).

Licia Fabiani (Doctor of philosophy in the history of art, Freiburg 2004) has a long-standing collaboration with the department of aesthetics at the University of Milano. She is interested in the philosophical and phenomenological content of avant-garde painting from the beginning of the twentieth century. She has a deep knowledge of the work of Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, Karl Einstein, Alois Riegl, Wilhelm Wundt, Hermann von Helmholtz, and deals with the

problems of pure visibility (*Reine Sichtbarkeit*) and empathy (*Einfühlungstheorie*) in general. She edited *La via al cubismo* (The Rise of Cubisme, 2001) and published articles in the journal *Materiali di Estetica*.

Andrzej Gniazdowski, Dr. Hab., is associate professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences and secretary of the Polish Association of Phenomenology. His main field of interest is the relation between phenomenology and political theory. He has published *Filozofia i gilotyna. Tradycjonalizm Josepha de Maistre'a jako hermeneutyka polityczna* (1996), *Polityka i geometria. Fenomenologia Edmunda Husserla a problem demokracji* (2007). He played a part in the translation of Heidegger's *Nietzsche* (1998).

Ludger Hagedorn, Dr. phil. (Technical University of Berlin, 2002), is Purkyně Fellow at the Czech Academy of Sciences and lecturer in philosophy at Charles University, Prague. His main areas of interest include phenomenology, philosophy of history, and political philosophy. He is the editor of Jan Patočka's *Andere Wege in die Moderne* (2005), two volumes on the history of Czech philosophy: *Tschechische Philosophen im 20. Jahrhundert* (2002), and *Tschechische Philosophen von Hus bis Masaryk* (2003). He edited Patočka's *Texte – Dokumente – Bibliographie* (with Hans Rainer Sepp, 1999) and *Über Zivilisation und Differenz. Beiträge zu einer politischen Phänomenologie Europas* (with Michael Staudigl, 2007).

Sara Heinämaa is docent and senior lecturer in theoretical philosophy at the University of Helsinki (Finland). She is currently working as Academy fellow at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. She is the author of *Toward a Phenomenology of Sexual Difference: Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, and Beauvoir* and has published several articles on the phenomenology of embodiment, personality, intersubjectivity, and sexual difference. She has coedited *Consciousness: From Perception to Reflection* and *Psychology and Philosophy: Inquiries into the Soul from Late Scholasticism to Contemporary Thought*.

Wolfhart Henckmann is professor of philosophy at the department of philosophy of the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich (1980), and since

1997 he has been president of the Max-Scheler-Society. He is interested in the history of German Philosophy since the eighteenth century, especially in aesthetics, hermeneutics, anthropology, philosophy of culture, and in the phenomenological movement. He has edited and commented on the aesthetics of Schiller, Solger, Hegel, K. Rosenkranz, Utitz, and Geiger. He is coeditor and coauthor of *Lexikon der Ästhetik* (2004) and *Ästhetische Theorie in der DDR 1949 bis 1990* (2001), and he is the author of *Max Scheler* (1998).

Terri J. Hennings received her Ph.D. from the department of comparative literature and cultural studies at the University of Minnesota after completing a Masters Degree in German language and literature at Purdue University. She has taught at the University of Minnesota, Macalester College, the University of Freiburg, and for the University of Wisconsin-Madison's Academic Year in Freiburg Program. Her areas of interest and research are the interplay between literature and philosophy (with particular emphasis on critical theory and theories of the aesthetic), and theories of the postmodern including cultural theory and film. As one of the co-founders and committee members of the *Freiburger Dialoge*, she also is active in the Freiburg cultural scene. Hennings has published on literature and philosophy, aesthetics, film, and popular culture in various journals and anthologies in English and German, which include editing the forthcoming volume *The Political Between Media/Images/Writing* in the series *Textures-Philosophy/Literature/Culture*. She is currently at work on a book exploring aesthetic ideology in relationship to new technology and its instantiation in economic globalization.

Galen A. Johnson (Boston University, 1977) is professor of philosophy and director of the Center for the Humanities at the University of Rhode Island. He is interested in contemporary aesthetics, recent French philosophy, especially Merleau-Ponty, American philosophy, and philosophy of psychology. He is the author of *Earth and Sky, History and Philosophy: Island Images Inspired by Husserl and Merleau-Ponty* (1989), coeditor with Michael B. Smith of *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty* (1990), editor of *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (1993, 1995, 1998), and author of *The Retrieval of the Beautiful: Thinking Through Merleau-Ponty's Aesthetics* (2009).

KANATA Susumu (Dr. Lit. from The University of Tokyo, 2004) is honorary professor and auditor at Hiroshima University. Since 1969 he has been professor of aesthetics and comparative culture studies at Hiroshima University and has lectured on phenomenological aesthetics at the Universities of Tohoku, Tokyo, Osaka. Since 1979 he has been on the organizing committee of the Phenomenological Association of Japan. He is interested in Husserl's phenomenology of imagination and image consciousness as well as in the *locus* of artistic activities and the stratal structure of the artwork, and currently in the publicity of aesthetic consciousness and the intersubjectivity of aesthetic feelings. He has published books that include *The Structures of the Beauties of Pictorial Works* (1984) and *The Phenomenology of Artworks* (1994).

Gediminas Karoblis (Vytautas Magnus University, 2003) is associate professor in philosophy at the Department of Philosophy of Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania. He is also assistant professor in dance at the Department of Music of the Norwegian University of Science and Technology. He has won international modern ballroom dance competitions (1986–1992). Since 1992 he teaches dance sport and social dance, including Argentinean Tango and Salsa. He is interested in the phenomenology of dance, particularly social dance.

Helmut Kohlenberger (Dr. Phil. Universität Tübingen) has lectured at Tübingen, Munich, Vienna, Salzburg, and Krakow. He published and (co-) edited studies on medieval philosophy, in particular on Anselm of Canterbury, on the history of ideas, philosophy of art, law, history, religion, cultural paradigms, and on Austrian literature in exile. His books include *Similitudo und Ratio. Zur Methode bei Anselm von Canterbury* (1972), *Cuando el juego va en serio* (1991), *Gesellschaftstheorien. Ihre Entwicklungsgeschichte als Krisenmanagement in Österreich 1850–1938* (coauthor R. Knoll, 1994), *Dopisy o Německu. Briefe über Deutschland* (1996).

Dean Komel (Ph.D. University of Ljubljana, 1995) is professor for contemporary philosophy and cultural hermeneutics at the University of Ljubljana. He is additionally president of the Phenomenological Society of Ljubljana since 1996 and Research Head at the Institute for the Humanities "Nova revija"

(Ljubljana) since 2005. He published *Fenomenologija in vprašanje biti* (Phenomenology and the Question of Being, 1993), *Razprstost prebivanja. O razmejitvi hermenevitične fenomenologije in filozofske antropologije* (The Disclosure of Existence. On the Delimitation between Hermeneutical Phenomenology and Philosophical Anthropology, 1996), *Diagrami bivanja* (Diagrams of Being, 1998), editor of *Annäherungen. Zur hermeneutischen Phänomenologie von "Sein und Zeit,"* (1999), *Osnutja. K filozofski in kulturni hermenevtiki* (Outlines. On a Philosophical and Cultural Hermeneutics, 2001), *Uvod v filozofsko in kulturno hermenevtiko* (Introduction to Philosophical and Cultural Hermeneutics, 2002), *Identita e mediazione* (2003), *Medpotja filozofije in kulture* (Intersections of Philosophy and Culture, 2004), *Kunst und Sein. Beiträge zur Phänomenologischen Ästhetik und Aletheiologie* (2004), *Tradition und Vermittlung. Der interkulturelle Sinn Europas* (2005), *Resnica in resničnost sodobnosti* (The Truth and the Realty of Contemporaneity, 2007), *Humanistični razgovori* (Humanistic Dialogues, 2007), *Smisao posredovanja* (The Sense of Mediation, 2008), and *Intermundus. Hermeneutisch-phänomenologische Entwürfe* (2009).

Annamaria Lossi, Dr. Phil. (Pisa and Freiburg, 2005) is interested in hermeneutics, aesthetics (theory of images and literature), and phenomenology. She is author of contributions about Nietzsche, Plato, and Fink published in international journals and compilations, and of the book *Nietzsche und Platon. Begegnung auf dem Weg der Umdrehung des Platonismus* (2006). She is editor and translator of Günter Figal's works: *Nietzsche. Eine philosophische Einführung* (Nietzsche. Un ritratto filosofico, 2002), *Heidegger zur Einführung* (Introduzione al pensiero di Martin Heidegger, 2006), *Das Untier und die Liebe* (Il mostruoso e l'amore. Saggi su Platone, 2006), and *Für eine Philosophie von Wahrheit und Streit* (Per una filosofia della libertà e del conflitto: saggi di estetica, politica, metafisica, 2007); and of Eugen Fink's works: *Grundphänomene des menschlichen Daseins* (Fenomeni fondamentali dell'esistenza, 2006) and *Nähe und Distanz* (Prossimità e distanza, 2006). At present she is working on a project at the University of Pisa about the concept of "Bildlichkeit" in German literature.

Christian Lotz is an associate professor of philosophy at Michigan State University. He is the author of *From Affectivity to Subjectivity. Revisiting Edmund Husserl's Phenomenology* (2007) and *Vom Leib zum Selbst. Kritische Analysen zu Husserl und Heidegger* (Lived Body and Self. Critical Investigations in Husserl and Heidegger, 2005). In addition, he has coedited *Phenomenology and the Non-Human Animal. At the Limits of Experience* (2007), *Erinnerung. Philosophische Positionen, Perspektiven und Probleme* (2004), *Subjektivität – Verantwortung – Wahrheit. Neue Aspekte der Phänomenologie Edmund Husserls* (2002), and *Philosophie als Denkwerkzeug. Zur Aktualität transzendentalphilosophischer Argumentation* (2000). He has published articles on various topics and philosophers in European philosophy in major US and German journals. His current research interests are in German philosophy, in aesthetics and philosophy of culture, as well as in the role of the concept of conscience for a theory of subjectivity.

Paul Majkut, founder of the Society for Phenomenology and Media, is professor of literature at National University, California. Recipient of two Fulbright stipends (Argentina, Finland) and a National Endowment for the Humanities grant (Cambridge University), he is a Reader of Rare Books and Manuscripts at the Huntington and Cambridge Libraries. He studied Husserl with V. J. McGill. His interests include media history and theory. Majkut has given courses at Universität Stuttgart, Jyväskylä University, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, and lectured at Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie Karlsruhe, Internationales Zentrum für Kultur- und Technikforschung Stuttgart, and the Experimental Arts Foundation, Australia. He was a juror at the Munich Filmfest, 2008, and has won numerous journalism awards. Recently he has published “Asterion’s Nightmare” (1999), “Empathy’s Impostor” (2000), “The Selflessness of Transcendental Deception” (2001), “Miranda’s World” (2002), “Phenomenological Flâneur” (2003), “Thao’s Smile” (2004), “Mohammed’s Miracle, Baudrillard’s Simulation,” “Toque intolerable” (2005), “Meta-TV” (2006), “Cool Media, Cold Consequences” (2007), and “The Illuminating Traveler” (2008).

Ram Adhar Mall is professor of philosophy at the Department of Philosophy of the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich and of the University of Cologne, Germany. He received his M.A. in philosophy from Calcutta University and did further studies in philosophy in Calcutta, Göttingen, and Cologne where he earned his Ph.D. in 1963. He did his habilitation at the University of Trier, Germany, in 1981. He is the founding president of the International Society for Intercultural Philosophy and coeditor of the series “Studies in Intercultural Philosophy.” He has taught at various Indian, German, and Austrian universities. Some of his main publications include: *Hume’s Concept of Man. An Essay in Philosophical Anthropology* (1967), *Experience and Reason. The Phenomenology of Husserl and its Relation to Hume’s Philosophy* (1973), *Naturalism and Criticism* (1975), *Der operative Begriff des Geistes. Locke, Berkeley, Hume* (1984), *Mall / Hülsmann: Die drei Geburtsorte der Philosophie. China, Indien, Europa* (1989), *Philosophie im Vergleich der Kulturen. Interkulturelle Philosophie—eine neue Orientierung* (1995), *Der Hinduismus. Seine Stellung in der Vielfalt der Religionen* (1997), *Mensch und Geschichte. Wider die Anthropozentrik* (2000), *Intercultural Philosophy* (2000), *Essays zur interkulturellen Philosophie* (2003), *Essays zur Religionsphilosophie und Religionswissenschaft* (2004), *Mahatma Gandhi—interkulturell gelesen* (2005), *Yousefi / Mall: Grundpositionen der interkulturellen Philosophie* (2005), *Buddhistische Lehre und die inhaltliche Toleranz. Eine interkulturelle Einführung* (2005). His main fields of interest are empiricism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, intercultural philosophy, and comparative religious studies.

Daniel Marcelle received his MA in philosophy at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven writing on problems of subjectivity in Levinas, Heidegger, and Husserl, and will defend his Ph.D. there in the Spring of 2009, which extends Aron Gurwitsch’s project of including Gestalt Theory in various aspects of Husserlian phenomenology, above all the field theory of consciousness, the structure of subjectivity, noematic organization, and the structures of the lifeworld. Presently he is the William F. Dietrich Fellow in Philosophy

at Florida Atlantic University. He has published articles on problems in perception and phenomenological method in psychology. He is interested in psychological aspects of aesthetic experience and the ontology of the aesthetic object.

Javier San Martín (Pamplona 1946, Spain; Ph.D., Madrid, *The Concept of the Reduction* 1972) is full professor of philosophy at UNED (Madrid) and founder of the Spanish Society of Phenomenology. He is author of over 100 articles on phenomenology and philosophical anthropology, and has written many books including: *La antropología, ciencia humana, ciencia crítica*, (1985, 2000), *La estructura del método fenomenológico* (1986), *La fenomenología como utopía de la razón* (1987), *La fenomenología como teoría de una racionalidad fuerte* (1994), *Fenomenología y cultura en Ortega* (1998), *Teoría de la cultura* (1999), and *Para una filosofía de Europa* (2008). He is the editor of José Ortega y Gasset's *Schriften zur Phänomenologie* (1997) and *Phänomenologie in Spanien* (2005).

Augusto Mazzoni (Philosophy and Letters at Milano University, 1987 and 1997, Clarinet at Brescia School of Music, 1985, Composition and Musicology at Milano School of Music, 1996) teaches at "V. Gambara" School of Social Sciences (Brescia, Italy) and at "O. Vecchi" School of Music (Modena, Italy). He is interested in musical theory, musical analysis, aesthetics, and philosophy of music. He is author of "La musica nell'estetica fenomenológica" (2004) and "La musica nell'ermeneutica contemporanea" (2005).

Bálazs M. Mezei (Ph.D. 1992, Habilitation 1999, Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences 2006). Since 2003 he has been the director of the Institute of Philosophy, and from 2005 a full professor at P. P. Hungarian Catholic University. He chairs the sections of phenomenology and the philosophy of religion for the Hungarian Philosophical Association. He has published extensively on phenomenology and has translated a number of works by Husserl and other phenomenologists into Hungarian. His work on philosophy of religion belongs to what is characterized as the post-secular religious thought. Currently he is working on a philosophy of divine revelation. His primary publications include: "The Concept of Person in the Thought of Karol Wojtila"

(2008), "Divine Revelation: A Central Notion of the European Legacy" (2008), *Vallásbölcsélet* (2005), "Platonic and Husserlian Intentionality" (2003), *The Four Phases of Philosophy* (with Barry Smith, 1998), "Phenomenology in Hungary" (1997), and *World and Life-World—Aspects of the Philosophy of Edmund Husserl* (1995).

César Moreno Marquez (University of Seville—Spain, 1988) was president of the Sociedad Española de Fenomenología. He organised the XVIIIth Congreso Internacional de Fenomenología (The World Phenomenology Institute & University of Seville—1986) and the Vth, VIth and VIIth Congresos de Fenomenología in Spain (Sociedad Española de Fenomenología—2000, 2002, 2004). He is interested in phenomenology and hermeneutics, the literary experience, contemporary art (avant-garde), mass media, and especially the problem of intersubjectivity and alterity. He is author of many studies in philosophical reviews and of three books: *La intención comunicativa. Ontología e intersubjetividad en la fenomenología de Husserl* (1989), *Tráfico de almas. Ensayo sobre el deseo de alteridad* (1998), and *Fenomenología y filosofía existencial* (2 Vols., 2000). He is coeditor of *Signo, Intencionalidad, verdad. Estudios de Fenomenología* (with Alicia de Mingo, 2005).

Simone Neuber studied philosophy and English literature in New York and Tübingen from where she graduated with a Master's thesis on Heidegger. At present she is mentor at the University of Tübingen and preparing a doctoral dissertation on fiction, appearance, and emotion.

Cathrin Nielsen (Dr., University of Tübingen, 2002) is a science assistant at the Eugen Fink-Archiv Freiburg, and a member of the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology at Charles University, Prague and the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. She works on ancient and modern philosophy, metaphysical and phenomenological traditions, and the tradition and theory of art. At present, she is pursuing a project on the concept of time in Nietzsche. She is the author of *Die entzogene Mitte. Gegenwart bei Heidegger* (2003), coeditor of *Die Phänomenologie und das Leib-Seele-Problem* (2005) and *Bildung im technischen Zeitalter* (2005), and collaborated with

Hans Rainer Sepp as general editors of the *Eugen Fink-Gesamtausgabe*.

Markus Ophälders (State University of Bologna, Ph.D., 1999) is assistant professor in aesthetics at the State University of Milan. He is interested in aesthetics and philosophy of history, particularly German Romanticism and Idealism as well as in authors such as Walter Benjamin and Theodor W. Adorno. He is author of *Dialettica dell'ironia romantica* (2000), *Costruire l'esperienza* (2001), *Romantische Ironie* (2004), *Filosofia arte estetica* (2008), *Labirinti* (2008), editor of *Arte e Fenomenologie. Immagini e Figure riflesse nella Filosofia* (2005), and *Etica della filosofia* (2007), as well as coeditor of F.W.J. Schelling, *Clara* (1987) and *Oswald Spengler. Tramonto e metamorfosi dell'Occidente* (2004).

Andrea Pinotti (Università degli Studi di Milano, Ph.D., 1998) is assistant professor in aesthetics at the Università degli Studi di Milano. His fields include the history of German aesthetics in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, image-theories, and the relationship between philosophy and art history. He was fellow at the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America at Columbia University (2003–2004) and Directeur d'études associé at the EHESS in Paris (2007). He is the author of several Italian editions of aesthetics texts (by K. Fiedler, A. Hildebrand, A. Riegl, W. Worringer, M. Geiger, G. Simmel, E. Straus, and D. Katz) and published the following books: *Il corpo dello stile. Storia dell'arte come storia dell'estetica a partire da Semper*, Riegl, Wölfflin (1998, 2001), *Piccola storia della lontananza. Walter Benjamin storico della percezione* (1999), *Memorie del neutro. Morfologia dell'immagine in Aby Warburg* (2001), *Quadro e tipo. L'estetico in Burckhardt* (2004), and *Estetica della pittura* (2007).

Christian Rabanus (University of Mainz, Dr. Phil., 2000) is lecturer in philosophy at the University of Mainz and research fellow at the Eugen Fink Archive at Freiburg. He is interested in practical aspects of phenomenology, especially the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Jan Patočka as well as on phenomenological research on art, new media, and technology. He is editor of *Primärbibliographie der Schriften Karl Jaspers* (2000), author of *Praktische Phänomenologie* (2002),

and coeditor of *Borderline. Strategien und Taktiken für Kunst und soziale Praxis* (2002).

Mario Teodoro Ramírez is professor of philosophy at the Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo of Morelia, Michoacán (Mexico) and Dean of the Institute of Philosophical Research of this university. He is a member of the editorial board and contributor of the review *Chiasmi International*. Among his specialities are the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty—about whom he has published three books and several articles—as well as aesthetics, philosophy of culture, and philosophy in Mexico.

Yvanka B. Raynova (M.A. Sofia University 1984; Ph.D. 1989 Institute of Philosophy) is professor of philosophy at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, founder and chair of the Bulgarian Phenomenological Center, and director of the Institute for Axiological Research in Vienna. She works on the anthropological, axiological, and religious aspects of phenomenology. She is author of seven books, including: *From Husserl to Ricoeur. The Phenomenological Account to Human Being* (1993), *Jean-Paul Sartre, the Philosopher without God* (1995), *Paul Ricoeur: Zwischen Sakral und Profan* (2005), and *Between the Said and the Unsaid. Conversations with Paul Ricoeur* (forthcoming). She is editor of numerous series, including: “Philosophie, Phänomenologie und Hermeneutik der Werte” at Peter Lang, and translated Sartre’s *L’être et le néant* and Ricoeur’s *Le conflit des interprétations* into Bulgarian.

Elena del Rio (UC Berkeley, Ph.D., 1996) is associate professor of Film Studies at the University of Alberta, Canada. Her essays on the intersections of cinema and the body in the areas of technology, affect, and performance have appeared in journals such as *Camera Obscura*, *Discourse*, *The New Review of Film and Television Studies*, *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, *SubStance*, and *Deleuze Studies*. She is the author of *Deleuze and the Cinemas of Performance: Powers of Affection* (2008).

OHASHI Ryosuke (Kyoto University, 1969; Ph.D. awarded by Munich University 1973, and Habilitation at Würzburg University 1983). The “Franz-Phillip von Siebold Prize” was awarded to him by the German President R. v. Weizsäcker 1990; Fellow of the Institute for Advanced Study Berlin (1997/1998).

Since 2002 he has been professor of philosophy and aesthetics at Osaka University. His fields are phenomenology, German Idealism, Japanese aesthetics, and philosophy of history. He is an editor of the Japanese Heidegger-Gesamtausgabe. His publications in European languages include the books: *Ekstase und Gelassenheit. Zu Schelling und Heidegger* (1975), *Die Zeitlichkeitsanalyse der Hegelschen Logik* (1984), *Die Philosophie der Kyoto-Schule* (1st ed. 1990), *Kire. Das "Schöne" in Japan* (1994), and *Japan im interkulturellen Dialog* (1999).

Gayle Salamon (UC Berkeley, Rhetoric, 2002) is assistant professor of English at Princeton University, where she was the Cotsen LGBT Postdoctoral Fellow in the Princeton Society of Fellows from 2005 to 2008. Her research interests are phenomenology, gender theory, queer theory, and psychoanalysis, and her manuscript *Assuming a Body: Transgender and Rhetorics of Materiality* on embodiment and transgendered subjectivity is forthcoming (2009). Recent articles include: "Transfeminism and the Future of Women's Studies" (2008), "The Sexual Schema: Transposition and Transgenderism in Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception*," "Sameness, Alterity, Flesh: Luce Irigaray and the Place of Sexual Undecidability," and "Justification and Queer Method, or: Leaving Philosophy" (2009).

Gabriele Scaramuzza was born in Milan in 1939 and has graduated in philosophy (aesthetics) in Pavia. He taught philosophy and history at the secondary schools and aesthetics at the Universities of Padua, Verona, Sassari, and now he teaches aesthetics at the University of Milan. He has published studies on phenomenological aesthetics in *Le origini dell'estetica fenomenologica* (1976) and *Oggetto e conoscenza* (1989), on Max Dessoir's aesthetics in *Estetica e scienza dell'arte* (with L. Perucchi, 1986), on the aesthetics of Banfi and his followers: *Antonio Banfi, la ragione e l'estetico* (1984), *Crisi come rinnovamento. Scritti sull'estetica della scuola di Milano* (2000), and *L'estetica e le arti. La scuola di Milano* (2007). Finally, he has investigated Hegel's aesthetics in *Arte e morte dell'arte* (with P. Gambazzi, 1997) and in particular the topic of the so-called "death of art." Connected to his Hegelian interests, he pursued the sphere of the ugly and the category of the melodramatic in *Il brutto nell'arte* (1995), and studies dedicated to Picasso and Kafka and

to Walter Benjamin's meditations in *Walter Benjamin lettore di Kafka* (1994).

Tatyana Schedrina (Far Eastern State University, 1994) is professor at the Moscow Pedagogical State University. She is interested in the history of Russian philosophy, particularly in the philosophy of Gustav Spet and the Russian phenomenological tradition. She is the author of *"I am Writing as an Echo of the Other...": Sketches of Gustav Spet's Intellectual Biography* (2004), *Archive of Epoch: Thematic Unity of Russian Philosophy* (2008), and coeditor and commentator of Gustav Spet's *Collected Works* (4 Vols., 2005–2007).

Hans Rainer Sepp is senior lecturer at the Faculty of Humanities of the Charles University Prague and director of the Central European Institute of Philosophy at the same faculty. His specialities are history and problems of the phenomenological philosophies; theories of knowing in overlapping areas of philosophy, science, religion, and art; intercultural philosophy; aesthetics and philosophy of art; ethics and moral philosophy, and philosophies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Among his recent book publications are: *Über die Grenze. Prolegomena zu einer Theorie der Transkulturalität* (2009) and *Bild. Phänomenologie der Epoché I* (2010). Together with Kah Kyung Cho and Yoshihiro Nitta he founded the book series *Orbis Phaenomenologicus* in 1993. With Joachim Fischer, Ada Neschke, and Gérard Raulet he has edited the book series *Phänomenologische Anthropologie—Themen und Positionen* since 2008, and he has founded the book series *conFrontatio* in 2009. He also edits the *Eugen Fink Gesamtausgabe* in cooperation with Cathrin Nielsen and colleagues from the University of Mainz.

NUKI Shigeto (Tokyo University 1985, Ph.D. awarded by Tohoku University 2003) is a professor of philosophy at Senshu University. His field is German and French phenomenology, the theory of performing arts and history. His publications in European language include "Theory of Association after Husserl" (1999), "Phenomenology as Calculus?" (1999), "Umgekehrte Alltäglichkeit. Zur phänomenologischen Analyse des Buto" (2000), "Phenomenology and the Problem of History" (2002), and "Übersetzbarkeit von Tanz: Der Fall Butoh" (2004).

Andreas Georg Stascheit is professor of media, aesthetics, and communication studies at the Dortmund University of Applied Sciences and Arts, chair of the Emil Berliner Institute, and an adjunct faculty member at the Institute of Music and Musicology, Dortmund University, Germany. He holds separate degrees in music (M.Mus. in Violin Performance, Detmold/Münster, Diploma in Pediatric Music Therapy, Munich), sociology (M.A., Bielefeld), and in educational studies and psychology (M.A., Bielefeld). He conducted field research on the social anthropology of indigenous medicine in Brazil, Pernambuco (1981/1982, DAAD grant) and on music therapy in the treatment of autism spectrum disorders (doctoral research project 1987/1988). After receiving his Ph.D. in sociology from Bielefeld University (1989) he was postdoctoral research fellow of the DFG Graduate School "Phenomenology and Hermeneutics" at Ruhr-University Bochum. His research interests include aesthetics, the philosophy and the sociology of music, the history of social thought, and the methodology of the human sciences. At present he is working on a book on the relevance of aesthetics in the context of the history of social thought. His activities as musician focus on *duo repertoire* for violin and organ, acoustic jazz, live electronics, and improvised music. At present he writes and records violin arrangements of *The George and Ira Gershwin Songbooks*.

Michael Staudigl (1971) received his philosophical doctorate at Vienna University in 2000. From 2000 to 2002 he was working for a psychotraumatological ambulance. From 2003 to 2006 he was APART scholar (Habilitationsstipendiat) of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Currently he holds a research grant by the Austrian Science Funds (FWF) and is a lecturer at Vienna University, as well as a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna. His work focuses on developing a phenomenological theory of violence. Furthermore, he is also interested in the past as well as the future of the phenomenological tradition. A particular focus of his work is on recent French phenomenology and its intersections with Husserlian phenomenology, on Alfred Schutz, and the interdisciplinary applicability of phenomenological methods. He is author of *Grenzen der Intentionalität* (2003) and *Zerstörter Sinn—Entzogene Welt—Zerbrochenes Wir* (2009), and co-edited *Epoché und Reduktion* (2003), *Grenzen des Kulturkonzepts* (2003),

Perspektiven des Lebensbegriffs (2005), *Ereignis und Affektivität* (2006), *Lebenswelt und Politik* (2007), *Über Zivilisation und Differenz* (2008), and *Alfred Schutz. A Phenomenological Hermeneutics of the Social World* (forthcoming 2009). He has also published various articles in professional journals, in German, as well as in English and French.

Georg Stenger is a professor of philosophy at University of Würzburg. Among other things he has published *Philosophie der Interkulturalität—Erfahrung und Welten. Eine phänomenologische Studie* (2006) and numerous articles on phenomenology, hermeneutics, intercultural philosophy and globalization, aesthetics, ethics, philosophical anthropology, philosophy of language and social philosophy, philosophy of enlightenment and German Idealism, and twentieth century and contemporary philosophy. He is the editor of *Philosophie der Struktur—'Fahrzeug' der Zukunft?* (Festschrift for Heinrich Rombach, 1995); coeditor of the *Japanese Complete Edition of Heidegger (JHGA)* (1977/1999 ff.), and coeditor of *Heidegger und das ostasiatische Denken* (2009/2010) and *The Intercultural Library (IKB)* (2004 ff.).

Ted Toadvine (University of Memphis, 1996) is assistant professor of philosophy and environmental studies at the University of Oregon. His interests include contemporary French philosophy, the history of the philosophy of nature, and environmental philosophy. He is author of *Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Nature* (2009), editor of *Merleau-Ponty: Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers* (2006), coeditor of *The Merleau-Ponty Reader* (2007), *Nature's Edge: Boundary Explorations in Ecological Theory and Practice* (2007), *Eco-Phenomenology: Back to the Earth Itself* (2003), and *Merleau-Ponty's Reading of Husserl* (2002); and cotranslator of Renaud Barbaras's *The Being of the Phenomenon: Merleau-Ponty's Ontology* (2004). He is managing editor of the journal *Environmental Philosophy* and editor of the CARP Series in Continental Thought at Ohio University Press.

TANI Toru (Keio University, 1984; Ph.D. awarded by Tohoku University 1998) is professor of philosophy at Ritsumeikan University. He is interested in Husserlian phenomenology, especially the

problem of primary passivity, and in probing the threshold of the possibility/impossibility of experience. He is the author of *Ishiki no Shizen* ("The Physis of Consciousness" 1998), *Korega Genshogaku Da* ("This is Phenomenology" 2002), and numerous other titles in Japanese. He has also translated various phenomenological studies into Japanese, including Husserl's four manuscripts for the *Encyclopedia Britannica* article. Western-language papers include "Heimat und das Fremde" (1993), "Inquiry into the I, Disclosedness, and Self-consciousness—Husserl, Heidegger, Nishida" (1998), and "Zeichen, Gegenwart und Ich" (2002).

Jürgen Trinks, Dr. Phil., is coeditor of *Mesotes: Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für philosophischen Ost-West-Dialog*, and published several studies on Marc Richir's phenomenology of language as well as on phenomenology of art, literature, and modern medias. He is the translator of several of Marc Richir's texts, especially of his book *Méditations phénoménologiques*.

Pol Vandavelde, Ph.D. Université de Louvain-la-Neuve 1990, is professor of philosophy at Marquette University and specializes in phenomenology and hermeneutics. He is the author of *Etre et discours. La question du langage dans l'itinéraire de Heidegger (1927–1938)* (1994), *The Task of the Interpreter: Text, Meaning, and Negotiation* (2005). He also cotranslated into French books by Heidegger (1991), Husserl (1998), and Karl-Otto Apel (Editions du Cerf, forthcoming) and into English a book by Pierre Rousselot (2007). He also edited two volumes and published more than forty articles in French, English, and German on issues related to literature, interpretation, and epistemology.

Ruud Welten (1962) Studied music at the Rotterdam Conservatory and Philosophy at the Erasmus University at Rotterdam. He is lecturer in philos-

ophy and aesthetics at the University of Tilburg and Academia Vitae, both in the Netherlands. He is a researcher in the field of contemporary phenomenology. His thesis concerns the phenomenological structure of the religious prohibition of images. His publications include two books on Levinas in Dutch, and articles on Husserl, Marion, Michel Henry, Merleau-Ponty, and Sartre.

Mirko Wischke earned his Ph.D. in philosophy in 1993 at the Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany. In 2001 he taught as a visiting professor at the summer school of the European Humanities University in Minsk (Belarus), and since 2002 as a visiting professor in the Department of Philosophy at Palacky University in Olomouc (Czech Republic). He also continues to be affiliated with Martin Luther University in Halle-Wittenberg, Germany, where he served as assistant professor for practical philosophy from 1994 to 2000. In 2003, he founded a German-speaking research center for philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy at the Czech Palacky University in Olomouc. He was visiting professor at the Mohyla Academy Kiev (Ukraine) from 2006 to 2007 and at the Adam Mickiewicz University Poznan (Poland) in 2007 and 2008. In 2008 he was a fellow at the Research Institute for Philosophy in Hannover. He is the author of *A Critique of the Ethic of Obedience. On the Problem of Morality in the Works of Theodor W. Adorno* (1993), *The Birth of Ethics. Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Adorno* (1994), *Impulse and Negativity. Adorno's Ethics and Aesthetics* (with Gerhard Schweppenhäuser, 1995), *The Weakness of Writing. On the Philosophical Hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer* (2001), *Gadamer verstehen. Understanding Gadamer* (with Michael Hofer, 2003), and *Right without Justice? Hegel and the Foundations on the Rule of Law* (with Andrzej Przylebski, 2009). In addition, he is the editor of the *Yearbook of the German Speaking Research Centre of Philosophy Olomouc* and *Freedom without Right? Politics and Right in the Age of Globalization* (2009).

Index

A

Adorno, Theodor, 27, 45, 104, 138, 139, 163, 164, 271, 288, 293
Alexander the Great, 161
Althusser, Louis, 202, 204
Anaxagoras, 93
Anceschi, Luciano, xvii, xxiii, 31
Anders, Günther, xxii, 212
Angelucci, Daniela, 53–55
Ansermet, Ernest, 99, 103, 225
Apel, Karl-Otto, 124
Aristophanes, 36
Aristotle, 83, 88, 93, 94, 137, 177, 188, 191, 211, 235, 241, 281, 292, 312, 331, 332, 334
Aristoxenos, 312
Artaud, Antonin, 343
Augustinus, 275
Austin, J. L., xx, 169, 190
Azorín, José Martínez, 246

B

Bach, Johann Sebastian, 148
Bachelard, Gaston, xvii, 172, 292, 317
Backhaus, Gary, 86
Baensch, Otto, 5
Bakhtin, Mikhail, 113, 187
Balanchine, George, 334
Bally, Gustav, 267
Banfi, Antonio, xvi, xx, xxiii, 29–32
Barbaric, Damir, 38
Barber, Michael D., 231–233, 312
Baroja, Pio, 246
Barth, Karl, 292
Barthes, Roland, 71, 107, 187, 260, 261, 341
Basch, Victor, 93, 96
Batteux, Charles, 275
Baudelaire, Charles, 190
Baudrillard, Jean, 107, 202, 345, 346–347
Baudry, Jean-Louis, 112, 113
Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb, 33, 242
Bazaine, Jean René, 195
Bazin, André, 112, 113, 260
Beardsley, Monroe C., 69, 212, 292
Becker, Oskar, xvi, xxii, 35, 38, 45–47, 99, 100, 101, 237, 238, 253

Becket, Samuel, 232, 333
Beethoven, Ludwig van, 103, 148, 183
Benjamin, Walter, xvii, 47, 73, 108, 138, 139, 211, 269, 271, 272, 325, 326
Benson, Bruce, 125, 227
Berger, Gaston, 157
Berger, John, 261, 262
Berger, Peter L., 312, 341
Bergson, Henri, 30, 63, 209, 225, 304, 311, 312, 313, 340
Berleant, Arnold, xxvi, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 318
Bernard, Emile, 58
Bernard, Michel, 67
Bertin, Giovanni Maria, 32
Besançon, Alain, 143
Biemel, Walter, xxii, 64, 65
Binswanger, Ludwig, 193
Black, Max, 212, 292
Blaga, Lucian, 30
Blaustein, Leopold, 11
Bloom, Harold, 73
Blume, Anna, 307–309
Boehm, Gottfried, 271, 272
Böhme, Gernot, 166, 238, 239, 272, 308, 309, 318
Bonfanti, Giosue, 32
Botticelli, Sandro, 121
Bradley, Francis Herbert, 30
Braque, Georges, 63, 219, 249, 253, 334
Brentano, Franz, 12, 17
Breton, André, 78
Brinkmann, Donald, 353
Broch, Hermann, xxii, 270
Brooks, Jodi, 115
Brough, John B., 151–153, 281–285
Brudzińska, Jagna, 9–14
Bultmann, Rudolf, 292
Burckhardt, Jakob, 256
Burger, Fritz, 64
Burgin, Victor, 262
Butler, Judith, 133
Buytendijk, F. J. J., 267

C

Cabestan, Philippe, 299–301
Cage, John, 38

Cairns, Dorion, 76, 77, 78, 215
 Callicott, Baird, 89
 Canetti, Elias, 270
 Cantoni, Remo, 31
 Čapek, Josef, 256
 Carbone, Mauro, 209
 Carlson, Allen, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90
 Carr, David, 293
 Carroll, Lewis, 42
 Cartier-Bresson, Henri, 260
 Casey, Edward S., 1–6, 81–84, 86, 156, 209
 Casey, Timothy K., 25–27
 Cassirer, Ernst, 30, 311
 Castorp, Hans, 232
 Cavell, Stanley, 113
 Cézanne, Paul, 5, 19, 58, 102, 131, 158, 193, 195, 207, 208, 209, 249, 252, 253, 284, 285, 296, 354
 Chacel, Rosa, 247
 Charles, Daniel, 81
 Chekhov, Anton, 256
 CHEN, Zhiyuan, 49–51
 CHEUNG, Chan-Fai, 259–263
 CHO, Kah Kyung, xxvi, 238
 Cicero, 308
 Cixous, Hélène, 42, 43, 204
 Clifton, Thomas, 225
 Coetzee, J. M., 191
 Cohen, Hermann, 30, 135
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 188
 Collingwood, R. G., 5
 Comolli, Jean-Luc, 112
 Conrad, Waldemar, xvi, 30, 53–55, 223, 224, 351
 Conrad-Martius, Hedwig, xvii, xix, 237
 Count de Buffon, 325
 Crary, Jonathan, 17
 Crawford, Donald, 87, 88, 89
 Croce, Benedetto, xxiii, 30
 Crosby, John F., 145–148
 Cunningham, Merce, 67

D

D'Allonnes, Revault, 81
 da Caravaggio, Michelangelo Merisi, 31, 207
 da Vinci, Leonardo, 18
 Daguerre, Louis Jacques Mandé, 259
 Dali, Salvador, 259
 Damisch, Hubert, 260
 Dastur, Françoise, 137–139
 de Beauvoir, Simone, xvi, xxiv, 41–43, 131, 133
 de Certeau, Michel, 202
 de Cervantes, Miguel, xxiv
 de la Bourdonnaye, Alain, 207
 de Lorris, Guillaume, 188
 de Man, Paul, xxv, 73
 de Montaigne, Michel, 188
 de Sade, D. A. F., 42
 de Staël, Madame, 188, 207, 253
 de Stael, Nicolas, 195, 252
 de Unamuno, Miguel, 246
 Debord, Guy, 202

Debussy, Claude, 245
 del Río, Elena, 111–116
 Delaunay, Robert, 195, 252
 Deleuze, Gilles, xvii, 34, 115, 116, 164, 165, 209, 271, 328
 Depraz, Natalie, 68, 155–159
 Derrida, Jacques, xvi, xxv, 5, 71–74, 138, 141, 187, 209, 212, 213, 265, 266, 267, 271, 293, 333
 Descartes, René, 18, 19, 208, 213, 235, 241, 246, 284
 Dessoir, Max, 30, 31, 303, 304
 Dewey, John, 30, 209
 Diaconu, Mădălina, 99–105, 317–319
 Didi-Hubermann, Georges, 356
 Dieste, Rafael, xxi, 247
 Dillard, Annie, 88
 Dilthey, Wilhelm, 30, 177
 Dostoevsky, Fyodor, xxii, xxiv, 31, 41, 255, 256, 331
 Dreyfus, Hubert, 209
 Duchamp, Marcel, 31, 207, 271, 355
 Düchting, Hajo, 142
 Dufrenne, Mikel, xvi, xx, xxiv, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 49, 51, 55, 58, 81–84, 85, 96, 99, 102, 103, 153, 158, 169, 236, 276, 285, 291, 319, 328, 340, 353
 Dürer, Albrecht, 1, 253, 300
 Dziemidok, Bohdan, 168

E

Eco, Umberto, xxiii, 267, 341
 Egoyan, Atom, 114
 Eisenmann, Peter, 272
 El Greco, 245, 246, 247
 Eliade, Mircea, 172, 292
 Eliot, T. S., 31
 Ellul, Jacques, 202
 Embree, Lester, xv–xxviii, 215–220
 Epicurus, 120, 121
 Escher, Maurice, 17, 20, 22
 Escoubas, Eliane, 63, 65, 193–195, 249–253
 Export, Valie, 114, 132, 133

F

Fabiani, Licia, 127–129
 Fechner, Gustav, 127
 Fernández, José Díaz, 247
 Feuerbach, Ludwig, 275
 Fiedler, Conrad, 30, 99, 243, 304
 Fields, Samuel, 247
 Fink, Eugen, xvi, xxii, xxiv, 6, 67, 76, 107, 119–121, 156, 211, 212, 238, 241, 265, 266, 267, 270, 271, 295, 311
 Fisher, Kevin, 113
 Flaubert, Gustave, xxiv, 190
 Flaxman, Gregory, 112
 Flusser, Vilém, 202, 204, 259, 345, 347
 Formaggio, Dino, xvii, xxiii, 31
 Foster, Susan Leigh, 69, 89, 115
 Fóti, Véronique M., 209
 Foucault, Michel, xvii, 69, 71, 133, 187, 209
 Fraleigh, Sondra Horton, 67
 Frankl, Vera, 293
 Frege, Gottlob, 190

Freud, Sigmund, 14, 19, 36, 73, 78, 113, 204, 242, 291, 292
 FUKUDA Heihachirō, 174

G

Gadamer, Hans-Georg, xvi, xxii, xxvi, 26, 33, 36, 57, 58, 63, 65, 67, 123–125, 135, 136, 138, 139, 161, 177, 178, 201, 266, 267, 285, 332, 341, 355, 356
 Gałęcki, Jerzy, 168
 Galilée, Galileo, 235, 246
 Gaos, José, 247
 Garb, Yaakov, 344
 Garner, Stanton, 331, 332, 333, 334–335
 Gauguin, Paul, 243
 Gautier, Théophile, 301
 Gehlen, Arnold, 63, 136, 256, 267
 Geiger, Moritz, xvi, xviii, xix, 11, 30, 51, 94, 95, 96, 99, 100, 104, 127–129, 224, 287, 288, 303, 318, 351
 Genet, Jean, 190
 Gentile, Giovanni, xxiii, 30
 George, Stefan, 30
 Gericault, Théodore, 207
 Giacometti, Alberto, 207, 284, 299
 Gibson, William, 345
 Giesz, Ludwig, 100, 102, 104, 105, 128
 Gilbert, Sandra M., 42
 Gleizes, Albert, 64
 Głowiński, Michał, 168
 Gniazdowski, Andrzej, 167–169
 Godlovitch, Stan, 87, 88
 Gołaszewska, Maria, 168
 Golding, John, 143
 Goldsworthy, Andrew, 86
 Goodman, Nelson, 69, 191, 355
 Gornung, Boris, 323
 Goya, Francisco, xxi, 194, 219, 245, 246
 Graham, Martha, 67, 334
 Greenburg, Clement, 334
 Greimas, Algirdas Julien, 69, 332, 335
 Grillparzer, Franz, 120, 121
 Gris, Juan, 63
 Grohman, Will, 143
 Grondin, Jean, 124
 Groos, Karl, 94
 Guattari, Felix, 34
 Gubar, Susan, 42
 Gurwitsch, Aron, 311

H

Habasque, Guy, 64
 Habermas, Jürgen, 124, 334
 Hagedorn, Ludger, 255–257
 Hagendoorn, Ivar, 69
 Hamann, Richard, 304
 Hamburger, Käte, xx, 168
 HAN, Junwei, 51
 HAN, Zhong'en, 51
 Hanslick, Eduard, 100
 Harries, Karsten, 25, 27
 Hartman, Geoffrey, 73

Hartmann, Nicolai, xvi, xix, xx, xxii, 61, 104, 123, 124, 135–136, 168, 224, 353
 Hatley, James, 86
 Havel, Václav, 257
 Hegel, G. W. F., xxiv, 30, 49, 71, 73, 102, 107, 121, 137, 138, 164, 165, 178, 179, 204, 211, 235, 255, 256, 271, 275, 278, 308, 317, 322, 331, 340, 341, 352, 356
 Heidegger, Martin, xvi, xxi, xxii, xxiii, xxiv, xxv, xxvi, xxvii, 1, 5, 6, 13, 25, 26, 35, 36, 38, 42, 45, 49, 50, 51, 58, 59, 60, 72, 73, 81, 85, 86, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 109, 114, 119, 124, 129, 137–139, 141, 153, 171, 172, 177, 178, 179, 181, 190, 193, 195, 198, 204, 212, 215, 232, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 249, 251, 253, 259, 260, 266, 267, 270, 271, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 283, 284, 285, 295, 296, 299, 301, 308, 328, 333, 340, 347, 353, 354, 355, 356
 Heim, Michael, 346
 Heinämaa, Sara, 41–43
 Henckmann, Wolfhart, 129, 303–305
 Hennings, Terri J., 71–74
 Henry, Michel, xvi, xxiii, xxv, 14, 63, 141–143, 158, 159, 271, 276, 277, 317
 Hepburn, Ronald, 88, 89
 Heraclitus, 265
 Herbart, Johann Friedrich, 12
 Herder, Gottfried, 93
 Héring, Jean, 75
 HIROSHIGE, Ando, 173
 HISAMATSU Shin'ichi, xvii, xxi, 243
 Hodler, Ferdinand, 243
 Hölderlin, Friedrich, xxii, 47, 137, 178, 188, 190, 354
 Holm, Hanya, 67
 Horn, Axel, 267
 Hribar, Tine, xxiv, 340, 341
 Huizinga, Jan, 267
 Hume, David, 94, 147
 Hundertwasser, Fritz, 174
 Husserl, Edmund, xvi, xviii, xix, 1, 9, 17, 26, 30, 34, 45, 49, 53, 64, 68, 71, 75, 81, 85, 94, 101, 111, 119, 127, 141, 145, 151–153, 155, 167, 177, 189, 193, 198, 201, 202, 207, 215, 223, 233, 236, 241, 250, 256, 259, 269, 275, 281, 287, 299, 304, 307, 312, 317, 321, 326, 333, 334, 344, 351, 352, 353
 HYAKUJŌ, 174

I

Ihde, Don, 201
 Ingarden, Roman, xvi, xix, xx, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 21, 30, 49, 50, 51, 99, 100, 101, 103, 112, 113, 148, 153, 167–169, 187, 189, 201, 224, 226, 231, 237, 256, 270, 276, 282, 283, 284, 293, 300, 301, 303, 321, 331, 332, 333, 334, 340, 351, 352, 353, 354
 Ingrès, Louise de Broglie, 207
 Irigaray, Luce, xvii, 42, 43, 132, 204, 209, 317
 Irwin, Robert, 202
 Iser, Wolfgang, xx, 159, 168, 169, 201, 202, 293

J

Jähnig, Dieter, 60
 Jakobson, Roman, xx, 187, 189, 323
 James, Henry, 145
 James, William, 12, 63, 225, 241, 311, 312
 Jaspers, Karl, 104, 129, 291

Jauss, Hans Robert, xx, 104, 128, 159, 168, 201, 293
 Jayamanne, Laleen, 115
 Jdanov, Andrei Alexandrovitch, 301
 JIANG, Yongji, 51
 Johns, Jasper, 73
 Johnson, Barbara, 132
 Johnson, Galen A., 207–209
 Jones, Amelia, 115

K

Kaelin, Eugene, xxvi, 293
 Kafka, Franz, xxii, xxiv, 31, 41, 42, 212, 232, 269
 Kahn, Louis, 26
 Kahnweiler, Daniel-Henry, 63, 64
 KANATA, Susumu, 241–243
 Kandinsky, Wassily, xxv, 79, 141, 142, 143, 159, 195, 252, 277, 334, 356
 Kant, Immanuel, xxv, 1, 5, 6, 21, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 363, 37, 38, 45, 46, 63, 64, 73, 82, 85, 100, 104, 124, 135, 138, 155, 165, 166, 178, 179, 184, 198, 233, 235, 243, 245, 260, 265, 275, 276, 288, 303, 308, 325, 326, 327, 334, 341, 351, 353
 Kantor, Tadeusz, 334
 Karoblis, Gediminas, 67–69
 Kaufmann, Fritz, xvi, xxii, xxv, 11, 95, 102, 103, 177–179, 276, 278
 Kayser, Wolfgang, xx, 168
 Kealiinohomoku, Joann, 69
 Kearney, Richard, 293
 Kersten, Fred, 311, 312
 Kierkegaard, Søren, xxiii, 41, 272
 Kishino, Fumio, 345
 Klages, Ludwig, 30
 Klee, Paul, 60, 194, 195, 207, 208, 253, 354, 356
 Klíma, Ladislav, 256
 Kohlenberger, Helmut, 269–272
 Kolář, Jiří, 257
 Komel, Dean, 339–341
 Kopelent, Marek, 257
 Kosovel, Srečko, 341
 Kouvaros, George, 115
 Kozel, Susan, 68
 Kracauer, Siegfried, xxv, 269
 Kramer, Hans, 124
 Krämer, Sybille, 346, 347
 Krämer-Bardoni, Rudolph, 138
 Krejča, Otomar, 257
 Kristeva, Julia, xvii, 42, 204, 293, 341
 Kubler, George, 325
 Kühn, Rolf, xxiii, 14
 KUKI, Shūzō, 171

L

Lacan, Jacques, 71
 Landgrebe, Ludwig, 13, 14, 67
 Landow, George, 204
 Langer, Susanne, 5, 67, 69, 333
 Lanier, Jaron, 344
 Lanigan, Richard, 204
 LAO-TZU, 172
 Lapoujade, Robert, 299
 Le Corbusier, 26, 27

Leibfried, Erwin, 168
 Lem, Stanislaw, 168
 Leopold, Aldo, 89
 Levin, David Michael, 67, 169, 334, 335
 Levinas, Emmanuel, xvi, xxv, 81, 157, 181–184, 233, 267, 271, 272, 276, 317
 Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 332
 Lewicki, Boleslaw, 168
 Lewin, David, 226
 LI, Youzheng, 49
 Lima, Lezama, 247
 Lipovetsky, Gilles, 107
 Lipps, Theodor, xviii, xix, 94, 95, 96, 99, 101, 127, 304, 353
 Lissa, Zofia, 168
 LIU, Shuguang, 51
 Loos, Adolph, 25
 Lossi, Annamaria, 211–213
 Lotz, Christian, 177–179
 Lotze, Hermann, 12
 Lukács, György, 46, 136, 202
 Lyotard, Jean-François, 33, 36, 37, 81, 191, 209

M

Maatje, Frank, 168
 Mácha, Karel Hynek, 256
 Machado, Antonio, 246
 Magritte, René, 17, 22
 Maharaj, Sart, 73
 Majkut, Paul, 201–205
 Makota, Janina, 168
 Maldiney, Henri, xvi, xxiv, 138, 193–195, 251, 252, 328
 Malevitch, Kasimir, 195
 Mall, R. A., 161–166
 Malraux, André, 207
 Mannheim, Ralph, 208
 Mann, Thomas, xxiii, 31, 178, 179, 232, 256
 Marcelle, Daniel, 181–184
 Marey, Etienne-Jules, 207
 Margolis, Joseph, 69
 Marin, Louis, 81
 Marinetti, Filippo T., 269
 Marion, Jean-Luc, xvi, xxv, 159, 197–199, 277, 278, 279, 317
 Maritain, Jacques, 146
 Markiewicz, Henryk, 168
 Marks, Laura, 114, 115
 Marrone, Pierpaolo, 212, 213
 Martini, Miro, 31
 Marx, Karl, 25, 26, 27, 31, 111, 112, 113, 168, 169, 202, 203, 204, 232, 243
 Masson, André, 299
 Mathauser, Zdeněk, xxi, xxiv, 256
 Matisse, Henri, 207, 243
 Mazzoni, Augusto, 223–228
 McLuhan, Marshall, 202
 McNamara, Joanne, 68
 Mead, George Herbert, 209
 Meinong, Alexis, xxiii, 339
 Meister Eckhart, 142
 Mendieta, Eduardo, 86

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, xvi, xx, xxiv, xxvi, 5, 6, 14, 19, 41, 42, 49, 51, 57, 58, 59, 67, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 96, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 131, 138, 141, 153, 157, 158, 165, 202, 204, 207–209, 215, 233, 236, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 270, 275, 276, 278, 279, 284, 285, 307, 308, 317, 318, 319, 326, 328, 333, 336, 353, 354, 355
 Metz, Christian, 81, 112, 113
 Metzger, Arnold, 76
 Metzinger, Jean, 64
 Meyer, Leonard B., 226
 Mezei, Bálaazs M., 275–279
 Michaux, Henri, 209
 Mickunas, Algis, 67, 68, 69
 Migliorini, Ermanno, 31
 MIKI Kiyoshi, 243
 Milgram, Paul, 345
 Miller, J. Hillis, 73
 Mitry, Jean, 113
 Mnouchkin, Ariane, 334
 Mohanty, J. N., 163–164
 Mokrejš, Antonín, xxiv, 256
 Mondrian, Piet, 195, 252
 Monet, Claude, 155
 Moore, Henry, 207
 Morawski, Stefan, 168
 Moreno Márquez, César, 107–110
 Morrison, Toni, 233
 Morselli, Guido, 31
 Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 103, 146, 148, 311, 312
 Mugerauer, Robert, 25, 26, 86
 Muir, John, 89
 Müller, Günther, 168
 Müller, Heiner, 334
 Müller, Max, 295
 Munker, Stefan, 346
 Murungi, John, 86

N

NANBŌ Sōkei, 174
 Narmour, Eugene, 226
 Natorp, Paul, 328
 Neri, Guido D., 31
 Neuber, Simone, 33–38
 Newman, Barnett, 37, 38, 334
 Newton, Isaac, 235
 NI, Liangkang, 49
 Nielsen, Cathrin, 235–238, 265–268, 351–356
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 30, 35, 65, 67, 121, 133, 137, 163, 179, 211, 236, 238, 256, 265, 266, 269, 305, 311, 312, 325
 Nikolais, Alwin, 67
 NISHIDA Kitaro, xvi, xx, xxi, xxvii, 241–243
 NISHITANI Keiji, 243
 Novalis, 47, 93
 NUKI, Shigeto, 331–336

O

Oberti, Elisa, 30, 55
 Odebrecht, Rudolf, 102, 351
 ŌHASHI, Ryōsuke, xxi
 Olivier, Laurence, 81
 Ophälders, Markus, 45–47
 Orozco, Clemente, 233

Ortega y Gasset, José, xvi, xx, xxi, 212, 245–247
 Orten, Fred, 73, 354
 Osborne, Harold, 169
 Otto, Rudolf, 5, 45, 124, 276

P

Paci, Enzo, xxiii, xxix, 31
 Palacký, František, 256
 Panofsky, Erwin, 31, 325, 326
 Papi, Fulvio, 31
 Pareyson, Luigi, xvii, xxiii, 58, 104
 Patočka, Jan, xvi, xxiv, 64, 76, 78, 191, 255–257, 270, 271, 331
 Pavese, Cesare, 120
 Pavlov, Ivan, 13
 Pelc, Jerzy, 168
 Perez-Gomez, Alberto, 27
 Perniola, Mario, 108
 Petersen, Julius, 168
 Pfänder, Alexander, xix, 76, 96, 128
 Picasso, Pablo, 19, 63, 64, 65, 219, 269, 272
 Pindar, 188
 Pinotti, Andrea, 63–65, 93–96, 325–328
 Pirjevec, Dušan, xxiii, 340, 341
 Piwocki, Ksawery, 64
 Plato, xxvii, 33, 73, 102, 124, 137, 147, 163, 164, 188, 189, 211, 218, 232, 265, 281, 288, 308
 Plessner, Helmuth, 104
 Plotinus, 308
 Pöggeler, Otto, 45
 Pollock, Jackson, 38, 143, 216
 Portoghesi, Paolo, 26
 Postman, Neil, 202, 345
 Poulet, George, 51
 Powell, Michael, 114
 Pozzi, Antonia, 31
 Preti, Giulio, 31
 Pries, Christine, 38
 Propp, Vladimir, 332
 Proust, Marcel, 31

Q

Quéau, Philippe, 346, 347

R

Rabanus, Christian, 343–348
 Rabelais, 188
 Ramírez, Mario Teodoro, 57–61
 Raynouard, Francois-Juste-Marie, 188
 Raynova, Yvanka B., 291–293
 Rembrandt, xxv, 207, 249, 253
 Renoir, Pierre-Auguste, 60
 Renouvier, Charles, 30
 Richards, I. A., 292
 Richier, Germaine, 207
 Richir, Marc, xvi, xxv, 76, 128, 287–288
 Richter, Václav, 256
 Rickert, Heinrich, 135, 303
 Ricoeur, Paul, xvi, xxv, 59, 78, 81, 191, 211, 212, 213, 291–293, 332
 Riegl, Alois, 243, 305, 325, 327, 328
 Rilke, Rainer Maria, xxii, 31, 120, 121, 145, 178, 179, 354

Risser, James, 124, 139
 Rivera, Diego, 233
 Riviere, Joan, 133
 Rodi, Frithjof, 124
 Rodin, Auguste, 207
 Rognoni, Luigi, 31
 Rombach, Heinrich, xxii, 295–297, 356
 Rorty, Richard, 191
 Ross, W. D., 147, 188, 189
 Rosset, Clement, 59, 60
 Rossini, Gioacchino, 103
 Roualt, Georges, 207
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 100

S

Salamon, Gayle, 131–133
 Salber, Wilhelm, 14
 San Martín, Javier, 245–247
 Santayana, George, 30, 147
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, xx, xxiv, xxvi, 5, 36, 37, 41, 42, 67, 76, 77, 104, 136, 141, 157, 158, 190, 232, 233, 260, 299–301, 399, 300, 301, 317, 331, 353
 Scaramuzza, Gabriele, xix, 29–31, 55, 95, 127, 128, 351
 Schapp, Wilhelm, xix, 77
 Schedrina, Tatyana, 321–323
 Scheler, Max, xix, xx, 17, 145, 146, 147, 148, 236, 270, 276, 278, 303–305
 Schelling, Friedrich W. J., 45, 46, 47, 96, 178, 209, 236, 238, 352
 Scheuerl, Hans, 267
 Schlegel, August Wilhelm, 188
 Schlegel, Friedrich, 47, 189, 265
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst, 188
 Schmitz, Hermann, xxiii, 307–309, 318
 Scholtz, Gunter, 124
 Schopenhauer, Arthur, 243, 312, 352
 Schulte, Günter, 307
 Schutz, Alfred, xxv, 75, 76, 224, 225, 226, 311–314
 Seamon, David, 86
 Sedlmayr, Hans, 355
 Seel, Martin, 271
 Seifert, Jaroslav, 257
 Semper, Gottfried, 243, 325
 SEN NO RIKYŪ, 174
 Sepp, Hans Rainer, xv–xxviii, 19, 45, 63, 65, 75–79, 119–121
 Sereni, Vittorio, 31, 100
 Shakespeare, William, 188, 282, 332
 Shank, Roger C., 94
 Shapiro, Meyer, 138
 Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine, 67, 69
 Shor, Rosaliya, 323
 Simmel, Georg, 30, 107
 Sloterdijk, Peter, 309
 Smith, P. Christopher, 124, 225
 Sobchack, Vivian, xxvi, 111, 112, 113, 115
 Sodnik, Alma, 339, 340
 Solger, K. W. F., 46, 47
 Sonderegger, Ruth, 124, 267
 Špet, Gustav Gustavovich, xx, 321–323
 Spiegelberg, Herbert, 128, 129
 Spivak, Gayatri, 72
 Srubar, Ilja, 311
 Staiger, Emil, xx, 168
 Stanzel, Franz, 168
 Stascheit, Andreas Georg, 311–314
 States, Bert O., 332
 Staudigl, Michael, 197–199
 Stefanovic, Leman, 86
 Stein, Edith, 95
 Steinbeck, Dietrich, 169
 Steiner, George, 68, 69
 Stenger, Georg, 295–297
 Stern, Lesley, 115
 Stern, William, 12
 Stolnitz, Jerome, 169
 Stone, Sandy, 133
 Straus, Erwin, 13, 193, 317, 328
 Strauss, Richard, 145
 Stravinsky, Igor, 183
 Strelka, Joseph, 168
 Strindberg, August, 30
 Stumpf, Carl, 12, 223
 SUN, Zhouxing, 49
 SUZUKI Daisetsu, 241, 243
 Szilasi, Wilhelm, 295
 Szlesák, Thomas A., 124

T

Talbot, William Henry Fox, 259, 262
 Tal-Coat, Pierre, 195, 252
 Talon-Hugon, Carole, 105
 TANG, Yonghua, 51
 Tanguy, Yves, 79
 TANI, Toru, 17–23
 TAO Yuanming, 50
 Tellenbach, Hubert, 318
 Thao, Tran Duc, 202, 204
 Thoreau, Henry David, 89
 Tilley, Christopher, 202
 Tintoretto, 299
 Tischner, Józef, xx, 213, 267
 Titchener, Edward, 93
 Titian, 282
 Todorov, Tzvetan, 169, 332
 Tolstoy, Leo, 233
 Trahair, Lisa, 115
 Trías, Eugenio, 57
 Trinks, Jürgen, 287–288
 Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa, 86, 336
 TZU Chuang, 49, 165
 TZU Hui, 165

U

Uccello, Paolo, 249, 253
 Urbančič, Ivan, 340
 Utitz, Emil, 99, 304

V

Vaculík, Ludvík, 257
 Valéry, Paul, xxi, xxii, 31, 67

van Camp, Julie, 69
 Van der Leeuw, Gerardus, 276
 van Eyck, Jan, 250, 253
 van Gogh, Vincent Willem, 58, 137, 138, 173, 174, 243, 251, 277, 283, 354
 Vandavelde, Pol, 187–191
 Vasconcelos, José, 247
 Veber, France, xvi, xx, xxiii–xxiv, 339–341
 Velázquez, Diego, xxi, 209, 220, 245, 246–247
 Vinokur, Grigoriy, 323
 Virilio, Paul, 345, 347
 Vischer, Friedrich Theodor, 94
 Vischer, Robert, 94, 95
 Volkelt, Johannes, 94
 Volkov, Nikolay, 323
 von Balthazar, Urs, 159
 von Ehrenfels, Christian, 223
 von Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 325
 von Helmholtz, Hermann, 325
 von Herder, Johann G., 171
 von Hildebrand, Adolph, xix, 94, 95, 325, 326, 327
 von Hildebrand, Dietrich, xvi, 34, 35, 38, 101, 145–148, 237, 352
 von Hofmannsthal, Hugo, 65, 145, 326
 von Humboldt, Alexander, 322
 von Jawlensky, Alexej, 195
 von Kleist, Heinrich, 288
 von Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 241

W

Wachterhauser, Brice R., 124
 Wagner, Richard, 100, 145
 Waldenfels, Bernard, 14, 166
 WANG Jianyuan, 50
 WANG Yuechuan, 51
 WANG Ziming, 51
 Warren, Austin, xx, 169
 WATSUJI Tetsurō, 171
 Wellek, René, xx, 169

Wells, Liz, 259
 Welsch, Wolfgang, 318
 Welten, Ruud, 141–143
 Weston, Edward, 262
 White, Hayden, 293
 Whitehead, Alfred North, 30, 209
 Wigman, Mary, 67
 Wilson, Robert, 334
 Windelband, Wilhelm, 303
 Winnicott, Donald W., 287, 288
 Winternitz, Emanuel, 311, 312, 313
 Wischke, Mirko, 123–125, 135–136
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 139, 209
 Wölfflin, Heinrich, 30, 94, 253, 325, 327, 328
 Worringer, Wilhelm, 94, 243, 305
 Wundt, Wilhelm, 127

X

XU Fuguan, 49
 XUE Hua, 49

Y

YE Weilian, 50
 YE Xiushan, 50
 Young, Iris Marion, 115
 YU Yunyang, 50

Z

Zambrano, María, 247
 Zea, Leopoldo, 247
 Zechner, Ingo, 121
 ZHANG Shiyang, 50
 ZHANG Xushu, 51
 ZHANG Zailing, 49
 Zhinkin, Nikolay, 323
 ZHOU Yueliang, 51
 ZHU Liyuan, 49, 51
 Zuckert, Cathrin H., 124
 Zuloaga, Ignacio, 245, 246