
One criticism of Hegel's *aesthetics* is that it is based upon an untenable *metaphysics*. Art historians often reject Hegel's account of the operation of *reason* in history. The unity Hegel “discovers” in art is perhaps something imposed. Gombrich believes that artistic production is unrelated to other social activities. Croce suggests there is no history of art. And Popper holds that no inductive generalizations based upon individual works of art are acceptable. Gaiger writes, “...the lectures on aesthetics do not present a... formulation of the inevitable “progress” of art, guided from on high by the categories of Hegel's *Science of Logic*...”¹


Most readers interpret Hegel as contending that only works of art are *beautiful*. Natural objects do not qualify. Peters disagrees, “The human figure appearing as a “sign” of its inner soul seems to be the primary example of a beautiful object for Hegel.”² This is based upon the observation that we *actualize* our souls by manifesting our subjectivity objectively through our bodies. The arguments presented are not convincing. For the author fails to acknowledge that we do not create our *bodies* in the manner that we create objects of *fine art*. Yet this distinction is integral to Hegel's definitions of *beauty*, the *beautiful* and the *Ideal*.


Pippin contends that Hegel's philosophy is consistent with and even forecasts the advent of *abstract* art. We see a gradual *abstraction* in art, architecture being the least, poetry the most *abstracted* from sensuous content. Historically, we require less and less sensuous imagery in order to understand ourselves. And Hegel himself suggests the *end of art*. This means,
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“...not the end of art making and appreciation, but something like a shift in its status and social role.”

What happens next? Abstract art. The author believes that Hegel anticipates this and would contend that, “...we have broken free of dependency on such [non-abstract] sensible images...”


Gasché observes, “...detail is neither a technical term nor a speculative concept in Hegel's aesthetics...” Etymologically, the word *detail* relates to feet and Hegel often mentions feet, heels, and shoes when discussing Greek statuary. Hegel writes that a statue given to Frederick the Great by Louis XV shows Mercury involved in the harmless occupation of paying attention to his sandals. The author concludes that the absence of *detail* as a technical term may, “...threaten the entire project of the Aesthetics.” Whether we have found Hegel's Achilles' heel, or a case of the author not putting their own best foot forward, remains unclear.


Hegel expresses concern over the *violent contrasts* in feelings aroused by contemporary music. Johnson cleverly takes issue. Beethoven, someone Hegel never bothers to mention, develops such contrasts as part of an evolving whole leading to a resolution that unifies the moments of contrast. We see in the compositions of Beethoven a dialectic corresponding to that of Hegel. The author observes, “...the subject... is reflected by a musical style based upon the same principles of self-contradiction and higher resolution.” Therefore the violent contrasts are not inexactitudes, but in fact serve to express the dialectic conflict of opposites essential to Hegelianism.


Hegel informs his students that his knowledge of music is incomplete.

---
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He then proceeds to demonstrate this contention by opining that the poetry of Schiller is ill-suited to musical accompaniment.\(^8\) Recall that Beethoven deploys a poem by Schiller in his *Ode to Joy*, found in the unparalleled *Symphony Number Nine in D minor*. Sallis contends that, “...[in] seeking to improve on his teacher, Hotho [an accomplished musician] produced a text that, especially in the account of music, deviates considerably from Hegel's own...”\(^9\) We cannot help but wonder how badly out of tune Hegel may have become had this not been the case.


For Hegel, sexual satisfaction involves the union of two self-consciousnesses. In attempting to find itself in the other, the individual experiences the loss of its own individuality. Reid states, “This feeling of self-loss can be understood as the intuition of dissolution or death.”\(^10\) At the end of Mozart's opera, *Don Giovanni*, the monotonous, endless antagonism between sexual desire and satisfaction, which is permeated by a sense of death, is reflected musically in one repeated note. Hegel confirms, “...deficiency in greater freedom of movement... readily leads to what is gloomy and melancholy... because the [listening] soul has available only a rather monotonous movement as a medium of expression...”\(^11\)


A serious question is raised. Poetry seems to be a mode of conceptual rather than sensuous expression. Hanly asks, does poetry therefore, “...lose entirely its identity within the project of the *Aesthetics*?”\(^12\) If poetry is devoid
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of the sensuous, it is incapable of expressing the Idea in sensuous form. By Hegel's definition, then, poetry may not fulfill the requirements necessary for it to be considered as an art form. The author quotes Hegel stating that poetry "...destroys the fusion of spiritual inwardness with external existence to an extent that begins to be incompatible with the original conception of art."\textsuperscript{13}


Shapiro writes, "Poetry is an art in the process of dissolution, for its external and objective aspect is, paradoxically, the inner imagination..."\textsuperscript{14} When we are reading or listening to spoken poetry, our imagination creates an image of the sensuous world. Poetry differs from philosophy in that, for example, a tale of brave Ulysses is expressed through imagination, while an analysis of what bravery is, is expressed in a more pure mode of thought. Mental imagery is necessarily provoked in the telling of a story, but not in philosophy. Thus, "Hegel's conception of poetry can be briefly characterized as imaginative dialectic..."\textsuperscript{15}


Wilson asks, "What [for Hegel] is poetry made from?"\textsuperscript{16} Poetry, to be deemed an art form, must have a sensible moment. Hegel states that poetry is made from, "...an idea, uttering itself in speech and letters."\textsuperscript{17} The medium of poetry is language, words. How then does poetry directly make use of the sensuous? The author writes, "...in its repeated declamations [uses of words] by living people."\textsuperscript{18} Ideas expressed in speech and letters, "...are the matter of the poet's spiritual working."\textsuperscript{19} Poetry is not reducible simply to a sequence of images, it is more primarily reducible to individual words.
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