

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Chapter One

EXPERIENCE AND THEORY IN AESTHETICS

From the earliest times art has been integral to human culture. Both fascinated and perplexed by the arts, people have tried, since the age of classical Greece, to understand how they work and what they mean. Philosophers wondered at first about the nature of art: what it is and how it relates to the cosmos. They puzzled over how art objects are created, and extolled human skills that seem at times godlike in their powers. But perhaps the central question for such philosophers as Plato and Aristotle concerned our involvement with art: the response we have to beautiful things, the moral and salubrious powers of art, and perhaps most of all, the power of art to transform and transcend, leading us into a condition of enhanced perception that may be wondrous, dangerous, and at times overwhelming.

The classical age displayed a richness of discussion that centered on art as an activity: an activity that is at once cosmic, social, and individual; an activity that brings understanding of a sort; an activity that may be salutary and even exalting, as in Aristotle's celebrated discussion of tragedy and its cathartic effects. Since the eighteenth century, however, this has changed. Questions about art have shifted to the idea of experience, paralleling the great change in the

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

focus of philosophy from matters of ontology to those of epistemology. In place of starting from an examination of the nature of the universe and moving to the human position in the order of things, we have come to realize, since Descartes and Kant, that all inquiry has its inception in a human locus. Now, at the end of the twentieth century, we have finally recognized that the human factor in every kind of awareness and knowledge is structurally unavoidable. Art has become both a symptom of this change and a standard for grasping it.

The scope of our claims has narrowed, then, and while the human place has become less cosmic, it is more pervasive and personal. Whatever the world be, we can only encounter it and know it as humans. Thus we may be less likely to ask what makes something art than to consider how our experience of art is to be explained, and even when we pose the former question, we answer it in terms of the latter. Theories of beauty have given way to doctrines of emotion, meaning, communication, with even symbol being taken as the embodiment of feeling. And questions that purport to be about art objects, like the search for aesthetic qualities, turn out to be attempts to locate experiential properties of these objects, since properties such as "delicate," "graceful," "elegant," "lovely," and "beautiful" require aesthetic sensitivity to be perceived.¹

Writings on aesthetics and the arts have proliferated since the Enlightenment, a tribute to the ceaseless activity of artists, the broadening of their public, and the ever strong influence of art and the uses to which that influence has been put. One can identify in this literature a continuing body of doctrine that derives from formulations shaped during the eighteenth century, when modern aesthetics first emerged. This was a time of broad intellectual change that affected the arts as much as anything. Early in that century, the various arts, some of which until

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

then had been bound with the mathematical and other sciences, with other quondam liberal arts, and with crafts, coalesced into a generally accepted set of fine arts in which they were compared with one another and organized by the same principles.² And in the writings of many of the same men who were codifying the body of fine arts, a coherent set of beliefs about art emerged which, by the latter part of the eighteenth century, had achieved the status of a separate discipline called "aesthetics." This was a seminal period that redirected the course of the philosophy of art and established the field as we know it today.³

Adapted and transmuted in the subsequent two centuries, this theory of the fine arts has rarely been challenged. The pattern of thought that developed at this time has become integral to discussions about art, hardening into a set of axioms that have since acquired the stature of unquestioned and inviolable dogmas. Three, in particular, are pertinent here: that art consists primarily of objects, that these objects possess a special status, and that they must be regarded in a unique way. A brief look at some of the writing of this period will illustrate these characteristic themes.

The work of the British theorists of the eighteenth century deals not so much with characterizations of art in general as with the types and locations of beauty and the manner in which it is apprehended. That beauty is a characteristic of objects, to which the mind supplies meaning and order, was beyond dispute. The task lay in identifying such beauty, in determining in which objects beauty occurs, and what traits of imagination are needed to respond to it pleasurably. As Shaftesbury wrote of the painter in 1711, "His piece, if it be beautiful, and carries truth, must be a whole, by itself, complete, independent, and withal as great and comprehensive

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

as he can make it." Art, then, is concerned with beauty, and beauty is associated with an object.

Related to this idea is the requirement that the art object be demarcated from its surroundings and set off as an independent and integral work, instead of being diffused across "the walls, the ceilings, the staircases, the cupolas, and other remarkable places either of churches or palaces," as Shaftesbury put it. "We may give to any particular work the name *Tablature* when the work is in reality 'a single piece, comprehended in one view, and formed according to one single intelligence, meaning, or design; which constitutes a real whole, by a mutual and necessary relation of its parts, the same as of the members in a natural body'."⁴

Hutcheson and Reid developed this characterization further. Hutcheson sought to inquire into the quality in objects that excites our ideas of beauty and harmony, which he discovered in pleasing formal relations, especially as they are found in what he called the compound ratio between uniformity and variety.⁵

And Reid, toward the end of the eighteenth century, tried to determine what is common to all objects in which beauty can be found, a condition he located "in the moral and intellectual perfections of mind, and in its active powers."⁶

Now such beauty, these men held, is not to be found in the material from which art is fashioned but appears only when that material acquires something that beautifies it. Art is what beautifies matter, and since there is no principle of beauty in the physical object, that principle of meaning, regulation, and order must be supplied by the mind. Moreover, a particular sort of attention is necessary to apprehend such beauty, one which considers the object for its own sake

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

without regard to further purposes.

Here arose the famous notion of disinterestedness; an attitude denoting the perception of an object for its own sake without regard to further purposes, especially practical ones, and requiring the separation of the object from its surroundings in order that it may be contemplated freely and with no distracting considerations. Disinterestedness began to emerge as the mark of a new and distinctive mode of experience called aesthetic, a kind of awareness distinct from more commonly recognized alternative modes, such as instrumental, cognitive, moral, and religious experience.

It was in the work of Kant, however, that the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness became fixed and assumed a distinct and integral place in aesthetic theory, just as aesthetics itself was integrated in his philosophy into a comprehensive system. While Kant remained true to the classical view of art as an activity of making, he described beautiful art as a product that pleases us solely in the act of judging it, not by pure sensation or by its conformity to a concept such as that of having a purpose.⁷ For Kant distinguished aesthetic perception by its separation from interests that have a practical concern or end; it is distinct from the apprehension of objects in ordinary experience. Taste, he held then, is the faculty of judging or representing an object by a satisfaction or dissatisfaction that is entirely disinterested, and it is the object of such satisfaction that is called beautiful.

So it came about that the experience of art took on central importance and that this experience was attainable through the use of the special attitude of disinterestedness.⁸ By

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

separating the experience of beauty from sensory pleasure or ordinary emotions, Kant effectively removed it from a locus in human affairs and attenuated its grounding in somatic activity to the point of dematerialization. And by making taste disinterested, he provided the theoretical impetus for isolating art from commerce with the world of human activity and setting it in its own region beyond the command of practical affairs. Art, however, retains some resemblance to the realm of practice, Kant admitted, through the judgment of taste, which exhibits "purposiveness without purpose."⁹

From this formative period in the history of modern aesthetics there emerged an identification of the art object as separate and distinct from what surrounds it and isolated from the rest of life. As Munsterberg put it much later, "To isolate the object for the mind, means to make it beautiful, for it fills the mind without an idea of anything else: . . . this complete repose, where the objective impression becomes for us an ultimate end in itself is the only possible content of the true experience of beauty."¹⁰ Such an object requires a special attitude for its proper appreciation, a disinterested attitude by which the object is regarded in the light of its own intrinsic qualities with no concern for ulterior purposes. This is a tenet echoed regularly through the halls of academe by such phrases as Bullough's well-known notion of psychical distance and Ortega y Gasset's less gracious dehumanization.¹¹ Stolnitz summed up two centuries of discussion when he defined the aesthetic attitude as "disinterested and sympathetic attention to and contemplation of any object of awareness whatever, for its own sake alone."¹²

Although formulated in the eighteenth century, the doctrine of disinterested contemplation has its roots in the distant past. Aristotle's contemplative model of cognitive

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

experience still rules the realm of aesthetics, and many share with Aquinas the conviction that we grasp the beauty in art with the same intuitive directness and certainty as the axioms and proofs of logic: "Clarity is for beauty what evidence is for truth."¹³ The art object thus stands whole and pure, and we must contemplate it with the attitude appropriate to an observer. One can read the history of the philosophy of art as a reflection of the powerful impact of this contemplative ideal, which has continued to the present day in attempts to identify art with language, symbol, and symbol systems.¹⁴

One might read this list of aesthetic axioms as a mere reiteration of obvious truths and wonder at the value of documenting a tradition so well established as to seem unquestionable and irrefutable. We shall pursue these axioms more directly later. But if they presume to describe the experience of beauty, and if experience is to provide the basis for aesthetic understanding, we might expect the first order of business to be a clear, unassumptive query about the characteristics of such experience. For experience is the central term in aesthetics, and all that we can say about art and the aesthetic is in some way an elaboration of this notion. In attempting to describe experience, however, it is essential to escape the prevalent tendency to regard it as a purely subjective event, a tendency that emerges in phenomenology as strongly as in traditional empiricism. Let us start by attempting to disentangle the concept of experience from the hereditary characteristics it has acquired during the past two centuries.

To the Western philosophical mind the term experience connotes sense experience, and the appeal to sensation as the source of knowledge, or empiricism, as this is known, suggests in turn the major tradition in British philosophy. What we have inherited from that history (it too,

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

like aesthetics, a product of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), is a view of experience as the composite product of separate, discrete sensations. Whether these unitary perceptions are called "ideas that we receive from sensation" (Locke), "ideas actually imprinted on the senses" (Berkeley), "impressions" (Hume), calculable units of pleasure or pain (Bentham) or, as with more recent writers, sense data or other immediately given percepts, what is alleged is that these units are what we experience directly and immediately.¹⁵ Furthermore, we derive all knowledge from these elements by combining and ordering them into the more complex structures of our cognitive world. Now such units of perception are sensory ones, and it is from this trait that experience is said to have a subjective ground, for is not sensation something that can be traced to the mind? Is it not a personal, inner awareness, an effect caused by impinging causes from the world outside?

If, however, we apply to the question of experience the same Occamist rigor that the empiricist tradition urges us to direct toward logical and metaphysical claims, it is clear that such an account of experience is neither descriptive nor simple. Like traditional aesthetics, it prejudices our experience by imposing on it a division between person and world. Yet this dualistic tradition of separating consciousness from an external world, so deeply ingrained in modern thought, cannot be assumed as given. For it presumes a structure in experience that, for all its initial plausibility, rests on a particular historical and cultural tradition not shared in other times and places.

Yet this pattern of separation continues to prevail in the way the arts are explained and treated. In the effort to keep them distinct from other activities and objects in human culture,

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

our aesthetic encounters are usually channeled along a carefully paved course through official cultural institutions--galleries, museums, concert halls, theaters. Such confinement not only often restricts the force of the arts; it conspires to erect obstructions that inhibit our openness to artistic modes that do not conform to those requirements. Moreover, it forces traditional aesthetic theory that has been modeled on its constraints to scurry after in a vain attempt to keep up with the irrepressible inventiveness of artists. By attempting to decree the acceptable modes of artistic action and appreciative response, traditional aesthetics ends by legislating itself into irrelevance.

Our Western involvement with science and technology, where the atomistic pattern of experience seems so effective, may in fact have provided us with a misleading paradigm. For the experience of the arts exhibits a unity, and holistic experience occurs here in ways which are sometimes subtle as well as obvious and compelling. The contemporary arts, in particular, frequently insist on experiences of engagement by provoking us into movement or action or by forcing us to adjust our vision and imagination. One can attain such experiential unity, moreover, with the traditional arts as well as with the recent ones.

A clear alternative to the dualistic claims of the empiricist tradition lies, then, in the claim for a continuity of experience, joining perceiver with the world in complex patterns of reciprocity.

The universal scope of this view has been emerging slowly during the past century, ranging across the social sciences, the physical sciences, and philosophy. But it is in art that the continuity of experience is exemplified most strikingly. Elaborated in aesthetic theory, experiential continuity in the arts can serve as a model for other areas of inquiry.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

The rise of the idea of experiential continuity as an alternative to this tradition of separation in modern philosophy has been gradual and groping. We are still impeded by a dualistic conceptual structure and its corollary, the reduction of experience to a subjective response. Perhaps we can avoid the pervasive dualism of the modern period and begin to grasp the meaning for aesthetics of the continuity of experience by identifying some of the significant stages in its emergence. For art is one of the regions of culture in which this continuity is a significant, perhaps a necessary explanatory concept. Moreover, by discerning the stages by which experiential continuity has emerged here, through intuition and empathy to involvement and engagement, we may begin to see a significance that goes beyond the aesthetic realm.

When Bergson writes of the difference between relative and absolute knowing, he is identifying an alternative between the dualistic relation with a separate object and the unitary condition of direct apprehension. The first, he claims, offers knowledge that is external; the second, knowledge that lies within. But Bergson's reference to knowledge is unlike our common, more literal use of that term. For him knowledge is a condition of awareness, a grasping of something, not a proposition or a statement of fact. Even so, Bergson's fascination with the different ways of knowing an object is nonetheless still an intellectual preoccupation. Despite his agreement with common sense that reality is independent of the mind, his account of knowing offers an answer to the question of how we can gain an awareness of something by placing it within a cognitive frame, and his concern is with the mental act of knowing an object by a kind of "intellectual sympathy," as he calls it.¹⁶

There is more to the experience of art, however, than mental involvement, and others

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

have pursued ways in which the whole person, not just mind, intellect, or consciousness is engaged. One thinks of the notion of Einfuhlung, which Lipps developed about the same time that Bergson was writing. For Lipps, Einfuhlung or empathy begins not with a separate object with which we then have aesthetic enjoyment and not with such pleasure taken in an object, but with both the object and the pleasure drawn together in a single act. "Empathy is the fact that the antithesis between myself and the object disappears, or rather does not yet exist." This is more than a psychic unity, for even though Lipps retains the notion of contemplation in his account, empathy is a concept that incorporates movement or activity. This activity is bound up with the observed object, both by being derived from it and by being inseparable from it. When empathy with a physical movement takes place, there is a consciousness that is wholly identical with the movement. "In a word, I am now with my feeling of activity entirely and wholly in the moving figure. Even spatially, if we can speak of the spatial extent of the ego, I am in its place."¹⁷

There is an identity here, yet this is no passive identity or purely visual assimilation, nor does it involve a private sensation or pleasure in an object. It is rather the activity of feeling oneself into the aesthetic object, an activity that engages not just our attention but also kinesthetic sensations, such as the muscle tensions that are so insistent a part of dance appreciation.

Dewey exhibits a still more explicit recognition of total organic involvement in art. The biological, evolutionary model underlies his account of experience and, when he turns to art, he employs the same factors. Whether one's interests be scientific or aesthetic, "the ultimate matter of both emphases in experience is...the constant rhythm that marks the interaction of the live creature with his surroundings." The function of art is consciously to restore "the union of sense, need, impulse and action characteristic of the live creature." Such an occurrence is integrated

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

and consummated in what Dewey calls "an experience," the distinguishing mark of the aesthetic.¹⁸

Aesthetic involvement is carried further yet in Merleau-Ponty's discussion of perception as a synthesis that finds unity and wholeness in our sensory grasp of objects. Such a synthesis involves the "body as the field of perception and action" and yet goes beyond what is directly perceived to a whole, a totality that is ultimately the world itself. In his description of seeing, Merleau-Ponty carries this idea of physical engagement to art, particularly painting. "Since things and my body are made of the same stuff, vision must somehow take place in them; their manifest visibility must be repeated in the body by a secret visibility."¹⁹

More recently Mikel Dufrenne has continued to extend this theme of perceptual unity. In aesthetic experience the spectator assists in revealing the aesthetic object, an object that is both a thing and its meaning and that exists through the perceiver and not independently. Yet it is only in perception that the being of the aesthetic object is realized. Not constituted by consciousness, it nonetheless exists only for a consciousness able to recognize it. Like Merleau-Ponty, Dufrenne argues that this produces a relation of subject and object in which each exists only by means of the other, a kind of reconciliation of the two. There is no opposed physical object here whose presence is externally related to the appreciator. One must enter into the work in an intimate fashion, active not as a pure spectator but as an involved viewer.²⁰

These characterizations of aesthetic experience vary in the degree of engagement they recognize between perceiver and object. They may even admit, as Dufrenne does, of a paradox

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

between the appreciator's absorption in the object and the distance imposed by its independent identity.²¹ Whatever their differences, they reflect a development that extends aesthetic experience well beyond a state of mind that is separate and distinct from the aesthetic object, beyond a psychological attitude or an act of consciousness. They join in stressing involvement, ranging from multi-sensory synaesthesia to somatic action and continuity with the object.

The notion of unitary perception in aesthetic experience has thus gradually taken form as an alternative to the theory of disinterestedness. Yet the efforts to shape this notion remain bound to the very theory they intend to challenge. Its development has followed an uneven course, often hampered by vestiges of an incompatible past difficult to recognize and set aside. Even though the proposals we have just reviewed reject key elements of traditional aesthetics, they often retain other features of that theory--its psychologism, its concentration on the spectator, its essential passivity, its acceptance of the autonomy of the art object. Yet perceptual unity is an essentially different idea, inconsistent with the tradition of disinterested contemplation. The maturation of this idea, moreover, complements a parallel development in the arts of the last hundred years: their assimilation of perceiver and object in appreciative experience.

Now the purpose of aesthetics is to clarify and explain our experiences with the arts, and all theoretical assertions must stand ultimately on their ability to do this. While art of the past might appear to corroborate the customary explanations of traditional aesthetics, this is only because their appreciation has been impeded and distorted by doctrines that misrepresent aesthetic activity.²² But when we consider the history of the arts from the perspective of the

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

present, the inadequacy of the traditional doctrines is striking. The arts of this century demand a transformation of theory.

These arts pose an intimidating challenge to traditional theory. For our initial fascination with the contemporary arts often turns into bafflement when we attempt to understand and explain the disconcerting array of materials and perceptual activities with which they confront us. Traditional aesthetics is uncomfortable with sharply new materials, such as plastics, electronic sounds, and found words and objects. It has difficulty accounting for artistic developments such as process art, where the product is secondary to the activity of producing it, and in explaining artistic activities that have purely ephemeral objects or no identifiable objects at all. Nor can traditional theory easily absorb the deliberate elimination of the customary devices of order from various arts. Even the distinctions among the arts have broken down, and we are often unable to decide where a new development belongs: whether, for example, environments are sculpture or architecture; assemblages are paintings or sculptures; Happenings are theater, painting (as an outgrowth of action painting), or an entirely new art form synthesizing elements of theater, sculpture, dance, painting, and music; and where, if anywhere, performance art can be placed. In fact, multi-media developments like performance art seem deliberately to rebuff the usual classifications of both artists and their art, as music, dance, theatrical spectacle, film, and poetry merge with the creative artist, performer, and audience into an inseparable flow. And among the conventional arts, too, basic distinctions no longer hold. We find it difficult to draw a clear line between design, decoration, illustration, and fine art, between musical sound and noise, and between architecture and environmental sculpture.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Thus the evolution of the arts in the twentieth century has often been described as experimental, controversial, even chaotic. This is hardly the first time in history that artistic innovations have evoked confusion and dismay. Still, in our own period there is a greater variety of diverse, independent, even conflicting movements and strands of development than in any previous age. Some commentators have extolled the new for its differences and its freshness; others have condemned it for its iconoclasm, its sensationalism, or its opportunism. But the artistic impulse toward fresh perceptions persists and, with the passage of time, history has accommodated itself to innovation and change by enlarging its embrace, as the "wild beasts" of the present become the masters of the recent past.

Yet the contemporary arts exhibit more than an expansion of styles, materials, and techniques, for technical innovations do not stand alone. They influence more than the forms of the arts: They affect the manner in which we engage with and appreciate art. And it is here in our relation to the arts that the most profound transformations have occurred, for artists have altered our very ability to identify what art is and our capacities for experiencing it. These are the changes that carry the most significance for aesthetics. By modifying what we accept as art and by reordering the conditions and character of our experience of it, these developments have at the same time undermined the customary beliefs through which people have appreciated, understood, and esteemed art. In the face of all this it is presumptuous for the theory of the arts to decree what qualifies as art and aesthetic. The converse is more appropriate: Aesthetic theory must examine artistic practice carefully and consider how best to respond to this alteration and enlargement of the traditional station and experience of the arts.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

It is precisely in accounting for many of these new developments that the traditional axioms of aesthetics have shown themselves increasingly inadequate. During the early years of this century, art movements arose that contradicted one or another of the received principles. By mid-century, however, the arts had developed to the point where these principles were no longer simply inadequate but had become utterly irrelevant in general. Let me illustrate their unsuitability by holding up each of the three eighteenth-century principles that we identified earlier against developments in the recent history of the arts. Many of these have become movements that have by now assumed "official" status and have been absorbed into the mainline history of the arts, where their very presence in that history denies those received principles.²³ While we shall consider these axioms separately here, many artistic developments refute them all. For, indeed, these are not independent principles at all but interdependent supports of a single obsolete philosophical structure.

The assumption that art consists primarily of objects has been challenged and undermined in both obvious and subtle ways. With increasing frequency during the past century, the art object has become less important in the aesthetic situation and at times has vanished altogether. In the visual arts this change appears clearly in the sequence of movements that began in the late nineteenth century and has continued to the present: impressionism, cubism, futurism, dadaism, expressionism, abstract expressionism, optical art, conceptual art, Happenings, and performance art. It was an evolution that started with the dissolution of the representational object within the traditional painting, shifted to the perceptual experience of the painting, and concluded with the disappearance of the painting itself. Braque's bold assertion was a symptom of this change: "I do not paint objects," he stated, "I paint the relations between

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

objects." And Matisse made a similar claim, saying that he paints not objects but the differences between them. Let us look at this sequence of stages more closely.

Impressionist painting began the process. It dissolved the substantiality of things into atmospheric appearances, from the pointillism of Seurat, whose dabs of brilliant, pure color needed to be mixed by the eye to form a semblance of the coherence and solidity of things in sunlight, to Monet's multiple versions of haystacks, the cathedral at Rouen, lines of poplars, the Seine, and other landscapes under the momentary conditions of the passing sun, suggesting a painterly exemplification of Berkeley's dictum of the century before, "To be is to be perceived."

Yet the dissolution of the pictorial object, separate and independent, only began with the Impressionists. The apparent solidity and permanence of objects do not just dissolve under the fleeting changes of light and atmosphere. These ephemeral objects also inhabit the transitory domain of duration, and painters rendered the very temporality of the perceptual process in various ways. Analytical cubism flattened out the thickness of things by delivering a multiplicity of perspectives simultaneously on the same picture plane, while the futurism of Boccioni, Balla, and Severini portrayed the world by fragmenting objects into the dynamic patterns of motion. In a similar fashion Duchamp's descending nudes unfolded into nothing more than their movement, so that the painterly object was no longer a coherent whole ignoring temporal change but an abstract construct conceptually conjoined from its passing presence.

The perceptual process took a psychological turn in the work of the Expressionists, whose subjects were transfigured by their emotive significance as the painter's heart beat through his hand. In surrealism the painter's oneiric world dominated the visual one, and painting relied

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

more on a metaphorical than a literal image. Magritte clearly illustrates the key role of imaginative consciousness. A master of the realistic image, he nonetheless did not develop his art out of his ability to render what is directly seen. The effectiveness of Magritte's sensibility lies rather in exciting an awareness of what is not seen at all but is contributed instead by the viewer. Birds in a cage, Magritte once remarked, are a known and expected combination. We can get a more interesting image if we put a fish or a shoe in a cage. "But though these images are strange, they are unhappily accidental, arbitrary. It is possible to obtain a new image which will stand up to examination through having something final, something right about it: it is the image showing an egg in the cage."²⁴ What Magritte observes reflects the truth of any effective metaphor, where the revealing juxtaposition is its most general condition.

In the third quarter of the twentieth century these developments expanded into the many modes of non-objective painting and sculpture. Trends such as abstract expressionism, optical art, and color field painting require active involvement in the visual perception of ambiguities in linear configurations, and of patterns, textures, and color relationships in order for the work to function at all. Moreover, appreciative engagement is not confined to the visual arts. In speaking of modernist fiction, for example, Annie Dillard observes that the art object's "doing, however internal, requires a perceiver to complete its value." Similar instances can easily be drawn from the other major arts.²⁵

Now these disappearances of the object occur within the enduring boundaries of larger things, and it may be argued that even though objects may vanish within a painting, the picture as an art object remains. Many instances appear, however, in which that very object begins to

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

disintegrate. In the installation piece Les fausses confidences (The False Confidences) (1983), Giulio Paolini has placed a number of merely primed canvases in a low arrangement, while a slide image is projected above them, exemplifying the liberation of the image from the art object.²⁶ There are other works in which the entire object recedes into insignificance, becoming merely the occasion for exciting a condition of awareness. Dada illustrates this in those instances where the art object is trivial or obscure, leading appreciation to rest on the meanings associated with it rather than on the object itself. Dada is more than a parody of the sanctimonious attitude toward art that its name signifies: It is a revitalization of aesthetic experience by transferring attention from the exhausted art object into the realm of meaning.²⁷

Consider Duchamp's The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors, the Large Glass (1915-1923). Offering "a mechanistic and cynical interpretation of the phenomenon of love," this sculpture of oil, lead wire, foil, dust, and varnish on two large glass panes superimposed to form a vertical panel offers its strongest impression iconographically rather than visually. Only when explicated as the ideally projected working of two love machines, utilizing a hermetic iconography that draws from Duchamp's earlier works, does its message of sexual futility emerge.²⁸ Yet visual perplexity is not the only condition in which meaning supersedes the object. Duchamp's Etant Donnée (The Door of the Given: 1. The Waterfall 2. The Illuminating Gas) (1946-1966) is his counterpart to the transparency of the Large Glass.²⁹ This sculpture takes an obvious subject matter--it is a realistic diorama of a meadow with a nude lying suggestively supine in the foreground--but makes it accessible only when the viewer looks through a pair of tiny peepholes situated in a dark corner. Thus the position of the spectator turns him or her unavoidably into a voyeur and adds the peculiar significance of experiencing that meaning to the

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

perceptual consciousness of the object.

The dadaist transformation of the art object into its meaning is extended to its fullest degree in conceptual art. Here meaning so dominates aesthetic consciousness that the object often devolves into trivial gestures, as in Sol Lewitt's Six Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty-Five Lines (1970), a surface covered with thirty-three rows of short, parallel vertical lines drawn freehand, or in Vito Acconci's Step Piece, a record of a daily sequence of steppings onto and down from a stool at a steady rate of speed, performed as a daily series for a month.³⁰ In fact, the object may disappear altogether, as in Richard Fleishner's conceptual sculpture, Sited Works, in which photographs of striking natural and human-made shapes were placed at various sites at which the viewer was asked to reconstruct their presence imaginatively. Happenings were another recent phase in the dissolution of the independent object. This development was somewhat akin to theater, except that there was often no audience but only participants who pursued in a largely improvisatory fashion the directions contained in a scenario.³¹ Currently, performance art continues in a similar direction, providing an occasion for display and participation in which the object is replaced by activity. Protesting against the commercialization and exploitation of the art object, the work of performance artists is deliberately ephemeral. Moreover, it characteristically overrides the conventional boundaries between the traditional arts by employing mixed media performances, so that even if there were an object, it could not be identified. The various forms of process art, like action painting, earth art, conceptual art, and performance art de-emphasize the final product and stress the activity of making and grasping art. Just as Newton proved in 1666 that color was not a property of matter but rather of light as it interacts with objects, artists in this century seem to be showing us that art is not a property of

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

objects but emerges from the perception by human beings in interaction with objects or events.

Theater provides many clear illustrations of the rejection of the second axiom of traditional aesthetics, the principle that accords a special status to art objects. Some artists in this century have been intrigued by the ordinariness of things, by those very features that make them undistinguished, and where significance lies not in what is presented but in what rises up, as it were, between the cracks. The tragic hero becomes a nondescript, unsuccessful salesman; the dramatic situation is discerned in the transcript of a trial; the poetry of language is sacrificed to the dull mundanities of common speech. Waiting for Godot is probably the best-known example of this dethroning of the object, where there are passages in which eloquence of word and gesture, so closely associated with the traditional theater, is notably absent. Action, furthermore, is virtually non-existent, and the force of the situation emerges from the intimations that rise out of the seemingly pointless reiteration of banalities and, perhaps even more, from the silences that interrupt them.

ESTRAGON: Ah! (Pause) You're sure it was here?

VLADIMIR: What?

EST: That we were to wait.

VLAD: He said by the tree. (They look at the tree.)

Do you see any others?

EST: What is it?

VLAD: I don't know. A willow.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

EST: Where are the leaves?

VLAD: It must be dead.

EST: No more weeping.

VLAD: Or perhaps it's not the season.

EST: Looks to me more like a bush.

VLAD: A shrub.

EST: A bush.³²

Similar instances in theater where art emerges from the depiction of the ordinary include such well-known plays as Beckett's Krapp's Last Tape and Happy Days, and Albee's The Zoo Story, The American Dream, and The Sandbox. Ionesco's The Bald Soprano is composed entirely of inane phrases taken from an English grammar book.

Dada again seems deliberately to deny any special status to art objects. Duchamp's readymades are often cited and frequently ridiculed, yet their artistic significance is nevertheless widely acknowledged. Much of the eloquence of the readymades lies precisely in their ordinary and undistinguished appearance and in the playfulness with which they twit serious aesthetic expectations. Bicycle wheels and urinals parody our search for significant form and our perception of aesthetic qualities. As for uniqueness, a readymade is by definition a standardized object, and placing it on a pedestal merely thrusts its ordinariness upon the viewer.

There are yet more recent instances of art that denies the claim to distinguished stature. One can recognize such art in the assemblage, which may use prosaic, everyday objects in sculptures and on the surface of paintings; in musique concrète, which utilizes often chance

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

arrangements of the sounds that constitute the aural ambience of our industrial culture or constructs musical works by manipulating spoken texts electronically; in pop art, which presents the unadorned forms, surfaces, and images that pervade popular culture; in found poetry, fashioned from chance arrangements of words obtained from mundane sources; and in objets trouvés, sculpture made out of the detritus of industrial society. Moreover, older and recent technologies alike have generated lithographs, woodcuts, photographs, movies, books, and music recordings for which there is no original but only copies, thus dispensing with the hallowed traditional traits of uniqueness and rarity.

Most interesting of all, however, is the ingenuity with which many artists have contradicted the precept that art objects must be regarded with a special attitude. The experience of art is indeed distinctive, and the doctrine of disinterestedness attempted to promote this by putting a frame of sorts around art, thereby isolating it from the rest of human objects and activities and placing it in a special realm free from practical demands. This frame is primarily a psychological one, a shift in attitude that leads the appreciator to attend to the qualities of the art object without concern for the usual meanings and uses it may have in ordinary experience. Much of the recent history of the arts, however, reads as an intentional denial of disinterestedness, for artists have shaped works in every medium in which the active participation of the appreciator in completing the artistic process is essential to the aesthetic effect. This is not just a matter of bringing attention and interest to the situation but of making a perceptual, sometimes even a physical contribution to the work.

Disinterestedness no longer identifies what is distinctive in the aesthetic situation. With

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

increasing insistence over the past century, artists have been moving toward producing work that denies the isolation of art from the active involvements of daily life. Joining with ancient traditions in the practice and use of the arts, they have seized on the connections art has to human activities, instead of stressing its differences and discontinuities. For one need not dissociate oneself from practice and use in order to take something on its own terms, as disinterestedness would have us do. Aesthetic experience thus becomes rather an emphasis on intrinsic qualities and lived experience than a shift in attitude.

This emphasis on qualities and experience is not confined to special, narrow conditions but can be extended everywhere. Moreover, perception now stands in the forefront of active experience instead of merely providing cues for action and meaning, as it does in other situations. Most important, artists have been forcing us to realize that entering the world of art requires the active engagement of the total person and not just a subjective cast of mind. Such engagement emphasizes connections and continuities and it leads ultimately to the aestheticization of the human world. Art thus remains distinctive without being separate. Just as the doctrine of disinterestedness is the central principle of eighteenth-century aesthetics, subsuming under it the belief that art refers to objects that possess a special and distinctive status, so the idea of aesthetic engagement has become the keystone of the new artistic sensibility.

Appreciative engagement occurs in different ways, depending on the period, style, and artistic modality. In the modern period artists have made this involvement explicit, and many forms of participation may require a variety of overt actions. The most obvious instances are

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

those in which the appreciator must perform some particular act in order for the art work to function completely. The patterns and colors of Yaacov Agam's corrugated paintings change as the viewer walks by, and the paintings are entirely different when seen from the right or the left, the transformation itself becoming part of the experience of the work. Appreciating certain sculptures requires walking into or through them, climbing upon them, or repositioning their parts. One is expected to clamber up or sit on Mark di Suvero's ride 'em pieces, such as Homage to Brancusi, a wooden desk chair set on a steel rod, and Atman, which incorporates a swinging platform (see illustration), while his arrangements of balanced steel beams must be pushed into motion. Again, there are wall sculptures of polished metal that need the reflected image of their viewer to be complete. Wall pieces, paintings, and sculptures are common that respond to environmental stimuli, emitting sounds, echoes, or light at the approach of the appreciator.

While these are innovative uses of overt participation, visual art that uses more traditional forms and technologies may work in similar ways by requiring an active perceiver. Calder's stabiles can be contemplated from a distance, to be sure, but they often can (and should) be walked through as well as around, so that their spaces, planes, mass, and curves can be perceived in continual rearrangement in relation to the body, just as happens with his mobiles. In the one case the wind is the activator; in the other, the viewer. Indeed, the three-dimensionality of most object sculpture requires a circumambulating perceiver to activate its potentialities of shifting surfaces, planes, and interrelations of volumes. Barbara Hepworth makes this explicit when she confesses, "I love working on a large scale so that the whole body of the spectator becomes involved." While painting does not usually take the form of shaped, three-dimensional canvases, the same participatory involvement is necessary. Jasper John's paintings of superimposed

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

numbers are more than a writhing mixture of shapes and colors; they intrigue one into deciphering the forms of the figures, just as cubism requires the viewer to reassemble the multiple planes into a perceptual consciousness of three-dimensional objects. Indeed, such active discernment is a demand of all painting, from recent color field and minimalist art to traditional landscape and portrait painting, where the distance and direction of the viewer as well as an activating eye set the forces of the painting in motion. Music, commonly considered an art of receptive enjoyment, has developed modes in which the audience must complete the work by singing or by making percussive sounds. Even in its more conventional forms, music demands an active contribution by which the listener joins in the sequence of sounds shaped by the composer with an active awareness that regenerates the original order of experience.

Innovations in theater have also appeared that disrupt dramatically the conventional protection of distance. Theater-in-the-round, now commonplace, breaks down the conventional separation between audience and performers by dispensing with the proscenium arch and having the audience surround the stage. This usually requires the actors to enter and exit through the audience, a practice that has also been adopted in more traditional theaters. Major reforms that recast the conventions of theatrical production are most prominent, however, in the modern movement that began with Artaud and moved through Brecht, Joseph Chaikin's Open Theater, Julian Beck and Judith Malina's Living Theater, and Peter Brook's *Marat/Sade*, to Jerzy Grotowski's ritualistic theater and, later, his paratheatrics, which abolished any distinction between the actor and the spectator. This development in modern theater might be taken as exemplifying Stanislavsky's comment that you don't lose yourself in a role, which would be mystical; you find yourself in a role.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

A striking instance of theatrical participation was the Open Theater's production of The Serpent: A Ceremony. After a compelling pantomime in which Eve finally succumbs to the temptation of the apple, the stage was suddenly filled with an orgy of apples and actors all rolling about, the members of the entire company presenting apples to each other. Then the apples and the actors spilled off the stage, and the players moved among the audience, offering the same treacherous temptation to the bewildered onlookers. The playwright, Jean-Claude van Itallie, expressed this changed theatrical mode well: "The playwright's work is not so much to 'write a play' as to 'construct a ceremony,'" in which the actors "are in some sense priests or celebrants, and the audience is drawn to participate with the actors in a kind of eucharist."³³

There are, however, still more subtle modes of participation that take us far beyond the psychological form of appreciative enjoyment found by assuming an attitude of psychical distance. Detective novels that must be read and solved at a computer are only a more explicit use of the reader participation that all novels require. The modernist novel, for example, along with some notable precursors, makes the reader a collaborator in the fictional process. One is no longer entertained by a narrative whose clear line carries an orderly sequence of continuous events. In place of a plot developed in a more or less direct manner, situations, events, and perceptions are described, which the reader is compelled to fit together in order for the novel to become coherent.

Joseph Conrad's Chance (1913) may be taken as a precursor of the modernist novel in this respect. It is a tale whose reader must arrange the constant shifts of scene and time in order to fit the narrated events into their chronological sequence. The present-tense account with which

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

the novel begins slips into the background until the very end, while the narrator, Marlow, supplies chapters from the strange history of Flora de Barral. Some of the occurrences are related as Marlow observed them, others as they were told to him by different people who entered Flora's life at critical points, and all are skillfully drawn together with a surprising conclusion in the fictional present. Conrad's technique of fragmentation itself exemplifies the quality of chance that is the motif of the story. Moreover, it also forces the reader to collaborate more directly in the evocation of character and situation than would a simple narrative.

The classic modern case of novelistic fractionalizing is undoubtedly Ulysses, in which nearly eight hundred pages of florid detail depict characters, dialogue, situations and, more than anything, the ruminations of its actors. Yet such colorful abundance may obscure the fact that Joyce's expansive novel pursues a regular temporal narrative, encompassing but a single day in the life of Leopold Bloom, a day rich in the company of Dublin's distinctive types and local culture. The reader must contribute to the work's coherence by discerning the order hidden amid the thick flow of events and thoughts.

Recent literature profusely illustrates this same fictional collaboration. One thinks of the nouveau roman, fiction that is highly descriptive of things and events but always through "the eye which sees them, the thought which re-examines them, the passion which distorts them." In fact, as Robbe-Grillet put it, "the objects in our novels never have a presence outside human perception, real or imaginary; they are objects comparable to those in our daily lives, as they occupy our minds at every moment."³⁴ His novel, The Voyeur, is exemplary. With dispassionate precision Robbe-Grillet describes the return of a watch salesman to the island on which he had

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

been born long before and where he has gone for a day of business. Through tireless detail, the author enumerates in a mundane, disconnected, and repetitious sequence Mathias's arrival, his colorless attempts at salesmanship, his dull conversations and trivial thoughts. It is a confusion of memories and actual events, which only ends with his departure. Joining with Mathias's consciousness, one begins but gradually to realize that, amid this welter of perceptions and reflections, he is likely responsible for the one notable event that occurred in the entire course of the novel, the death of a young girl, who was apparently raped and murdered. The indefiniteness of consciousness remains to the end.³⁵

There is, then, a rich strand among the novels of this century in which the regular recounting of occurrences found in traditional narrative has little interest for the writer. Instead of reality we are given "hallucinations provoked by reality," as Gide once described his own work. The lines between what happens and what is imagined are indiscernible, and we are placed in the state of the characters, a "plane of delirium," in Céline's apt phrase, in which emotions and not objects are captured. Céline's work itself offers the reader no objective narration, no difference between the things and events that take place and the full scope of the jostling emotions they evoke.³⁶ One is cast into the tawdry, seething undersurface of Parisian life, petty and mean but absorbing in its details and characters. No dispassionate gaze is possible, no curious but white-gloved gentility; one can touch that world only by entering it.

Other cases of demanding fictional participation are easy to find. There is Nabokov's Pale Fire, a novel that flickers simultaneously among the incidents in an epic poem, in the life of its poet, and in that of the poem's commentator, which are all evoked in the exegesis of the poem.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

In Lawrence Durrell's Alexandria Quartet, each of the four novels purveys its own distinct perspective on the same events as they have been fashioned through the eye and mind of a different participant. For the work to attain its complete effect, the reader must join together and encompass, if not reconcile, the accounts. The parts of Durrell's Avignon Quintet, a more recent "quincunx" of five novels, as he calls it, are interconnected in still more complex involutions. Such novelistic fragmentation is hardly new. It gives a discursive charm, for example, to Laurence Sterne's Tristram Shandy and Tobias Smollett's The Expedition of Humphrey Clinker, both from the eighteenth century. But in the modern novel such techniques have become a recurrent theme.³⁷

Still other arts share a particular need for participation to attain appreciative fulfillment. There is film, which captures the consciousness of the viewer and joins it with the moving eye of the camera in a living sequence of events. There are architecture and urban design which, contrary to our usual expectations, do not offer contemplative objects but require human activity to complete them, perceptually as well as functionally. Dance carries irresistible somatic appeal, as the viewer's empathetic attention accompanies the dancer and may even break out involuntarily into overt movement.

Such experiences in the arts as these did not appear spontaneously. Like all cultural phenomena, they are part of an evolutionary process that still continues. We shall grasp these developments better if we consider the origins of such changes in our experience and the social and perceptual transformations that characterize them. These developments, moreover, possess theoretical importance, for they suggest the recasting of aesthetics into a unified theory that

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

reflects the continuity, perceptual integration, and engagement of our new encounters with the arts. Let us see how this has come about.³⁸

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

1. See Frank Sibley, "Aesthetic Concepts," in J. Margolis,

Philosophy Looks at the Arts (New York: Scribner's, 1962), pp.63-87.

2. In The Book of the Courtier (1528), for example, the Italian Renaissance nobleman Count Baldassare Castiglione grouped in undifferentiated order such activities as the appreciation of poetry, music, and painting with fencing, horseback riding, the collection of coins, medals, and natural curiosities, and classical learning. The classic account of the historical coalescence of the various arts into a stable group of fine arts composed of painting, sculpture, architecture, music, and poetry is Paul Oskar Kristeller's essay, "The Modern System of the Arts," in his Renaissance Thought II (New York: Harper & Row, 1965). See esp. pp.207, 215, 222-223, 225.

3. The brief account of the emergence of modern aesthetics which follows here summarizes part of my developed study in "The Historicity of Aesthetics, I" in The British Journal of Aesthetics, 26/2 (Spring 1986), 101-111. How the notion of disinterestedness arose to denote a special kind of attention, how it was disentangled from moral considerations of ends and consequences, and how it became established as the central trait of the aesthetic attitude are questions that have attracted continuing attention. The seminal discussion of the historical emergence of aesthetic disinterestedness is Jerome Stolnitz's, "On the Origin of 'Aesthetic Disinterestedness'," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism XX, 2 (Winter 1961), 131-143. More recent scholarship has contested Stolnitz's claim that a clear sense of 'aesthetic disinterestedness' can be found as far back as Shaftesbury. Saisselin detects the notion earlier in the French Enlightenment, while Townsend finds it entangled with the sense of 'experience,' showing no steady evolution but developing gropingly in Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, and the Scottish Enlightenment writers finally to emerge in its modern sense

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

at the end of the eighteenth century in Kant. See Remy Saisselin, "A Second Note on Eighteenth Century 'Aesthetic Disinterestedness'," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism XXI, 209; Dabney Townsend, "From Shaftesbury to Kant," Journal of the History of Ideas, 48, 2; and "Archibald Alison: Aesthetic Experience and Emotion," British Journal of Aesthetics, 28/2, 132-144. Attention to this important period in the history of modern aesthetics continues also in the work of George Dickie, Peter Kivy, Stephanie Ross, Noel Carroll, and Ted Cohen, among others.

4. Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times (1711) (New York, 1900), Vol. I, p. 94; Vol. II, pp. 136-7, 130-1. Shaftesbury, "A Notion of the Historical Draught or Tablature of the Judgment of Hercules" (1712), quoted in M. Fried, Absorption and Theatricality (U. of California Press, 1980), p. 89.

5. Francis Hutcheson, An Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue (1725), 3rd ed. (London, 1729), Sect. II, Para. 1, 3.

6. Thomas Reid, On the Intellectual Powers of Man (1785), "Of Beauty".

7. Immanuel Kant, Critique of Judgment (1790), Sects. 43, 45.

8. Kant, Critique of Judgment, Sect. 5. Further, when Kant describes taste as universal (Sects. 6-9), he frames his view within the cognitivist tradition that has dominated western thought since classical times.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

9. Critique of Judgment, Sects. 11, 16. Kant, of course, was himself not as exclusive as this account may suggest, for he distinguished between pure and impure judgments of taste and admitted a relationship between the arts and culture. However, Kant's enormous and continuing influence, like that of most seminal thinkers, derives from a selective and therefore unbalanced interpretation of his theory. The descendants of a theoretical giant are frequently more orthodox than the originator. It appears, furthermore, that this tendency toward enshrining disinterested perception as peculiarly aesthetic was not consistently or universally maintained at the time it was being formulated. See Fried, Absorption and Theatricality, pp.103, 104, 131-132.

10. Hugo Munsterberg, The Principles of Art Education (1905). See Calogero's more recent description of the aesthetic attitude as "lyrical equilibrium" in M. Rieser, "The Aesthetics of Guido Calogero," The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XXX, 1 (Fall 1971), 19-26.

11. Edward Bullough, "'Psychical Distance' as a Factor in Art and an Esthetic Principle," British Journal of Psychology V (1913), reprinted in Melvin Rader, ed., A Modern Book of Esthetics, 3rd ed., (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960), pp. 394-411. Jose Ortega y Gasset, The Dehumanization of Art (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956).

12. Jerome Stolnitz, Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art Criticism (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1960), p. 35.

13. See Maurice de Wulf, Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages (Princeton, 1922), p.28.

14. It is obvious that any general statement (this one included) must be qualified in particular cases. The history of aesthetics, like the history of art, indeed like any history, includes such

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

variety as to provide exceptions to any generalization. However, the task of historical review (and, in fact, the reason for its constant revision) is to identify from the ever-changing perspective of the present the dominant influences and trends that have shaped the course of things. That is part of the purpose of this chapter.

15. John Locke, Essay Concerning Human Understanding, Book II, Ch.1, Sect. 2, 3. George Berkeley, Principles of Human Knowledge, Part First, 1. David Hume, An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding, Section II.

16. Bergson, An Introduction to Metaphysics (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1955), pp.21 ff.

17. Theodor Lipps, Asthetik, 2 vols., 1903-1906; 2nd ed., 1914-1920. See "Empathy and Abstraction," in A Modern Book of Esthetics, 3rd ed., Melvin Rader, ed. (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), pp.376, 379.

18. John Dewey, Art as Experience (New York: Minton, Balch, 1934), pp.15, 25.

19. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "The Primacy of Perception," and "Eye and Mind," both in The Primacy of Perception, ed. J.M. Edie (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964), pp. 16, 164.

20. Mikel Dufrenne, The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience, trans. by E. Casey et al (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973), pp.51, 205, 71, 218, 219, 56, 55.

21. Mikel Dufrenne, The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience,
p. 232.

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

22. The history of appreciation stands independent of the history of the theory of appreciation, and it is likely that doctrines of disinterestedness have been more influential in academic circles than in artistic ones.

23. If the axioms are inadequate in any important instance, they are inadequate in general. Moreover, these developments cannot be dismissed merely as exceptions to the rule since, for universal claims, exceptions are contradictions.

24. Quoted in Annie Dillard, Living by Fiction (New York: Harper & Row, 1982).

25. Living by Fiction, p. 176.

26. Collection of The Guggenheim Museum, New York, New York.

27. Danto regards the essential place of interpretation in such art as the final stage in the transformation of art into philosophy and thus the end of its history. This provocative thesis animates much of his work. See Arthur C. Danto, The Transfiguration of the Commonplace (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981) and The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

28. See Andre Breton, "Lighthouse of the Bride," in Robert Lebel, Marcel Duchamp (New York, 1959), p. 92; and William S. Rubin, Dada, Surrealism and Their Heritage (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1968), pp. 19-21. See also Katherine S. Dreier and Matta Echaurren, Duchamp's Glass: An Analytical Reflection (New York, 1944); and Arturo Schwarz, The Large Glass and Related Works (Milan, 1967).

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

29. Collection of The Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, PA.
30. Ursula Meyer, ed., Conceptual Art (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1972) pp. 2-7, 174-179.
31. See Allan Kaprow, Assemblage, Environments and Happenings (New York: Abrams, 1966), pp. 195-198.
32. Samuel Beckett, Waiting for Godot (New York: Grove Press, 1954), p. 10.
33. Quoted in Walter Kerr, "What If Cain Did Not Know How to Kill Abel?," The New York Times, February 9, 1969, Section 2, p. 1.
34. Alain Robbe-Grillet, "New Novel, New Man," in For a New Novel (New York: Grove Press, 1965), p. 137.
35. Alain Robbe-Grillet, The Voyeur (New York: Grove Press, 1958).
36. Ralph Manheim, in the "Preface" to Louis-Ferdinand Celine, Death on the Installment Plan (New York: Signet, 1966), p. vii.
37. Annie Dillard's Living by Fiction traces such features as we have been treating here through the landscape of contemporary fiction.
38. Diacritical Emendations:
Einführung: p. 14, l. 4. 33; 4. 47; e. n. 10

Arnold Berleant, in *Possibility of the Aesthetic Experience*, ed. Michael Mitias (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1986), pp. 91-106.
Re-printed as Chapter 1 in *Art and Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Munsterberg: p. 8, ln2.33

concrete: p.30, ln 5

trouves: p.30, ln 7.33

Celine: p.39, ln. 4, 4.33; e.n. 36

Donnee: acute accents over first 'e', p.26, ln 4.67