

THE CONCEPT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS
IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY OF ART:
KANT, SCHOPENHAUER, NIETZSCHE, AND HEIDEGGER

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BÜŞRA AKKÖKLER KARATEKELİ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

JUNE 2016

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Tansu Açık	(A.U., GRE)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan	(METU, PHIL)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Çırakman	(METU, PHIL)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Būşra Akk kler Karatekeli

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE CONCEPT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY OF ART: KANT, SCHOPENHAUER, NIETZSCHE, AND HEIDEGGER

Akkökler Karatekeli, Büşra
M.A., Department of Philosophy
Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan

June 2016, 101 pages

This thesis aims to investigate the concept of disinterestedness in the modern philosophy of art. To this end, I firstly attempt to elucidate how this concept is described and gained its specific meaning in Kant. Then, I focus on Schopenhauer's salient contribution to the discussion of aesthetic disinterestedness – thought along with his metaphysics –, namely the body, and attempt to bring into view the relation between the body and aesthetic disinterestedness. In the following, I investigate how Nietzsche's thought concerning the concept of disinterestedness has shifted from the partial approval of the concept to its criticism by emphasising the physiological aspect of aesthetic experience. Bearing in mind Schopenhauer's emphasis on the role of the body, I discuss that its function in aesthetic experience is fully developed in Nietzsche. To elaborate Nietzsche's shift on the concept of disinterestedness, I discuss the concepts of Apollinian and Dionysian art drives, *Rausch*, and lastly the affirmation and denial of life. Finally, I investigate Heidegger's understanding of the concept of disinterestedness. For this purpose, I problematise his claims as to the instigator of the misreading of this concept, namely Schopenhauer, and as to the link he draws between Kant and Nietzsche by paying attention to the concepts of pleasure of reflection and interest.

Keywords: Aesthetic disinterestedness, Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Heidegger

ÖZ

MODERN SANAT FELSEFESİNDE ÇIKARSIZLIK KAVRAMI: KANT, SCHOPENHAUER, NIETZSCHE VE HEIDEGGER

Akkökler Karatekeli, Büşra
Yüksek Lisans, Felsefe Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan

Haziran 2016, 101 sayfa

Bu tez çıkarsızlık (*disinterestedness*) kavramının modern sanat felsefesinde incelenmesini amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, ilk olarak bu kavramın Kant'ta nasıl tanımlandığı ve özgün anlamını kazandığı açıklanmaya çalışılacaktır. Ardından, Schopenhauer'ın – metafiziği ile beraber ele alınacak olan – estetik çıkarsızlık tartışmasına en önemli katkısı olan beden temasına odaklanılarak beden ile estetik çıkarsızlık arasındaki ilişki görünür kılınmaya çalışılacaktır. Sonrasında, estetik çıkarsızlık kavramına dair, Nietzsche'nin düşüncesinin bu kavramın kısmi onaylanmasından, estetik deneyimin fizyolojik yönü vurgulanarak eleştirisine doğru olan değişimi incelenecektir. Bu noktada, Schopenhauer'un bedenine dair yaptığı vurgu da göz önünde tutularak estetik deneyimde beden işlevinin tam olarak Nietzsche'de geliştiği tartışılacaktır. Nietzsche'nin estetik çıkarsızlık konusundaki değişimini detaylandırmak için Apolloncu ve Dionisosçu sanat dürtüleri (*art drives*), esrime (*Rausch*) ve son olarak yaşamın olumlanması ve yadsınması kavramları tartışılacaktır. Son olarak, Heidegger'in çıkarsızlık kavramını nasıl yorumladığı incelenecektir. Bu amaçla, ilk olarak Heidegger'in estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının yanlış okunmasını başlatan olarak yorumladığı Schopenhauer'a ilişkin tartışmasına odaklanılacaktır. Ardından, Heidegger'in Kant ve

Nietzsche arasında kurduđu bađ düşünmeden alınan haz ve çıkar kavramları dikkate alınarak sorunsallaştırılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Estetik çıkarsızlık, Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Heidegger

To Emre

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan, without whom this thesis would not have been finished. His precious suggestions, guidance and support enabled me to continue and complete this thesis. Also, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Andrea Rehberg for her close attention and efforts throughout the development of this thesis. Without her help and guidance, my understanding of philosophy would have lacked a lot. I also wish to thank my examining committee members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Çırakman and Prof. Dr. Tansu Aık for their valuable comments and suggestions.

I would like to thank my husband, Emre Karatekeli, who inspired me to study philosophy and never got tired of sharing his precious thoughts and dreams with me. Without his emotional and intellectual support, I would have never found the joy of living.

Finally, I would like to thank TUBITAK for its munificent scholarship, Transition to Social Sciences – National Scholarship Programme for MA Students, 2210-B. Without its financial support, I would not have found the opportunity to carry out my graduate studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Historical Background of the Concept of Aesthetic Disinterestedness: Eighteenth-Century British Philosophers	1
1.2 An Outline of the Following Chapters.....	7
2. KANT: THE FLOWERING OF THE CONCEPT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS	12
2.1 Kant’s Project in the Analytic of the Beautiful	12
2.2 The Features of A Judgment of Taste.....	13
2.3 The Notion of Interest.....	20
2.3.1 The Interested Liking for the Agreeable	21
2.3.2 The Interested Liking for the Good.....	25
2.4 A Coda to Disinterested Aesthetic Judgment	26
3. SCHOPENHAUER: THE BODY AND THE CONCEPT OF AESTHETIC DISINTERESTEDNESS	29
3.1 Schopenhauer’s Metaphysics: An Explanatory Step and Background to His Aesthetics.....	29
3.1.1 The World as Representation	29
3.1.2 The World as Will.....	30
3.2 Schopenhauer’s Aesthetics	35
3.2.1 The Body	35

3.2.2 Asceticism	37
3.2.3 Aesthetic Contemplation	41
3.2.4 Thinking the Body and Aesthetic Contemplation Together.....	44
3.3 Schopenhauer’s Contribution to the Notion of Disinterestedness in Aesthetic Contemplation.....	45
4. NIETZSCHE: REMINDING OF THE EMBEDDED PHYSIOLOGY IN AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE.....	49
4.1 Aesthetic Disinterestedness in <i>The Birth of Tragedy</i>	49
4.2 Aesthetic Disinterestedness in Nietzsche’s Later Thought.....	56
4.2.1 The Physiology of Art: The Naturalistic Account of Disinterestedness	58
4.2.2 The Problem of Asceticism: A Response to Schopenhauer	61
4.3 Concluding Remarks.....	64
5. HEIDEGGER: DISINTERESTED AESTHETIC LIKING AND LETTING-BE.....	66
5.1 Disinterestedness: Indifference or Letting-Be	66
5.2 Nietzsche: Affinity with Kant and <i>Rausch</i> as <i>Stimmung</i>	72
6. CONCLUSION	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY.....	90
B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	101

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AN** Marsden, Jill, *After Nietzsche: Notes Towards a Philosophy of Ecstasy*.
- BT** Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Birth of Tragedy*.
- CDE** Rind, Miles, “The Concept of Disinterestedness in Eighteenth-Century British Aesthetics”.
- CJ** Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgment*.
- CPR** Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*.
- DA** Rehberg, Andrea, “*Delectare aude*: On a Non-Rational Requirement of Enlightenment according to Kant”.
- EM** Sallis, John, “Dionysus – In Excess of Metaphysics”.
- GAT** Hammermeister, Kai, *The German Aesthetic Tradition*.
- GM** Nietzsche, Friedrich, *On the Genealogy of Morality*.
- HN** Haar, Michel, “Heidegger and the Nietzschean ‘Physiology of Art’”.
- KAL** Rehberg, Andrea, “On a Feeling for All: Kant, Arendt and Lyotard on *sensus communis*”.
- KAT** Berger, David, *Kant’s Aesthetics Theory: The Beautiful and Agreeable*.
- KB** Daniels, Paul, “Kant on the Beautiful: The Interest in Disinterestedness”.
- KEF** Guyer, Paul, *Kant and the Experience of Freedom*.
- MAW** Jacquette, Dale, “Schopenhauer’s Metaphysics of Appearance and Will in the Philosophy of Art”.
- MD** White, David A., “The Metaphysics of Disinterestedness: Shaftesbury and Kant”.

- NR** Urpeth, Jim, “Nietzsche and the Rapture of Aesthetic Disinterestedness: A Response to Heidegger”.
- OAD** Stolnitz, Jerome, “On the Origin of ‘Aesthetic Disinterestedness’”.
- P** Taminiaux, Jacques, *Poetics, Speculation and Judgment: The Shadow of The Work of Art from Kant to Phenomenology*.
- PA** Wood, Robert E., *Placing Aesthetics: Reflections on the Philosophic Tradition*.
- PS** Rehberg, Andrea, “The Problem of Subsumption”.
- RS** Schacht, Richard, *Nietzsche*.
- TS** Carbone, Mauro, “The Thinking of the Sensible”.
- WP** Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Will to Power*.
- WPA** Heidegger, Martin, *Nietzsche: Volume I: The Will to Power as Art*.
- WWR I** Schopenhauer, Arthur, *The World as Will and Representation*.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is astonishing to realise how a similar pattern of thinking keeps reoccurring in varying disguises throughout the history of philosophy. Keeping anything that has a relation to the physical, such as desires and passions, at bay has become a commonplace requirement in order for a subject to be counted among the suitable topics for philosophising. Not just a disregard for the body but at the same time the glorification of what is deemed to be its opposite, reason, mind, soul, which is not smudged by the body, dominated discussions of not just philosophy but also of ethics, art and the artist.

This pattern of thinking is, to my mind, best exemplified in the concept of disinterestedness. In order to better understand what this loaded concept gained and lost in the course of modern and contemporary Western philosophy, in my thesis, I will pursue a thread of the discussion of disinterestedness, starting from Kant, who first expounds this concept, through Schopenhauer and Nietzsche to Heidegger. Through discussions of these philosophers' views on the topic, I will carry out an investigation of what was added or changed by each of these thinkers in contemplating the notion of aesthetic disinterestedness. Before delving into such an investigation, in the following, I will firstly give a brief historical background of the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness. Secondly, I will provide a summary of the following chapters.

1.1 Historical Background of the Concept of Aesthetic Disinterestedness: Eighteenth-Century British Philosophers

Before its development in German thought, discussions on art and the beautiful¹ are first manifested in the works of the eighteenth-century British philosophers. These

¹ Alexander Baumgarten was the first who used the word "aesthetics" in its modern sense, and it is through him that this discipline emerged as a distinct field of inquiry and entered philosophical discourse. Before him, thinkers were writing about taste and the beautiful, but their writings were not

discussions can be traced well by consulting Jerome Stolnitz, who discusses the origins of aesthetic disinterestedness by paying attention to the origins of modern aesthetic theory in the eighteenth-century British thought and brings together the readings of prominent figures of that time. According to Stolnitz, the early eighteenth-century British thought exhibits a shift of attention, or in his words, “a Copernican Revolution in aesthetics”, according to which the experience of the beholder becomes much more important than the beautiful itself². In other words, it is the feelings or thoughts which an object awakens in the beholder and the sense of beauty which is created and perceived by one’s reason that classifies that object as beautiful. This interpretation, however, brings with it some criticisms. One of them says that, in Stolnitz’s account, the beautiful itself, or specifically what belongs to the beautiful, namely its materiality, is excluded from aesthetic experience. Further, what is instead emphasised in Stolnitz are the formal features that the beautiful might generate³. This lack of concern for the physicality of the beautiful and also the disregard for the physiology of the beholder or the artist has been prevalent also in British thought. In order to better understand this bold emphasis on the formal characteristics of aesthetic experience from the perspective of the spectator, it is useful firstly to consider how the concept of disinterestedness appeared on the stage.

Before it appeared in aesthetics, the concept of disinterestedness was a concept in the fields of ethics and religion. In these areas, it is mostly understood as a feature of benevolent and altruistic actions. Disinterestedness, as it will be seen also in the posterior German thought, is considered in its relation to its opposite,

addressing the theoretical and philosophical aspects of their topics. Nevertheless, despite this difference between Baumgarten and early British philosophers in their dealings with art, for easiness in reading, I will use the words “aesthetics”, “aesthetic theory” and “discussion on art and the beautiful” interchangeably while examining art in the eighteenth-century British thought – even though it is in fact only the last two phrases that eighteenth-century British philosophers used in their inquiries.

² Stolnitz Jerome, “On the Origin of ‘Aesthetic Disinterestedness’”, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 20, No. 2, Winter 1961, p. 138. Hereafter OAD.

³ For a detailed criticism of Stolnitz’s remarks about aesthetics and the origin of aesthetic disinterestedness, the following article can be consulted: White, David A., “The Metaphysics of Disinterestedness: Shaftesbury and Kant”, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Winter 1973.

interestedness. Interest with its connotation of selfishness and egoism affected the understanding of disinterestedness. On this score, being not motivated by self-concern is thought to determine the latter. It is very striking that, as we will see shortly, the thinking of the concept of disinterestedness in aesthetics with its relation to ethics, or moral and practical issues, has continued to be prevalent throughout the eighteenth-century British thought.

Despite this prevalence, the development of this concept from these areas to an aesthetic realm can also be seen in many of the key figures of eighteenth-century British aesthetics, such as Third Earl of Shaftesbury, Francis Hutcheson, Edmund Burke, Archibald Alison, etc. Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Third Earl of Shaftesbury, is deemed to be the first philosopher to give prominence to the “disinterested perception”⁴. Shaftesbury distinguishes disinterestedness from interestedness by emphasising the latter’s relation to the practical and self-concerned actions, while interpreting the former as being indifferent to the consequences of one’s actions⁵. That is to say, Shaftesbury draws a distinction between disinterestedness and the desire to possess or to gain an advantage from the object. Moreover, this distinction between disinterestedness and desire is accepted thenceforth in aesthetics⁶. In this sense, anything related to physical and emotional motives as well as personal considerations are to be left aside in an aesthetic experience. In Shaftesbury’s understanding, our comportment towards the beautiful is independent of “any reflection on the personal or private interests or the advantage of the agent enjoying it”, but this does not mean that this response is also independent of any practical or theoretical interest⁷. Actually, the link between the sense of beauty and that of morality is a point of agreement in eighteenth-century

⁴ OAD, p. 132.

⁵ OAD, p. 133.

⁶ OAD, p. 134.

⁷ Guyer, Paul, *Kant and the Experience of Freedom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 49. Hereafter *KEF*.

British thought with the exception of Hutcheson⁸. In their view, underlying theoretical and practical elements cannot be separated from disinterested aesthetic response⁹. Besides this close link between morality and aesthetics, as stated above, Shaftesbury's most significant contribution to the concept of disinterestedness is his thinking of the aesthetic response and private interest as separate.

Another eighteenth-century British philosopher in the field of aesthetics is Francis Hutcheson. His treatment of the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, that is to say, his exclusion of private interests and advantages from the aesthetic, bears a resemblance to Shaftesbury's understanding of this concept¹⁰. Also, what we can see in Hutcheson is the exclusion of any knowledge about or any reflection on the object from the aesthetic¹¹. In fact, this view is in line with Shaftesbury, since for the latter aesthetic response is natural and immediate. That is to say, it is not a reflective response to the beautiful but a sensory one¹². What Hutcheson asserts is that pleasure derived in the perception of the beautiful is unaffected by and independent of any knowledge about the object. By doing so he disregards the pleasures that any knowledge about the object can produce¹³. The latter pleasures are defined as "rational pleasures [derived] from the prospects of advantage" and therefore as interested¹⁴. Hence, we can say that, even though he does not state it explicitly, Hutcheson distinguishes the pleasures derived from the beauty which are disinterested (since it is dependent on neither private interest nor cognition) from the pleasures of knowledge which is interested due to its relation to one's advantages and the usefulness of the object. Therefore, for Hutcheson, disinterestedness only refers

⁸ *KEF*, p. 49.

⁹ *KEF*, p. 55.

¹⁰ *OAD*, p. 134.

¹¹ *OAD*, p. 134.

¹² *KEF*, p. 49.

¹³ Rind, Miles, "The Concept of Disinterestedness in Eighteenth-Century British Aesthetics", *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 40, No. 1, January 2002, p. 78. Hereafter CDE.

¹⁴ CDE, p. 78.

to being independent of any knowledge of the object that may serve to one's private interests.

On the other hand, this being independent of any knowledge about the object should not lead us to a misinterpretation that in an aesthetic experience the faculty of reason is not used. For Hutcheson, reason is not operative in an aesthetic experience, in other words, it is passive and does not prevent or trigger the perception of beauty, and it does not constitute the ground for the sense of beauty¹⁵. This inclusion of the *passive* reason enables Hutcheson to stay away from reducing aesthetic experience to five senses¹⁶. But it at the same time points to a divergence between him and Shaftesbury, since for the latter the faculty of reason functions as that which makes possible aesthetic experience as well as theoretical and moral, or practical, experience, hence for him it is by no means passive. This leads us to another point of divergence between Hutcheson and Shaftesbury, which is the relation between the aesthetic and practical. As has been mentioned, for Shaftesbury the aesthetic and the practical are intertwined and can be even called as identical, while for Hutcheson the aesthetic is completely separate from the practical¹⁷. The reason why Hutcheson divorces the aesthetic from any consideration of the practical or the theoretical stems from his description of sensation. Hutcheson describes sensation as ideas evoked in the reason in an encounter with an object, whereas reason, as stated above, as passive and inert in the process of sensation¹⁸. It is due to this passivity of reason in the process of sensation that our aesthetic response is completely separated from any recognition of use or interest, either theoretical or practical. In this sense, we can say that Hutcheson's understanding of aesthetic response anticipates Kant's interpretation of disinterestedness.

The next philosopher I would like briefly to discuss is Edmund Burke. Burke asserts that so as to perceive an object as beautiful, one's entire concern must be in

¹⁵ *KEF* p. 57.

¹⁶ *KEF*, pp. 58-9.

¹⁷ *KEF*, p. 49.

¹⁸ *KEF*, p. 57.

perceiving¹⁹. For this said perceiving to happen, perceiver needs to inhibit their private interest or “any action on behalf of [their] self”²⁰. Even though Burke does not emphasise what perceiving results in, what he seems to mean by the phrase, mere perceiving, is that in an aesthetic experience the attention is neither on the beautiful itself nor on the perceiver, but on the process of perceiving which does not include either of them entirely.

Another British philosopher, Archibald Alison, echoes to some extent what Burke puts forward. Nevertheless, the difference between them comes into view in the former’s emphasis on the phrase “aesthetic attitude”. According to Alison, disinterestedness can be best understood if it is described as an “aesthetic attitude”, which stipulates that the spectator’s attention is to be only in perceiving the object in question²¹. In other words, this attention should be organized in such a way that spectator and the aesthetic object are harmonised with each other, as a result of which the aesthetic experience can transpire. The type of attention or attitude which enables such an aesthetic experience is the disinterested attitude to the object, according to which “the useful, the agreeable, the fitting, or the convenient in objects” is excluded from the aesthetic²².

Going back to Burke, we can also see that Burke disagrees with Hutcheson on the point where the latter asserts that the perception of beauty is independent of anything that is related to private interests²³. Burke contends that our pleasure in the beautiful is affected by and bears the traces of the “fundamental principles of our constitution, our psychology and even our physiology”²⁴. According to him, affections and passions cannot be separated from the pleasure one takes from the

¹⁹ OAD, p. 135.

²⁰ *KEF*, p. 49.

²¹ OAD, p. 137.

²² OAD, p. 137.

²³ *KEF*, p. 71.

²⁴ *KEF*, p. 72.

beautiful²⁵. Of these passions, Burke considers sexually stimulating associations that one finds in an encounter with the beautiful and passions that are related to society, such as sympathy and imitation²⁶. Along with the connection between passions and aesthetic response, Burke equates aesthetic response with the pleasure gained from the satisfaction of private interests and utility²⁷. Despite all that, Burke's introduction of the passions and physiology to the discussion of aesthetics deserves attention, which, as we will see, will reach its fully fledged form in Nietzsche.

1.2 An Outline of the Following Chapters

In Chapter 2, I discuss what the aesthetic judgment is according to Kant and what role the concept of disinterestedness has in an aesthetic judgment for him. In order to elucidate disinterested aesthetic judgment, I begin section 2.2 by laying out the main features of the judgment of taste (aesthetic judgment), which are related to the concept of disinterestedness. These main features are aesthetic judgment's being reflective rather than determinative, its being independent of determinate concepts, its being an aesthetic rather than a cognitive or logical judgment, and its demand for a universal assent. Along with these four features of an aesthetic judgment, an explanation as to how aesthetic judgment is made is warranted, and Kant discusses this through the harmonious (free) play of the cognitive faculties, namely the imagination and the understanding.

In section 2.3, following Kant's steps, I try to explain what an interest is, and how interest manifests itself. According to this narrative, interest is described as the liking connected with the representation of an object. There are three types of liking: the liking for the agreeable, for the good, and for the beautiful. These three kinds of liking constitute what Kant calls the three types of relations between representations and one's feeling of pleasure and displeasure. *The* difference between these three

²⁵ *KEF*, p. 72.

²⁶ *KEF*, p. 73.

²⁷ *KEF*, p. 74.

types of liking becomes apparent when Kant characterises the liking for the agreeable and the good as interested, and the liking for the beautiful as disinterested. The reasons lying behind this classification are that in the first two types of liking, by foregrounding the real existence of the object, a path that enables one to reach their sensual or moral satisfaction is opened. This opening, however, is what precludes and smudges the aesthetic judgment, according to Kant. It is not the physical characteristics of the object, but the formal features of it that – by instigating the free play of the faculties – produces aesthetic pleasure and judgment. Further, discerning these formal features is possible so long as an aesthetic judgment is made disinterestedly, without the intrusion of private concerns or desires.

In Chapter 3, I trace the development of the concept of disinterestedness in Schopenhauer. So as to apprehend Schopenhauer's conception of this concept, in section 3.1, I firstly bring under discussion Schopenhauer's metaphysics, since his aesthetics can only be understood by taking into account his metaphysics. In his metaphysics, the world has two facets, one of which is termed the world as representation and the other as will²⁸. The latter is regarded as the underlying ground of the world as representation. Schopenhauer contends that the will is an impersonal, unconscious and irrational force and, unlike the world as representation, is independent of any forms of space, time and causality. To better understand the will, he distinguishes the two senses of the will, namely the will as thing in itself and the will that registers in human being as desire and suffering. Even though the individual will may help one to catch a sight of the will as thing in itself by realizing its nature as blind urge through the desires it prompts in the human being, the more trouble-free way of getting a glimpse of the will is through the suppression of the individual will.

At this point, the body enters the discussion (3.2.1), since for Schopenhauer it is the site in which catching a glimpse of the will as thing in itself can occur to a satisfactory and acceptable extent and it is the site in which the individual will can be

²⁸ *WWR* I, § 30, p. 169.

suppressed. The body is capable of doing both of these movements thanks to its twofold nature according to Schopenhauer.

Besides asceticism (3.2.1), says Schopenhauer, another way of suppressing the individual will can be achieved through aesthetic contemplation (3.2.2). To my mind, this constitutes the crux of Schopenhauer's conception of disinterestedness together with his conception of the body. He propounds that aesthetic contemplation has two components, one of which is related to the beautiful and the other is about the transformation within the subject. It is in the discussion of this second component of the aesthetic contemplation that the concept of disinterestedness comes to the fore. It is only after elucidating what aesthetic contemplation is for Schopenhauer that the body enters into the discussion once more, and by means of this, the establishment of the link between the body and aesthetic disinterestedness becomes possible (3.2.3). In other words, by being capable of turning away from willing, the body helps us to better understand how the aesthetic disinterestedness functions in aesthetic contemplation.

Finally, in section 3.3, I problematise the question of in what ways Schopenhauer converges to and diverges from Kant as regards the latter's understanding of disinterestedness. Schopenhauer diverges from Kant by laying stress on the pure, will-less subject of cognition, and on the body. However, on the emphasis on the suspension or the overruling of one's desires and interest regarding the beautiful so as to have an aesthetic experience, they concur.

In Chapter 4, in pursuit of Nietzsche's interpretation of the concept of disinterestedness, I firstly bring under discussion *The Birth of Tragedy* (4.1). In this section, I seek to elucidate what the concept of disinterestedness means for Nietzsche. In order to expand on his views on this issue, I firstly examine what he designates as the two "fundamental forces of nature", namely the Apollinian and the Dionysian. According to Nietzsche, these two forces of nature both constitute, and are operative in, art²⁹. After delineating their characteristic features, I discuss Nietzsche's problematisation of the designations of "objective" and "subjective"

²⁹ *GAT*, p. 139; *RS*, p. 482.

artist, which can be read along with the Apollinian and the Dionysian art drives. In this problematisation, to my mind, Nietzsche tries to distance himself from this designation and treats the segregation of the artist to objective and subjective along with its attached qualities as nothing but a *doxa*. Nietzsche distances himself from this *doxa* by suggesting a novel, catch-all idea, namely the Dionysian forces. These Dionysian forces are not to be reduced only to Apollinian or Dionysian art drives, since they include the qualities of both of them, namely disinterestedness and desires.

In the second section of this chapter, by taking *On the Genealogy of Morality* as our guide, I try to discern how Nietzsche's views on the issue of aesthetic disinterestedness has changed and branched out. In this later text, Nietzsche's emphasis on how desires and interests have a voice in aesthetic experience becomes much more visible. A discussion concerning physiology in general and physiology of art in particular is carried out to expound the naturalistic account of aesthetic experience. To this end, some concepts, such as bodily states, rapture, sensuality and sexuality are examined. In the following, I discuss another aspect of art which is its relation to life. According to Nietzsche, art is an affirmation and this apprehension of art or aesthetic experience goes against the Schopenhauerian function of it. While for the latter aesthetic experience is related to the denial of life, for the former art, with its links to sensuality, sexuality and rapturous state, has an opposite characteristic. That is to say, instead of suppressing desires and life, it affirms and promotes life. It is for these reasons that Nietzsche criticises the positive valorisation of aesthetic disinterestedness, in which the main features of life is repudiated.

In the fifth chapter of my thesis, by following Heidegger's line of argument, I attempt to detect in what points his interpretations concerning aesthetic disinterestedness are illegitimate or may at least mislead one to understand this concept in its development. Heidegger's main claim hinges on the thought that Schopenhauer's misreading of the notion of aesthetic disinterestedness has predominated over the reading of this notion, and Nietzsche too relied on this misreading even though what Nietzsche and Kant say in the end are in fact similar. In order to elucidate these points, in section 5.1, I discuss the notion of aesthetic disinterestedness firstly by considering Heidegger's remarks on Kant's and

Schopenhauer's understanding of it. Heidegger firstly questions what being disinterested may mean: Does it mean indifference or could it have another meaning which brings into view the "supreme effort of our essential nature"? Heidegger unravels this issue firstly by putting forward a phrase Kant makes use of, namely the "unconstrained favouring", and tries to dispose of the thought that disinterestedness might mean indifference. Secondly, Heidegger claims that this reading of disinterestedness as indifference actually stems from Schopenhauer's reading of it, since the latter was the one who foregrounded the state of will-lessness or apathy towards the object in an aesthetic experience. However, to my mind, Heidegger disregards what Schopenhauer actually claims and, as we will see on this chapter, this thread of the issue will constitute my main problematisation of Heidegger's reading of Schopenhauer.

In the following section, I examine Heidegger's claim regarding Nietzsche's reliance on Schopenhauer's 'misreading' of this concept. Heidegger claims that, in Kant, disinterested liking in effect contains a pleasure which carries "an interest of the highest sort", which comes into view in the notion of "pleasure of reflection". After making this claim, Heidegger equates what Nietzsche says concerning the aesthetic experience with Kant's understanding of it. At this point, I seek to elucidate the points Heidegger overlooks on this issue, by taking into account what Kant means by the phrase "pleasure of reflection". Lastly, I discuss how Heidegger interprets the notion of *Rausch*, which Nietzsche makes visible in the discussion of aesthetic experience.

CHAPTER 2

KANT: THE FLOWERING OF THE CONCEPT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS

2.1 Kant's Project in the Analytic of the Beautiful

My topic in this thesis, in a word, is the issue of aesthetic disinterestedness. Therefore, in this chapter, I will start at the beginning and try to explain what Kant means by this term and how the requirement for it directly arises from the other features of aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful. In his *Critique of Judgment*³⁰ Kant does not investigate the work of art itself, or its essence, rather he analyses the fundamental features of a judgment of taste by means of the procedure already established in the earlier *Critiques*. As in the previous *Critiques*, in the *Critique of Judgment* Kant investigates the conditions of possibility of synthetic a priori judgment. Nevertheless, in contrast to previous *Critiques*, in the *Critique of Judgment* he is concerned with the power of judgment, by which the aesthetic judgment is made possible. Put differently, by investigating the *a priori* conditions of our ability to judge aesthetically, Kant explores “what is required for calling an object beautiful”³¹. In this regard, Kant emphasises that aesthetic judgment is different from theoretical or moral judgment, which are the subject matter of the first and the second *Critique*, respectively.

Before proceeding further, it should be stated that the word ‘aesthetics’ has a completely different meaning in the *Critique of Pure Reason* than in the *Critique of Judgment*. In the former, Kant excludes ‘aesthetics’, among Germans a word designating the critique of taste in Kant’s time, from the realm of the critical investigation of the *a priori* conditions of experience³². The reason for this exclusion

³⁰ Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgment*. Tr. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett, 1987, Introduction, IX, p. 38. Hereafter *CJ*.

³¹ *CJ*, First Moment, p. 43.

³² Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*. Tr. Norman Kemp Smith. London: The Macmillan Press, 1992, A21/B35, footnote a. Hereafter *CPR*.

is that the criteria of “the critical treatment of the beautiful”³³, which must be *a priori* in order to be included in the critical investigation, are regarded as empirical and private, or better, stemming from empirical sources. By contrast, in the *Critique of Judgment*, it refers to the realm of aesthetic experience and so the third Critique investigates the *a priori* conditions of the experience of beauty in nature and in art³⁴.

In the search for the *a priori* grounds of aesthetic experience, the investigation begins with an existent object, or better, its representation. Kant enquires how one (in effect, one’s faculties) responds to a sudden encounter with a singular, individual, beautiful appearance by which one is fortuitously seized and affected in a pleasurable way, even though the provocative nature of this encounter cannot be cognized or understood sufficiently³⁵. In order to investigate this response effectively, according to Kant, anything that derives or stems from the empirical should be left out of the investigation of aesthetic judgment. This is why Kant begins his investigation by saying that a judgment, in order to be a pure aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful, must first of all be disinterested or, as he says, “devoid of all interest”³⁶.

2.2 The Features of a Judgment of Taste

In order to apprehend the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, we need, first of all, to elucidate some other but equally necessary features of the judgment of taste, the first of which is its being a reflective rather than a determinative judgment³⁷. For a judgment to be determinative there must first of all be a universal, i.e., a concept, and

³³ *CPR*, A21/B35, footnote a.

³⁴ Hammermeister, Kai, *The German Aesthetic Tradition*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 23. Hereafter *GAT*.

³⁵ Rehberg, Andrea, “On a Feeling for All: Kant, Arendt and Lyotard on *Sensus Communis*”, *Cogito*, no. 74, Summer 2013, p. 1. Hereafter *KAL*.

³⁶ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

³⁷ *CJ*, Introduction, IV, pp. 18-9.

later the particular is subsumed under it³⁸. A judgment of taste, however, is reflective, that is to say, first “the particular is given and the judgment has to find the universal for it”³⁹. This reflective feature of a judgment of taste provides us with the first hint of its being different from other, either theoretical or moral, judgments.

The other feature of a judgment of taste is its being an aesthetic rather than a cognitive or logical judgment. By referring the representation of that which may then be called beautiful to the subject, to one’s “feeling of pleasure and displeasure”, rather than to the object “so as to give rise to cognition”, Kant states that the reflective judgment on the beautiful is aesthetic⁴⁰. Furthermore, he adds that the “determining basis” of aesthetic judgment on the beautiful “cannot be other than subjective”⁴¹. By saying that the judgment of taste is aesthetic and hence subjective, Kant draws a line between the aesthetic and the objective theoretical judgment, through the latter of which, by using the faculty of understanding, one attains knowledge of the object that is the same for everyone. On the other hand, to say that the judgment is subjective means that it stems from the subject’s feeling of pleasure and displeasure, experienced in being affected by the representation of the object⁴². Thus, in claiming that something is beautiful, the judgment is not about the object, but about my response to that object⁴³, even though the former seems to be the case. This is to say that a person who is making this judgment is affected in a pleasurable way by that particular appearance⁴⁴. In other words, Kant deals with beauty as it lies in the eye of the beholder, that is, there are no objectively beautiful objects, but objects that instigate an aesthetic response in the beholder. However, this should not

³⁸ *CJ*, Introduction, IV, p. 18.

³⁹ *CJ*, Introduction, IV, pp. 18-9.

⁴⁰ *CJ*, § 1, 203, p. 44. Pluhar controversially renders Kant's term *Vorstellung* as presentation, but in the following I will be rendering it throughout as representation.

⁴¹ *CJ*, § 1, p. 44.

⁴² *CJ*, § 1, p. 44.

⁴³ *CJ*, § 1, p. 44.

⁴⁴ *CJ*, § 1, p. 44.

be understood as saying that the object that is found beautiful is irrelevant and can be dismissed altogether. Instead, it should be borne in mind that in any case first of all the object must be given, since only after this givenness can the judgment of taste about this object be made.

More explanation regarding the meaning of ‘subjective’ in Kant’s thinking is required in order to understand Kant’s manner of dealing with aesthetic judgments. ‘Subjective’ does not mean or imply any concern about my private being or any of my desires or needs. Instead, it points to what all subjects have in common, that is, “the fundamental constitution of the faculties and their interaction in a judgment”⁴⁵. In other words, in Kant’s understanding, ‘subjective’ refers to the transcendental features of human being, rather than to any of its individual and empirical factors. In this regard, even though in aesthetic judgment *my response* to the object that I find beautiful constitutes the chief concern, it should be clarified that *my response* is not about my empirical, private concerns and being, but about something more fundamental, namely the relationship of the faculties in the *Gemüt*⁴⁶, which I will discuss in the following.

Before proceeding further, it is crucial to pay attention to the words Kant uses just at the beginning of the first section, namely *Lust* and *Unlust*, which are generally rendered as pleasure and displeasure⁴⁷. Unlike pleasure and displeasure, however, the German words have a more intense, erotic and physical sense⁴⁸, and Kant makes this sense more apparent in his discussion of the “feeling of life”⁴⁹. When encountering an object that I will call beautiful, there occurs an affective relation to the object,

⁴⁵ KAL, p. 2.

⁴⁶ The German word *Gemüt* is often rendered as “mind”. However, the former has a wider meaning than the latter. *Gemüt*, as opposed to the Cartesian “mind”, includes feeling, “a corporeal awareness of sensation and self-affection” (Caygill, Howard, *A Kant Dictionary*, Oxford, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 2000, p. 210).

⁴⁷ *CJ*, §1, p. 44.

⁴⁸ It is for this reason that the Nietzschean concepts of rapture and the physiology of art, which I will discuss in the fourth chapter, can be said to bear traces of Kantian aesthetic disinterestedness.

⁴⁹ *CJ*, § 1, p. 44.

which invigorates me⁵⁰, and which thereby increases my life force. Similarly, when I find something ugly, it depresses me, it lowers my life force. That is to say, aesthetic objects have a physiological influence upon us, and this proves that this feeling of life is not only a mental but also a bodily feeling. Similarly, it can be said that the feelings of pleasure or displeasure (*Lust* and *Unlust*) are not only states of consciousness, but also physical states. This is what Rehberg refers to as the “libidinal-affective interruption” of the pleasure of the beautiful⁵¹, and which will gain its full meaning in the following chapters⁵².

Another feature of aesthetic judgment is its not being dependent on any determinate concepts, unlike objective theoretical judgments. This feature can be understood more easily by considering aesthetic judgment’s being a reflective judgment. As stated above, in reflective judgments, “the particular is given and the judgment has to find the universal for it”⁵³, that is, in the case of aesthetic pleasure and aesthetic judgment, concepts are secondary, since having a concept beforehand presupposes that we know what sort of a thing we are judging or what the object is for. However, in a judgment of taste, knowing what the object is or what it is for makes no difference. Nonetheless, this does not mean that concepts are excluded from aesthetic judgments altogether, since otherwise it would be impossible to realise the object as such. In other words, in order at least to say that there is something, which I may call beautiful, I must have recognised it, and hence have used concepts, even though these concepts cannot be determinate. To wit, we should say that in an aesthetic judgment concepts are used, but they cannot give an explanation of the beautiful, that is, we relate to objects we apprehend aesthetically in an indeterminate manner.

⁵⁰ *CJ*, § 1, p. 44.

⁵¹ Rehberg, Andrea, “*Delectare aude*: On a Non-Rational Requirement of Enlightenment according to Kant”, p. 10. Hereafter DA. Unpublished conference presentation. A copy of this was provided by the author.

⁵² In fact, this is the thread which Nietzsche explicitly develops (as did Schopenhauer), even though in the *Critique of Judgment* it is not made explicit.

⁵³ *CJ*, Introduction, IV, pp. 18-19.

Kant continues his discussion by posing the question how it is possible to judge something in art or nature as beautiful when this judgment only refers the representation of the object to the subject – thus being a subjective rather than an objective judgment – and yet demands universal assent⁵⁴. This point about the universalisability of an aesthetic judgment is crucial, for it opens up a path for the discussion of disinterestedness. In other words, disinterested liking is one of the guarantors of one's making a pure aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful. Even though the concept of the disinterestedness of a pure aesthetic reflective judgment will only be fully elaborated below, for now it can be said that such a judgment must be devoid of all interest, i.e., of anything that is determined pathologically, which means being determined by stimuli rather than by reason, according to Kant⁵⁵. Hence, since none of one's private concerns enters into one's judgment, one feels that one is justified in requiring everyone's agreement with one's aesthetic judgment⁵⁶. This universalisability of aesthetic judgment, however, should be distinguished from objective universality, which is the logical universality of cognitive judgment, and which depends on concepts. Aesthetic judgment, on the other hand, only has subjective universality. The word 'subjective' is used in the second sense of the word stated above, that is, this subjective universality refers to the facultative constitution of the subject or, in other words, to its transcendental constitution. Thus, both this facultative constitution that is common to all rational beings and our being disinterested in an aesthetic judgment pave the way for the subjective universality of aesthetic judgment. However, this type of universality is in the *as if* mode of aesthetic judgment. Due to these facultative and disinterested characteristics of aesthetic judgments, we treat the object *as if* beauty was its characteristic feature, demand other people's assent, and assume the (subjective) universality of our aesthetic judgment.

⁵⁴ *CJ*, § 6, pp. 53-4.

⁵⁵ *CJ*, § 5, p. 51.

⁵⁶ *CJ*, § 6, pp. 53-4.

Hitherto most of the necessary features of an aesthetic judgment have been examined, but how aesthetic judgment occurs, or better, what must have happened in the subject in an aesthetic encounter with the object has so far remained unexamined. In order to expound this point, Kant discusses the harmonious interaction (free play) of the cognitive faculties, namely the imagination (the faculty of representation) and the understanding (the faculty that imposes concepts or rules on the representation of an object)⁵⁷. Generally, the interaction of these faculties is composed of the application of a concept (i.e., a rule for the subsumption of the manifold of intuition) to an object, and this interaction results in objective knowledge. In other words, in determinative judgments the function of the imagination is to synthesise intuitions so that the subsumption of them under a concept of the understanding can occur. Nonetheless, in aesthetic judgments the interaction occurs indeterminately⁵⁸, that is, the imagination harmoniously interacts with “the understanding’s *concepts* in general”, but “which concepts they are is left indeterminate”⁵⁹. Concerning the interaction of these faculties in a judgment of taste Kant explains that a judgment is aesthetic

if (before we attend to a comparison of the object with others) the power of judgment, having no concept ready for the given intuition, holds [for the sake of comparison] the imagination [itself] (as it merely apprehends the object) up to the understanding [itself] ([so that] a concept as such is exhibited) and perceives a [certain] relation between the two cognitive powers, a relation that constitutes the condition, which we can only sense, under which [alone] we can use the power of judgment objectively (namely, the mutual harmony of imagination and understanding)⁶⁰.

The interaction of the faculties can be called “free lawfulness”⁶¹, in which “free” signifies the imagination and lawfulness the understanding⁶². This means that the

⁵⁷ *CJ*, § 9, p. 62.

⁵⁸ *CJ*, § 9, p. 63.

⁵⁹ *CJ*, § 26, p. 113.

⁶⁰ *CJ*, First Introduction, p. 412.

⁶¹ *CJ*, General Comment, 241, p. 91

⁶² *CJ*, § 35, 287, p. 151.

interaction of the faculties is free and “unintentional”⁶³, since “no determinate concept restricts them to a particular rule of cognition”⁶⁴ or, put differently, the interaction is not the result of following a rule. In the free play of the faculties, even though the imagination is not limited by the understanding, it still relates to objects in various ways and works together with the understanding, yet here its working is free, that is, it is undetermined. This enables us to stick not only with one interpretation of the object (e.g., as work of art), but by exhibiting a variety of interpretations of the object, it reveals the manner of the harmonious interaction of the faculties, i.e., the concepts of the understanding play with the representations provided by the imagination, but do not settle on any objective cognition of it. Additionally, this free, non-conceptual play of the faculties is a requisite for “cognition in general”⁶⁵, which does not result in actual cognition, as in the case of objective theoretical judgment. By not subsuming the object under any determinate concept or rule of the understanding, thus by not resulting in actual cognition, whose normal result would be knowledge or objective cognition of the phenomenon at issue, a judgment of taste makes room for aesthetic pleasure. Put differently, it is only through the attunement and the “quickenings” of the faculties in an aesthetic judgment which does not lead to “the imposition of a determinate concept on the object”⁶⁶ that an aesthetic pleasure or a feeling of pleasure can be produced. Additionally, it is this pleasure that makes us feel more alive, that invigorates us, and it is this free play of the faculties which registers with us as the physiological effect of the beautiful and that Kant sees as a prerequisite for any cognition⁶⁷. On the other hand, ruling out the free play of the faculties, makes the “lawfulness” of the understanding achieve complete dominance

⁶³ *CJ*, Introduction, VII, p. 30.

⁶⁴ *CJ*, § 9, p. 62.

⁶⁵ *CJ*, § 9, p. 62.

⁶⁶ Rehberg, Andrea, “The Problem of Subsumption”, in *Immanuel Kant - Essays Presented at the Muğla University International Kant Symposium*, Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 2007, pp.573-80. Hereafter PS, p. 577.

⁶⁷ PS, p. 578.

over the “freedom” of the imagination⁶⁸, and therefore eradicates the aesthetic pleasure that is produced by the free play.

The last feature of aesthetic judgment that I will spell out and which also constitutes my main discussion is its having to be “devoid of all interest”⁶⁹. In effect, all previous features of aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful gain their full meaning when this characteristic of aesthetic judgment is unfolded and when they are thought in association with the concept of disinterestedness. The concept of disinterestedness, in the Analytic of the Beautiful of the *Critique of Judgment*, however, is described negatively, that is, through the concept of interest. For this reason attention must firstly be paid to the latter.

2.3 The Notion of Interest

As we can see from the “First Moment” of the *Critique of Judgment*, Kant commences his discussion of the characteristics of aesthetic judgment not by describing what disinterestedness is, but by explaining what should not enter into aesthetic judgment, namely, interest⁷⁰. Even though it will only become clear later on, for now it can be said that Kant analyses the concept of interest by means of the notions of existence and desire and by asking whether it is based on concepts. Firstly, Kant describes interest as “the liking we connect with the [re]presentation of an object’s existence”⁷¹. Through the real existence of an object, one may either acquire a sensuous gratification from it and prolong the pleasure that is taken from it or use it in order to reach some end. In either case, what is required is the real existence of the object by means of which one can satisfy and gratify one’s sensual or moral desires. The second aspect of the concept of interest is its being understood as any private

⁶⁸ Daniels, Paul, “Kant on the Beautiful: The Interest in Disinterestedness”, *Colloquy Text Theory Critique*, Issue: 16, December 2008, p. 206. Hereafter KB.

⁶⁹ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

⁷⁰ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

⁷¹ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

basis or condition for delight⁷². This means that if one's desires, one's practical and utilitarian projects come into view, they preclude that person from making a pure aesthetic judgment. This word 'pure' is significant here, since for Kant there are several possible objects of liking, such as for 'the agreeable' and for 'the good'⁷³; and it is the liking for the good that constitutes the concept-based aspect of an interest which the liking for the beautiful and the agreeable lack. In light of the considerations regarding the concept of interest, the characteristic of disinterested liking, which is non-conceptual, non-desire based, non-sensuous, and intersubjectively valid, becomes more apparent. However, in order to have more insight into the issue of disinterestedness or disinterested liking, attention should be paid to the factors that distinguish a pure aesthetic judgment (liking for the beautiful) from the liking for the agreeable and the good, respectively.

Kant distinguishes "three different relations that representations have to the feeling of pleasure and displeasure"⁷⁴. The agreeable by gratifying us, the good by arousing a feeling of esteem in us, and the beautiful by instigating a pure liking in us⁷⁵ constitute these different relations and ways of stimulation which representations have to this feeling. To distinguish the liking for the beautiful from the interested liking for the agreeable and for the good is thus decisive for Kant, since aesthetic liking comes to light more effectively through its comparison with the other kinds of liking.

2.3.1 The Interested Liking for the Agreeable

The most characteristic feature of the liking for the agreeable is its arousing an inclination towards the object's existence by awakening in the beholder a strong

⁷² *CJ*, § 6, 211, p. 54.

⁷³ *CJ*, §§ 3-4, pp. 47-51.

⁷⁴ *CJ*, § 5, p. 52.

⁷⁵ *CJ*, § 5, p. 52.

desire either to possess⁷⁶ it or to prolong the pleasure that is derived from it⁷⁷. It is closely related to one's private conditions and desires, and brings a project with it: practical, utilitarian concerns, plans and aims that one has in relation to the world. It is a merely private subjective liking ('subjective' used in the first sense of the word described above as being related to one's individual and empirical being, desires, or conditions). Aesthetic judgments, on the other hand, do not indicate any utilitarian relations with the object, they do not add to our knowledge, and they do not involve any plans or projects. In an aesthetic judgment one takes time out of one's plans and projects and in this sense one is without interest in an aesthetic judgment. Furthermore, pleasure in the agreeable sheds light on the "bodily, sensuous, and animalistic side of our nature"⁷⁸, and it is in this sense that this pleasure is non-reflective and dependent on sensations. It is these sensations, caused by the intrusion of the objects on our senses, that incite the desire to possess them.

Unlike a liking for the agreeable in which the object's existence and the desires it generates constitute the main concern of such liking, for an aesthetic liking, "what matters is what I do with this representation *within myself*, and not the [respect] in which I depend on the object's existence"⁷⁹. Additionally, Kant states that an aesthetic judgment is a "merely contemplative" judgment, that is to say, it is "indifferent to the existence of the object"⁸⁰. This statement, however, does not say that the object's real existence is not necessary, but only says that aesthetic judgment's concern is not with the actual existence of the object. In other words,

⁷⁶ The desire to possess, which we see here as a feature of a liking for the agreeable, appears in a discussion as to aesthetics as early as Plato. In the *Symposium*, Diotima asks Socrates what the lover of the beautiful things desire. Socrates responds by saying: "That they become his own". It is considered to be a natural response of the lover of the beautiful things. However, in Kant, the desire to possess is seen not a feature of the liking for the beautiful but for the agreeable. For Plato's remarks on this issue, see Plato, *Symposium*. Tr. Alexander Nehamas, Paul Woodruff. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1989, 204D.

⁷⁷ *CJ*, § 3, p. 48.

⁷⁸ Berger, David, *Kant's Aesthetics Theory: The Beautiful and Agreeable*. London and New York: Continuum, 2009, p. 66. Hereafter *KAT*.

⁷⁹ *CJ*, § 2, p. 46, emphasis added.

⁸⁰ *CJ*, § 5, p. 51.

aesthetic judgment is indifferent to the object's material, physical features, but relates to it indeterminately. That is to say, in aesthetic reflective judgment the beholder does not have any specific ideas about the object's physical, material appearance. By contrast, in determinative judgments, the object at issue is subsumed under a determinate concept, and as a result the subject acquires knowledge about the object.

The desire for the existence of an object, the liking for the agreeable, is described by Kant as being pathologically conditioned⁸¹. A pathological, sensuous determination of the liking for the agreeable, or, in other words, its being conditioned by contingent factors and outside forces, opens up a rift between the liking for the beautiful and for the agreeable.

On the other hand, however indeterminate the relation of aesthetic judgment to the object is, the need for the real existence of the object for the renewal of the beholder's pleasurable state should not be ignored. It is only through the renewed engagement with the existent object that one's cognitive powers can maintain their interaction and thus the pleasurable state can be prolonged⁸². Hence, for the renewal and the prolongation of the subject's pleasurable state, the givenness of the object or, in other words, its real existence is required. Furthermore, it is thanks to this pleasure that "we linger in the contemplation of the beautiful, because this contemplation reinforces and reproduces itself"⁸³. Since an imaginary representation or the reminiscence of an aesthetic experience do not have enough power to maintain their state and their influence on the subject, the real existence of an object is required, even though the pleasure aroused in this process does not have "any further aim", such as to possess the object or use it for one's own desires⁸⁴. It may now be said that the disinterestedness of an aesthetic judgment in comparison with the liking for the agreeable requires first of all that one does not act upon the object for the gratification of one's desires, yet this disinterestedness does not exclude my mere

⁸¹ *CJ*, § 5, p. 51.

⁸² *CJ*, § 12, p. 68.

⁸³ *CJ*, § 12, p. 68, translation modified.

⁸⁴ *CJ*, § 12, p. 68.

and implicit desire about “the object’s continued availability for my pleasurable contemplation”⁸⁵. However, this desire is not about my private conditions or my practical or utilitarian aims, rather it is just about the activity of my faculties which generates the pleasure and helps to maintain and prolong this pleasure.

Even though in the experience of the beautiful the actual empirical object is required for the free and harmonious play of the faculties, which registers as pleasure in us, according to Kant, it is actually the form of the object that excites the feeling of the beautiful⁸⁶. Giving privilege to the form of the object in aesthetic judgment prevents the object from arousing any interest in its physical, material, empirical features, since “desire or need”, which arise in association with the object’s existence, “do not linger over forms”⁸⁷. Also it is the privileging of the object’s form that distinguishes a pure aesthetic reflective judgment from judgments expressing a liking for the agreeable, since aesthetic pleasure is not derived from the object’s influence on the subject’s sensation but only from the form of the object⁸⁸.

Foregrounding the form of the object, while disregarding the physical, material features of an object, is one of the pure aesthetic reflective judgment’s factors distinguishing it from the judgment on the agreeable. The role played by the real existence of the object, both in supplying more pleasure than any imaginary representation and in helping to renew and sustain the pleasure, cannot be dismissed or overlooked. However, in an aesthetic judgment the real existence of an object functions only as the first condition which is required but the object remains conceptually undetermined (due to there not being a determinate concept). The value of the object that will then be called beautiful lies in its possessing purely formal characteristics. As stated above, it is only these formal features that can cause the faculties to harmonise with each other. But if the relation of the subject to the object

⁸⁵ *KAT*, p. 65.

⁸⁶ *CJ*, Introduction, VII, p. 30.

⁸⁷ Lyotard, Jean-François, *Lessons on the Analytic of the Sublime*. Tr. Elisabeth Rottenberg. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994, p. 78.

⁸⁸ *CJ*, Introduction, VII, p. 30.

remains at a crude level and affects the subject's power of desire and arouses in him/her an urge to act upon it, then this relation can be classified under the liking for the agreeable, whereas the liking for the beautiful requires the subject to be "devoid of all interest"⁸⁹ in the existence of the object, and without any desire in it. In an aesthetic judgment what matters is what I feel within myself, even though I may feel invigorated by the representation, therefore it does not compel me to act upon the object or possess it. As Kant states, aesthetic judgment is a pure contemplative judgment⁹⁰ (although it has an effect upon my physiological constitution), thus any interest in the object's existence is excluded from the aesthetic judgment from the start.

2.3.2 The Interested Liking for the Good

The other interested pleasure that must be distinguished from the pleasure taken in the beautiful is the pleasure we take in the good. This kind of pleasure is the opposite of the pleasure we take in the agreeable, since by being purely subjective, the latter hinges only on my private conditions and desires, while the pleasure in the good depends on a concept of the good which must be valid for everyone⁹¹. This means there must be a concept of what the good is supposed to be. In other words, there must first of all be a concept which determines our judgment. This means that the judgment on the good is a determinative judgment in which there is first of all a universal, and later the particular is subsumed under it⁹². Aesthetic judgment, however, as stated above, is an aesthetic reflective judgment, that is to say, it does not depend on any concept and does not presuppose the existence of a concept beforehand.

⁸⁹ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

⁹⁰ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

⁹¹ *GAT*, p. 28.

⁹² *CJ*, Introduction, IV, p. 18.

Furthermore, the good, by being closely connected with a concept, presupposes a cognitive interest which is required for the elucidation of the good⁹³. Either by being good for its own sake or being useful for something else, the concept of a purpose is always involved in the case of the good. This leads us to the fact that in our relation to the good there is also “a relation of reason to volition”⁹⁴. This volition or the concept of a purpose hints at “a liking for the existence of an object or action”⁹⁵. Hence a liking for the good also takes us to the notion of interest. Either by being morally desirable (being “*intrinsically good* if we like it for its own sake”⁹⁶) or useful for some end (i.e., for taking pleasure, or being useful as a means to something else), the good needs the existence of an object and a concept that would guide the subject to reach its ends. Hence the liking for, or the pleasure derived from, the good is quite different from the liking for the beautiful, since for the former willing something and hence having a liking for its existence is unavoidable, whereas for the latter there is no question of willing and a direct desire for the object’s existence, but only the involuntary exposure to a given, empirical, beautiful representation.

2.4 A Coda to Disinterested Aesthetic Judgment

So far we have seen that a liking for the agreeable hinges entirely on sensation, one’s private conditions and desires, and that a liking for the good contains a determinate concept. A liking for the beautiful, however, depends on reflection which does not lead to a determinate concept. As stated above, aesthetic judgment refers not to the object but only to “the subject and [its] feeling of pleasure and displeasure”⁹⁷ (thus there cannot follow any objective knowledge about an object), and, unlike in the case of the good, no determinate concept is required in such a judgment.

⁹³ White, David A., “The Metaphysics of Disinterestedness: Shaftsbury and Kant”, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Winter 1973, p. 242.

⁹⁴ *CJ*, § 4, p. 49.

⁹⁵ *CJ*, § 4, p. 49.

⁹⁶ *CJ*, § 4, p. 48.

⁹⁷ *CJ*, § 1, p. 44.

Why Kant concerns himself with disinterestedness in an aesthetic judgment can now be clearly seen, since without this feature the free play, and therefore aesthetic judgment itself, does not seem possible. According to Kant, interest first of all includes in one way or another recognizing the object (recollecting that interest is “the liking we connect with the representation of an object’s existence”⁹⁸, and thus requires a determinate relation with the object). This requires, however, subsuming an object under a concept of the understanding or, in the case of a moral judgment, under a concept of reason. Both of these subsumptions, however, eliminate aesthetic pleasure. In other words, interest eradicates aesthetic pleasure by eliminating the free play of the faculties, and thus enabling the rule-imposing feature of the understanding to gain dominance over the “freedom” of the imagination⁹⁹.

Detachment both from the private conditions of my own existence and from all desires I have regarding the object will then enable me to give the object what Kant calls free favouring¹⁰⁰. Hence, to sum up, it can be said that disinterestedness entails a distance both from the object and from oneself. Therefore, any consideration of the object in its social context or of one’s own desires and inclinations should be left out in order to make a pure aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful. This does not mean, however, an indifference towards or lack of involvement in the object, rather it refers to the contemplative stance towards the object in the pure aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful.

The disinterestedness of a pure aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful with its non-conceptual, not desire-based, non-sensuous, and thus universally valid character paves the way for the “free play” of the faculties in an aesthetic judgment, which is realised as pleasure, and which is a pre-condition for any cognition whatsoever. Causing a pleasure which is without any interest, a pleasure which is neither the cause nor the result of any desire, constitutes the unique character of

⁹⁸ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

⁹⁹ *KB*, p. 206.

¹⁰⁰ Wood, Robert E., *Placing Aesthetics: Reflections on the Philosophic Tradition*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1999, p. 130.

disinterested aesthetic judgment. Also, by being a non-cognitive condition for cognition, by not being dependent on any concept, that is, by not being mediated by any concept, and by involving the free, instantaneous, unexpected play of the faculties, by being without any specific end, and lastly by producing the feeling of pleasure and displeasure rather than cognition, the disinterested aesthetic liking points to a side of the subject of experience which is other than the theoretical and the moral, but equally significant for a sound understanding of human experience as such.

CHAPTER 3

SCHOPENHAUER: THE BODY AND THE CONCEPT OF AESTHETIC

DISINTERESTEDNESS

In the discussion of aesthetic disinterestedness attention should be paid now to Schopenhauer, who considers this issue in association with his philosophy of the will. In order for a sound understanding of Schopenhauer's thoughts about art to emerge, I will firstly discuss his metaphysics, since his aesthetics is embedded in and grows out of his metaphysics.

3.1 Schopenhauer's Metaphysics: An Explanatory Step and Background to His Aesthetics

As the title of his *magnum opus*, *The World as Will and Representation*, indicates, the world is presented as both mere representation and will¹⁰¹, and aesthetics, or better, in Schopenhauer's language, aesthetic contemplation, stands amid these two aspects of the world, as a way to be free from the suffering experienced in the one, to the relief and peace that come through the apprehension of the other. In order to comprehend this, however, some explanations are required concerning these two aspects of the world.

3.1.1 The World as Representation

Schopenhauer begins his book by asserting that “[t]he world is my representation”¹⁰², which indicates that the world gains its meaning in the eyes of the subject, or better, through the imposition of the forms that the subject brings to the world. These forms are space, time and causality, which are, according to Schopenhauer, the universal

¹⁰¹ Schopenhauer, Arthur, *The World as Will and Representation: Volume I*. Tr. E. F. J. Payne. New York: Dover Publications, 1969, § 30, p. 169. Hereafter *WWR I*.

¹⁰² *WWR I*, § 1, p. 3.

forms of any object and the factors that render existence coherent. This means that by means of these forms representational knowledge of the world becomes possible¹⁰³. Schopenhauer regards these forms as “the different aspects of the principle of sufficient reason”¹⁰⁴ and states that in the world as representation any cognition and any experience that an individual subject can have are subject to this principle of sufficient reason¹⁰⁵.

Behind these representations, however, there lies a principle which is hidden and whose clear conception is essential for understanding Schopenhauer’s conception of aesthetic contemplation. In explaining this point Schopenhauer draws on Hindu philosophy in which the multitude of representations are thought of as *Maya*, which signifies “the veil of appearance behind which the truth of existence [...] is hidden”¹⁰⁶. This is the thread that constitutes his understanding of the world as will.

3.1.2 The World as Will

According to Schopenhauer, the principle that lies behind representations is the thing-in-itself, namely the will¹⁰⁷. It is a universal, metaphysical, underlying principle, which is spaceless, timeless and uncaused¹⁰⁸, that is, it is free from the principle of sufficient reason. It continues to exist even if there is no subject. In other words, it does not need a subject for its existence, unlike things in the representational world. Dealing with the will as an underlying principle leads one to

¹⁰³ Marsden, Jill, *After Nietzsche: Notes Towards a Philosophy of Ecstasy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, p. 60. Hereafter *AN*.

¹⁰⁴ *WWR I*, § 30, pp. 169. Schopenhauer reduces the forms of intuition and categories which Kant describes in his *Critique of Pure Reason* to only one principle, which he calls the “principle of sufficient reason”.

¹⁰⁵ *WWR I*, § 33, p. 176.

¹⁰⁶ Hammermeister, Kai, *The German Aesthetic Tradition*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 114. Hereafter *GAT*.

¹⁰⁷ *WWR I*, § 32, p. 174.

¹⁰⁸ *WWR I*, § 30, p. 169.

consider Schopenhauer as a traditional metaphysician, since both in traditional and in Schopenhauer's metaphysics an underlying principle is assumed, which is itself not a part of, but the ground of the entire reality. Both in ancient and modern metaphysics, from Plato to Hegel, this underlying principle is thought to be a rational force, namely reason, spirit, the forms, or God. However, for Schopenhauer the underlying principle is an impersonal, unconscious and irrational force, namely the will¹⁰⁹. That is to say, by giving priority to the will as an irrational force over reason or spirit, which is held by traditional metaphysics as an organising and founding principle, Schopenhauer dissociates himself from traditional (speculative) metaphysics¹¹⁰.

Moreover, in order to grasp the world as will, some further explanations should be given, one of which is, as briefly stated above, the understanding of the will as thing in itself. The will as thing in itself exists independently of any forms of the subject's cognition as such. This means that the thing-in-itself is what the world in itself is without any need for recognition or for the imposition of forms. Given that in *World as Will and Representation* Schopenhauer describes the world first of all in terms of representation and then as will, these two ways of relating to the world can now be brought together and the world as representation can be termed the "objecthood of the will"¹¹¹. There are, additionally, levels of this objectification through which the will manifests itself in representations and which Schopenhauer calls Platonic Ideas¹¹². Platonic Ideas are "only the immediate, and therefore adequate"¹¹³ objectification of the will and are "unchanging forms and properties of all natural bodies [...] as well as the universal forces that manifest themselves

¹⁰⁹ *GAT*, p. 113.

¹¹⁰ *GAT*, p. 113.

¹¹¹ *WWR I*, § 30, p. 169. While in Payne's translation of *WWR I* this phrase is rendered as the "objectivity of the will", I prefer here to say the "objecthood of the will", following the translation of *WWR I* by Judith Norman, Alistair Welchman and Christopher Janaway. Schopenhauer, Arthur, *The World as Will and Representation: Volume I*. Tr. Judith Norman, Alistair Welchman, Christopher Janaway. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010, § 30, p. 191.

¹¹² *WWR I*, § 30, p. 169.

¹¹³ *WWR I*, § 32, p. 174.

according to natural laws”¹¹⁴. Just like the will as thing in itself, the Platonic Ideas are free from the principle of sufficient reason, they remain the same, that is, the universal forms of the object (space, time and causality) do not apply to them, even though the manifestation of these Ideas occurs through them. By being the species of particular objects, the Platonic Ideas manifest themselves in a multitude of individual beings¹¹⁵. The Ideas stand between the particular things and the will as thing in itself¹¹⁶, and it is for this reason that, while the Ideas are called the immediate objectification of the will, the particular things can only be called the indirect objectification of the will. Hence, for Schopenhauer, particular things that appear to us are the expressions of the Ideas and the “Ideas, in turn, are the expressions of what stands behind or above them”¹¹⁷. As we will shortly see on the following pages, this feature of the Platonic Ideas will be useful in understanding the function of aesthetic contemplation.

In the discussion of the will, however, Schopenhauer distinguishes two senses of the will, the first of which is the will understood as thing in itself, as the unconscious, impersonal will, while the second is the will seen in human being as desire and suffering. The will in the first sense is characterised as a “supra-individual metaphysical substratum of the world”¹¹⁸, the ultimate reality, which stands not as the cause but as “the underlying *transcendental ground* of the world” as representation¹¹⁹. It is an impersonal, non-egoic, unconscious, continuous,

¹¹⁴ *WWR I*, § 30, p. 169.

¹¹⁵ *WWR I*, § 30, p. 169.

¹¹⁶ *WWR I*, § 32, p. 175.

¹¹⁷ Wood, Robert E., *Placing Aesthetics: Reflections on the Philosophic Tradition*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1999, pp. 189-90. Hereafter *PA*.

¹¹⁸ Guyer, Paul, “Pleasure and Knowledge in Schopenhauer’s Aesthetics”, in Dale Jacquette (ed.), *Schopenhauer, Philosophy and the Arts*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007, p. 130, footnote 1.

¹¹⁹ Jacquette, Dale, “Schopenhauer’s Metaphysics of Appearance and Will in the Philosophy of Art”, in Dale Jacquette (ed.), *Schopenhauer, Philosophy and the Arts*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007, p. 4. Hereafter *MAW*.

unindividuated and transformative force¹²⁰, which refers to the noumenal rather than the phenomenal, over which the *principium individuationis* presides. The *principium individuationis* is, as Schopenhauer states, “the mode of cognition governed by the principle of sufficient reason” which enables individuals to cognize things as appearance and which posits a distinction between one thing and another¹²¹.

The will in the second sense, however, points to the individual will, that is, it is the will which manifests itself in the human being as desire, craving, suffering and pain¹²². According to Schopenhauer, the innermost nature of life is suffering, since human desires are endless. A constant struggle to satisfy these ever-recurring desires, which in effect cannot be fully satisfied due to their creating a new desire again and again, is rampant in life. There is nothing more prevalent than suffering in life and it is for this reason that Schopenhauer regards it as the hallmark of the will. The will in this second sense, in other words, beguiles human being into this striving by demanding more, even though the need or lack can never fully or once and for all be satiated and therefore causes one to suffer and feel pain¹²³.

Another manifestation of the will in human being is through the sexual impulse and in explaining this point Schopenhauer emphasises that the will “appears on the whole as a hostile demon, endeavouring to pervert (*verkehren*), to confuse, and to overthrow everything”¹²⁴. The manifestation of the will as sexual impulse is “the strongest and most active of all motives”¹²⁵. However, this characteristic of the will unveils the will as underlying ground all the more. That is to say, in Schopenhauer’s metaphysics the underlying ground of phenomena is not something good or beautiful (like the forms for Plato), but rather a vicious and blind force

¹²⁰ AN, p. 61.

¹²¹ WWR I, §§ 66, 63, 65, pp. 400, 379, 393.

¹²² WWR I, § 38, p. 196.

¹²³ WWR I, § 38, pp. 196-7.

¹²⁴ AN, p. 61.

¹²⁵ Schopenhauer, Arthur, *The World as Will and Representation*: Vol. II. Tr. E. F. J. Payne. New York: Dover Publications, 1958, p. 533.

which manifests itself both as individual will and sexual impulse in human being and which causes suffering¹²⁶.

Besides its association with human desire and the sexual impulse, the individual will has another aspect, which helps one to better understand the will as thing in itself. Put differently, it is by means of the individual empirical will, which is at work in most of one's everyday desires, and which generally results in frustration since it cannot be completely fulfilled, that the hidden nature of the world as it is in itself is revealed¹²⁷. That is to say, through suffering, which is the distinctive feature of the individual will and the result of the insatiable nature of willing, one attains direct access to the world as will, sees the will as a blind urging, as an "endless undirected"¹²⁸ and uncontrollable striving, as an impelling impetus, which is always in tension with itself. Although the individual will can function as a site for accessing to the world as will, that is, for non-representationally revealing the world as it is in itself, by being also a site of willing, desiring and craving the individual will can also function as an obstacle in grasping the nature of the world as thing in itself. Due to this second feature of the individual will, Schopenhauer says that the best way to attain the world as will is through suffering not induced by the individual will's craving but by the suppression of the individual will. The issue of the will's suppression will be a helpful element in understanding Schopenhauer's aesthetics, but before delving into Schopenhauer's thoughts on aesthetic contemplation, his understanding of the body, which is closely connected with his understanding of aesthetic experience, and which opens up a new dimension to this experience and aesthetic disinterestedness, warrants explanation.

¹²⁶ *PA*, p. 192.

¹²⁷ *MAW*, p. 4.

¹²⁸ *MAW*, p. 3.

3.2 Schopenhauer's Aesthetics

3.2.1 The Body

As stated above, Schopenhauer's aesthetics is closely related to his metaphysics and in his metaphysics the body stands out as its most significant component. For Schopenhauer, the body functions as a way to catch a glimpse of the impersonal will or the thing-in-itself, which he explains as follows: Human being finds itself in a world and regards itself as an individual living being and as having a body in that world¹²⁹. It conceives of things and relations in this representational world through its body and it is in this sense that for human being all perception begins by means of the body¹³⁰. The body is also a representation, that is to say, it follows the universal forms of the object (the principle of sufficient reason), relates to things other than itself in space, time and causality, and in this sense it is an object among other objects¹³¹. On the other hand, it is also a privileged site for Schopenhauer, since it is an immediate object for the subject, which means one knows the relations, the experiences and the manifestations of one's own body immediately and comprehensively¹³². In other words, the body has two aspects, first of which is conceived as subject to universal forms, namely as representation and secondly as will¹³³.

By being a key to one's own understanding, the will expresses itself through movements, actions and relations, namely through the manifestations of one's body¹³⁴. The body, in other words, is "nothing but the visibility of the individual acts of the will"¹³⁵. This aspect of the relation between the will and the body opens up a

¹²⁹ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 99.

¹³⁰ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 99.

¹³¹ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 99.

¹³² *WWR I*, § 18, p. 100.

¹³³ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 100.

¹³⁴ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 100.

¹³⁵ *WWR I*, § 20, p. 106.

new outlook that has not been discussed so far, that is, every act of the will is at the same time an act of the body¹³⁶. That is to say, the will and the body do not have a causal relation, rather they “are one and the same thing, though given in two entirely different ways: first quite directly, and then in perception for the understanding”¹³⁷. One way to understand their identity is by taking into consideration the fact that every strong movement of the will agitates the body¹³⁸. That is to say, the will manifests itself in human being through desires, cravings, sexual impulses and therefore suffering and pain. The body, on the other hand, by being subject to them, is the immediate site in representational world where the will expresses itself directly. In other words, this aspect of the body suggests that the body by means of its movements and relations can be regarded as the most visible site in which the will as thing in itself can be caught sight of most adequately. The body is therefore designated as the immediate objectification of the will in the representational world, as constituting a way to reach the impersonal will, and even as knowing the thing-in-itself. Due to these features, the body gains a privileged place in Schopenhauer’s discussion of metaphysics. It enables one to know the thing-in-itself, the will, only non-representationally, since representational knowledge of the thing-in-itself is not possible for human being¹³⁹. At this juncture, however, what remains to be explained is how the body achieves the access to the will as thing in itself. Before delving into this aspect of the issue, a brief emphasis on the significance of the body within Schopenhauer’s metaphysics in general is required.

By being “the condition of knowledge of [one’s] will”¹⁴⁰, the body not only adds a new layer to the traditional understanding of metaphysics but also, and above all, it points to a radically new orientation and moment that necessitates further explanation. Schopenhauer emphasises and gives a privilege to something which is

¹³⁶ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 100.

¹³⁷ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 100.

¹³⁸ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 101.

¹³⁹ *AN*, p. 60.

¹⁴⁰ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 102.

not rational. In this privileging of the body over reason and by attributing to the body immediate access to the thing-in-itself, Schopenhauer disrupts traditional metaphysics without leaving it altogether. That is to say, on the one hand he remains part of traditional metaphysics, since for him too there is ‘this’ world, the world of representation, as well as the world of the will, which constitutes the ground for the former. On the other hand, Schopenhauer introduces a new and radical moment to this conception, namely the body. Schopenhauer explicitly states the importance of this point by saying that both the meaning of the world of representation and “the transition from it [...] to whatever it may be besides it” [are] possible only if the conception of the human being as “the purely knowing subject” – that is, as “a winged cherub without a body” – is abandoned¹⁴¹. In other words, by emphasising the role played by the body, Schopenhauer dissociates himself from understanding the body as an obstacle to thinking or a hindrance and instead catches a glimpse of the thing-in-itself.

3.2.2 Asceticism

According to Schopenhauer, one way of catching a glimpse of and accessing the world as will (as thing in itself) is asceticism through the mortification of the body. In other words, through asceticism one can gain an understanding of the world as it is in itself, but this does not mean that asceticism enables one to have a total and all-encompassing understanding of it¹⁴². Rather, it suggests a limited revelation of the non-representational aspects of the world as it is in itself¹⁴³. At this juncture, how asceticism succeeds in attaining an understanding of the thing-in-itself is a question that needs to be answered first. Schopenhauer says that if the “veil of Maya, the *principium individuationis*”, is even temporarily lifted from the eyes of a person,

¹⁴¹ WWR I, § 18, p. 99.

¹⁴² MAW, p. 4.

¹⁴³ MAW, p. 4.

then they would thereby be able to know the thing-in itself¹⁴⁴. In such a moment of unveiling one can no longer care only about one's egoistical concerns, but also take into consideration other people's sufferings as if they were one's own issues¹⁴⁵. As a result of this, one gets closer to "the whole [...], its inner nature, and find [...] it involved in a constant passing away, a vain striving, an inward conflict, and a continual suffering"¹⁴⁶. After seeing all the suffering which encompasses humanity and the animal world, Schopenhauer enquires how someone could "affirm [their] very life", and he reaches the conclusion that that person could do nothing but to turn away from life¹⁴⁷. They should voluntarily renounce any pleasure which the world offers after being confronted with all-encompassing suffering and withdraw into "complete will-lessness"¹⁴⁸.

The motivating idea, according to Schopenhauer, is that by means of complete self-abnegation suffering can be entirely avoided¹⁴⁹. Although in the discussion of a complete withdrawal from life, Schopenhauer acknowledges the great difficulty of permanently avoiding suffering¹⁵⁰, he also points to the disinterested attitude, which is of central importance for this thesis. As stated above, after seeing the inner nature of life as wicked and full of vain striving, any deed which lessens the effects of this knowledge such as loving others as one loves oneself or regarding their suffering as if they were one's own distresses becomes insufficient. So one denies not just one's own body which makes noticeable the tremendous effects to which one's will exposes one, but also denies the will-to-live. Attempt to turn away from pleasures and to suppress the demands of the individual will on the one hand,

¹⁴⁴ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 378.

¹⁴⁵ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 378.

¹⁴⁶ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 379.

¹⁴⁷ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 379.

¹⁴⁸ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 379.

¹⁴⁹ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 379.

¹⁵⁰ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 379.

and to be unresponsive to the sufferings of life on the other hand, in short, the disinterested attitude that is taken towards life, is what characterises asceticism according to Schopenhauer. Spurning the body and its unceasing demands for satisfaction is the chief function of asceticism in this regard. Here the disinterested attitude is used in a different aspect. That is to say, disinterestedness as will be explained shortly in its aesthetic register is here understood as a means to refuse the will-to-live, that is, as not just disregarding the pleasures aroused through the body but also as the complete blocking or escaping from it.

The body in general and the sexual impulse in particular are seen as something to be quietened on the way to asceticism or “the denial of the will-to-live”¹⁵¹. In other words, “voluntary and complete chastity” constitute the first step in asceticism, since the body as being the phenomenon of the will is regarded as the biggest obstacle to being freed from the misery of life¹⁵². A further step in asceticism is “voluntary and intentional poverty” which helps to mitigate the suffering of others and helps to serve as a constant action of subduing one’s own will¹⁵³. However, all these are not enough; hence that same person continues not even to counteract any injury, ignominy or outrage that is imposed upon him/her¹⁵⁴. Fasting, self-abnegation, and self-flagellation are seen as strategies to be adopted¹⁵⁵. The rationale behind these practices is to annihilate the individual will by continuous privation and suffering if one thinks that the individual will is the source and thus the cause of one’s suffering and the suffering in the representational world¹⁵⁶. To put it differently, all these practices show that the body, which makes visible the will and

¹⁵¹ *WWR* I, § 68, p. 380.

¹⁵² *WWR* I, § 68, p. 380.

¹⁵³ *WWR* I, § 68, p. 381.

¹⁵⁴ *WWR* I, § 68, p. 382.

¹⁵⁵ *WWR* I, § 68, p. 382.

¹⁵⁶ *WWR* I, § 68, p. 382.

which is the objecthood of the will as thing in itself, should be mortified in order to subjugate the individual will¹⁵⁷.

According to Schopenhauer, Christianity, the writings of the Christian saints and mystics and ancient Sanskrit works are seen as the stages of asceticism¹⁵⁸. In them one finds “moderation in eating and drinking for suppressing desire, resistance to sexual impulse, even complete if possible” and “complete indifference to all worldly things”¹⁵⁹. Here it can be detected that the complete withdrawal from any pleasure that can be bestowed on one is rampant in asceticism. This withdrawal, that is, the denial of the will-to-live is not construed as an abominable or as a gloomy state by Schopenhauer, rather he considers this state as “full of inner cheerfulness”¹⁶⁰. According to Schopenhauer, in its true composure, this ascetic life induces a jubilant delight as well as an inner serenity¹⁶¹. He even likens these moments of liberation from the ferocious pressure of the will to the most blissful that one can experience as one is freed “from the heavy atmosphere of the earth”¹⁶². Since one has put one’s individual will aside and is released from the effects of it by following the steps in asceticism and of course by a constant struggle, no one and nothing can disturb, distress or depress one any more¹⁶³. This is the moment that “deliberate” will-lessness brings forth by a complete turning away from what is agreeable and by “looking for the disagreeable, the voluntarily chosen way of life of penance and self-chastisement, for the constant mortification of the will”¹⁶⁴.

¹⁵⁷ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 382.

¹⁵⁸ *WWR I*, § 68, pp. 386-7.

¹⁵⁹ *WWR I*, § 68, pp. 386-7.

¹⁶⁰ *WWR I*, § 68, pp. 389-90.

¹⁶¹ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 390.

¹⁶² *WWR I*, § 68, p. 390.

¹⁶³ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 390.

¹⁶⁴ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 392.

3.2.3 Aesthetic Contemplation

For Schopenhauer, apart from the role played by ascetic self-abnegation, there is a second way to be free from the will's tyrannous and relentless regime and to suppress the individual will, which causes suffering and pain. This second way, for the sake of which all the discussions and clarifications on Schopenhauer's metaphysics and on his views about the body have been brought forward so far, is aesthetic contemplation. Schopenhauer states that in aesthetic contemplation we are lifted:

out of the endless stream of willing, snatch[ing] knowledge from the thralldom of the will, the attention is now no longer directed to the motives of willing, but comprehends things freed from their relation to the will. Thus it considers them *without interests, without subjectivity, purely objectively*; it is entirely given up to them in so far as they are merely representations, and not motives. Then all at once the peace, always sought but always escaping us on that first path of willing, comes to us of its own accord, and all is well with us. It is the painless state prized by Epicurus as the highest good and as the state of the gods: for that moment we are delivered from the miserable pressure of the will. We celebrate the Sabbath of the penal servitude of willing; the wheel of Ixion stands still¹⁶⁵.

In aesthetic contemplation the imperious individual will is suppressed and overruled by means of the enraptured encounter with the beautiful object¹⁶⁶. The subject is absorbed in the object apprehended aesthetically, it loses itself, its willing and desiring is silenced, and hence the subject experiences the peace that, according to Schopenhauer, it has been hoping for, even if the peace or the release is only temporary. Through the aesthetic experience the subject receives passively the Platonic Ideas, which are the immediate, direct objectification of the will, and which make possible the particular things, the indirect objectifications of the will¹⁶⁷. The Platonic Ideas are received in the form of which they are expressed in the individual

¹⁶⁵ *WWR* I, § 38, p. 196, emphasis added.

¹⁶⁶ *MAW*, p. 8.

¹⁶⁷ *PA*, p. 190

thing contemplated¹⁶⁸. In other words, art or aesthetic experience enables both the beholder and the artist to experience and to apprehend the Ideas through which the world as will manifests and objectifies itself in the world of representation. The subject, however, cannot be receptive to the Platonic Ideas unless the individual will is suppressed and silenced, and this suppression, as stated above, is realised through the aesthetic experience of the beautiful.

This feature of aesthetic contemplation (by silencing desire and therefore releasing the sufferer, even if the release is only temporary) becomes one of the “two corporeal conduits to the ‘truth’ of pre-individual desire”¹⁶⁹. It is through aesthetic contemplation that the non-representational features of the world as it is in itself are revealed¹⁷⁰. In other words, the stunning experience of beauty enables one to encounter the thing-in-itself, that is, the impersonal, non-egoic will by temporarily suspending suffering and pain. Through it the servitude of cognition to the individual will is brought to a standstill, that is, the activity of the individual will is interrupted, the subject becomes overwhelmed by the encounter with the beautiful, but also this experience takes the subject from the ordinary cognition of particular things to the cognition of the Ideas, enabling both the beholder and the artist to recognize the true nature of things.

Schopenhauer explains this aesthetic contemplation, or better, the aesthetic way of regarding things, by means of its two inseparable components, the first of which is the cognition of an object as a Platonic Idea and the second is the pure, will-less subject of that cognition¹⁷¹. According to Schopenhauer, the transition from the cognition of particular things to the cognition of the Ideas takes place by means of a rapturous encounter with beauty which causes the subject to undergo a unique

¹⁶⁸ *PA*, p. 190.

¹⁶⁹ *AN*, p. 62. As discussed above, asceticism constitutes the other way of being free from the individual will and desire.

¹⁷⁰ *MAW*, p. 8.

¹⁷¹ *WWR I*, § 38, p. 195.

transformation¹⁷². That is to say, the transition takes place when the subject ceases “to be merely individual” and becomes the “pure, will-less subject of knowledge”¹⁷³. How this transition happens needs to be explicated. It happens when the thing’s relations to the individual will, which follow the principle of sufficient reason, are not in the interest of the subject or, put differently, when the subject is not concerned with, maybe not even aware of, the spatial, temporal and causal relations that a subject usually has to an object. That is to say, in such a moment, the subject considers not “the where, the when, the why, and the whither in things, but simply and solely the *what*”¹⁷⁴. This entails, on the other hand, forgetting all individuality, getting rid of all bodily desires for a time and becoming absorbed in the reflection of the object, being a pure mirror of the object, forgetting all the connections and being one with the object¹⁷⁵. It is only when the distinction between the object and subject disappears, when the subject and the object cannot be distinguished and they suffuse each other and when the object is regarded as if it “existed on its own without anyone to perceive it”, on the one hand, and when at the same time the subject loses itself and cannot regard itself as the individual who perceives the thing, on the other, that the transition from the cognition of the particular thing to the cognition of the Idea of its species, the immediate and adequate objectification of the will, takes place. Only after this does the intuiting individual become the “*pure will-less, painless, timeless subject of knowledge*”¹⁷⁶. Through these two components of aesthetic contemplation one attains release from the contradictions of the will as it appears in us and it is through them that the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness gains a rather different meaning in Schopenhauer than in Kant, which difference I will discuss below.

¹⁷² *WWR I*, § 33, p. 176.

¹⁷³ *WWR I*, § 34, p. 178.

¹⁷⁴ *WWR I*, § 34, p. 178.

¹⁷⁵ *WWR I*, § 34, p. 178.

¹⁷⁶ *WWR I*, § 34, pp. 179-180.

3.2.4 Thinking the Body and Aesthetic Contemplation Together

In my discussion of Schopenhauer's aesthetics, I emphasized on the one hand the role played by asceticism in its relation to the body and, on the other, aesthetic contemplation. Firstly, the body reveals a physiological aspect which becomes eminent in the discussion of the disinterested aesthetic experience. As stated in the opening sentences of this section¹⁷⁷, for Schopenhauer, the body paves the way for a transition from the individual, human, goal-oriented willing to impersonal, non-teleological willing¹⁷⁸. The body achieves this by being the dwelling site of the will, by being the immediate realm available for objectification and, on the other hand, by being the closest and most direct means of access to the will as thing in itself for a subject. The representational world, over which a constant struggle reigns, exhibits its clearest manifestation in and through the body, and bearing in mind this function of the body, it can be said that the body can be helpful on the way to one's liberation from the struggle of desiring and feelings of pain and frustration. As discussed above, the body as being its visible and noticeable manifestation is regarded as the convenient site to "break down and kill the will"¹⁷⁹ and asceticism, the denial of the will-to-live, enables one to subdue and suppress the individual will and thus to liberate oneself from suffering. By being both the will and a corporeal, material phenomenon inhabiting and transmitting one's desires to oneself and others, the body exhibits the physiological ground in which aesthetic contemplation is rooted. It is through the body's twofold character that in aesthetic contemplation the individual will and desire, and thus suffering, can be overcome.

With this feature of the body, Schopenhauer introduces it into the discussion of aesthetic experience and gives rise to that which can be termed the physiological aspect of the aesthetic experience. In an encounter with the beautiful, the individual will manifested in the body is stirred and the will as thing in itself finds an occasion

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Section 3.2.1, p. 7.

¹⁷⁸ *AN*, p. 62.

¹⁷⁹ *WWR I*, § 68, p. 382.

in which it can express itself vividly and directly in and through the body. The inner nature of the will as thing in itself reveals itself through the body in aesthetic experience and this revelation entails the suspension of the individual will. This aspect of the body, due to its being the realm of manifestation of both the individual will and the will as thing in itself, indicates that it is capable of moving away from the individual will, namely desiring and interest in it, and in a way silencing the subjective conditions as exemplified in asceticism and, on the other hand, heading towards the impersonal will. This shows that while the body is on the one hand the site of desiring and willing, it is on the other hand capable of turning away from them. It is this second aspect of the body that one can consider it as it is in line with aesthetic disinterestedness. Put differently, the body prepares the path for an easier understanding of aesthetic contemplation in Schopenhauer. Even though the body and its role in silencing the individual willing play a small part in Schopenhauer's philosophy in general, it is still significant, since the body adds or makes explicit an aspect of aesthetic experience which remains implicit in Kant but constitutes a major development of the Kantian concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, that is, the function of the body in pure aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful.

3.3 Schopenhauer's Contribution to the Notion of Disinterestedness in Aesthetic Contemplation

Bearing in mind all these features of aesthetic contemplation in Schopenhauer's philosophy, it is now time to foreground the relation of aesthetic contemplation to the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness. For Schopenhauer, the starting point of aesthetic contemplation, as stated above, is grasping things free from their relation to the will, suspending the individual will, letting cognition be free from the slavery of the individual will¹⁸⁰. This enables the subject to regard things without any interest, "without subjectivity, purely objectively"¹⁸¹. In an aesthetic experience imperious,

¹⁸⁰WWRI, § 38, pp. 196-7.

¹⁸¹WWRI, § 38, p. 196.

incessant willing, craving or desiring is temporarily suspended. In these short moments of relief the individual will is cancelled. Hence aesthetic disinterestedness can now be associated with these moments, since, in Schopenhauer as well as in Kant, for a subject to experience beauty it first needs to disregard, suspend and overrule the desires and interests it has in life. Also, the cognition following the principle of sufficient reason must be transcended, in other words, the ordinary relation of a subject to an object must be abandoned. Schopenhauer does not state that in aesthetic contemplation concepts are not used, rather he specifies that in such experiences anything that is related to space, time and causality and any way of considering things representationally is suspended for a while so that one can encounter something aesthetically and let things show themselves as they are in themselves. This way of dealing with the issue reveals how Schopenhauer endorses Kant's characterization of pure aesthetic reflective judgment on the beautiful, which is without any concepts and which is not a theoretical judgment. Both of these qualifications indicate that the everyday way of regarding the phenomena is silenced for a while and any delineation of the object is suspended in order to make room for an aesthetic relation with the object. One knows nothing about the object or simply ignores any knowledge about its spatio-temporal and causal relations. It is in this sense that Schopenhauer's comprehension of aesthetic contemplation is similar to Kant's, since for both of them what is required in order to encounter an object aesthetically is the detachment and liberation from the worldly relations that a subject usually has to an object.

Schopenhauer develops this feature of aesthetic experience and associates it with the extreme form of Kant's understanding of aesthetic disinterestedness. That is to say, Schopenhauer takes Kant's concept of aesthetic disinterestedness and expands it by means of transforming the individual subject, either the beholder or the artist, into the will-less subject of cognition. This will-lessness is the element Schopenhauer adds to this concept and is also the element that can be considered as the radicalisation of Kant's understanding of it. Will-less experience of things in the representational world means interrupting one's desires temporarily, disabling one to act upon any object and means in a way the disappearance of the representational

world or one's rising above it. It offers a rapturous experience of the beautiful. It does not imply indifference to the particular things contemplated, rather it refers to an intense relation to the object, but this relation is not gained through the phenomenal relations which an object has but through delving into the object and being one with it in order to see it in itself. Schopenhauer's insistence on the willlessness of the subject arises from the thought that regards the stirring of the will, and therefore "exciting lustful feelings in the beholder"¹⁸², as one of the obstacles to experiencing something aesthetically. In this regard, disinterestedness functions similarly in Schopenhauer's aesthetics as in Kant, but the difference that can be indicated between them and the aforementioned radicalisation lie in Schopenhauer's emphasis on the will-less subject of cognition in aesthetic experience on the one hand and the role played by the body on the other. Despite this difference, the most fundamental element common to both of these philosophers' thinking of aesthetic judgment and aesthetic contemplation is the need for the will to have no attachment to the objects of desire¹⁸³.

At this point, it is crucial to see that reaching the impersonal, non-egoic will through aesthetic contemplation by temporarily suspending the suffering and pain that are part of the individual will and the function of the body as the immediate manifestation of the will are two sides of the same coin. Being an element that – prior to Schopenhauer – had been disregarded by most philosophers as not being a suitable area for philosophical discussion, the body enters into this realm as the area in which the will manifests itself immediately and makes it possible for human being to apprehend something aesthetically. The importance lies in Schopenhauer's exposition of the will-less disinterested subject of cognition with its body, i.e., with its material aspect, which unveils the nature of things if desires, interests and personal concerns are left aside, that is, if the subject of aesthetic experience is disinterested or, in Schopenhauer language, will-less. With this aspect it can be inferred that in Schopenhauer's work Kantian aesthetic disinterestedness is

¹⁸² MAW, pp. 23-4.

¹⁸³ MAW, p. 7.

transformed into a concept which hinges on the body, i.e., the physiological side of the subject, which is revealed there for the first time but will become much more central in Nietzsche's works.

CHAPTER 4

NIETZSCHE: REMINDING OF THE EMBEDDED PHYSIOLOGY IN AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE

In the discussion of aesthetic disinterestedness, Nietzsche accentuates what remains untouched in Schopenhauer despite his contribution to the subject, namely the introduction of the will and the body to the discussion of aesthetic experience. These significant features, which are mostly omitted in the discussion of aesthetics, however, find their main thrust in Nietzsche's thought. In order to comprehend Nietzsche's role in the expansion and problematisation of this concept, it is necessary to look into how Nietzsche deals with the issue. In the following, I will discuss the change of approach and emphasis from Nietzsche's earlier text *The Birth of Tragedy*¹⁸⁴ to the later *On the Genealogy of Morality*¹⁸⁵.

4.1 Aesthetic Disinterestedness in *The Birth of Tragedy*

In *The Birth of Tragedy* Nietzsche does not seem to go against the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, but it would at the same time be erroneous to claim that he endorses this concept in its totality. Nietzsche's dealing with this concept, however, has a tone of distance even though in this early text Nietzsche does not yet explicitly problematise it. In order to elucidate Nietzsche's conception of this issue, attention should first of all be paid to the instances of him addressing the union of the two principles of art or the two "fundamental forces of nature"¹⁸⁶, namely the Apollinian and the Dionysian. Secondly, we will examine how he directs our

¹⁸⁴ Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Birth of Tragedy*. Tr. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books, 1967. Hereafter *BT*.

¹⁸⁵ Nietzsche, Friedrich, *On the Genealogy of Morality*. Tr. Maudemarie Clark and Alan J. Swensen. Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett, 1998. Hereafter *GM*.

¹⁸⁶ Hammermeister, Kai, *The German Aesthetic Tradition*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 139. Hereafter *GAT*.

attention to the problem of how to account for the “subjective” artist, namely, the lyric poet¹⁸⁷.

Nietzsche states that the Greeks thought art by means of the “figures of their gods”, namely Apollo and Dionysus¹⁸⁸. According to Nietzsche, the Apollinian and the Dionysian are the basic tendencies and impulses of nature operative in art¹⁸⁹. These are the “artistic energies which burst forth from nature herself, *without the mediation of the human artist*”¹⁹⁰. In this sense, by means of these aesthetic impulses art appears as “a force of nature” which releases artistic powers in human being¹⁹¹. To say that art is a “force of nature” is to say that it is a force rather than the product of a cognitive, intentional act, which is discernible when considering human being, the artist, as the origin of the work of art. In other words, in Nietzsche’s understanding of them, these two artistic drives, the Apollinian and the Dionysian, exclude a conception of art entrenched in subject-object dualism. These drives, in other words, being forces of nature itself, show themselves through, in a sense, a porous human being which is then called an artist. In this process, human being is not the origin of the work of art, but a channel through which these art drives can flow and generate a work of art. This understanding of art and “artist” is significant, since it foregrounds not the subject but the forces operative in life in general and in art in particular.

Nietzsche asserts that the Apollinian and the Dionysian are opposite art drives, both “in origin and aims”¹⁹². According to Nietzsche, this opposition between the Apollinian art drive, which constitutes visual art (*der Kunst des Bildners*) and the Dionysian, which constitutes non-visual art (*die unbildliche Kunst*), namely music, is

¹⁸⁷ *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

¹⁸⁸ *BT*, § 1, p. 33.

¹⁸⁹ Schacht, Richard, *Nietzsche*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, p. 482. Hereafter *RS*.

¹⁹⁰ *BT*, § 2, p. 38.

¹⁹¹ Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Will to Power*. Tr. Walter Kaufmann, R. J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage Books, 1968, § 798. Hereafter *WP*.

¹⁹² *BT*, § 1, p. 33.

tremendous¹⁹³. However, he also adds that they “run parallel to each other” and “they continually incite each other to new and powerful births”¹⁹⁴. That is to say, in their opposition they need each other despite the fact that they are in a continuous strife with each other¹⁹⁵. However, in their *agon*, both by distancing themselves from and by approaching each other, they retain their character and maintain their very opposition. Also, so as to understand these two art drives more effectively, Nietzsche introduces them as being two “separate art worlds”, namely dreams (the Apollinian visual arts) and *Rausch*¹⁹⁶ (characterised as the Dionysian non-visual arts, namely music and dance). Keeping these two aspects *pari passu* Nietzsche regards them as being the “physiological phenomena” which accompany aesthetic states¹⁹⁷. The physiological aspect of aesthetic experience will be discussed later in this chapter, but I find it necessary to point out beforehand that these art drives have a physiological strand that will be effective in understanding Nietzsche’s conception of art.

Before going further, a more detailed explanation regarding the characteristics of these two art drives is warranted. One of the art deities of the Greeks, Apollo, is the god of delicate boundary and shape¹⁹⁸. It is characterised by an urge towards form, it is a desire for being and for fixation. It is the dream world, the deceptive appearance (*Schein*) and the god of beautiful shining (*Schein*)¹⁹⁹. The

¹⁹³ *BT*, § 1, p. 33.

¹⁹⁴ *BT*, § 1, p. 33.

¹⁹⁵ *BT*, § 1, p. 33.

¹⁹⁶ *BT*, § 1, p. 33. The German word *Rausch* is often translated as either rapture or intoxication, but the German word has a more comprehensive meaning than either of them by involving states of drunkenness, ecstasy, fever, frenzy, rush etc. Therefore, in order not to miss out any of the possible meanings of the word, I will leave the word *Rausch* untranslated in the following.

¹⁹⁷ *BT*, § 1, p. 33.

¹⁹⁸ *BT*, § 1, p. 34.

¹⁹⁹ *BT*, § 1, p. 34. As can also be found in Homer’s *The Iliad*, one of the appellations of Apollo is *Φοῖβος* (*Phoibos*), which literally means bright or shining. Homer, *The Iliad*. Tr. Robert Fagles, New York: Penguin Books, 1990, Book I, line 50.

Apollinian brings with it, or better, demands, order and clarity²⁰⁰. It is “the urge [...] to all that simplifies, distinguishes, makes [...] clear, unambiguous”²⁰¹. Its essence is measure and limit. It is characterised by regularity, calmness, moderation and harmony²⁰². It is what constitutes phenomenal beings, and its principle is the principle of individuation. That is to say, it is through the figure of Apollo that the limits of individuation can be delineated²⁰³. Also, in order to delimit the boundaries of the individual, the imperative “‘know thyself’ and ‘nothing in excess’”, in other words, self-knowledge and moderation are required²⁰⁴. Self-knowledge is one of the main characteristics of the Apollinian, since it is by means of this that measure and moderation can be maintained²⁰⁵.

In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche contrasts the Dionysian with the Apollinian by foregrounding the features of the Dionysian art drive found in the orgiastic festivals of Dionysus²⁰⁶. What the Greeks find in their god Dionysus is the orgiastic religious experience in which a temporary increase of instinct occurs. Ecstatic music, singing, dancing and drinking abound in such a degree that in this orgiastic frenzy the principle of individuation can no longer be seen²⁰⁷. In addition, the intense register of delight as well as suffering, but also sexuality and voluptuousness, libidinal experience in other words, describe the distinctive features of the Dionysian²⁰⁸. The Dionysian is characterised by the melting away of

²⁰⁰ Wood, Robert E., *Placing Aesthetics: Reflections on the Philosophic Tradition*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1999, p. 217. Hereafter PA.

²⁰¹ WP, § 1050, p. 539.

²⁰² BT, § 1, p. 35.

²⁰³ Sallis, John, “Dionysus – In Excess of Metaphysics”, in David Farrell Krell and David Wood (eds.), *Exceedingly Nietzsche*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988, p. 7. Hereafter EM.

²⁰⁴ BT, § 4, p. 46.

²⁰⁵ BT, § 4, p. 46.

²⁰⁶ BT, Attempt at a Self-Criticism, § 3, translator’s footnote 5, p. 20.

²⁰⁷ PA, p. 217.

²⁰⁸ Sallis, John, *Crossings: Nietzsche and the Space of Tragedy*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991, footnote 21, p. 68. Hereafter C.

boundaries, complete self-forgetfulness and ecstasy²⁰⁹. Ecstasy – literally, standing outside oneself – suggests a state in which the limits and boundaries of individuality are transgressed and demolished. It is self-forgetfulness, namely “a deconstruction of subjectivity”²¹⁰, that occurs in the Dionysian. As Nietzsche states, when the Dionysian emotions hold the stage and “grow in intensity, everything subjective vanishes into complete self-forgetfulness”²¹¹. At this point, the contrast between the Apollinian and the Dionysian art drives can clearly be seen. For the former, as discussed above, drawing the borders of individuality, the principle of individuation in other words, is of utmost importance and for this to be maintained self-knowledge is required. For the latter, by contrast, the “abysmal loss of self”²¹², that is to say, the complete tearing apart of subjectivity and the “dissolution of ground and determination”²¹³ are the issue. It is a desire for becoming rather than a desire for being²¹⁴, as well as a continuous destruction and change²¹⁵. As opposed to the moderation of the Apollinian, the Dionysian is rife with excess²¹⁶: either excess in pleasure or in grief. Also instead of the self-knowledge of the Apollinian, the Dionysian is replete with hubris²¹⁷, nourished by transgressing and demolishing the limits of subjectivity. As will be seen below, it is with these Dionysian elements that a new dimension related to aesthetic disinterestedness will be added.

Nietzsche carries these divergent features of the Apollinian and the Dionysian art drives to a further discussion where he makes reference to the two Greek poets,

²⁰⁹ *BT*, § 1, p. 36.

²¹⁰ *EM*, p. 5.

²¹¹ *BT*, § 1, p. 36.

²¹² *EM*, p. 6.

²¹³ *EM*, p. 6.

²¹⁴ *WP*, § 846.

²¹⁵ *WP*, § 846.

²¹⁶ *BT*, § 4, p. 46.

²¹⁷ *BT*, § 4, p. 46.

Homer and Archilochus (the lyric poet), the first of whom is regarded as “objective”, the other as “subjective” by modern aesthetics²¹⁸. It is in the demand for a justification of the lyric poet that the discussion of aesthetic disinterestedness appears in *The Birth of Tragedy*.

Before examining what Nietzsche understands from the designations “objective” and “subjective” in their relation to art or the artist, I would like to point out that on this point I hear what Nietzsche says differently than its usual interpretation. That is to say, if one pays close attention to the tonality of Nietzsche’s words in this section of *The Birth of Tragedy*²¹⁹, it can be discerned that Nietzsche does not entirely endorse the Kantian concept of disinterestedness, despite Jill Marsden’s claim concerning Nietzsche’s “explicit” approval of this concept²²⁰. Nietzsche’s choice of words, saying “we” as in “we know”, “we demand”, seems, to my mind, to suggest rather a distance from the view which he seems to put forward. Also, the inverted commas he uses with the words “objective” and “subjective” may suggest that classifying art and the artist as objective and subjective does not reflect his own views but a common *doxa*. Hence, in my view, Nietzsche regards the distinction made between the “objective” and the “subjective” only as ostensible, and for this reason it seems more reasonable to interpret this characterisations of art not as Nietzsche’s fully fledged views but rather as an implicit distancing himself from the possibility of understanding art as objective, as “pure contemplation without interest”²²¹.

In my view, in this section Nietzsche introduces, first of all, the common view, that is, the *doxa*: the splitting of the artist into the “objective” and the “subjective” artist. This discrimination, Nietzsche states, is added by modern

²¹⁸ *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

²¹⁹ *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

²²⁰ Marsden, Jill, *After Nietzsche: Notes Towards a Philosophy of Ecstasy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, p. 50. Hereafter *AN*.

²²¹ *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

aesthetics²²². The “objective” artist who is redeemed from their ego and who has silenced their individual desires and will is contrasted with the “subjective” artist whose passions and desires dominate their art and who “is continually saying ‘I’”²²³. Nietzsche reminds his readers of the view that throughout the entire history of art getting rid of anything subjective or anything that is related to the individual will, desire or interest is what is demanded (“we demand”) if there is to be art²²⁴. Art, in other words, includes only that which is objective and which is “devoid of interest”²²⁵. However, if art is defined like this, it does not seem possible to account for the lyric poet as an artist in a realm which only includes the qualities attached to the “objective” artist.

In other words, the contrast between the objective artist, who bears the characteristics of the Apollinian, with its support of aesthetic disinterestedness, and the subjective artist, full of desire and being reigned over by Dionysian features is insufficient to provide a satisfactory explanation of the lyric poet. This ostensible contradiction between passion or desire on the one hand and disinterestedness or objectivity on the other is resolved by taking into consideration the Dionysian forces which are also impersonal, non-egoic, and anti-utilitarian²²⁶. In them everything subjective vanishes, rapture (*Rausch*) reigns over human being²²⁷. Thus, even though we hear the “I” of the lyric poet, it is not the empirical, “subjectively willing and desiring” artist, rather it is the a-subjective Dionysian, impersonal, creative forces that are dominant in him/her²²⁸.

²²² *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

²²³ *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

²²⁴ *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

²²⁵ *BT*, § 5, p. 48.

²²⁶ Urpeth, Jim, “Nietzsche and the Rapture of Aesthetic Disinterestedness: A Response to Heidegger”, in Nicholas Martin (ed.), *Nietzsche and the German Tradition*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003, p. 222. Hereafter NR.

²²⁷ *BT*, § 1, p. 36.

²²⁸ *BT*, § 5, pp. 49-50.NR, p. 222.

Hence, by getting rid of this seeming contradiction, Nietzsche shows that the relation between disinterestedness and the Dionysian is not that of an opposition but of an alignment. That is to say, in this early text Nietzsche offers a catch-all idea, Dionysian forces, which include both disinterestedness and desires, without privileging either of them. Hence, it can be said that by foregrounding impersonal, non-subjective Dionysian forces Nietzsche stresses an affirmative conception of aesthetic disinterestedness, since for him the alignment of disinterestedness with the Dionysian, that is, with desires and thus interests, is what constitutes the nature of art. Yet this does not mean that he entirely approves of the concept of disinterestedness. Instead, what he does is to hold all aspects of aesthetic experience side by side, without letting them oppose and eliminate each other. Also, as a last point, it can be said that the discussion of lyric poetry can be interpreted as a response to Schopenhauer, who conceives lyric poetry as a “‘semi-art’ in which desire and disinterestedness are “wonderfully mingled” rather than fused”²²⁹.

4.2 Aesthetic Disinterestedness in Nietzsche’s Later Thought

Where Nietzsche’s later text, *On the Genealogy of Morality*, is concerned, however, one can discern how his treatment of the theme of aesthetic disinterestedness has changed and become explicit. In his later texts, he distances himself from any valorisation of the Dionysian form of disinterestedness and seems to be pointing out instead an oppositional framework in which disinterestedness and instinctual desire are contrasted²³⁰. There are basically two criticisms Nietzsche addresses to the Kantian understanding of aesthetics in *On Genealogy of Morality*. First of all, Nietzsche brings into view what Kant privileged concerning art, namely the qualities which are much more appropriate to theoretical judgment, namely “impersonality and universal validity”²³¹. In his criticism, Nietzsche questions and problematises

²²⁹ *BT*, § 5, pp. 51-2.

²³⁰ *NR*, p. 225.

²³¹ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 72.

Kant's choice of these two qualities among many attributes of the beautiful²³². Nietzsche's second criticism, although it is related to the first, is Kant's envisaging art from the point of the spectator, rather than that of the artist, "the one who creates"²³³.

According to Nietzsche, the qualities impersonality and universality, and thus the introduction of the concept of disinterestedness, which goes in parallel with these qualities, into the discussion of aesthetics befit more the standpoint of the spectator²³⁴. In fact, the problem does not lie in the spectators themselves, but in their not being sufficiently familiar with the aesthetic experience, or rather with beauty. "[I]ntense experiences, desires, surprises, delights in the realm of the beautiful" are what the Kantian subject of the beautiful, namely the spectator, lacks²³⁵, according to Nietzsche. As frequently quoted, Nietzsche even describes this misconception as "a fat worm of basic error"²³⁶, since for him these experiences and desires, interests in general, are the *sine qua non* of any aesthetic experience. Thus, excluding these aspects of aesthetic experience and insisting upon the disinterestedness of the aesthetic experience amounts to disregarding the artists themselves and aesthetic experience with its effects as the upsurge of desires, interests and sensuality. The spectator's point of view thus goes well with the concept of disinterestedness which excludes anything that is related to desire, sensuality and sexuality.

This oppositional framework between desire and disinterestedness pointed out in *On the Genealogy of Morality* can clearly be seen in Stendhal's formulation of the beautiful as "a promise of happiness", in contrast to Kant's understanding of aesthetic judgment as being disinterested²³⁷. In fact, Nietzsche puts great emphasis

²³² *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 72.

²³³ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 72.

²³⁴ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 72. Ridley, Aaron, "Une Promesse de Bonheur? Beauty in the *Genealogy*", in Simon May (ed.), *Nietzsche's On the Genealogy of Morality, A Critical Guide*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011. p. 312.

²³⁵ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 72.

²³⁶ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 72.

²³⁷ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 72.

on a narrow interpretation of Stendhal's formulation by rendering it as the "excitement of the will", and contrasts this effect of the beautiful with Schopenhauer's conception, according to which beauty is the "calming of the will"²³⁸. As could be seen in the previous chapter (in ch. 3.2.2), with the "calming of the will" Schopenhauer suggests a will-less subject of aesthetic experience who leaves aside their desires and interests temporarily and thus lessens the suffering of life. However, by embracing Stendhal's point of view, Nietzsche foregrounds the desires and exalts the will that is indispensable for any art to be created. In fact, this view constitutes Nietzsche's core idea of art and life. In order to grasp what this idea consists of, it is first necessary to discuss a topic in which the overcoming of the opposition between disinterestedness and desire is examined by means of a naturalistic account of disinterestedness, which can be revealed through the Nietzschean concept of "the physiology of art"²³⁹.

4.2.1 The Physiology of Art: The Naturalistic Account of Disinterestedness

"The physiology of art", which stresses the "primordial material and instinctual processes of life"²⁴⁰, is the core concept in discerning the meaning which the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness has in Nietzsche's thinking. To this end, some other concepts which are closely related to "the physiology of art" will be beneficial, such as bodily state, *Rausch*, and sensuality.

Dichotomies drawn between the body and soul, reason or mind have occupied philosophers for centuries and the degradation of the body has been a commonplace for many of them. It is regarded as a deceiver, subject to change rather than something suggesting reliability and permanence. It has been considered as a threat and hindrance to reaching the "truth", the "form" or "being". In Nietzsche's view, however, the body is one of the loci of the *agon* of forces, hence it suggests a

²³⁸ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, pp. 73-4.

²³⁹ *NR*, p. 229.

²⁴⁰ *NR*, p. 232.

sphere of constant becoming rather than that of being. It is these forces passing through the body that create art, rather than a conscious artist²⁴¹. This may help us to get into Nietzsche's thinking, since in Nietzsche's work physiology does not only imply a physical, material, biological, animal body (*Körper*) and its study, but more importantly, as Rehberg points out, "an active science of material becomings by asking how forces vie with each other and how some become formative of a body"²⁴². The term physiology, in other words, implies a continuous struggle of forces within which phenomena appear.

Beyond this broad understanding of physiology, Nietzsche also makes use of a narrower side of it, namely, the physiology of art. As frequently noted, Nietzsche regards aesthetics as "nothing but an applied physiology"²⁴³. He sees physiology as requisite for artistic creation and aesthetic enjoyment²⁴⁴. It is by means of animal vigour, a healthy body and pleasure acquired from the senses that art can be created²⁴⁵. Awakened, aroused and exuberant physicality, in other words, is both a necessary component in the creation of art and the inevitable effect of it. By emphasising the physiological aspects of art, Nietzsche indicates that the opposition between aesthetic experience and desires, and thus interests, which is mostly endorsed throughout the history of art is not of a genuine one. He distances himself from any such understanding of it by stating the inseparable nature of physiology and

²⁴¹ In many places Nietzsche speaks of the artist as the creator of art as if it is the conscious, human artist. However, as discussed earlier, according to Nietzsche, nature itself is the true artist, and it is ultimately the forces of nature that produce art. Hence, whenever in this chapter, I use the word artist, it should be understood as implying not the human artist who is reckoned to be the origin of the work of art, but the unconscious forces that even the body is subject to in artistic creation.

²⁴² Rehberg, Andrea, "The Overcoming of Physiology", *The Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, Issue: 23, Spring 2002, p. 41.

²⁴³ Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Nietzsche Contra Wagner*, in Walter Kaufmann (Tr. and ed.), *The Portable Nietzsche*. New York: Penguin Books, 1988, p. 664.

²⁴⁴ Haar, Michel, "Heidegger and the Nietzschean 'Physiology of Art'", in David Farrell Krell and David Wood (eds.), *Exceedingly Nietzsche: Aspects of Contemporary Nietzsche Interpretation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010, p. 23. Hereafter HN.

²⁴⁵ HN, p. 22.

desires with aesthetics either in its creation (on the part of the artist) or in its perception (spectator).

One of the physiological states Nietzsche distinguishes is *Rausch*²⁴⁶. It is a state that reveals why the concept of disinterestedness, as seen in Kant's and Schopenhauer's interpretation of it, is inappropriate to aesthetics. It is closely related to the intensification of physical strength²⁴⁷. In Nietzsche's work, *Rausch* is associated with the resurgence of both muscular and sensual strength²⁴⁸. This resurgence or intensification of strength is by no means an illusory increase but is real. Just as anything ugly "weakens and afflicts" human being, in the same way the beautiful pleases and arouses joy²⁴⁹. Nietzsche makes this point clear by stating that "[a]ll art works tonically, increases strength, inflames desire" and brings about *Rausch*²⁵⁰. Both the spectator of the work of art and the artist experience this feeling of *Rausch* and physical strength, and with this experience pleasure and the aesthetic state are aroused in human being²⁵¹.

At this point, a similarity that can be seen between Nietzsche and Kant should be emphasised. As previously discussed (in ch. 2.2), just at the beginning of the first section of the *Critique of Judgment* Kant uses the words *Lust* and *Unlust* which have an erotic and physical sense and which are related to the effect of the beautiful on the subject who encounters it. That is to say, the beautiful invigorates the spectator, it increases their life force and the ugly effects them inversely. Hence, already in Kant's third Critique, at least on this specific point, a physiological influence of an aesthetic object on the experiencing subject can be discerned. However, even though

²⁴⁶ WP, § 811, p. 428.

²⁴⁷ WP, § 800, p. 420. .

²⁴⁸ WP, § 809, p. 427.

²⁴⁹ Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings*. Tr. Judith Norman. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 'Skirmishes of an Untimely Man', § 20, p. 202.

²⁵⁰ WP, § 809, p. 427.

²⁵¹ HN, p. 21.

Kant mentioned this aspect of the aesthetic experience, he does this in passing and does not broaden the issue, as Nietzsche does.

Among the various manifestations of *Rausch*, one of them stands out as being the “most original and ancient form” of it, namely sexual excitement²⁵². Nietzsche regards sexuality as constituting artistic creation and links the sense of beauty with procreation²⁵³. Since an urge to create is what determines these two types of creation, one in the production of offspring and the other in the artist themselves, it is not surprising to discern the link Nietzsche sees between the sense of beauty and procreation. However, to say that sexuality constitutes artistic creation demands more explanation. Nietzsche points out that sexual arousal is both the necessary condition and the effect of art. It is, in fact, more appropriate to say that it is not sexuality itself with which Nietzsche concerns himself, but rather the state sexuality enables: exuberance and strength²⁵⁴. Nietzsche does not separate artistic conception and the sexual act since, according to him, the force that operates in both of these realms is one and the same²⁵⁵. Despite Nietzsche’s valorisation of sexuality, it has been considered with great hatred as being a hindrance and diversion in matters including beauty, and Schopenhauer is one of those who devalued the sexual condition of the artistic creation.

4.2.2 The Problem of Asceticism: A Response to Schopenhauer

Despite the change, not in the idea but in the tone of Nietzsche’s views on aesthetic disinterestedness, his thoughts on the relation between art and life exhibit an explicit continuation. In his later works, Nietzsche states that “art is essentially affirmation, blessing [and] deification of existence”²⁵⁶, it is “the great stimulant of life”²⁵⁷. The

²⁵² *RS*, p. 521.

²⁵³ Moore, Gregory, *Nietzsche, Biology and Metaphor*, pp. 103-4.

²⁵⁴ *RS*, p. 522.

²⁵⁵ *WP*, § 815.

²⁵⁶ *WP*, § 821.

main reason lying behind this assessment stems from the rapturous creativity and celebration of life in aesthetic experience²⁵⁸.

Before discussing why this way of thinking constitutes the crux of the issue, we should recall how life is interpreted by Platonism or the Christian worldview. Contempt for the world, for the instincts, desires and urges, and for sensuality and sexuality characterises this tradition.

Hatred of 'the world', condemnations of the passions, fear of beauty and sensuality, a beyond invented the better to slander this life, at bottom a craving for nothing, for the end, for respite, for 'the sabbath of the sabbaths'²⁵⁹.

In this point of view, life is rendered destructive due to its being full of suffering, thus anything good is thought to belong not to this but another, a beyond, world. The Greek embracing of both suffering and happiness is belittled or even ignored. Life's capability of producing new facets and forms, its giving birth to new dominances within itself, is cast aside. Life, in which forces continuously fight with each other and in which tension constitutes the main trait, however, has creation and destruction within itself. Thus, the denial of the destructive side of life and the denial of differentiation it involves amount to the denial of life itself²⁶⁰. It is for these reasons that Nietzsche inveighs against the denial and hostility to life and renders it as paying homage to asceticism.

In the above quotation, Nietzsche summarises the core idea of his own criticism by saying "the sabbath of the sabbaths" thereby alluding to Schopenhauer's view. That is to say, Nietzsche states that a final relief of life considered as chaos, pain and distress is seen by many philosophers, including Schopenhauer, as breaking away from the torture one feels. Nietzsche contends that it should not be surprising to

²⁵⁷ *WP*, § 853.

²⁵⁸ *PA*, p. 221.

²⁵⁹ *BT*, Attempt At a Self-Criticism, § 5, p. 23.

²⁶⁰ Taminioux, Jacques, *Poetics, Speculation and Judgment: The Shadow of The Work of Art from Kant to Phenomenology*. Tr. Michael Gendre. Albany: SUNY Press, 1993, p. 124. Hereafter *P*.

hear what the source of this torture that a philosopher feels is, namely his or her body, the sensual part, sexuality.²⁶¹ Even though Schopenhauer privileges the body, as discussed in the previous chapter (in ch. 3.2.1), he still attaches more importance to silencing its willing, its desires and interests, sometimes by having recourse to aesthetic experience and sometimes through asceticism. However, Nietzsche recognises a vital problem in Schopenhauer's ideas where Schopenhauer considers not life itself, but only the ways to quieten its effects in order to reach the will as thing in itself. The denial of life, in other words, is meant to close the door on recognising life in its various aspects, both its being full of suffering and full of excitement (in a rapturous state in the case of an artist, for example), in destruction and creation. Abstinence from any sensuality or chastity is, according to Nietzsche, a typical characteristic of asceticism and the denial of life. Nietzsche addresses the inevitability of sensuality in general and sexuality in particular in life and in art, which is in itself an affirmation and which is an expression of life's creative aspect. A pessimistic art is a contradiction in terms since art is a stimulant to life.

It is the interpretation of aesthetic disinterestedness as a demand for objectivity in which the expression of one's sensuality, sexuality and desires is suppressed, or it is the demand for the suspension of willing in the realm of aesthetics that is unintelligible to Nietzsche. It is therefore art with its high connection with the senses and thus with life that goes counter to what Schopenhauer thinks regarding the function of art as a way to the will as thing in itself.

The main contrast between Nietzsche and Schopenhauer lies on their respective understanding of the experience of art. While for the former aesthetic experience cannot be detached from physiology and cannot ignore the desires one has and therefore is necessarily interested, for the latter aesthetic experience has the function of suspending the will that constantly increases suffering and opens up a way to the will as thing in itself. Disinterestedness, in other words, is in line with the Schopenhauerian conception of art, while for Nietzsche this concept as understood by Schopenhauer is more in line with asceticism and hence the denial of life. Art is

²⁶¹ *GM*, Third Treatise, § 6, p. 74.

the highest expression of action and creation for Nietzsche, while for Schopenhauer it is best responded to with disinterested contemplation. While for Schopenhauer one can only speak of the renunciation of, or the suppression and the silencing of, the will in the discussion of aesthetics, for Nietzsche there is the activity of the will. That is to say, even though, for Nietzsche, the will can show itself in the destruction of individuality, it can also show itself in the production of it²⁶². For this reason, the activity of the will which is also visible in the Apollinian and the Dionysian art drives cannot be equated with the Schopenhauerian understanding of the will, and thus of art.

Even though the body is valorised by Schopenhauer as the vehicle which has direct access to the will, he does not discuss the rapturous or sexual drives latent in aesthetic experience. For Schopenhauer, art, as the escape from desire and willing, consists of ignoring erotic beauty, that is, above all, that of the body. However, by highlighting sexual or erotic beauty, Nietzsche once more makes it apparent that aesthetic experience cannot be wholly removed from the physical, physiological, and sexual drives.

4.3 Concluding Remarks

Nietzsche's initial stance towards the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, as evinced in *The Birth of Tragedy*, can be seen to change if one pays attention to his later texts. While in the earlier text he does not explicitly state his criticisms of this issue, he implicitly moves forward by distancing himself from any positive valorisation of aesthetic disinterestedness by introducing and emphasising the coexistence of desire and disinterestedness in an aesthetic experience. Even though it is rather problematic to keep both of these aspects, this approach to the issue can be regarded as useful as a first step on the way to develop a bolder criticism of aesthetic disinterestedness. That is to say, by reminding us of the physiological and sexual aspects of aesthetic pleasure in his later texts, Nietzsche moves away from aesthetic disinterestedness. He problematises the positive valorisation of disinterestedness in

²⁶² *P*, pp. 120-1.

the realm of aesthetics, since there are other aspects of an aesthetic experience which deserve much more attention, such as the state of *Rausch*, the body, sexuality or in general sensuality. Nietzsche, therefore, problematises the Kantian concept of aesthetic disinterestedness by means of his understanding of physiology, first signs of which can be seen in Schopenhauer's emphasis on the body.

CHAPTER 5

HEIDEGGER: DISINTERESTED AESTHETIC LIKING AND LETTING-BE

In the winter semester of 1936-7, Heidegger gave his first lecture on Nietzsche and after some amendments he published his lecture notes under the title of “*The Will to Power as Art*”, which today constitutes the first volume of his book, *Nietzsche*²⁶³. As mentioned earlier, this book will be the main source that I confine my investigation of aesthetic disinterestedness in Heidegger.

Heidegger states that Kant’s notion of aesthetic disinterestedness has been read through Schopenhauer’s misunderstanding of Kant’s text, and that Nietzsche too fell into this misreading even though there are in fact, according to Heidegger, some affinities between Nietzsche’s and Kant’s understanding of the beautiful²⁶⁴. At this point, it may be useful firstly to say that Heidegger does not simply express his disagreement with Schopenhauer’s and Nietzsche’s interpretations of Kantian aesthetic disinterestedness, rather he rejects them out of hand and thinks that they are wrong. Since Heidegger deals with the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness by consulting Kant, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, in this chapter I will discuss Heidegger’s remarks on this issue mainly by tracing the convergences and divergences between the thoughts of Heidegger and these aforementioned philosophers.

5.1 Disinterestedness: Indifference or Letting-Be

To begin with, a brief reminder of what this concept means in Kant may be useful. As previously discussed (in ch. 2.3), in the search for “the determining ground for our finding something beautiful”²⁶⁵, Kant commences his discussion by posing the

²⁶³ Heidegger, Martin, *Nietzsche: Volume I: The Will to Power as Art*. Tr. D. F. Krell. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1991. Hereafter *WPA*.

²⁶⁴ *WPA*, p. 107.

²⁶⁵ Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgment*. Tr. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett, 1987, §§ 2-5. Hereafter *CJ*.

question of what falls inside and outside the realm of the beautiful. He answers this question by saying that anything that includes interest cannot be the ground for a judgment on the beautiful, since interest is either pathological or a matter of ethics²⁶⁶. Therefore, he says, the liking which determines a judgment of taste – our comportment towards the beautiful – must be “devoid of all interest”²⁶⁷.

The phrase, “devoid of interest”, however, is understood in varied ways if we remind ourselves of its interpretations seen in Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. It is due to its varied interpretations that Heidegger first of all focuses on what being “devoid of interest” or disinterested denotes. Heidegger begins his unravelling of the concept of disinterestedness by introducing first of all what it means in the common notion. If, he states, disinterestedness is read from the point of view of the common notion, then it amounts to an “indifference [*Gleichgültigkeit*] towards a thing or a person”²⁶⁸. Further, according to Heidegger, disinterestedness understood as indifference points to an understanding in which “we invest nothing of our will in relation to that thing or person”²⁶⁹.

The understanding of disinterestedness as indifference, however, is not actually without any foundation. If we remind ourselves of Kant’s remarks regarding the judgment of taste and its relation to the existence of the object, we can see that he explicitly uses the word indifference: “In order to play the judge in matters of taste, we must not be in the least biased in favour of the thing’s existence but must be wholly *indifferent* about it.”²⁷⁰ However, as it is clear in the quoted sentence indifference is used as an indifference to the thing’s existence. That is to say, Kant uses this word only when he speaks of the existence of the object, and does not extend the usage of this word to any other discussion.

²⁶⁶ *CJ*, §§ 2, 3.

²⁶⁷ *CJ*, § 2, p. 45.

²⁶⁸ *WPA*, p. 108.

²⁶⁹ *WPA*, p. 108.

²⁷⁰ *CJ*, § 2, p. 46. Italics added.

On the other hand, aesthetic behaviour, the comportment towards the beautiful, is defined by Kant as “unconstrained [free] favouring” (*freie Kunst*)²⁷¹ and this, says Heidegger, cannot be associated with indifference. Here, Heidegger interprets this “unconstrained favouring” as letting-be that which we encounter, and as freely granting “what belongs to it and what it brings to us”²⁷². Heidegger contends that aesthetic disinterestedness, which is an unconstrained favouring, entails the “supreme effort of our essential nature”²⁷³. Further, this supreme effort necessitates liberating or releasing ourselves in order to encounter purely that which is considered beautiful. Hence, according to Heidegger, what is at issue here is more of an intensification rather than an indifference. With unconstrained favouring, by being devoid of all interest in other words, “the object come[s] to shine forth [*zum Vorschein kommt*] as a pure object”²⁷⁴. This shining-forth of the object amounts to uncovering the veil of the self-concealing object and this can be done by means of the disinterested comportment towards the object.

All these aside, focusing on the letting-be of things or releasing the thing so that it can show itself as it is in itself betrays the difference between Kant’s and Heidegger’s dealing with the issue. This means that, Kant considers disinterestedness as one of the most important characteristics of the aesthetic relation to the beautiful, and, unlike Heidegger, Kant does not attach a further function – the letting-be of the being – to it.

As can be seen now, with the shining-forth of the object through disinterested liking, Heidegger takes us to the issue of “letting-be”. To my mind, the main problem concerning Heidegger’s interpretation of Kant’s aesthetic disinterestedness lies in his undue emphasis on this letting-be, that is to say, seeing things in their own being in a disinterested aesthetic experience. In fact, even this would not have been an

²⁷¹ WPA, p. 109. Heidegger uses the word *Kunst* which is translated into English as “favouring” while in Kant’s text, this word is *Wohlgefallen* (KU, § 5).

²⁷² WPA, p. 109.

²⁷³ WPA, p. 109.

²⁷⁴ Faas, Ekbert, *Genealogy of Aesthetics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 216. Faas’ amendment is accepted. WPA, p. 110.

insurmountable problem if it had been considered as only an interpretation. However, Heidegger claims that this releasement of what encounters us, this letting things be in other words, is also what concerns Kant²⁷⁵. In making releasement the central issue, Heidegger, in a way, projects his views onto Kant and distorts him.

After briefly discussing Heidegger's reading of Kant on aesthetic disinterestedness, we can now turn to Schopenhauer, and try to understand Heidegger's claims concerning Schopenhauer's views on this issue. Heidegger states that Schopenhauer interprets the concept of disinterestedness as will-lessness, and considers the aesthetic state as a state of restfulness, of tranquillity, and a state in which "the will is put out of commission"²⁷⁶. Such a reading of Schopenhauer's views on the role of aesthetic contemplation is not incompatible with what he actually says, but for all that the addition of the notion of indifference to Schopenhauer's understanding of aesthetic experience is a new element Heidegger puts forward. Even though this element is functional in Heidegger's own project by enabling him to contrast the interpretation of disinterestedness as indifference with aesthetic disinterestedness as a letting-be, as we will see on the following pages, this way of understanding the concept significantly alters firstly what Schopenhauer says and secondly the meaning it has in Kant's work.

For a better understanding of the interpretation of disinterestedness as indifference, it may be useful firstly to consider what Schopenhauer says on this issue and how Heidegger conceives of it. For Schopenhauer, in an aesthetic contemplation the individual will is temporarily suspended, and the subject of this contemplation becomes the pure subject of cognition. That is to say, this subject can regard things without any interest and this opens up the possibility to consider things "purely objectively"²⁷⁷. The temporary silencing of interests, which Schopenhauer discusses, is thus related more to the getting rid of individual will's imperious craving, which stand in the way of seeing the object aesthetically. Even though

²⁷⁵ *WPA*, p. 109.

²⁷⁶ *WPA*, p.108.

²⁷⁷ *WWRI*, § 38, p. 196.

Schopenhauer speaks of will-lessness, which can only be achieved when interests are put aside at least temporarily, as the basic character of this disinterested aesthetic contemplation, what he emphasises is actually not the abolishment of will altogether which excites the lustful feelings in the subject of aesthetic experience. Rather, it is the temporary suspension of it. As to the indifference, which, as Heidegger claims, began with Schopenhauer, it implies rather apathy towards, or a lack of concern about, the thing at issue. This way of interpreting the matter is actually the strand to which Heidegger himself adheres rather than Schopenhauer himself. It is for this reason that Heidegger's claim regarding Schopenhauer's misinterpretation of Kant's concept is illegitimate.

On the other hand, even though Heidegger, to my mind, misreads Schopenhauer, it may be useful to examine what Heidegger asserts regarding this issue. He states that, as discussed above, since aesthetic behaviour entails such a supreme effort by reminding us of the "unconstrained favouring", it cannot be indifferent to that which we encounter. Put differently, according to Heidegger, the unconstrained favouring, which Kant attributes to the characteristic of aesthetic liking, is misinterpreted by Schopenhauer by saying that it suggests a suspension of the will, and thus precludes any "essential relation to the object"²⁷⁸. Heidegger's rejection of Schopenhauer's interpretation lies here, since, to Heidegger, aesthetic behaviour is the essential relation through which letting things appear as they are in themselves occurs²⁷⁹. Heidegger emphasises that by means of disinterestedness the object for the first time "comes to the fore as pure object, and [states] that such coming forward into appearance is the beautiful"²⁸⁰. Given this, it can be said that through disinterested aesthetic behaviour, the "subject", while freeing itself from any interest or desire, also frees the object, which is then deemed beautiful, and lets it

²⁷⁸ Carbone, Mauro, "The Thinking of the Sensible", in Fred Evans and Leonard Lawlor (eds.), *Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2000, p. 124. Hereafter TS.

²⁷⁹ TS, p. 124.

²⁸⁰ WPA, p. 110.

appear as it is²⁸¹. All these considerations apropos of letting the object be as it is, however, can mislead a reader if these thoughts are attributed only to Kant by reason of his thoughts on “unconstrained favouring” and not also to Schopenhauer. Suspension of the will, which we see in Schopenhauer, has a twofold function. That is to say, through it, first of all, the subject becomes the pure will-less subject of cognition. Secondly, since acting upon the object as just an agreeable thing or just the object of one’s desires is disabled by means of the suspension of the will, the pure will-less subject of cognition can experience the object intensely, without the interfering of the representational world or that of one’s ceaseless desires. Hence, as opposed to what Heidegger claims, in Schopenhauer one can discern not an indifference to the object that will then be called beautiful, but an intense concern of and relation to the object. The pure will-less subject immerses themselves in it and becomes one with it, and as a result this subject can reach the world as will, which is Schopenhauer’s main goal.

Despite Heidegger’s misconception, to my mind, there is in fact a point of convergence between Heidegger and Schopenhauer. This convergence can be discerned in their strivings to come close to things as they are in themselves, it is termed the unconcealment or letting things be in Heidegger and the goal of catching a glimpse of the will as thing in itself in Schopenhauer. Even though for the latter the will as thing in itself is also the principle of the representational world and thus points to another realm than this representational world, and even though for the former the unconcealment does not require going or dreaming a beyond world, the demand for revealment or trying to reach what is hidden to human beings in their daily states, in which desires, interest abound, can be considered as the common movement in both of these philosophers. This point of convergence also shows itself in the subject’s passivity in the aesthetic experience. In Schopenhauer, the subject by being absorbed in the object becomes the pure, will-less subject for whom the getting a sight of the will happens without the agent. Similarly, in Heidegger, the thing

²⁸¹ TS, p. 124.

reveals itself by itself, the subject is nothing but the one who prepares the ground for such an releasement by being devoid of interest.

5.2 Nietzsche: Affinity with Kant and *Rausch* as *Stimmung*

After considering Heidegger's remarks on disinterestedness by taking into account Kant and Schopenhauer with the notions of unconstrained favouring, indifference and letting-be, we can now move on to Nietzsche and try to figure out whether Heidegger's claim as to the affinity between Nietzsche and Kant is tenable. Heidegger takes up the issue by focusing on Nietzsche's posthumous texts, rather than also taking into consideration *The Birth of Tragedy* and *On the Genealogy of Morality*, in which one can trace varying approaches Nietzsche has to the issue of aesthetic disinterestedness. By basing his views only on Nietzsche's posthumous texts, he claims that Nietzsche too misinterprets the Kantian concept of disinterestedness because he relies too much on Schopenhauer's reading of the text²⁸². Furthermore, Heidegger states that what Nietzsche thinks in his own way is in fact akin to what Kant says concerning the beautiful²⁸³.

First of all, an explanation as to in what ways Heidegger thinks Nietzsche and Kant are similar is warranted. According to Heidegger, when Nietzsche asserts that "such 'getting rid of interest and the ego' is nonsense and imprecise observation", Nietzsche could not realize that he in fact refers to Schopenhauer's interpretation of Kant's notion²⁸⁴. In order to substantiate his claim, Heidegger goes back to Kant and brings the notion of "unconstrained favouring" out of mothballs, which Heidegger thinks is the core concept of Kant in understanding aesthetic contemplation²⁸⁵ even though Kant does not make use of this phrase as much as Heidegger claims it to be. Unconstrained favouring, as discussed above, is understood to be the liking in which

²⁸² WPA, p. 111.

²⁸³ WPA, p. 111.

²⁸⁴ WPA, p. 112.

²⁸⁵ WPA, p. 113.

one puts aside all the desires one has in order to have a pure aesthetic experience. In this sense, it can be thought in line with disinterested liking.

Despite this understanding of the notion, Heidegger brings to light another aspect of the notion of “unconstrained favouring”, which is its being “interest of the highest sort”²⁸⁶. Heidegger explains that in this unconstrained favouring, there is not getting rid of interest, but rather being involved in the “pleasure of mere reflection”, which is, according to Kant, is “the pleasure we take in the beautiful”²⁸⁷. Kant’s notion of a disinterested “pleasure of reflection”, which characterises aesthetic behaviour, is completely removed from the interested pleasure of mere satisfaction, and what Kant means by the pleasure of reflection is not getting rid of all pleasure or interest *per se*, but instead it points to a higher pleasure²⁸⁸. This pointing to *higher pleasure* has its roots in foregrounding the form rather than the physicality of the object, thus this pleasure is exempt from any interest which the agreeable may generate. By basing his views on Kant’s thought, according to which by means of unconstrained favouring or disinterested delight all empirical and moral interest and desires are suspended, Heidegger thinks that aesthetic feeling gains access to the *pure* “pleasure of reflection”. It is pure and capable of letting the beautiful reveal itself. Therefore, considering the pleasure not being smudged by any desires or any empirical interests, and having a role in unconcealment, Heidegger reckons that the pleasure taken in disinterested aesthetic liking is a higher pleasure and the *interest* in it is “an interest of the highest sort”, since it enables purer and closer relation to the beautiful²⁸⁹. This seems to be the reason why Heidegger equates Kant’s “pleasure of reflection” with “the thrill that comes of being in *our* world now”, which Nietzsche states when problematising the “getting rid of interest”²⁹⁰. Also, that is why

²⁸⁶ WPA, pp. 112-3.

²⁸⁷ WPA, p. 112. *CJ*, § 39, p. 158.

²⁸⁸ Urpeth, Jim, “Nietzsche and the Rapture of Aesthetic Disinterestedness: A Response to Heidegger”, in Nicholas Martin (ed.), *Nietzsche and the German Tradition*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003, p. 218. Hereafter NR.

²⁸⁹ WPA, p. 113.

²⁹⁰ WPA, p. 112.

Heidegger claims Nietzsche, by trusting Schopenhauer's interpretation of disinterestedness, misapprehended Kant's concept. Therefore, Heidegger claims that even though Nietzsche excoriates disinterested liking, by reminding us of the embedded interests and desires in aesthetic experience, the latter is closer to what Kant says than he realises²⁹¹. The reason for this claim is put forward by saying that Kant does not ignore, rather he acknowledges the higher interest deriving from the pleasure of reflection in aesthetic judgment.

Despite all these, however, the interest, which Heidegger thinks is connected to the unconstrained and (even though it seems as a contradiction) disinterested favouring, has a different meaning from the meaning it has in Kant. That is to say, even though making the comportment towards the beautiful pure is of utmost importance both for Heidegger and for Kant, for the former this making pure is to do with revealing the basic state of being, while for the latter this making pure is to do with the aesthetic judgment one is making. In other words, for Kant what concerns the judging subject is their judgment itself, while for Heidegger it is the releasement of the thing itself. Also, going back to the alleged similarity between Kant and Nietzsche, we should discern that the meaning of the concept of interest for these philosophers varies and interest for each of them points to the opposite directions. That is to say, for Kant interest, which is at bottom is described as being related to the existence of the object and the possible excitement it may produce in the subject, is not equal to the pleasure that is derived from aesthetic judgment. Therefore, thinking the pleasure of reflection with the interest of the highest sort can only be intelligible if the said interest is understood as the pleasure, since for Kant interest has a completely different meaning. Furthermore, with these in mind, claiming that there is a similarity between Kant and Nietzsche since both of them accept that there is an interest in aesthetic experience, becomes without any foundation.

Another thread that can help us to clarify Heidegger's understanding of aesthetic experience is the topic of *Rausch*, which Nietzsche proposes to be one of

²⁹¹ WPA, pp. 112 -3.

the most significant issues regarding aesthetic experience²⁹². This topic deserves to be emphasised, since with this topic we can see how Heidegger sees the unconcealment in line with it. Heidegger reckons that the unconcealment of Being and the disclosure of the beautiful occur in *Rausch*²⁹³. However, what Heidegger foregrounds at this point is again not the *Rausch* as Nietzsche describes it, but the disclosure, the letting-be. Furthermore, instead of conceiving it as a physiological state which stimulates artistic creation, Heidegger discusses it as being a *Stimmung* (attunement), “an affective disposition in which Being in its totality reveals itself.”²⁹⁴ *Stimmung* is one of the core elements in Heidegger, at least on the issues of *Rausch* and art. *Rausch* as *Stimmung* is connected with “‘seeing’ the main features of Being”²⁹⁵. Transcendence is considered to be its main feature, that is to say, one may go outside of itself and be opened to the world²⁹⁶. Rapture understood as *Stimmung* is in this sense a transcendence which has nothing to do with the bodily state or the body (*Körper*), even though it is related to the lived body (*Leib*)²⁹⁷. Its relation to sensuality, the body and to sexuality is completely excluded from the discussion²⁹⁸. What is crucial here is that Heidegger ignores and even draws a veil over Nietzsche’s emphasis on the body, through which *Rausch* can be aroused and an aesthetic experience can occur²⁹⁹. To interpret *Rausch* in the way Heidegger interprets it is, however, to disregard Nietzsche’s remarks on the relation between “the distribution

²⁹² For not using rapture instead of *Rausch*, cf. Chapter 4, footnote 13.

²⁹³ WPA, p. 113.

²⁹⁴ Haar, Michel, “Heidegger and the Nietzschean ‘Physiology of Art’”, in David Farrell Krell and David Wood (eds.), *Exceedingly Nietzsche: Aspects of Contemporary Nietzsche Interpretation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010, p. 17. Hereafter HN.

²⁹⁵ HN, p. 15.

²⁹⁶ HN, pp. 17, 19.

²⁹⁷ HN, pp. 14, 17.

²⁹⁸ HN, p. 19.

²⁹⁹ At this point, it may be useful to remind ourselves of Nietzsche’s remarks on art which says even though the physiological states are important in the creation of art, they are not its origin, but it is the nature from which art can be derived.

of semen” in the blood and the creativity of the artist³⁰⁰. Why Heidegger tries to divorce Nietzsche from anything that is related to biology or the body as organism remains to be discussed, yet, to my mind, what Heidegger tries to do is related to saving Nietzsche from the deterministic interpretation of him, which may arise from taking Nietzsche’s remarks on the physiological state of aesthetic experience and put them into the cause and effect relations. Hence, the stripping the body from Nietzsche’s *Rausch* and thus art is to do with saving him from the scientific approach which also Nietzsche criticises in his later works.

Despite all these differences in understanding the issue of *Rausch*, Heidegger too accepts it as a significant element of aesthetic experience and asserts that the sensible is interpreted anew which breaks away from the metaphysical dualism, that is, from separating the sensible and the supra-sensible³⁰¹. This remark, however, does not suffice to redeem Heidegger from his misinterpretations. Furthermore, what strikes one attention is the fact that Heidegger sees his concept of unconcealment of Being in all of the philosophers discussed so far. The function Heidegger is attaching to *Stimmung* is again the disclosure of being, and it is in this sense that *Rausch* as *Stimmung* can be connected to Heidegger’s understanding of aesthetic disinterestedness. However, this understanding skips what Nietzsche brings into view, namely the physiological aspect of aesthetic experience.

From what has been discussed so far, it can now be discerned that in spite of the alleged similarity between Kant and Nietzsche, what Heidegger puts forward actually suits more to his understanding of Being and its revealment rather than what aesthetic disinterestedness means to be either in Kant or Nietzsche. Hence to claim that they are in fact similar but Schopenhauer’s misinterpretation precludes this similarity to be recognised, is a misunderstanding of the concept.

³⁰⁰ *WP*, § 805.

³⁰¹ *HN*, p. 14.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In this thesis I began my discussion of the concept of disinterestedness first of all by paying attention to Kant, who gives a distinctive shape to this concept. To be able to delineate what aesthetic disinterestedness is, in section 2.2, by following Kant's steps, I firstly described the salient features of the judgment of taste (aesthetic judgment), which are the *sine qua non* to understand disinterested aesthetic judgment. Among these features are its being reflective rather than a determinative judgment, its being independent of determinative concepts, and its being aesthetic rather than a cognitive or logical judgment. Last but not least, in describing the features of aesthetic judgment, its demand for a universal demand and, in relation to this, the free play between the cognitive faculties in the process of making an aesthetic judgment are discussed.

After making clear what kind of a judgment an aesthetic judgment is, in section 2.3, before going into disinterestedness of aesthetic judgment, I discussed what an aesthetic judgment cannot contain, namely interest. Interest, as Kant describes it, is connected with the representation of an object and manifests itself in two types of liking, that is, in the liking for the agreeable and for the good. The liking for the beautiful on the other hand is defined as disinterested. The main contrast between the liking for the beautiful on the one hand and the liking for the agreeable and for the good on the other is the latter's relation to one's desires, which mar the aesthetic judgment altogether.

In Chapter 3, I discussed how Schopenhauer interprets the concept of disinterestedness, and since his aesthetics can only be understood as a part of his metaphysics, I firstly brought under discussion his metaphysics (3.1). Schopenhauer has the related conceptions of the world as representation and the world as will. Even though they are considered separate, Schopenhauer elucidates how these two aspects relate to each other. The world as will, by being an irrational, unconscious and impersonal force, is thought to be the underlying principle of the world as

representation, which constitutes the world being organised by the forms of space, time, and causality. So as not to cause any misunderstanding, Schopenhauer distinguishes the two senses of the will, first of which is the will as thing in itself, and the second is the will which registers in human being as desire and therefore as suffering – thus termed the individual will. The individual will enables us to realise the nature of the will, namely its being a blind urge, and, by means of this realisation, it helps us to catch a glimpse of the world as will. Despite this function of the individual will, the most efficient path for such a glimpse of the world as will is thought to be achieved not through realisation of the nature of the will, but through the suppression of the individual will or the individuality of the subject.

One way to suppress the individual will, says Schopenhauer, is asceticism. In fact, it is the moment in which Schopenhauer brings his novelty to the light by making the body a subject for a philosophical discussion (3.2.1). Its Janus-faced nature, that is to say, its being both the site of the immediate manifestation of the will as thing in itself and the site of human being's desires and thus cravings, grants the body a special status in catching a sight of the will.

At this point, aesthetic contemplation and its meaning and function enter into the discussion, since, for Schopenhauer, apart from asceticism, aesthetic contemplation is thought to be able to suppress the individual will and reach the will as thing in itself (3.2.2). This can be achieved, since it is described that in an encounter with the beautiful, firstly, the subject (the beholder or the artist) is immersed in the beautiful and receive the Platonic Ideas and, secondly, in such an enchanted state the subject becomes the pure, will-less subject of cognition. This transformation, however, can happen so long as the desires, which the object or its physical features might arise, are disregarded, at least temporarily. This process of being absorbed in the beautiful on the one hand and of putting aside the desires on the other hand is intertwined, since the immersion in the object amounts to thinking nothing but the object. In other words, in an aesthetic experience, any desires or interest cannot be in one's concern, according to Schopenhauer. This aspect of aesthetic experience is also the thread to which the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness is linked. This link lies in that, in a disinterested liking what is

required is the silencing of the individual cravings and plans concerning the beautiful, and this requirement is claimed to be achieved in Schopenhauer's understanding of aesthetic experience. In addition to this thread, there is also the body, which sets an example of how it can silence desires and interests, at least temporarily.

All these considerations as to Schopenhauer's understanding of aesthetic experience demonstrate on the one hand a continuation of Kant's emphasis on the first requirement of aesthetic experience, that is, the liking for the beautiful must be disinterested. Being devoid of interest, silencing the desires and cravings that are awakened in an aesthetic experience are the points Kant and Schopenhauer can be thought to be in line with each other. On the other hand, these considerations also betray some points of divergence, such as the undue emphasis on the will-lessness of the subject, on the goal to catch a glimpse of the thing in itself, and finally on the body (3.3).

In the examination of Nietzsche's role in the elaboration of the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, I followed his change of approach by taking into account, first of all, his earlier text, *The Birth of Tragedy*, and, afterwards, *On the Genealogy of Morality* (ch. 4). In this chapter, the two forces of nature or two art drives, namely the Apollinian and the Dionysian, are discussed (4.1). These two artistic drives constitute the opposite poles of a scale. While the Apollinian represents calmness, regularity, and individuation, the Dionysian represents an ecstatic state, destruction, and change. The corresponding art worlds are visual arts such as sculpture and architecture in the case of the Apollinian and the non-visual arts such as music and dance in the case of the Dionysian.

Bearing in mind this distinction between these two art drives, so as to discern the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, the objective-subjective dualism in the context of art is scrutinised. According to the traditional view, art, which has thus far thought to be objective, is supposed not to include any subjective features of the artist in order to be called art. It is for this reason that disinterestedness is considered to be in line with this traditional understanding of art and the 'objective' artist. By being devoid of desires and interest in an aesthetic state, the Apollinian art drives are

considered to be in charge of the objective artist. On the other hand, Nietzsche reminds us of the subjective artist, the lyric poet, who unceasingly says 'I' and in whom emotions, desires, and cravings abound. If there is an artist and a type of art which can give voice to these 'subjective' features, it becomes illegitimate to winnow out these unwanted 'subjective' elements from the conception of art and to speak only of the objective, that is disinterested, art. It is at this point that Nietzsche brings the Dionysian forces into effect. This new element is different both from the Dionysian and Apollinian drives. Rather, these Dionysian forces are the ones which keep these two drives in line with each other, that is to say, they include both desires and disinterested state or liking. Hence, as we can see in *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche does not reject the concept of disinterestedness in an aesthetic experience; rather what he suggests is to keep disinterestedness alongside one's desires.

In the next section (4.2), by taking into account *On the Genealogy of Morality*, I discussed how Nietzsche's approach to the concept of disinterestedness has changed. There he zeroes in on the role of desires and interest in an aesthetic experience. In expounding these issues, he accentuates the naturalistic aspect of aesthetic experience, namely the physiology of art. To be able to frame the issue of physiology of art, I discussed *Rausch*, sensuality and sexuality in their relation to aesthetic experience. Another axis of the aesthetic experience, to Nietzsche, is its connection to life. Thinking art or aesthetic experience as a way to escape from the sufferings of life goes contra to the conception of art in Nietzsche, since for him art is itself an affirmation of life in its entirety. Hence, anything that has been thought to cause suffering or pain, namely sensuality, sexuality, and desires, is now, with Nietzsche, thought to be the constitutive elements of aesthetic experience, rather than that which must be suppressed or abolished. In fact, the attempt to suppress or demolish them is what can be considered to be in line with the aim of the concept of disinterestedness. To my mind, what is of utmost importance in Nietzsche's understanding of aesthetic experience is his emphasis on the physiological aspect of it, on the features such as sensuality, sexuality and suffering. These features are actually embedded in life and their suppression by means of affirming disinterestedness – which is here equivalent to denial of life – is nothing but futile.

In the fifth chapter of my thesis, by tracing Heidegger's claims regarding the concept of disinterestedness, that is, by charting the development of this concept by examining Kant, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche from Heidegger's perspective, I tried to outline in what respects Heidegger's claim as to this concept is legitimate and illegitimate. The first issue I discussed concerns whether the concept of disinterestedness means indifference or something which requires an essential relation to the object. By basing his claim on Kant's notion of "unconstrained favouring", which points to an intense relation to the object without the interference of one's desires or interest, Heidegger claims that disinterestedness construed as indifference is not Kant's view. Rather, says Heidegger, this construal has its source in Schopenhauer's misconception of it by reminding us of Schopenhauer's notions of will-less subject or one's withdrawal of the individual will. However, to my mind, what is ignored at this point is the second component of aesthetic experience which Schopenhauer explicates, namely the subject's immersion in the object, being one with it and forgetting all the phenomenal, representational features that the object or the subject has. This component of the aesthetic contemplation in Schopenhauer is, to my mind, sufficient to repudiate any thought which asserts that Schopenhauer helps to spread the understanding of disinterestedness as indifference. On the other hand, what Heidegger asserts to be the case when talking about the concept of disinterestedness is the letting-be, the releasement. This is the main thread of Heidegger's argumentation and this letting the object show itself is the recurrent theme in Heidegger, at least in this discussion. It is true that there can be detected some similarities as to the function of aesthetic experience between Heidegger and Schopenhauer (5.1). Nevertheless, as I have pointed out above, Heidegger's contention that Schopenhauer played "the leading role in the preparation and genesis"³⁰² of this 'misreading' of this concept is untenable.

After indifference is discarded from the discussion of disinterestedness, we can now turn to the discussion of whether there is in fact an interest in the aesthetic experience (5.2). It is at this point that Heidegger claims to detect the similarity

³⁰² WPA, p. 107.

between Nietzsche and Kant. Kant's notion of the "pleasure of reflection", which is a type of pleasure that bears "an interest of the highest sort", is considered to be the aforementioned convergence between Kant and Nietzsche, according to Heidegger. However, I think, at this point at least, Heidegger overlooks what Kant means by the phrase "pleasure of reflection". Pleasure of reflection and the claimed interest in it are related to the form of the object rather than to its physicality or to the desire that this physicality awakens in the beholder. As can be discerned, interest has a different meaning here: a meaning that is not related to the existence of the object or the desires it may arise. Also, what Kant means by the interest, which the pleasure of reflection brings with it, is entirely different from the interest – or excitement and thrill – that, Nietzsche says, embedded in life and in aesthetic experience. In Nietzsche, interest is connected with the physiology of the object and the beholder. Further, the physiology of both the object and the beholder, and what this physiology awakens – namely interests, desires and passions – definitely have a say in aesthetic experience. Interest that may have a connection with what Nietzsche says is the interest which Kant describes at the beginning of the *Critique of Judgment*, not the interest Kant makes use of in discussing "pleasure of reflection". As discussed in Chapter 2, there, Kant describes the concept of interest in its relation to the existence of the object, which is said to be capable of stirring private interests in the beholder. It is for this reason that, in Kant, in order to make a proper aesthetic judgment, interest is excluded unconditionally. In this sense, since what is left outside the aesthetic experience for one – that is, desires, interests, and physiology – is seen as the main component of the aesthetic experience for the other, it is therefore illegitimate to claim such an equation between what these two philosophers argue. In the following pages of the chapter, the topic of *Rausch*, which forms another heading in delineating Heidegger's conception of aesthetic experience, is discussed. We see that by interpreting this notion not from the perspective of physiology, but again from that of the releasement of being, Heidegger divorces aesthetic experience from its bodily, sexual, sensual aspects.

Based on the discussion above, by charting the various interpretations of the concept of aesthetic disinterestedness, it can be deduced that even though aesthetic

disinterestedness was, to a great extent, developed through Kant's treatment of it, the understanding of this concept would have been meagre without problematising it by taking into account the physiological aspect of an aesthetic experience. This physiological aspect, as we saw before, is firstly brought into view by Schopenhauer with his concept of the body, but has mainly flourished in Nietzsche's thoughts. Exclusion of physiology – and also desires, interests, the sensuous and sexual relations – from the aesthetic experience, and considering this experience merely as that which takes place so long as one is disinterested, are nothing but an attempt to separate the aesthetic experience, which is *embedded in life*, from life itself. It therefore points to an effort in vain. Besides, even though Heidegger criticises Schopenhauer for his 'misreading' of the concept of disinterestedness, and, for this reason, distances himself from the latter, in my opinion, there is a common element in Heidegger and Schopenhauer. It is true that the body enters into discussion through Schopenhauer, but this does not mean that the significance of the role of the body and physicality is entirely recognised in his considerations on aesthetic experience. Also, we saw (in ch. 5) that Heidegger overlooked the role of physiology in the discussion of aesthetic experience. Hence, we can conclude that the underestimating the importance of physiology in aesthetic experience is one of the common elements that can be found in Schopenhauer and Heidegger. Besides, instead of directing their investigations to the aesthetic experience per se, both of them make use of the *disinterestedness* of the comportment to the beautiful: Heidegger in disclosing the Being, Schopenhauer in reaching the will as thing in itself. Either of these attempts, however, does not consider the concept itself in aesthetic experience, but pay attention to it with the aim of bringing to light their own philosophy. Along with this point, it should be stated that in fact each of the philosophers discussed throughout this thesis treats the concept of disinterestedness in a different context. That is to say, Kant discusses disinterestedness in the context of judgment while Schopenhauer, as mentioned above, in that of his metaphysics. Nietzsche relates it to physiology and, lastly, Heidegger addresses it in his discussion of unconcealment.

All these aside, as a last point I would briefly like to consider some further implications about the concept of disinterestedness. Disinterestedness, which has been treated as belonging mostly to ethics (even though it was transformed into the discipline of aesthetics in the eighteenth-century British thought), to my mind, continues to bear this aspect in and after Schopenhauer. What can be found in an aesthetic experience as similar to the ethical or religious thinking is, firstly, the withdrawal from one's willings or desires, which have been thought to engender suffering and pain (Schopenhauer and Kant). Secondly, seeking a 'pure repose' even in an aesthetic experience (Schopenhauer), which is, in fact, a site where one can extol their sensuality and physicality, betrays the resemblance between the aesthetic experience and ethical thinking. In this understanding, by emphasising, firstly, turning away from anything that is related to desires, passions, and physiology, and, secondly, what can be 'reached' as a result, namely the thing in itself, the Being, or the world as will, aesthetic experience again exhibit a resemblance to the ethical or religious thinking.

Furthermore, removing the veil from that which is hidden and mostly escapes from one – the world as will, the Being – as in the case of Schopenhauer and Heidegger, betrays the traditional, metaphysical, dualistic worldview: in the case of human being, there is a side which is observable such as the body and a side which is unseen such as its Being, its essence or the thing in itself. Further, in the case of life, this dualistic view shows itself in the designations phenomenal and noumenal. Disinterestedness, to my mind, is only an example of this thinking. Considering human being as “a winged cherub without a body”³⁰³ betrays what is incompatible with the actual human being with their desires, interests and body, which do not preclude but rather promote both one's aesthetic experience and judgment.

³⁰³ *WWR I*, § 18, p. 99.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berger, David, *Kant's Aesthetics Theory: The Beautiful and Agreeable*. London and New York: Continuum, 2009. (KAT)

Carbone, Mauro, "The Thinking of the Sensible", in Fred Evans and Leonard Lawlor (eds.), *Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2000. (TS)

Cassirer, Ernst, *Kant's Life and Thought*. Tr. James Haden. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Caygill, Howard, *A Kant Dictionary*, Oxford, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Daniels, Paul, "Kant on the Beautiful: The Interest in Disinterestedness", *Colloquy Text Theory Critique*, Issue: 16, December 2008, p. 206. (KB)

Faas, Ekbart, *Genealogy of Aesthetics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Guyer, Paul, "Disinterestedness and Desire in Kant's Aesthetics", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 36, no. 4, Summer 1978, pp. 449-60.

Guyer, Paul, *Kant and the Experience of Freedom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. (KEF)

Guyer, Paul, "Pleasure and Knowledge in Schopenhauer's Aesthetics", in Dale Jacquette (ed.), *Schopenhauer, Philosophy and the Arts*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Haar, Michel, "Heidegger and the Nietzschean 'Physiology of Art'", in David Farrell Krell and David Wood (eds.), *Exceedingly Nietzsche: Aspects of Contemporary Nietzsche Interpretation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010. (HN)

Hammermeister, Kai, *The German Aesthetic Tradition*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. (GAT)

Heidegger, Martin, *Nietzsche: Volume I: The Will to Power as Art*. Tr. D. F. Krell. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1991. (WPA)

Homer, *The Iliad*. Tr. Robert Fagles, New York: Penguin Books, 1990.

Jacquette, Dale, “Schopenhauer’s Metaphysics of Appearance and Will in the Philosophy of Art”, in Dale Jacquette (ed.), *Schopenhauer, Philosophy and the Arts*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. (MAW)

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgment*. Tr. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett, 1987. (CJ)

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*. Tr. Norman Kemp Smith. London: The Macmillan Press, 1992. (CPR)

Lyotard, Jean-François, “*Sensus communis: The Subject in statu nascendi*”, in E. Cadava, P. Connor, J.-L. Nancy (eds.), *Who Comes After the Subject?* New York and London: Routledge, 1991.

Lyotard, Jean-François, *Lessons on the Analytic of the Sublime*. Tr. Elizabeth Rottenberg. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Marsden, Jill, *After Nietzsche: Notes Towards a Philosophy of Ecstasy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. (AN)

Moore, Gregory, *Nietzsche, Biology and Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Nietzsche Contra Wagner*, in Walter Kaufmann (Tr. and ed.), *The Portable Nietzsche*. New York: Penguin Books, 1988.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *On the Genealogy of Morality*. Tr. Maudemarie Clark and Alan J. Swensen. Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett, 1998. (GM)

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings*. Tr. Judith Norman. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Birth of Tragedy*. Tr. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books, 1967. (BT)

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Will to Power*. Tr. Walter Kaufmann, R. J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage Books, 1968. (WP)

Plato, *Symposium*. Tr. Alexander Nehamas, Paul Woodruff. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1989.

Rehberg, Andrea, “*Delectare aude*: On a Non-Rational Requirement of Enlightenment according to Kant”. Unpublished conference paper. (DA)

Rehberg, Andrea, “On a Feeling for All: Kant, Arendt and Lyotard on *sensus communis*”, *Cogito*, no. 74, Summer 2013, pp. 150-66. (KAL)

Rehberg, Andrea, “The Overcoming of Physiology”, *The Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, Issue: 23, Spring 2002.

Rehberg, Andrea, “The Problem of Subsumption”, in *Immanuel Kant - Essays Presented at the Muğla University International Kant Symposium*, Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 2007, pp.573-80. (PS)

Ridley, Aaron, “Une Promesse de Bonheur? Beauty in the *Genealogy*”, in Simon May (ed.), *Nietzsche’s On the Genealogy of Morality, A Critical Guide*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Rind, Miles, “The Concept of Disinterestedness in Eighteenth-Century British Aesthetics”, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 40, No. 1, January 2002. (CDE)

Sallis, John, "Dionysus – In Excess of Metaphysics", in David Farrell Krell and David Wood (eds.), *Exceedingly Nietzsche*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988. (EM)

Sallis, John, *Crossings: Nietzsche and the Space of Tragedy*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991. (*Crossings*)

Schacht, Richard, *Nietzsche*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. (RS)
Schiller, Jerome, "An Alternative to 'Aesthetic Disinterestedness'", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 22, No. 3, Spring 1964.

Schopenhauer, Arthur, *The World as Will and Representation: In Two Volumes, Volume I*. Tr. E. F. J. Payne. New York: Dover Publications, 1969. (*WWR I*)

Schopenhauer, Arthur, *The World as Will and Representation: In Two Volumes, Volume II*. Tr. E. F. J. Payne. New York: Dover Publications, 1958.

Schopenhauer, Arthur, *The World as Will and Representation: Volume I*. Tr. Judith Norman, Alistair Welchman, Christopher Janaway. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Stolnitz, Jerome, "On the Origin of 'Aesthetic Disinterestedness'", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 20, No. 2, Winter 1961. (OAD)

White, David A., "The Metaphysics of Disinterestedness: Shaftesbury and Kant", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Winter 1973. (MD)

Wood, Robert E., *Placing Aesthetics: Reflections on the Philosophic Tradition*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1999. (PA)

Taminiaux, Jacques, *Poetics, Speculation and Judgment: The Shadow of The Work of Art from Kant to Phenomenology*. Tr. Michael Gendre. Albany: SUNY Press, 1993. (P)

Urpeth, Jim, "Nietzsche and the Rapture of Aesthetic Disinterestedness: A Response to Heidegger", in Nicholas Martin (ed.), *Nietzsche and the German Tradition*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003. (NR)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY

Felsefe tarihi boyunca benzer bir düşüncenin, farklı formlarda dahi olsa, birçok felsefi tartışmanın altında yattığını fark etmek şaşırtıcıdır. Bu düşüncenin en iyi görülebileceği nokta ise bir konunun felsefe yapmaya uygun bir konu olarak sayılabilmesi için o konunun fiziksel olan her şeyden – arzulardan, tutkularından – arındırılmış olması gerektiğinin düşünülmesi olgusudur. Sadece beden ve beden ile ilişkili olan her şeyin tartışma dışı bırakılması değil, aynı zamanda bunların karşısında yer aldığı ve beden ile ilişkilendirildiğinde bozulduğu düşünülenlerin, yani usun, zihnin, ruhun, yüceltilmesi felsefede olduğu gibi etik, sanat ve sanatçı ile alakalı tartışmalara da hakim olmuştur.

Bu düşünme şeklini en iyi örnekleyen konulardan biri ise estetik çıkarlıksızlık (*aesthetic disinterestedness*) kavramıdır. Estetik çıkarlıksızlık kavramı ile ilgili tartışmalar onsekizinci yüzyıl İngiliz filozoflarının eserlerinde karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Bu filozoflar estetik tartışmaları ile bir değişime yol açmışlardır. Şöyle ki, onların tartışmalarıyla estetik deneyimde güzelin kendisinden çok seyircinin (*beholder*) kendisi öne çıkmıştır. Öznenin nesne karşısında uyanan duyguları ve düşünceleri ile öznenin us tarafından yaratılan güzellik algısının nesneyi güzel yaptığı düşüncesi gelişmiştir. Bu gelişme beraberinde bazı eleştirileri de getirmiştir, bunlardan en önemlisi güzelin kendisinin özelliklerine yüz çevrilmesinin eleştirisidir. Sadece güzelin değil, estetik deneyimde aynı zamanda öznenin de fizyolojisi ve bu fizyolojiye bağlı unsurlar tartışma dışı bırakılmış ve önemsenmemiştir. Güzelin ve öznenin fizyolojisi yerine konulan ve vurgulanan ise güzelin uyandırdığı veya ürettiği formal özelliklerdir. Estetik çıkarlıksızlık kavramının tartışılması da bu noktada karşımıza çıkmaktadır.

Çıkarlıksızlık kavramı estetikte karşımıza çıkmadan önce ahlaki ve dini alanlarda kendisini gösterir. Bu alanlarda ifade ettiği mana ise bencil olmamak ve yardımseverlikle ilgilidir. Çıkarlıksızlık kavramı karşıtı olan çıkarlılık kavramı ile beraber düşünüle gelmiştir. Bu bakımdan ben-merkezci olmamak olarak tanımlanan

çıkarsızlık bir deęilleme ile kurulmuştur. Çıkarsızlığın karşıtı olan çıkar üzerinden tanımlanması onsekizinci yüzyılda olduęu gibi daha sonraki yüzyıllarda da devam etmiştir.

Estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının gelişimi ise – bu kavramın etik alanından estetik alanına taşınması – yukarıda deęinildięi gibi onsekizinci yüzyıl İngiliz filozofları arasında başlamıştır. Bu filozoflardan estetik çıkarsızlık kavramını, her ne kadar kısa olsa da, açık bir şekilde dile getirenler arasında, Üçüncü Shaftesbury Kontu Anthony Ashley Cooper, Francis Hutcheson, Edmund Burke ve Archibald Alison sayılabilir. Bu filozofların estetik çıkarsızlık kavramı konusundaki yorumları kendilerinden sonra gelecek olan bir çok düşünürü etkilemiştir.

Bu tezde, estetik çıkarsızlık kavramı Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche ve Heidegger çizgisinde ele alınıp irdelenmektedir. Tezin ana hatları şöyledir: tezin ilk bölümünde yukarıda adı geçen onsekizinci yüzyıl İngiliz filozofları kısaca incelenir ve tarihsel arka plan verilmeye çalışılır. İkinci bölümde ise estetik çıkarsızlık kavramına bugünkü manasını veren Kant'ta bu kavramın ne ifade ettięi ve estetik yargıdaki rolü sunulup genel tartışmada estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının temel alınacak özellikleri irdelenir. Üçüncü bölümde, Schopenhauer'ın estetik anlayışını anlamlandırabilmek için öncelikle metafizięi tartışılır. Ardından, Schopenhauer'ın estetięi nasıl metafizik dünya görüşüyle beraber düşündüęü ve estetięi ancak metafizięi içinde anlamlandırılabileceęi tartışılır. Bu tartışmada önce çıkan husus beden tartışmaya katılmasıdır. Her ne kadar Schopenhauer'da beden estetik deneyimin olmazsa olmaz bir parçası olarak görülmesi de, beden çıkarsız estetik deneyime örnek teşkil ettięi vurgulanır. Dördüncü bölüm estetik çıkarsızlık kavramına dair Nietzsche'nin deęişen yorumlarını irdeler. Bu amaçla, ilk olarak erken bir eseri olan *Tragedyanın Doğuşu* incelenir. Burada estetik çıkarsızlık kavramı yadsınmasa da tamamen de olumlanmaz. Daha geç bir eseri olan *Ahlakın Soykütüğü*'nde ise Nietzsche'nin estetik çıkarsızlık kavramını eleştirdięi görülür. Bu eleştiri estetik deneyimin arzu, haz, çıkar ve fizyolojiden ayrı düşünölemeyeceęi üzerine temellendirilmiştir. Bu noktayı açılmayabilmek için, fizyoloji ve esrime (*Rausch*) tartışılmıştır. Son olarak beşinci bölümde, Heidegger'in öne sürdüęü estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının yanlış okunmasının Schopenhauer'dan kaynaklandığı ve

Nietzsche'nin bu noktada Schopenhauer'dan etkilendiğini düşüncesi incelenir ve sorunsallaştırılır. Ayrıca, Heidegger'in Kant ve Nietzsche arasında gördüğü benzerlik tartışılır. Teze ilişkin bu genel bakışın ardından Kant ile başlayan estetik çıkarırsızlık kavramının irdelenmesine geçilebilir.

Estetik çıkarırsızlık kavramını anlayabilmek için ilk olarak bu kavramın Kant'ta hangi bağlamda ele alındığını irdelemek gerekmektedir. Estetik çıkarırsızlık kavramı, Kant'ın *Yargı Yetisinin Eleştirisi*'nde beğeni yargısının, diğer bir deyişle estetik yargının, temel özellikleriyle birlikte ele alınarak anlaşılabilir. Bu sebeple, ilk olarak estetik yargının belirleyici (*determinative*) değil reflektif olduğu vurgulanmalıdır. Bu ifade ile anlatılmak istenen ise estetik yargıda tikelin verili olduğu (örneğin, güzel şey/nesne) ve bu tikel için yargının kendisinin tümeli ya da kavramı bulmasıdır. Diğer bir deyişle, estetik yargıda tikelin altında toplanabileceği önceden belirlenmiş herhangi bir tümel ya da kavram yoktur. Bu da güzeli betimleyen ya da tanımlayan bir kavramın olmadığını söylemek ile eş değerdir. Neyin güzel olduğu önceden kesin olarak belli değildir, nesne öznenin kendi içerisinde gerçekleşen sürecin sonucunda elde edilen estetik yargıya göre güzel olarak adlandırılır.

Estetik yargının bu özelliği bu yargının bir diğer özelliği olan estetik yargının belirleyici (*determinative*) kavramlardan bağımsız olması ile yakından ilişkilidir. Ancak bu bağımsızlık estetik yargıda kavramların kullanılmadığı şeklinde anlaşılmalıdır, çünkü en başta bir nesnenin anlaşılabilmesi ve estetik bir biçimde tecrübe edilebilmesi için kavramlara ve onların kullanımına ihtiyaç vardır. Fakat, kavramların estetik deneyime katılımı belirsiz bir biçimde, yani nesnenin ne olduğu ve hangi amaç için olduğu belirlenmeden, gerçekleşmektedir. Bir başka deyişle, estetik yargıda güzelin kendisine dair bir açıklama, kavramların belirsiz kullanıp söz konusu nesneyi bilmeye olanak vermemesi dolayısıyla, verilememektedir.

Beğeni yargısının bir diğer özelliği bu yargının bilişsel olmaktan ziyade estetik olmasıdır. Burada ifade edilen özellik, güzelin, söz konusu nesneye ya da bu nesneye dair bilişsel bir ilişkiye değil, kişinin haz (*Lust*) ve hazzsızlık (*Unlust*) duygularına işaret etmesidir. Bu bakımdan ele alındığında estetik yargının öznel bir yargı olduğu söylenebilmektedir. Diğer bir ifade ile, burada vurgulanan estetik yargının, nesnenin

kendisiyle değil, estetik yargıyı yapanın (seyircinin) verdiği tepki ya da yargısı ile alakalı olduğudur. Bu tartışmada Kant'ı ilgilendiren seyircinin yargısı ve bu yargının oluşma sürecidir: Kant'ın ifadesiyle, estetik yargının yapılabilmesinin olanağının koşullarının araştırılmasıdır.

Estetik yargının evrensel olması özelliği ise estetik yargının çıkarılsızlık özelliğini anlamada bize yeni bir yol açar. Bu evrensellik iddiası, estetik yargının öznel, yani kişinin öznel haz ve hazzınlık duygularına işaret etmesine rağmen, aynı kişinin nesneye dair verdiği yargının evrensel olduğunu varsayması ve dolayısıyla bu evrensel yargısının başkaları tarafından da kabul edileceğinin düşünülmesidir. Bir öznenin yaptığı estetik yargının evrensel olduğunu düşünmesi, öncelikle öznel bir yargı olduğu söylenen estetik yargıdaki 'öznel' ifadesinin Kant için ne ifade edildiğine bakılması gerekmektedir. Öznellik Kant'ta iki farklı manada kullanılmıştır. Bunlardan ilki, gündelik hayatta kullanılan özneli, yani öznenin kişisel durumunu imlemektedir. Diğer mana ise Kant'ın estetik yargının evrensel olmasında da kullandığı tüm insanlarda ortak olan yetileri (*faculties*) imlemektedir. Bu sebeple, Kant, her insanda aynı yetiler olduğundan öznenin yaptığı yargı da evrenseldir sonucuna varmıştır. Bunun yanında, evrensellik iddiasının estetik çıkarılsızlık ile ilgili olan bir tarafı da vardır. Bu da estetik yargıda, öznenin nesnenin ne olduğu ile ilgilenmemesi, dolayısıyla özneyi nesneye sahip olma ve onu kullanmaya dair isteklerine yönelten dürtülerin engellendiği düşüncesidir. Diğer bir yandan, evrensel onay talebi öznenin estetik yargısını çıkarılsız olarak verdiği düşüncesine de dayanmaktadır. Öznenin öznel ilgilerini, isteklerini ve arzularını estetik yargısının dışında bıraktığının düşünülmesi, özneye kendisinden başka herkesin de kendi verdiği estetik yargıda onunla aynı fikirde olacaklarını beklemesine gerekçe oluşturmaktadır.

Estetik yargının tüm bu özelliklerinin yanında, estetik yargının nasıl yapıldığına dair bir açıklama da gerekmektedir. Bu nokta bilişsel yetilerin – imgelem ile anlama yetisi – arasındaki ahenkli etkileşim (*free/harmonious play*) ile açıklanmaktadır. Bilişsel yetilerin bu ahenkli etkileşiminde, nesnenin temsilini temin eden imgelem ile bu temsile kurallar yükleyen anlama yetisi belirsiz olarak etkileşir. Bu etkileşimde, anlama yetisinin kavramları belirsiz bir şekilde rol alır ve imgelem

anlama yetisi tarafından sınırlandırılmaz; böylelikle, imgelem ile anlama yetisinin etkileşiminde herhangi bir nesnel bilgi ortaya çıkmaz. Bu ahenkli etkileşimin sonucunda ortaya çıkan ise estetik hazdır. Genellikle estetik deneyimi başlatan unsur olarak düşünülen ve bu sebeple sürecin sonunda değil başında var olduğu düşünülen estetik hazın Kant'ın tartıştığı estetik yargının yapılması sürecinde en son karşımıza çıkması ise estetik deneyim tartışmasında Kant'ın getirdiği bir yeniliktir.

Çıkarsızlık kavramını anlayabilmek için öncelikle Kant'ın çıkar kavramını nasıl tanımladığının ve bu kavramının nerede ve nasıl ortaya çıktığının açıklanması gerekmektedir. Çıkar, bir nesnenin varoluşunun temsiline dair bir beğeniye ifade etmektedir. Beğeni ise, Kant'a göre üçe ayrılmaktadır, bunlar, hoş bulunan, iyi olan ve güzel için olan beğenilerdir. Bu beğeniler, temsiller ile öznenin haz ve hazzsızlık duygusu arasında oluşabilecek üç tür ilişkiyi imlemektedir. Bu üç tür ilişkiden iyi olan ve hoş bulunan için olan beğeniler çıkar barındırdığı halde, güzel için olan beğeni çıkarsız olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bu sınıflandırmanın arkasında yatan sebep ise iyi olan ve hoş bulunan için olan beğenin nesnenin varoluşunu öne çıkartarak özneye oluşabilecek duyumsal (*sensual*) veya ahlaki tatmin isteklerini açığa çıkartacak yolun açılacak olmasıdır. Ancak, bu tam da hoş bulunan için olan beğenin öznenin öznel, duyumsal ilgilerini tetikleyen, iyi olan için ise öznenin faydacı amaçlarını öne çıkartan özellikleri dolayısıyla Kant'ın saf, düşünsel estetik yargının dışında bırakmak istediği unsurlardır. Kant'a göre, bilişsel yetilerin ahenkli etkileşimine yol açarak estetik hazı üreten ve estetik yargıyı mümkün kılan nesnenin fiziksel değil biçimsel (*formal*) özellikleridir. Ayrıca, Kant'a göre, bu biçimsel özellikler ancak estetik yargı çıkarsız yapılırsa ve öznel ilgilerin ve arzuların müdahalesi engellenirse fark edilebilir.

Estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının gelişimi ve yorumlanmasında incelenmesi gereken bir diğer figür Schopenhauer'dır. Schopenhauer'ın estetik hakkındaki düşünceleri ancak onun metafizik tartışması içinde anlaşılabilirdiğinden bu tezde öncelikle Schopenhauer'ın metafiziği açıklanmaya çalışılmaktadır. Schopenhauer'ın dünyayı istenç ve tasarım olarak tanımlamıştır. Tasarım olarak dünya, özne tarafından getirilen uzay zaman ve nedensellik formlarından oluşmuştur. Bu formlar evrensel unsurlar olarak görülüp kavramayı ve deneyimi mümkün kılarlar. İstenç

olarak dünya ise tasarım olarak dünyanın ardında yatan, onu teşkil eden ilke olarak tanımlanmıştır. İstenç kişiye ilişkin olmayan (*impersonal*), irrasyonel bir kuvvettir ve tasarım olarak dünyanın tersine formlardan bağımsızdır. Schopenhauer istenci iki farklı manaya gelecek şekilde kullanır. Bunlardan ilkinde istenç kendinde-şey olarak tasvir edilir iken, diğer istenç insanda arzu ve ızdırıp olarak açığa çıkar. Bireysel istenç olarak adlandırılan bu ikinci tür istenç, kendinde-şey olarak istenci, bir anlık dahi olsa, görmede insana yardımcı olur. Bu yardım, bireysel istencin, kendinde-şey olarak istencin doğasının, insanda arzuları harekete geçiren kör bir dürtü (*blind urge*) olduğunu açığa çıkartmasıyla gerçekleşir. Ancak, kendinde-şey olarak istence ulaşmada daha sorunsuz olarak düşünülen seçenek bireysel istencin, kısa bir süreliğine dahi olsa, askıya alınmasıdır.

Bu noktada, kendinde-şey olarak istence ulaşmanın yeterli ve kabul edilebilir ölçüde gerçekleşebileceği ve bireysel istencin çilecilik yoluyla bastırılabilmesi en uygun yer olarak görülen beden tartışmaya katılır. Bedenin hem kişiye ilişkin olmayan istence ulaşmada hem de bireysel istencin bastırmadaki rolü onun ikili doğasından kaynaklanmaktadır: kendinde-şey olarak istencin dolaysız belirişi (*manifestation*) olarak beden ve öznenin arzularının, tutkularının ve ızdırabının cereyan ettiği alan olarak beden. Bireysel istencin bastırılması ya da kısa süreliğine iptal edilmesi bedenin çilesi (*mortification*) ile – en azından kısmi olarak – bedenin sunduğu haz veya onun belirgin kıldığı arzulardan yüz çevirmek yoluyla gerçekleşebilir.

Schopenhauer'a göre bireysel istenci, öznenin bedende belirgin kılınan arzularından ve hazlarından vazgeçerek, diğer bir deyişle çilecilikle, bastırmasından başka bir başka yol daha vardır: estetik anlayış (*aesthetic contemplation*). Öznenin güzel ile karşılaşması, öznenin (sanatçının kendisinin ya da seyircinin) nesneyi estetik açıdan kavramasına ve Platonik ideaların ya da söz konusu nesnenin Platonik ideasının idrakine yol açar. Böyle bir deneyimde, sadece nesnenin Platonik ideasının idraki ile kendinde-şey olarak istencin açıldığı dünyaya yaklaşma değil, aynı zamanda öznenin de dönüşümü söz konusudur. Estetik anlayışta, özne kavramının arı ve istençsiz (*will-less*) öznesine dönüşür. Fakat, bu dönüşümün gerçekleşebilmesi ancak öznenin nesnenin bireysel istenç ile olan ilişkisiyle ilgilenmemesi, nesnenin

fiziksel özelliklerinin özne için en yüksek değeri oluşturmaması ve son olarak nesnenin insanda uyandırabileceği her türlü arzu ve çıkarları bir kenara koyması ile mümkündür. Estetik deneyimde gerçekleşen bu iki değişimin ilkinde, tasarım olarak dünyadan kendinde-şey olarak istencin açıldığı dünyaya ulaşmada bir yol olarak düşünüldüğü için Schopenhauer'ın estetik hakkındaki düşünceleri metafiziğinden ayrı olarak düşünülmemelidir.

Bedenin arzu ve bireysel istencin açığa çıkma alanı olmasının yanında bu arzu ve istençten yüz çevirmeye de en uygun alan olarak düşünülmesi estetik deneyimde estetik çıkarlılığın nasıl bir rol oynadığını anlamada bize bir örnek teşkil etmektedir. Bedenin bu ikili rolü, – örneğin, ilerde görülebileceği gibi, Nietzsche'de arzu, haz ve çıkarların etkin olması gerektiği düşünülen – estetik deneyimde öznenin çıkarlılık kavramı ile dışarıda bırakılan haz, arzu ve çıkarlarını nasıl deneyimin dışında bırakabileceğini ya da bu dışarıda bırakma gereksiniminin nasıl kurulduğunu anlamada bize yardım etmektedir.

Son olarak, Schopenhauer ve Kant'un hangi noktalarda birleştiği ve ayrıştığı estetik çıkarlılığa dair yorumları anlamada gereklidir. Her iki filozofun kabul ettiği düşünce estetik deneyimde (Kant için estetik yargıda) yapılan öznenin arzu ve çıkarlarının askıya alınması ya da kısa süreliğine iptalidir. Öznenin nesneyle olan olağan ilişkisinin – diğer bir deyişle, onu nesneye karşı hareket etmeye sevk edecek herhangi bir arzu uyandırıp Kant'ın estetik reflektif yargısını, Schopenhauer'ın ise kavramın istençsiz öznesinin arılığını bozabilecek, nesnenin belirlenmesi, tanımlanması ya da nesnenin fiziksel özellikleri ile ilgili herhangi bir ilişki – nesnenin estetik olarak deneyimi için terk edilmesi fikri Kant ve Schopenhauer'ı birleştiren bir noktadır. Kısaca, bu iki filozofu birleştiren estetik çıkarlılık hakkındaki görüşleridir. Diğer yandan, aralarındaki farklılık Schopenhauer'ın kavramın arı ve istençsiz öznesine, kendinde-şeye ulaşma amacına ve bedene yaptığı vurgulardır.

Nietzsche'nin estetik çıkarlılık kavramına karşı olan görüşleri ise onun erken ve geç eserleri dikkate alınarak açıklanmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu amaçla, ilk olarak *Tragedyanın Doğuşu* ardından *Ahlakın Soykütüğü*'ndeki görüşleri incelenmiştir. Nietzsche *Tragedyanın Doğuşunda*, doğanın temel kuvvetleri diye tanımladığı ve

hem sanatı oluşturduğunu hem de onda operatif olduğunu söylediği Apolloncu ve Diyonisosçu dürtüleri (*drive*) anlatır. Bu sanat dürtüleri doğanın kendisinden gelmektedir ve özne (sanatçı ya da seyirci) sanatta edilgen olarak düşünülmüştür. Bu dürtülerinden ilki olan Apolloncu sanat dürtüsü düzenlilik ve açık seçikliğinin hakim olduğu bir dürtü olarak tasvir edilir. Bireyselleşmenin sınırlarını ve öz-bilgiyi (*self-knowledge*) tayin etmek bu dürtünün temel özelliklerindedir. Diyonisosçu sanat dürtüsünde ise öz-unutkanlık (*self-forgetfulness*) etkindir. Diyonisosçu sanat dürtüsünde sınırların kaybolması, ekstatik (*ecstatic*, kendinin dışında olma) olma durumu hakimdir. Apolloncu dürtünün sakinliğine ve durağanlığına karşın Diyonisosçu dürtüde sürekli bir yıkım, yapım, yani değişim ve oluş vardır.

Nietzsche'nin estetik deneyim tartışmasında öne çıkan – ve estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının da daha belirgin bir biçimde görülebildiği – bir diğer konu ise öznel sanatçı, yani lirik şairdir. Bu tartışmada, sanatçı kavramına iliştirilmiş olan 'nesnel' ve 'öznel' adlandırmaları sorunsallaştırılmıştır. Kendi arzu ve istencini bastıran ve güzeli çıkarsız bir şekilde deneyimleyebilen 'nesnel' sanatçı sanat tarihi boyunca övülmüştür. Ayrıca 'nesnel' sanatçının yalnızca bu özelliklerinin sanatı oluşturduğu düşünülmüştür. Bu düşüncede 'nesnel' sanat ve sanatçı anlayışının çıkarsızlık kavramı ile paralel olduğu görülebilmektedir. Bu geleneksel sanat anlayışında, 'öznel' sanatçı ifadesinin kendi içinde çelişkili olduğu ileri sürülmüştür. Çünkü bu geleneksel bakış açısından sanat ve onu üreten sanatçı ancak nesnel olabilir. Böylelikle, arzuları ve tutkuları öne çıkartan 'öznel' sanatçı fikri sanat ile ilgili tartışmalardan dışlanmıştı. Ancak bu tutum Nietzsche'nin de altını çizdiği öznel düşünce ve duygularını ifade eden lirik şairi açıklayamamaktadır. Buradan hareketle, bu tartışmada benim vurgulamak istediğim Nietzsche'nin bu geleneksel sanat anlayışına karşı mesafeli olduğu ve sanata ve sanatçıya yüklenen 'nesnel' ve 'öznel' olarak adlandırılan nitelermelerin *doxa* olduğunu düşünmesidir. Nietzsche'nin, bu sanatın ve sanatçının geleneksel algılanışından kendini uzaklaştırması, her iki durumu ('nesnel' ve 'öznel') da içeren kapsayıcı bir kavramın ortaya atılmasıyla anlaşılabilir: Diyonisosçu kuvvetler. Bu kuvvetler Nietzsche'nin daha önce tartıştığı Diyonisosçu sanat dürtüsünden farklıdır. Diyonisosçu kuvvetler, hem Apolloncu hem de Diyonisosçu sanat dürtülerini içeren, bir başka ifade ile, hem

çıkarsızlığı, 'nesnelliği' içeren, hem de arzu, haz ve çıkarları, yani 'öznelliği' göz önünde bulunduran yeni bir sanat anlayışını ifade eder. Dolayısıyla, *Tragedyanın Doğuşunda*, Nietzsche'nin estetik çıkarsızlık kavramını topyekün kabul etmesini değil ama onu arzu ve hazlarla beraber düşünmesini görürüz.

Nietzsche'nin *Ahlakın Soykütüğü* adlı eserinde ise estetik çıkarsızlık kavramı konusundaki düşüncelerinin değiştiği göze çarpmaktadır. Bu eserde, Nietzsche'nin estetik deneyimde arzuların ve hazların rolü üzerine olan vurgusu daha belirgindir. Nietzsche, burada, estetik deneyimin naturalist açıklamasında genel anlamda fizyoloji ve özel anlamda sanatta fizyolojiye dair tartışmaları vurgulamıştır. Sanatta fizyolojinin rolünün daha da anlaşılması için bedensel durumların, esrimenin, duyumsallığın (*sensuality*) ve cinselliğin sanat ile ilişkisi incelenmiştir. Nietzsche yaratımında ya da algılanmasında estetik deneyim ile fizyolojinin ayrılmazlığını vurgulamıştır. Sanatın fizyoloji ile olan bağı bizi, Schopenhauer'ı da tartışmaya dahil edecek bir başka tartışmaya, yani sanatın yaşam ile olan ilişkisine götürür. Nietzsche'ye göre, yaşam olumlama (*affirmation*). Bu anlayış ise Schopenhauer'ın sanat ve sanat deneyimi ile ilgili olan anlayışına karşıtlık oluşturmaktadır. Schopenhauer'a göre, sanat deneyimi, kendinde-şey olarak istence ulaşmada, özneye bireysel istençten, dolayısıyla arzu ve çıkarlardan kurtulmada yardım eder. Dolayısıyla, Nietzsche'ye göre yaşama içkin olan arzuları, hazları susturmaya çalışarak, Schopenhauer yaşamı olumlamak yerine onu yadsır. Nietzsche'ye göre sanat duyumsallık, cinsellik ve esrime hali ile ilişkileri ile Schopenhauer'ın sanat anlayışına karşıt konumlanır. Sanat arzuları, hazları ve dolayısıyla yaşamın kendisini bastırmanın yerine yaşamı olumlar ve yüceltir. Tüm bu sebepler nedeniyle, bu daha geç eserinde, Nietzsche, yaşamın temel özelliklerini reddedilmesine imkan sağlayan bir kavram olması sebebiyle estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının pozitif değerlendirilmesini sorunsallaştırır.

Estetik çıkarsızlık tartışmasında incelediğim son filozof olan Heidegger, öne sürdüğü düşüncesiyle bu tezin ana figürlerini belirlemiştir. Bu sebeple, bu kavramın gelişiminde Heidegger'in hangi noktadaki yorumlarının haklı ve hangi eleştirilerinin bizi bu kavramı doğru anlamada yanlış yöne yönlendireceğini irdelemek gerekmektedir. Heidegger'in ana savı estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının

yorumlanmasında Schopenhauer'ın yanlış okumasının baskın olduğu, ve Kant ve Nietzsche aslında benzer fikirler öne sürse de – bu benzerlik Heidegger'in var olduğunu iddia ettiği bir benzerliktir – Nietzsche'nin estetik çıkarsızlık kavramı konusunda Schopenhauer'un bu yanlış okumasından fazlasıyla etkilendiğidir.

Heidegger'in bu iddialarını anlayabilmek için öncelikle estetik çıkarsızlık kavramına dair Heidegger'in Kant ve Schopenhauer hakkında tartıştığı konulara bakmak gerekmektedir. Heidegger ilk olarak çıkarsızlığın kayıtsızlık (ilgisizlik, *indifference*) mı yoksa 'asli doğamızın üstün bir çabası' (*supreme effort of our essential nature*) mı olduğu fikrini tartışmaya açar. Bu tartışmada Kant'ın kullandığı bir ifade olan 'sınırlandırılmamış beğeni'den (*unconstained favouring*) yararlanarak çıkarsızlığın kayıtsızlık anlamına gelemeyeceğini tartışır. Ona göre, çıkarsızlık nesneye karşı bir kayıtsızlığı değil, nesne ile özsel bir ilişkiyi ifade eder. Ardından, Heidegger çıkarsızlık kavramının kayıtsızlık olarak anlaşılmasına Schopenhauer'ın yol açtığını söyler. Heidegger bu savını destekleyebilmek için, estetik deneyim tartışmasında Schopenhauer'ın nesneye karşı istençsizlik ve alakasızlık (*apathy*) durumlarını tartışmanın merkezine koyduğunu ve yanlış okumaya sebebiyet verdiğini iddia eder. Fakat, Heidegger burada, Schopenhauer'un istençsizlik ile nesneye karşı olan bir tutumu değil, öznenin kendi içindeki dönüşümü vurguladığını ve Schopenhauer'da estetik deneyimin bir unsuru olan (Platonik Idealara ulaştırarak olan) nesne ile bir olma, nesnede kaybolmayı göz ardı eder. Dolayısıyla, bu tezde, Heidegger'in estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının kayıtsızlık olarak algılanmasının başlatıcısı olarak gördüğü Schopenhauer'ın okuması, Heidegger'in okuması sorunsallaştırılarak incelenmiştir.

Estetik çıkarsızlık kavramının, Heidegger'in Schopenhauer'a atfetmiş olduğu kayıtsızlık manasına gelip gelmemesinin tartışılmasından sonra, Heidegger'in öne sürdüğü Nietzsche'nin kendi okumasını Schopenhauer'ın yorumlarına dayandırdığı fikri incelenmiştir. Heidegger, Kant'ın çıkarsız beğenisinin aslında en üst çıkarı (*interest of the highest sort*) içeren bir haz içerdiğini ve bu hazzın düşünmeden alınan hazda (*pleasure of reflection*) açığa çıktığını ileri sürer. Çıkarın çıkarsız olarak tanımlanan estetik deneyimde aslında var olduğunu vurgulamasıyla, Heidegger Nietzsche ve Kant'ın benzer düşüncelere sahip olduğunu iddia eder. Fakat, bu

noktada Heidegger, Kant'ın 'düşünmeden alınan haz' ile neyi kastettiğini, yani fizikselden öte formu öne çıkarttığını ve çıkar kavramının her iki filozofta ne manaya geldiğini dikkate almaz. Bu sebeplerden ötürü Heidegger'in ileri sürdüğü gibi Kant ile Nietzsche arasında bu konuda bir benzerlik kurmak geçerli görülmemektedir. Son olarak, Nietzsche'nin estetik deneyim konusundaki düşüncelerini incelerken tartışılan esrime (*Rausch*) kavramı, bu sefer Heidegger'in yorumlaması ile tekrar açılmış ve irdelenmiştir. Hem esrime kavramının tartışmasında hem de yukarıda sözü edilen çıkarsızlığı 'asli doğamızın üstün bir çabası' olarak yorumlamada karşımıza çıkan olgu Heidegger'in estetik çıkarsızlık kavramını varlığın açılanması ile paralel düşünmesidir.

APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Akkökler Karatekeli

Adı : Büşra

Bölümü : Felsefe

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : THE CONCEPT OF “DISINTERESTEDNESS” IN THE MODERN PHILOSOPHY OF ART: KANT, SCHOPENHAUER, NIETZSCHE, HEIDEGGER

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: