The Interpretation of Art in the 21st Century A Survey of Leading Positions in Contemporary Art Philosophy

J.Konstapel,Leiden,6-6-2026

Abstract

This article provides a systematic survey of the most influential theoretical positions in contemporary art philosophy and art interpretation, from the post-Panofskian tradition through the pictorial turn, the politics of images, and the current debates around AI, materiality, and global art. The aim is to map the intellectual landscape as it stands in 2026, identifying the major figures, their core arguments, the fault lines between them, and the open questions that animate the field.

1. The Panofskian Legacy and Its Discontents

Any survey of contemporary art interpretation must begin with the shadow cast by Erwin Panofsky (1892–1968). His tripartite method — pre-iconographical description, iconographical analysis, and iconological interpretation — established the dominant paradigm of 20th-century art history in the Anglophone world. For Panofsky, the deepest level of interpretation uncovers the *intrinsic meaning* of a work: the artwork as a symptom of broader cultural, philosophical, and historical attitudes, what he called the *Weltanschauung* of an era.

The strength of this model was its systematic ambition: it grounded interpretation in verifiable literary and cultural sources, resisted both formalist aestheticism and psychological speculation, and gave art history a disciplinary identity distinct from mere connoisseurship. Panofsky's work on Dürer's *Melencolia I*, on disguised symbolism in Early Netherlandish painting, and on Gothic architecture and scholasticism remain exemplary exercises in this method.

The critiques, however, have accumulated. Critics have charged that Panofsky overintellectualizes art, risks imposing modern conceptual frameworks onto historical works, and tends to reduce the visual to the textual. The method works best for iconographically rich traditions — Renaissance altarpieces, medieval manuscripts — and becomes strained when applied to abstract art, non-Western traditions, or the bodily and affective dimensions of visual experience.

The Dutch art historian **Evert van Uitert** (1936–2021) represents perhaps the most rigorous 20th-century application of the Panofskian method to 19th-century art, specifically to Van Gogh. Van Uitert's central innovation was the concept of *aemulatio*: artistic identity forms not through autonomous genius but through productive rivalry with precursors, through the strategic concealment and transformation of sources. His reconstruction of Van Gogh's literary reading as the key to understanding the iconographic programs of individual paintings — the *Poet's Garden* series, the *Portrait of Dr. Gachet* — demonstrated that the Panofskian method could be extended beyond the Renaissance. Van Uitert's later work on modernism as a quasi-religious system and irony as its internal corrective mechanism broadened this into a general theory of cultural dynamics. His method: the library as epistemological instrument, reading as the constitutive act of artistic production.

2. The Pictorial Turn: W.J.T. Mitchell

The most significant theoretical intervention in the Anglophone tradition since Panofsky is the work of **W.J.T. Mitchell** (born 1942, University of Chicago). In his 1994 book *Picture Theory* and the subsequent *What Do Pictures Want?* (2005), Mitchell diagnosed a *pictorial turn* in contemporary culture: a shift away from the linguistic paradigm that had dominated theory since the 1960s (structuralism, semiotics, deconstruction) toward the recognition that images, pictures, and visual representations have a logic and a power that is not reducible to language.

Mitchell's central question is ontological and almost animistic: what do pictures *want*? He argues that images are not passive containers of meaning waiting to be decoded by an iconologically trained interpreter. They are, in a sense, active agents — they make demands, they produce desire, they haunt and possess their viewers. This is not a mystical claim but a structural one: images function within social and political economies of desire, fear, and power that exceed any single interpretive framework.

Mitchell's *critical iconology* — as distinct from Panofsky's iconology — is therefore inherently interdisciplinary and politically alert. His analyses range from dinosaurs and clones as cultural icons to the image politics of war and empire. The central methodological move is to treat images as sites of theoretical turbulence, where disciplines (art history, media theory, biology, anthropology, political theory) encounter and disturb one another.

Mitchell's concept of the *metapicture* — an image that reflects on its own nature as image — is particularly productive: it identifies a recursive structure in visual culture, from Velázquez's *Las Meninas* to contemporary media self-reflexivity.

3. The French Tradition: Georges Didi-Huberman

3.1 The Thinker and His Project

The most philosophically ambitious and prolific contemporary theorist of images is the French philosopher and art historian **Georges Didi-Huberman** (born 1953, Saint-Étienne). Author of more than fifty books, winner of the Adorno Prize (2015), and curator of major exhibitions, Didi-Huberman has over four decades constructed a comprehensive and still-expanding theory of the image that is simultaneously post-Panofskian, post-structuralist, psychoanalytically informed, and deeply political. His work has been an established reference in French, German, and Spanish scholarship for decades; its reception in the Anglophone world has been slower, partly due to theoretical disagreements with the *October* group (notably Rosalind Krauss) over the interpretation of Georges Bataille's concept of *l'informe*, and partly due to the density of his engagement with specifically French and German philosophical traditions. That reception is now accelerating.

His career can be organized around four interconnected axes: (1) the critique of Panofsky and the rehabilitation of Warburg; (2) the theory of the *Nachleben* and the *Pathosformel*; (3) the concept of anachronism and the dialectical image; and (4) the political turn toward the image of peoples and resistance.

3.2 Against Panofsky: The Irreducibility of the Visual

Didi-Huberman's foundational argument, developed in *Confronting Images* (*Devant l'image*, 1990), is that Panofsky's iconological method is ultimately **theological** in its deep structure. It assumes that every visual element in a work of art is a vehicle for a meaning that can, in principle, be fully recovered by the trained interpreter; that the visual is ultimately translatable into the verbal; that there is a stable *intrinsic content* — a *Weltanschauung*, a cultural essence — waiting to be unlocked through scholarly labor. The artwork, on this model, is a kind of enigma that scholarship solves.

Against this, Didi-Huberman argues for the **irreducibility of the visual** — for what he calls the *underside* (*dessous*) of images, the dimension that resists rational understanding and iconographic decoding. His exemplary case is Fra Angelico's frescoes in San Marco, Florence. Alongside their legible iconographic content — saints, angels, narrative scenes — there are passages of pure, unmodulated color, what Didi-Huberman calls the *pan*: patches of white or pink that have no referential content, that cannot be explained by any literary or theological source, that simply *are*, as pure chromatic presence. For Panofsky, such passages would be noise in the iconographic signal. For Didi-Huberman, they are the most important thing: the moment where the image exceeds the text, where the visual asserts its autonomy against the verbal.

This is not a formalist argument. Didi-Huberman links these passages to the *incarnation* — to the theological problem of how the divine becomes material, how the transcendent takes on sensible flesh. The *pan* is not decorative surplus but the visual equivalent of a theological problem that no amount of literary source-tracing can resolve. Visual representation has an *underside* in which seemingly intelligible forms lose their clarity and open onto something that defies rational understanding — something closer to desire, to the dream-work, to the uncanny.

3.3 The Return to Warburg: Nachleben and Pathosformeln

The central theoretical resource for Didi-Huberman's alternative is **Aby Warburg** (1866–1929), the Hamburg art historian who was also Panofsky's own intellectual predecessor. The crucial move is that where Panofsky *systematized* Warburg — domesticated his restless, fragmentary, psychically charged project into the clean tripartite method of iconology — Didi-Huberman returns to the wild, unfinished, and pathological dimensions of Warburg's thinking.

Warburg's key concepts are *Nachleben*, *Pathosformel*, and *Mnemosyne*:

Nachleben (literally: afterlife, survival) designates not the Renaissance *revival* of antiquity — the conscious imitation or rebirth of classical forms — but their *survival*: the way ancient gestural and emotional formulas continue to live, underground, in the visual memory of Western culture, resurfacing in unexpected contexts, transformed and yet recognizable. As Didi-Huberman formulates the distinction with characteristic precision: *whereas art has a history, images have survivals*. The history of art is the history of conscious choices, influences, styles, and periods. The survival of images is something else: a psychic or cultural memory that operates below consciousness, that cannot be fully controlled or predicted, that returns like a symptom.

Pathosformel (pathos formula) is Warburg's term for the specific gestural and expressive formulas through which intense emotional states — grief, ecstasy, triumph, terror — are crystallized into repeatable visual configurations. The flowing drapery of the *Nympha*, the raised arms of the *Maenads*, the contorted body of *Laocoön* — these are not individual artistic inventions but cultural *engrams*, traces impressed into collective visual memory, surviving across millennia in forms that preserve their emotional charge while transforming their iconographic context. A Renaissance painting of Salome can mobilize the same Pathosformel as an ancient Greek vase precisely because both are drawing on the same underground reservoir of affective memory.

Warburg's great unfinished project, the **Mnemosyne Atlas** — a series of large panels covered in black cloth to which photographs of artworks, astrological diagrams, newspaper cuttings, and advertising images were pinned in constantly shifting constellations — was an attempt to visualize these survivals: not to explain them in a linear narrative but to *show* their constellation, to let the resonances between images across centuries become visible as a spatial arrangement. Warburg himself described his method as an *Aalsuppenstil* — an eel-soup style — a mass of serpentine bodies without clear beginning or end, resisting systematic definition.

Didi-Huberman reads Warburg's breakdown and hospitalization (1918–1924) not as an interruption of his scholarly project but as its most extreme *symptom*: the historian who studies the pathological energies embedded in images becomes himself possessed by the *pathos* he analyzes. The *Pathosformeln* of images are inseparable from the pathos of the historian. This destroys the Panofskian ideal of the disinterested interpreter standing outside his object; the art historian is always already *inside* the affective field of the images he studies.

3.4 Anachronism and the Dialectical Image

The theoretical core of Didi-Huberman's methodology is his concept of **anachronism**. Images, he argues, are not contemporary with themselves. A work of art produced in the 15th century does not belong simply to the 15th century; it carries within it survivals from antiquity, anticipations of modernity, temporal layers that are genuinely heterogeneous and irreducible to a single historical moment. The art historian who attempts to situate a work purely *within* its own historical period — the ideal of *historicism* — systematically misses this temporal complexity.

This anachronism is not a defect to be corrected but a *structural feature* of images as such. Images are *temporally impure*: they contain past and present simultaneously, they are haunted by what they survive and what they anticipate. The proper response is not to purify images by situating them securely in a single period but to *read their anachronism* — to attend to the different temporal layers they contain and the tensions between them.

The theoretical instrument for this reading is Walter Benjamin's concept of the **dialectical image**: the moment when *what has been* comes together in a flash with *the now* to form a constellation. For Benjamin, the dialectical image is the form in which historical truth becomes legible — not in the continuous narrative of historicism but in the sudden, explosive collision of different temporal moments. Didi-Huberman takes this concept as the methodological basis for art history: the art historian's task is to construct or recognize such dialectical constellations, to place a 15th-century painting in productive collision with a 20th-century photograph, a Renaissance *Pathosformel* alongside a contemporary news image, and to attend to what the collision releases.

This is the atlas method: not a chronological survey but a montage of resonances, in which meaning emerges from *relations* between images across time rather than from the internal content of any single image. It is, in effect, a Warburgian art history conducted under the sign of Benjamin.

3.5 The Political Turn: Peoples and Resistance

The most recent major arc of Didi-Huberman's work is explicitly political. His multi-volume project *L'Œil de l'histoire* (*The Eye of History*, 2009–ongoing) and the related *Peuples* series (*Peoples Exposed*, *Peoples in Tears*, *Peoples Uprisings*, etc.) turn the theoretical apparatus developed in relation to Renaissance and ancient images toward the political history of the 20th and 21st centuries: the documentary image of atrocity, the photographic representation of mass movements and peoples, the visual testimony of resistance and suffering.

The central argument of the *Peuples* series is that images of peoples — crowds, masses, faces in extremis — pose a specific theoretical problem: they simultaneously *expose* the people (make them visible, render them vulnerable to surveillance and domination) and *express* the people (give form to their desire, memory, and resistance). There is no image of a people that is simply documentary; every such image is entangled in the politics of visibility, of who is permitted to be seen and how.

This leads to his engagement with **Bertolt Brecht** — specifically with Brecht's *War Primer*, a collection of photographs from World War II accompanied by Brecht's epigrammatic poems, which Didi-Huberman reads as an exemplary practice of dialectical image-making: the poem does not *explain* the photograph but creates a *friction* with it, a productive gap that forces the viewer to think rather than simply consume.

His 2024–2025 exhibition *In the Troubled Air...*, co-produced by the CCCB Barcelona and the Reina Sofía Madrid, exemplifies the full range of this approach. Organized around Lorca's concept of *duende* — the heightened emotional state generated between observer and image, what Lorca called the "troubled air" between them — the exhibition spans 300 works from Goya, Hugo, Goethe, Brecht, Giacometti, Camarón, Dalí, Picasso, Pasolini, and Rodin. It is explicitly not a linear art-historical survey but a Warburgian atlas in three dimensions: a constellation of emotional resonances across periods, media, and cultures, organized by affective logic rather than chronological sequence.

3.6 Didi-Huberman's Position in the Field

Didi-Huberman occupies a unique position in contemporary art theory: he is simultaneously the most systematic and the most anti-systematic thinker in the field. His project is systematic in its scope — spanning antiquity to the present, engaging every major tradition of image theory from Freud and Benjamin to Deleuze and Rancière — but anti-systematic in its method, which resists the closure of any definitive interpretation and insists on the open, unfinalized, anachronistic character of images.

His debate with **Jacques Rancière** — whose *The Politics of Aesthetics* (2000) offers a competing account of the relationship between images and political subjectivity — is one of the most significant ongoing controversies in contemporary image theory. Where Rancière emphasizes the *redistribution of the sensible* — the way aesthetic practices reorganize the shared field of perception and thus have inherently political effects — Didi-Huberman insists on the specificity and opacity of particular images, on what resists any general theory of aesthetic politics.

His relationship to the *October* group is marked by a fundamental disagreement over Georges Bataille's concept of *l'informe* (the formless): where Krauss and Bois read *l'informe* as a formal and semiotic operation, Didi-Huberman insists on its psychoanalytic and phenomenological dimensions — on the way formlessness registers in the viewer's body as well as in the artwork's structure.

What unifies Didi-Huberman's project, across all its phases, is a single fundamental commitment: **the image always exceeds the concept**. No iconographic program, no semiotic analysis, no political theory exhausts what an image *does*. The task of the image theorist is not to master images but to remain open to what in them remains unmastered — to what Didi-Huberman, following Warburg, calls the *surviving* dimension of every image: the affective energy that outlasts any particular historical moment and returns, transformed, in every serious encounter with visual art.

4. The Critical Tradition: Hal Foster and *October*

The American critical tradition represented by the journal *October* and its contributors — **Hal Foster**, **Rosalind Krauss**, **Yve-Alain Bois**, and **Benjamin Buchloh** — constitutes the most influential institutionalized alternative to mainstream art history in the Anglophone world since the 1970s.

Hal Foster (born 1955, Princeton) is the central synthesizing figure of this tradition. His work operates at the intersection of art history, psychoanalytic theory (Lacan), Marxist critical theory, and political analysis. His landmark books include *The Return of the Real* (1996), which theorized the neo-avant-garde's relationship to the historical avant-garde through Lacan's notion of the *repetition* and the *traumatic real*; *Design and Crime* (2002), a critique of the aestheticization of everyday life under late capitalism; and *Brutal Aesthetics* (2020), which traces the "brutal" sensibility in postwar art (Dubuffet, Bataille, Jorn, Paolozzi) as a counter to the sanitization of modernism. His most recent book, *Fail Better: Reckonings with Artists and Critics* (MIT Press, 2025), gathers forty essays assessing the critical legacies of key artists and critics from the 1960s to the present.

Foster's central methodological commitment is to *critical distance*: art history must be driven by the present as much as informed by the past, but it must resist the seductions of the market, the spectacle, and institutional consensus. His concept of the *archival impulse* in contemporary art — artists constructing alternative archives of cultural memory against official histories — has been widely influential.

Yve-Alain Bois (born 1952, Princeton — significantly, the chair once held by Panofsky), trained under Roland Barthes, works at the rigorous intersection of formalism and semiotic theory. His analyses of Matisse, Mondrian, Picasso, and Ellsworth Kelly combine close formal attention with theoretical precision, resisting both iconological overdetermination and impressionistic aestheticism.

Rosalind Krauss developed the concept of the *index* — the photographic trace as opposed to the iconographic symbol — as the organizing principle of postwar art, from Duchamp through minimalism to conceptual art. Her debate with Didi-Huberman over Georges Bataille's concept of *l'informe* marks one of the most important theoretical controversies of recent decades.

5. Social Art History: T.J. Clark

T.J. Clark (born 1943) represents the tradition of social art history at its most rigorous and most skeptical. His landmark studies — *The Absolute Bourgeois* (1973), *Image of the People* (1973), *The Painting of Modern Life* (1984), *Farewell to an Idea* (1999) — locate the formal transformations of modern art (Courbet, Manet, the Impressionists, Cubism, abstract painting) within the social and political contradictions of bourgeois modernity.

Clark's method is neither iconographic nor semiotic but dialectical: the *form* of a painting — its spatial structure, its handling of facture, its modes of address to a viewer — is itself a form of social knowledge, encoding and displacing the contradictions of its historical moment. Meaning is not carried by iconographic symbols but produced in the gap between what a painting shows and what it refuses to show, between its visible surface and its social unconscious.

His essay *Farewell to an Idea* reads the history of modernism as a series of wagers on the possibility of an art adequate to modernity — wagers that were successively lost, as the social contradictions that generated the formal innovations of modernism rendered those innovations obsolete. This gives Clark's work a tragic dimension absent from most art theory: the sense that the history of modern art is a history of defeat.

6. Postcolonial and Decentered Modernism: Partha Mitter

Partha Mitter (born 1942) has been the most influential voice in the project of decentering the history of modern art from its implicit Western, Eurocentric framework. His *Art and Nationalism in Colonial India* (1994) and *The Triumph of Modernism* (2007) demonstrated that modernist innovation was not the exclusive achievement of the Parisian avant-garde, but emerged simultaneously and independently in colonial and postcolonial contexts — in Bengal, in Latin America, in Africa — through complex and asymmetrical negotiations with Western influence, local tradition, and anti-colonial politics.

Mitter's central argument is that the canonical history of modernism is structured by what he calls *diffusionism*: the assumption that genuine artistic innovation originates in the West and spreads outward to the periphery. Against this, he documents the ways in which non-Western artists transformed, resisted, and appropriated Western modernism in ways that cannot be reduced to influence or derivative practice.

This project connects to a broader decolonization of art history now underway institutionally, visible in the Venice Biennale's 2026 curatorial direction under the late Koyo Kouoh — the first African woman invited to lead that exhibition — whose theme *In Minor Keys* explicitly privileged non-Western, marginal, and politically dispossessed voices.

7. Relational Aesthetics and Its Critics: Nicolas Bourriaud

Nicolas Bourriaud (born 1965) offered in *Relational Aesthetics* (1998) the most influential theoretical framework for understanding art practice of the 1990s: the claim that the most significant art of that decade constituted *social interstices*, micro-communities of interaction and exchange, against the atomizing logic of capitalist social relations. Art was not an object but a *relation* — a configuration of human encounters, a temporary arena of exchange.

The concept generated both wide influence and sharp critique. **Claire Bishop**, in her essay *Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics* (2004), argued that Bourriaud's framework aestheticizes social relations in a way that is politically complacent: it mistakes the appearance of community for its substance, and ignores the antagonistic and exclusionary dimensions of social space. Bishop's alternative — drawing on Laclau and Mouffe's theory of radical democracy — insists that genuine political art must stage *conflict*, not consensus.

This debate between relational conviviality and productive antagonism remains unresolved and continues to structure discussions of socially engaged art.

8. Current Debates: AI, the Handmade, and the Question of Authorship

The entry of generative AI into artistic production has precipitated the most acute crisis of art theory since the readymade. The debates are multiple and not easily separated:

Authorship and copyright: The training of generative AI models on copyrighted artworks without consent has produced organized resistance from the artistic community — more than 6,000 artists

signed an open letter in 2025 protesting these practices. The legal and philosophical questions about authorship, originality, and the status of artistic labor are unresolved.

Ontological status: What is a generative AI image? It is not an index (it bears no physical trace of a cause), not an icon (it has no intentional resemblance to a model), and not quite a symbol (it has no conventional meaning assigned by a cultural community). It problematizes all three terms of Peirce's semiotic triangle, and by extension the foundational categories of both iconography and the pictorial turn.

The counter-movement: Precisely in response to the saturation of visual culture with algorithmically generated imagery, there is a documented return in artistic practice to the handmade, the tactile, and the materially imperfect. Ceramics, textiles, slow painting, the visible mark of the artist's body — these are understood not as nostalgia but as a philosophical stance: a claim that artistic meaning is inseparable from embodied making, from the risk and duration of physical process.

This counter-movement has theoretical resonance with the phenomenological tradition in art theory — with **Maurice Merleau-Ponty**'s account of the painter's bodily engagement with the canvas, and with more recent work on *material agency* (Jane Bennett, Tim Ingold) that refuses the sharp distinction between human intentionality and the resistance of materials.

9. An Emerging Synthesis?

The survey above reveals not a single dominant paradigm but a field organized by productive tensions:

- Between **iconographic reconstruction** (Van Uitert, Panofsky) and **the irreducibility of the visual** (Didi-Huberman)
- Between **critical distance and political engagement** (Foster, Clark) and **relational participation** (Bourriaud)
- Between **Western canon** and **decentered global modernity** (Mitter, Kouoh)
- Between **linguistic/semiotic approaches** (Mitchell, Krauss) and **affective/temporal approaches** (Didi-Huberman, Warburg tradition)
- Between **algorithmic reproducibility** and **embodied singularity**
- Between **cultural diagnosis from outside** (Han, Sloterdijk) and **disciplinary art history from within**
- Between **humanistic interpretation** and **neuroscientific substrate** (Friston)

What is increasingly evident is the inadequacy of any single-axis methodology. The most generative work tends to hold multiple tensions in productive suspension rather than resolving them.

The three provocateurs of Section 10 introduce a further dimension that the mainstream field has not yet fully absorbed. Han, Sloterdijk, and Friston converge — from entirely different starting points — on a shared intuition: **that genuine aesthetic experience requires resistance, complexity, and the sustained encounter with something that cannot be immediately assimilated**. Han calls this negativity. Sloterdijk calls it the symbolic immune challenge. Friston calls it sustained prediction error. The convergence is not coincidental: it suggests that the aesthetics of the smooth — the dominant aesthetic regime of digital capitalism — is not merely culturally impoverished but biologically and ontologically deficient. It fails to activate the processes through which living systems actually grow, update, and transform themselves.

This convergence also illuminates the deeper stakes of the iconographic tradition. Van Uitert's reconstruction of Van Gogh's reading, Didi-Huberman's tracking of the *Nachleben* of ancient Pathosformeln, Mitchell's question of what images want — all of these are, at bottom, attempts to identify what in an artwork generates genuine epistemic engagement rather than mere recognition. The library as method (Van Uitert) is a device for generating productive surprise: by reconstructing the sources an artist competed with and concealed, it restores to the work the prediction error that familiarity has smoothed away.

The question that defines the next theoretical generation is therefore not simply *what is the ontological status of an image?* but a more pointed version of it: *what is the difference between an image that changes its beholder and one that merely confirms what the beholder already knows?*

The answers converge across traditions: Panofsky's *intrinsic meaning* that exceeds conscious intent; Didi-Huberman's *pan* that resists iconographic decoding; Han's aesthetics of injury and veiling; Sloterdijk's artwork as symbolic immune challenge; Friston's epistemic arc that holds open uncertainty long enough to force genuine model revision. All name the same phenomenon from different angles: the capacity of certain images — not all images, not smooth images, not algorithmically optimized images — to constitute an encounter with something genuinely other, something that the beholder's existing categories cannot contain without being transformed in the process.

Whether this constitutes an emerging synthesis or merely a family resemblance across incommensurable frameworks remains open. But the convergence is real, and it points toward a 21st-century art theory that will need to be simultaneously philological (Van Uitert), temporal (Didi-Huberman), political (Foster, Clark, Mitter), diagnostic (Han, Sloterdijk), and neurobiological (Friston) — not sequentially, but at once.

10. Outside the Mainstream: Three Provocateurs

10.1 Byung-Chul Han: The Aesthetics of Negativity

Byung-Chul Han (born 1959, Seoul; professor in Berlin) is the most widely read art-philosophical provocateur of the current moment — and among the least comfortable for the mainstream art world. A former student of metallurgy who reinvented himself as a philosopher via Freiburg and Basel, Han writes in short, aphoristic books that combine the precision of German idealism with the diagnostic sharpness of cultural criticism. He has published more than twenty books since 2002, most of them under 150 pages, many of them translated into thirty languages.

His central contribution to aesthetics is *Saving Beauty* (*Die Errettung des Schönen*, 2015). The argument is as simple as it is uncomfortable: **contemporary culture has abolished negativity from its concept of beauty**, and in doing so has produced a world of aesthetic death.

Han traces the aesthetics of the contemporary moment back to what he calls **the smooth** (*das Glatte*): the dominant aesthetic signature of the present, shared by Jeff Koons sculptures, iPhone screens, Brazilian waxing, and Instagram selfies. The smooth is characterized by the absence of resistance, injury, or rupture. It seeks the *Like*, the frictionless positive response. As Han writes: *the smooth object deletes its Against*. When Jeff Koons says that the only response his work requires is "Wow" — requiring no judgment, interpretation, hermeneutics, or reflection — Han reads this as a symptom of a civilization that has systematically expelled the negative from its aesthetic experience.

Against this, Han argues for five aesthetics that the contemporary world has lost:

- **The aesthetics of veiling**: beauty requires concealment, opacity, semblance. Transparency destroys beauty; the pornographic — nakedness without drapery, without secrets — is the precise opposite of the beautiful.
- **The aesthetics of injury**: genuine beauty shocks, wounds, disturbs. From Pseudo-Longinus and Plato (beauty does not cause pleasure, it shocks) through Rilke's "terrible beauty" and Adorno's "broken beauty," the tradition insists that the beautiful carries a negative charge.
- **The aesthetics of disaster**: the sublime dimension of beauty involves the encounter with something that threatens to overwhelm the subject. Kant's mathematical and dynamical sublime, Heidegger's *Erschütterung* — these name an aesthetic experience fundamentally incompatible with the smooth.
- **The aesthetics of mourning and reminiscence**: beauty is experienced as fidelity, as a bonding with what has been. Against the cult of novelty and the acceleration of cultural consumption, Han (following Plato's *Phaedrus* and Hegel) argues that genuine aesthetic experience involves *Anamnesis* — remembrance, recognition of something that was always already known.
- **The aesthetics of contemplative distance**: aesthetic judgment requires distance. The smooth abolishes distance — it invites touch, immediate consumption, the frictionless scroll. Without distance, there is no judgment; without judgment, there is no aesthetics.

Han's critique extends to the digital image more broadly. The "smooth body" of Instagram or YouTube — optimized, filtered, blemish-reduced — represents the aesthetics of data: a surface that has eliminated every trace of vulnerability, labor, and mortality. The selfie is the emblematic form of contemporary non-beauty: a self that cannot come to rest, that tries to produce itself through the camera lens because it is haunted by inner emptiness.

His recent work *The Crisis of Narration* (2024) extends this diagnosis to storytelling: the shift from *narrative* (which requires duration, complexity, and the willingness to be changed by what one encounters) to *storyselling* (the optimization of story for emotional impact and algorithmic distribution) mirrors the shift from beauty to smoothness in the visual domain.

Han is controversial precisely because his critique is indiscriminate: it applies not only to commercial culture but to much of the contemporary art world, which he regards as complicit in the aesthetics of positivity. His conservatism — his appeal to Plato, Hegel, Rilke, and Heidegger against the present — is both his strength and his limitation. He diagnoses a real pathology but his prescriptions remain formally vague. Nevertheless, no one else in contemporary philosophy has articulated the costs of the aesthetic regime of smoothness with comparable sharpness.

10.2 Peter Sloterdijk: Spheres, Immunity, and the Art of Self-Formation

Peter Sloterdijk (born 1947, Karlsruhe; professor of philosophy and media theory at the Hochschule für Gestaltung Karlsruhe) is the most encyclopedic and formally ambitious philosopher working in the German tradition since Hegel — a description he would likely find both accurate and amusing. His three-volume *Spheres* trilogy (*Bubbles*, 1998; *Globes*, 1999; *Foams*, 2004) — totalling more than 2,500 pages — is the most ambitious philosophical project of the late 20th century in any language, and one of the most ignored by the Anglophone academic mainstream.

Sloterdijk's central contribution to art philosophy is indirect but far-reaching. His key concept is **spherology**: the thesis that human existence is fundamentally *spatial* and *immunological*. Humans do not simply exist in space; they *produce* the spaces — the bubbles, globes, and foams — that

make existence possible. These spaces are simultaneously physical, psychological, and symbolic; they are the conditions of possibility for any form of culture, including art.

The smallest sphere is the **bubble**: the dyadic space of intimacy between two beings, paradigmatically the mother-child relation, the space of breath and voice and warmth that constitutes the original human dwelling. The sphere is not a metaphor but an ontological structure: the medium of shared existence, the condition of any possible communication.

Art, on this account, is a form of **sphere-construction**: a practice of creating shared spaces of meaning, resonance, and protection. The museum, the concert hall, the theater — these are institutional bubbles, environments designed to suspend the ordinary flows of time and utility and create conditions for a specific kind of attention and receptivity. Every artwork is a condensed sphere: a structure of resonance that, when encountered by a suitably prepared subject, produces a temporary expansion of the sphere of existence.

This connects to his concept of **anthropotechnics**: the diverse practices — religious, athletic, artistic, technological — through which humans actively shape and transform themselves over time. Art is an anthropotechnic: it is not primarily a vehicle for meaning (iconography) or a social relation (Bourriaud) but a *practice of self-formation*, a technique for expanding what a human being can perceive, feel, and understand.

Sloterdijk's most direct engagement with aesthetics is *The Aesthetic Imperative* (2014), a collection of essays ranging from music to film, design to urban architecture. His central argument is that the capacity to discern the beautiful is simultaneously an art of self-formation and a political act: the subject who has cultivated genuine aesthetic responsiveness — who can be *touched* by an artwork, genuinely moved rather than merely stimulated — is a subject capable of genuine political judgment. Beauty, for Sloterdijk, is not a pleasure but a demand: the Rilkean imperative *You must change your life* is the fundamental aesthetic experience.

His three-tiered **immunology** is of direct relevance: humans maintain biological, social, and *symbolic* immune systems. Art functions as part of the symbolic immune system — it processes threats, losses, and traumas that cannot be handled by biological or social means alone. The artwork that confronts death, suffering, or disorder without resolving it — that maintains the open wound rather than suturing it — performs a genuine immunological function: it keeps the symbolic system flexible, capable of metabolizing what it encounters rather than simply defending against it.

Sloterdijk's reception has been complicated by his political provocations — his 1999 lecture *Rules for the Human Zoo*, which raised questions about genetic engineering and human breeding, generated a furious public controversy in Germany — and by his resistance to both leftist orthodoxy and liberal consensus. He is neither a conservative nor a progressive in any recognizable sense; he is a diagnostician of modernity who reserves the right to be uncomfortable in all directions.

10.3 Karl Friston and the Free Energy Principle: Aesthetics from Outside the Discipline

The most unexpected intruder into contemporary art philosophy is **Karl Friston** (born 1959, York; Wellcome Principal Research Fellow at University College London), the most cited neuroscientist alive and the architect of the **Free Energy Principle** (FEP) — a mathematical framework for understanding the self-organizing behavior of living systems.

Friston's FEP proposes that all living systems — from single cells to complex organisms — can be understood as continuously minimizing *variational free energy*: a measure of the difference between their internal model of the world and the sensory data they receive. To minimize free energy is to minimize *surprise* — the discrepancy between predictions and outcomes. This is achieved either by updating the internal model (perception, learning) or by acting on the world to make it conform to predictions (action). The framework provides a unified mathematical account of perception, action, attention, emotion, learning, and social behavior.

In a landmark 2024 paper published in *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, Friston, Van de Cruys, and Frascaroli applied this framework to **aesthetic experience**. Their central argument: artworks generate *epistemic arcs* — structured sequences of curiosity, epistemic action, and *aha experience* — that are formally identical to the dynamics of active inference. An artwork holds open uncertainty in a controlled way: it generates prediction error (something unexpected, something that doesn't resolve immediately) without causing the anxiety that would normally accompany such uncertainty in ordinary life. The aesthetic *aha* — the moment of sudden resolution, of seeing how the parts fit together — is formally equivalent to the Bayesian update that occurs when a surprising observation is finally integrated into the generative model.

This framework has radical implications for art theory:

Against the iconographic tradition: meaning is not a static property of an artwork waiting to be decoded; it is a dynamic event, the product of a real-time probabilistic inference process in the perceiving subject. The same work will generate different epistemic arcs — and therefore different aesthetic experiences — in different subjects, because they bring different generative models (different priors, different prediction hierarchies) to the encounter.

Against purely social accounts: aesthetic experience has a neurobiological substrate that is not reducible to cultural convention or social relation. The *aha* of aesthetic resolution is not a learned response but a fundamental feature of how living systems process information. This does not mean aesthetic experience is universal (the generative model is culturally shaped) but it means it has a biological dimension that social art theory systematically ignores.

For a dynamic, embodied aesthetics: the body is not a vehicle for the reception of pre-formed meanings but an active inference machine, continuously generating and testing predictions about the sensory environment. Aesthetic experience is not passive contemplation but active engagement — the *curiosity* that the artwork arouses, the *epistemic action* of looking more closely, circling, returning — these are not metaphors but literal descriptions of the active inference process.

The connection to Han is provocative: the aesthetics of the smooth, on a predictive processing account, would be aesthetics that minimize prediction error too rapidly — that offer no genuine epistemic arc, no sustained uncertainty, no real *aha*. Jeff Koons' "Wow" is the aesthetic of zero prediction error: the smooth object surprises nobody, updates nobody, changes nobody. Genuine art, on the Friston account, necessarily involves a managed encounter with complexity that exceeds immediate resolution — which is precisely what Han's aesthetics of injury, disaster, and veiling also require, though arrived at from entirely different premises.

The connection to Didi-Huberman is equally striking: the experience of *being rendered speechless* by an image — which Didi-Huberman identifies as the most radical form of aesthetic encounter — maps directly onto a moment of maximum prediction error, where the generative model fails completely and must be radically restructured. The *pan* in Fra Angelico, the patch of pure color that defies iconographic decoding, is precisely the kind of stimulus that generates irreducible prediction error — that cannot be assimilated into any existing model and therefore forces a fundamental reorganization of perception.

Friston's framework does not replace the humanistic traditions surveyed in this article; it provides a potential scientific substrate for them, a way of asking *why* certain formal structures produce the experiences that art theory has described. Whether this represents a genuine convergence between neuroscience and art philosophy, or merely a formal analogy, remains an open question — and perhaps the most interesting open question in the field.

Thinker	Base	Core concept	Method
Erwin Panofsky (1892–1968)	Princeton (IAS)	Iconology / Intrinsic meaning	Tripartite textual-cultural analysis
Evert van Uitert (1936–2021)	Amsterda	Aemulatio / Library as	Philological source
W.J.T. Mitchell (b. 1942)	Chicago	Pictorial turn / What do	Critical iconology / image
T.J. Clark (b. 1943)	Berkeley	Social art history / Modernism as wager	Dialectical formal-social analysis
Georges Didi-Huberman (b. 1953)	Paris (EHESS)	Nachleben / Anachronism / Survival	Warburgian constellation / Atlas method
Hal Foster (b. 1955)	Princeton	Neo-avant-garde / Archival	Psychoanalytic-Marxist
Yve-Alain Bois (b. 1952)	Princeton (IAS)	Formalism / L'informe	Semiotic formalism
Rosalind Krauss (b. 1941)	Columbia	Index / Postmodernism	Semiotic / Lacanian analysis
Nicolas Bourriaud (b. 1965)	Paris	Relational aesthetics	Sociological / participatory
Partha Mitter (b. 1942)	Sussex	Decentered modernism	Postcolonial historiography
Claire Bishop (b. 1971)	CUNY	Antagonism / Participatory	Political aesthetics

References (Selected)

- Panofsky, E. (1939). *Studies in Iconology*. Oxford University Press.
- Van Uitert, E. (1983). *Vincent van Gogh in Creative Competition*. Davaco.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. (1994). *Picture Theory*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. (2005). *What Do Pictures Want?* University of Chicago Press.
- Didi-Huberman, G. (1990). *Confronting Images*. Penn State University Press.
- Didi-Huberman, G. (2002). *The Surviving Image*. Penn State University Press.
- Foster, H. (1996). *The Return of the Real*. MIT Press.
- Foster, H. (2020). *Brutal Aesthetics*. Zone Books.
- Foster, H. (2025). *Fail Better: Reckonings with Artists and Critics*. MIT Press.
- Clark, T.J. (1984). *The Painting of Modern Life*. Princeton University Press.
- Clark, T.J. (1999). *Farewell to an Idea*. Yale University Press.
- Bourriaud, N. (1998). *Relational Aesthetics*. Les Presses du Réel.
- Bishop, C. (2004). Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics. *October*, 110.
- Mitter, P. (2007). *The Triumph of Modernism*. Reaktion Books.
- Krauss, R. (1985). *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*. MIT Press.