Heidegger

the original sense of the gathering which reigns in place, is spoken. To empty a glass means: To gather the glass, as that which can contain something, into its having been freed.

To empty the collected fruit in a basket means: To prepare for them this place.

Emptiness is not nothing. It is also no deficiency. In sculptural embodiment, emptiness plays in the manner of a seeking-projecting instituting of places.

The preceding remarks certainly do not reach so far that they exhibit in sufficient clarity the special character of sculpture as one of the graphic arts. Sculpture: an embodying bringing-into-the-work of places, and with them a disclosing of regions of possible dwellings for man, possible tarrying of things surrounding and concerning man.

Sculpture: the embodiment of the truth of Being in its work of instituting places.

Even a cautious insight into the special character of this art causes one to suspect that truth, as unconcealment of Being, is not necessarily dependent on embodiment.

Goethe said: 'It is not always necessary for the true to be embodied; it is enough if it flutters nearby as spirit and generates a sort of concord, like when the sound of bells floats as a friend in the air and as a bearer of peace.'[1]

NOTE

1 The translation of this quotation has been amended to accord with that given by Gianni Vattimo in 'Ornament/Monument'.

HANS-GEORG GADAMER

Hans-Georg Gadamer

German philosopher, Hans-Georg Gadamer (b. 1900) was a pupil of Martin Heidegger, and his work can be seen as an elaboration of Heidegger's thought. Central to Gadamer's contribution to the world of hermeneutics is the distinction which he draws between 'understanding' and 'explanation'. Against the shortcomings of earlier attempts to address such problems *methodologically*, Gadamer emphasizes how understanding is culturally conditioned and dependent upon an effective historical consciousness. We view texts according to our own cultural horizon. Thus the interpretation of the past becomes a 'fusion of horizons'.

The work of art is a primary concern for Gadamer, as it had been for Heidegger. Truth is to be found in the work of art no less than in scientific reason. The work of art plays a key ontological role in 'representing'. The viewer, meanwhile, needs to engage dynamically with the work of art, while recognizing that almost inevitably the work would have been intended to make a particular statement within a given cultural context. It is precisely this cultural situatedness that distinguishes authentic works of art from mere reproductions.

Gadamer elaborates upon these themes in the extract 'The Ontological Foundation of the Occasional and the Decorative'. Here 'occasionality' refers to the occasion, or situation, out of which works of art emerged. 'Occasionality,' Gadamer observes, 'means that their meaning is partly determined by the occasion for which they are intended.' He therefore draws the distinction between specific portraits and the anonymous use of models in paintings. The portrait is to be understood 'as a portrait', and even if displaced into a modern museum, the 'trace of its original purpose' would not be lost. The work of art goes beyond mere signification. Although not pure symbol, it also has an important symbolic dimension to it, which effectively enriches our understanding of its subject matter.

Architecture, for Gadamer, is of primary significance in that it points beyond itself to the totality of its context. A building has the dual purpose of fulfilling its functional requirements and contributing to its setting. A building would not be a work of art if it stood *anywhere*. Nor can it change its use without losing some of its 'reality'. Architecture, no less than the other arts that it embraced, has an ontological role of 'representing'. Here ornament is crucial, and Gadamer seeks to revise the received views on ornament. Ornament is not to be perceived as something additional or applied. 'Ornament,' Gadamer comments, 'is part of presentation. But presentation is an ontological event; it is representation.'

Obvious comparisons can be made between this extract and those by Heidegger and Vattimo included in this volume. Gadamer's treatment of the monument can also be contrasted with that of Lefebvre and Bataille.

Gadamer

THE ONTOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF THE OCCASIONAL AND THE DECORATIVE

If we proceed from the point of view that the work of art cannot be understood in terms of 'aesthetic consciousness', then many phenomena, which have a marginal importance for modern aesthetics, lose what is problematical about them and, indeed, even move into the centre of an 'aesthetic' questioning which is not artificially abbreviated.

I refer to things such as portraits, poems dedicated to someone, or even contemporary references in comedy. The aesthetic concepts of the portrait, the dedicated poem, the contemporary allusion are, of course, themselves cultivated by aesthetic consciousness. What is common to all of these is presented to aesthetic consciousness in the character of occasionality which such art forms possess. Occasionality means that their meaning is partly determined by the occasion for which they are intended, so that it contains more than it would without this occasion.[1] Hence the portrait contains a relation to the man represented, a relation that it does not need to be placed in, but which is expressly intended in the representation itself and is characteristic of it as portrait.

The important thing is that this occasionality is part of what the work is saying and is not something forced on it by its interpreter. This is why such art forms as the portrait, in which so much is obvious, have no real place in an aesthetics based on the concept of experience. A portrait contains, in its own pictorial content, its relation to the original. This does not mean simply that the picture is in fact painted after this original, but that it intends this.

This becomes clear from the way in which it differs from the model which the painter uses for a genre picture or for a figure composition. In the portrait the individuality of the man portrayed is represented. If, however, a picture shows the model as an individuality, as an interesting type whom the painter has got to sit for him, then this is an objection to the picture; for one then no longer sees in the picture what the painter presents, but something of the untransformed material. Hence it destroys the meaning of the picture of a figure if we recognize in it the well-known model of a painter. For a model is a disappearing schema. The relation to the original that served the painter must be extinguished in the picture.

We also call a 'model' that by means of which something else that cannot be seen becomes visible: e.g. the model of a planned house or the model of an atom. The painter's model is not meant as herself. She serves only to wear a costume or to make gestures clear – like a dressed-up doll. Contrariwise, someone represented in the portrait is so much himself that he does not appear to be dressed up, even if the splendid costume he is wearing attracts attention: for splendour of appearance is part of him. He is the person who he is for others.[2] To interpret a work of literature in terms of its biographical or historical sources is sometimes to do no more than the art historian who would look at the works of a painter in terms of his models.

The difference between the model and the portrait shows us what 'occasionality' means here. Occasionality in the sense intended clearly lies in a work's claim to significance, in contradistinction from whatever is observed in it or can be deduced from it that goes against this claim. A portrait desires to be

Gadamer

understood as a portrait, even when the relation to the original is practically crushed by the actual pictorial content of the picture. This is particularly clear in the case of pictures which are not portraits, but which contain, as one says, elements of portraiture. They too cause one to ask after the original that can be seen behind the picture, and therefore they are more than a mere model which is simply a schema that disappears. It is the same with works of literature in which literary protraits may be contained, without their therefore necessarily falling a victim to the pseudo-artistic indiscretion of being a roman à clef.[3]

However fluid and controversial the borderline between the allusion to something specific and the other documentary contents of a work, there is still the basic question whether one accepts the claim to meaning that the work makes, or simply regards it as a historical document that one merely consults. The historian will seek out all the elements that can communicate to him something of the past, even if it counters the work's claim to meaning. He will examine works of art in order to discover the models: that is, the connections with their own age that are woven into them, even if they were not recognized by the contemporary observer, and are not important for the meaning of the whole. This is not occasionality in the present sense, which is that it is part of a work's own claim to meaning to point to a particular original. It is not, then, left to the observer's whim to decide whether a work has such occasional elements or not. A portrait really is a portrait, and does not just become it through and for those who see in it the person portrayed. Although the relation to the original resides in the work itself, it is still right to call it 'occasional'. For the portrait does not say who the man portrayed is, but only that it is a particular individual (and not a type). We can only 'recognize' who it is if the man portrayed is known to us, and only be sure if there is a title or some other information to go on. At any rate there resides in the picture an unredeemed but fundamentally redeemable pledge of its meaning. This occasionality is part of the essential import of the 'picture', quite apart from whether or not it is known to the observer.

We can see this in the fact that a portrait also appears as a portrait (and the representation of a particular person in a picture appears portrait-like) even if one does not know the sitter. There is then something in the picture that is not fully realized by the viewer, namely that which is occasional about it. But what is not fully realized is not therefore not there; it is there in a quite unambiguous way. The same thing is true of many poetic phenomena. Pindar's poems of victory, a comedy that is critical of its age, but also such literary phenomena as the odes and satires of Horace are entirely occasional in nature. The occasional in such works has acquired so permanent a form that, even without being realized or understood, it is still part of the total meaning. Someone might explain to us the particular historical context, but this would be only secondary for the poem as a whole. He would be only filling out the meaning that exists in the poem itself.

It is important to recognize that what I call occasionality here is in no way a diminution of the artistic claim and meaning of such works. For that which presents itself to aesthetic subjectivity as 'the irruption of time into play',[4] and appeared in the age of experiential art as a lessening of the aesthetic meaning of a work, is in fact only the subjective aspect of that ontological relationship that has been developed above. A work of art belongs so closely to that to which it

Gadamer

is related that it enriches its being as if through a new event of being. To be fixed in a picture, addressed in a poem, to be the object of an allusion from the stage, are not incidental things remote from the essential nature, but they are presentations of this nature itself. What was said in general about the ontological status of the picture includes these occasional elements. The element of occasionality which we find in those things presents itself as the particular case of a general relationship appropriate to the being of the work of art: namely, to experience from the 'occasion' of its coming-to-presentation a continued determination of its significance.

This is seen most clearly in the interpretative arts, especially in drama and music, which wait for the occasion in order to exist and find their form only through that occasion. Hence the stage is a political institution because only the performance brings out everything that is in the play, its allusions and its echoes. No one knows beforehand what will come across and what will have no resonance. Every performance is an event, but not one that would in any way be separate from the work – the work itself is what 'takes place' in the performative event. It is its nature to be occasional in such a way that the occasion of the performance makes it speak and brings out what is in it. The producer who stages the play shows his ability in being able to make use of the occasion. But he acts according to the directions of the writer, whose whole work is a stage direction. This is quite clearly the case with a musical work – the score is really only a direction. Aesthetic differentiation may judge what the music would be like in performance by the inner structure of sound read in the score, but no one doubts that listening to music is not reading.

It is thus of the nature of dramatic or musical works that their performance at different times and on different occasions is, and must be, different. Now it is important to see that, *mutatis mutandis*, this is also true of the plastic arts. But in the latter it is not the case either that the work exists *an sich* and only the effect varies: it is the work of art itself that displays itself under different conditions. The viewer of today not only sees in a different way, but he sees different things. We only have to think of the way that the idea of the pale marble of antiquity has ruled our taste, of our attitude to preservation, since the Renaissance, or of the reflection of classicist feeling in the romantic north as found in the purist spirituality of gothic cathedrals.

But specifically occasional art forms, such as the parabasis in classical comedy or the caricature in politics, which are intended for a quite specific occasion, and finally the portrait itself, are forms of the universal occasionality characteristic of the work of art inasmuch as it determines itself anew from occasion to occasion. Likewise, the unique determinateness through which an element, occasional in this narrower sense, is fulfilled in the work of art, gains, in the being of the work, a universality that renders it capable of yet further fulfilment. The uniqueness of its relation to the occasion can never be fully realized and it is this now unrealizable relation that remains present and effective in the work itself. In this sense the portrait too is independent of the uniqueness of its relation to the original, and contains the latter even in transcending it.

The portrait is only an intensified form of the general nature of a picture. Every picture is an increase of being and is essentially determined as representation, as coming-to-presentation. In the special case of the portrait this

Gadamer

representation acquires a personal significance, in that here an individual is presented in a representative way. For this means that the man represented represents himself in his portrait and is represented by his portrait. The picture is not only a picture and certainly not only a copy, it belongs to the present or to the present memory of the man represented. This is its real nature. To this extent the portrait is a special case of the general ontological value assigned to the picture as such. What comes into being in it is not already contained in what his acquaintances see in the sitter. The best judges of a portrait are never the nearest relatives nor even the sitter himself. For a portrait never tries to reproduce the individual it represents as he appears in the eyes of the people near him. Of necessity, what it shows is an idealization, which can run through an infinite number of stages from the representative to the most intimate. This kind of idealization does not alter the fact that in a portrait an individual is represented, and not a type, however much the portrayed individual may be transformed in the portrait from the incidental and the private into the essential quality of his true appearance.

Religious or secular monuments display the universal ontological value of a picture more clearly than the intimate portrait does. For it is on this that their public function depends. A monument holds what is represented in it in a specific state of presentness which is obviously something quite different from that of the aesthetic consciousness.[5] It does not live only from the autonomous expressive power of a picture. This is clear from the fact that things other than works of art, e.g. symbols or inscriptions, can have the same function. The familiarity of that of which the monument should remind us, is always assumed: its potential presence, as it were. The figure of a god, the picture of a king, the memorial put up to someone, assume that the god, the king, the hero, the event, the victory, or the peace treaty already possess a presence affecting everyone. The statue that represents them thus adds nothing other than, say, an inscription: it holds it present in this general meaning. Nevertheless, if it is a work of art, this means not only that it adds something to this given meaning, but also that it can say something of its own, and thus becomes independent of the anterior knowledge of which it is the bearer.

What a picture is remains, despite all aesthetic differentiation, a manifestation of what it represents, even if it makes it manifest through its autonomous expressive power. This is obvious in the case of the religious picture; but the difference between the sacred and the secular is relative in a work of art. Even an individual portrait, if it is a work of art, shares in the mysterious radiation of being that flows from the level of being of that which is represented.

We may illustrate this by an example: Justi[6] once described Velasquez's *The Surrender of Breda* as a 'military sacrament'. He meant that the picture was not a group portrait, nor simply a historical picture. What is caught in this picture is not just a solemn event as such. The solemnity of this ceremony is present in the picture in this way because the ceremony itself has a pictorial quality and is performed like a sacrament. There are things that need to be, and are suitable for being, depicted; they are, as it were, perfected in their being only when represented in a picture. It is not accidental that religious terms seem appropriate when one is defending the particular level of being of works of fine art against an aesthetic levelling out.

It is consistent with the present viewpoint that the difference between

Gadamer

profane (secular) and sacred should be only relative. We need only recall the meaning and the history of the word 'profane': the 'profane' is the place in the front of the sanctuary. The concept of the profane and of its derivative, profanation, always presuppose the sacred. Actually, the difference between profane and sacred could only be relative in classical antiquity from which it stems, since the whole sphere of life was sacrally ordered and determined. Only Christianity enables us to understand profaneness in a stricter sense. The New Testament de-demonized the world to such an extent that room was made for an absolute contrast between the profane and the religious. The Church's promise of salvation means that the world is still only 'this world'. The special nature of this claim of the Church also creates the tension between it and the State, which comes with the end of the classical world, and thus the concept of the profane acquires its own topicality. The entire history of the Middle Ages is dominated by the tension between Church and State. It is the spiritualistic deepening of the idea of the Christian Church that ultimately makes the secular State possible. The historical significance of the high Middle Ages is that it created the secular world, and gave its wide modern meaning to the notion of the 'profane'.[7] But that does not alter the fact that the profane has remained a concept related to the area of the sacred and determined by it alone. There is no such thing as profaneness by itself.[8]

The relativity of profane and sacred is not only part of the dialectic of concepts, but can be seen as a reality in the phenomenon of the picture. A work of art always has something sacred about it. True, a religious work of art or a monument on show in a museum can no longer be desecrated in the same sense as one that has remained in its original place. But this means only that it has in fact already suffered an injury, in that it has become an object in a museum. Obviously this is true not only of religious works of art. We sometimes have the same feeling in an antique shop when the old pieces on sale still have some trace of intimate life about them; it seems somehow scandalous to us, a kind of offence to piety, a profanation. Ultimately every work of art has something about it that protests against profanation.

This seems decisively proved by the fact that even pure aesthetic consciousness is familiar with the idea of profanation. It always experiences the destruction of works of art as a sacrilege.[9]

This is a characteristic feature of the modern aesthetic religion of culture, for which there is plenty of evidence. For example, the word 'vandalism', which goes back to mediaeval times, only became popular in the reaction against the destructiveness of the Jacobins in the French Revolution. To destroy works of art is to break into a world protected by its holiness. Even an 'autonomous' aesthetic consciousness cannot deny that art is more than it would admit to.

All these considerations justify a characterization of the mode of being of art in general in terms of presentation; this includes play and picture, communion and representation. The work of art is conceived as an ontological event and the abstraction to which aesthetic differentiation commits it is dissolved. A picture is an event of presentation. Its relation to the original is so far from being a reduction of the autonomy of its being that, on the contrary, I had to speak, in regard to the picture, of an 'increase of being'. The use of concepts from the sphere of the holy seemed appropriate.

Now it is important not to confuse the special sense of representation proper

Gadamer

to the work of art with the sacred representation performed by, say, the symbol. Not all forms of representation have the character of 'art'. Symbols and badges are also forms of representation. They too indicate something, and this makes them representations.

In the logical analysis of the nature of expression and meaning carried out in this century, the structure of indicating, common to all these forms of representation, has been investigated in great detail.[10] I mention this work here for another purpose. We are not concerned primarily with the problem of meaning, but with the nature of a picture. We want to grasp its nature without being confused by the abstraction performed by aesthetic consciousness. It behoves us to examine the nature of indicating, in order to discover both similarities and differences.

The essence of the picture stands, as it were, midway between two extremes: these extremes of representation are pure indication (the essence of the sign), and pure representation (the essence of the symbol). There is something of both in a picture. Its representing includes the element of indicating what is represented in it. We saw that this emerges most clearly in specific forms such as the portrait, for which the relation to the original is essential. At the same time a picture is not a sign. For a sign is nothing but what its function demands; and that is, to point away from itself. In order to be able to fulfil this function, of course, it must first draw attention to itself. It must be striking: that is, it must be clearly defined and present itself as an indicator, like a poster. But neither a sign nor a poster is a picture. It should not attract attention to itself in a way that would cause one to linger over it, for it is there only to make present something that is not present, and in such a way that the thing that is not present is the only thing that is expressed.[11] It should not captivate by its own intrinsic pictorial interest. The same is true of all signs: for instance, traffic signs, bookmarkers, and the like. There is something schematic and abstract about them, because they point not to themselves, but to what is not present, e.g. to the curve ahead or to one's page. (Even natural signs, e.g. indications of the weather, have their indicative function only through abstraction. If we look at the sky and are filled with the beauty of what we see there and linger over it, we experience a shift in the direction of our attention that causes its sign character to retreat into the background.)

Of all signs, the memento seems to have most reality of its own. It refers to the past and so is effectively a sign, but it is also precious in itself since, being an element of the past that has not disappeared, it keeps the past present for us. But it is clear that this characteristic is not grounded in the specific being of the object. A memento only has value as a memento for someone who already – i.e. still – recalls the past. Mementos lose their value when the past of which they remind one no longer has any meaning. Furthermore, someone who not only uses mementos to remind him, but makes a cult of them and lives in the past as if it were the present, has a disturbed relation to reality.

Hence a picture is certainly not a sign. Even a memento does not cause us to linger over it, but over the past that it represents for us. But a picture fulfils its function of pointing to what it represents only through its own import. By concentrating on it, we also put ourselves in contact with what is represented. The picture points by causing us to linger over it. For its being is, as I pointed out, that it is not absolutely different from what it represents, but shares in the

Gadamer

being of that. We say that what is represented comes to itself in the picture. It experiences an increase in being. But that means that it is there in the picture itself. It is merely an aesthetic reflection – I called it 'aesthetic differentiation' – that abstracts from this presence of the original in the picture.

The difference between a picture and a sign has an ontological basis. The picture does not disappear behind its pointing function but, in its own being, shares in what it represents.

This ontological sharing is part of the nature, not only of a picture, but of what we call a 'symbol'. Neither symbol nor picture indicate anything that is not at the same time present in themselves. Hence the problem arises of differentiating between the mode of being of a picture and the mode of being of a symbol.[12]

There is an obvious distinction between a symbol and a sign, in that the former is more like a picture. The representational function of a symbol is not merely to point to something that is not present. Instead, a symbol manifests as present something that really is present. This is seen in the original meaning of 'symbol'. When a symbol is used for a sign of recognition between separated friends or the scattered members of a religious community to show that they belong together, such a symbol undoubtedly functions as a sign. But it is more than a sign. It not only points to the fact that people belong together, but proves and visibly presents that fact. The *tessera hospitalis* is a relic of past living and proves through its existence what it indicates: it makes the past itself present again and causes it to be recognized as valid. It is especially true of religious symbols not only that they function as distinguishing marks, but that it is the meaning of these symbols that is understood by everyone, unites everyone and can therefore assume a sign function. Hence what is to be symbolized is undoubtedly in need of representation, inasmuch as it is itself non-sensible, infinite and unrepresentable, but it is also capable of it. It is only because it is present itself that it can be present in the symbol.

A symbol not only points to something, but it represents, in that it takes the place of something. But to take the place of something means to make something present that is not present. Thus the symbol takes the place of something in representing: that is, it makes something immediately present. Only because the symbol presents in this way the presence of what it represents, is it treated with the reverence due to that which it symbolizes. Such symbols as a crucifix, a flag, a uniform are so representative of what is revered that the latter is present in them.

That the concept of representation that was used above in describing the picture essentially belongs here is shown by the closeness between representation in the picture and the representative function of the symbol. In both cases, what they represent is itself present. At the same time a picture as such is not a symbol; symbols do not need to be pictorial. They perform their representative function through their mere existence and manifesting of themselves, but of themselves they say nothing about what they symbolize. They must be known, in the way that one must know a sign, if one is to understand what they indicate. Hence they do not mean an increase of being for what is represented. It is true that it is part of the being of what is represented to make itself present in symbols in this way. But its own being is not determined in its nature by the fact that the symbols are there and are shown. It is not there any more fully

Gadamer

when they are there. They are merely representatives. Hence their own significance is of no importance, even if they have any. They are representatives and receive their representative function of being from what they are supposed to represent. The picture also represents, but through itself, through the extra significance that it brings. But that means that in it what is represented – the 'original' – is more fully there, more properly just as it truly is.

Hence a picture is equipoised halfway between a sign and a symbol. Its representative function is neither a pure pointing-to-something, nor a pure taking-the-place-of-something. It is this intermediate position which raises it to its own unique level of being. Artificial signs and symbols alike do not – like the picture – acquire their functional significance from their own content, but must be taken as signs or as symbols. We call this origin of their functional significance their 'institution'. It is decisive in determining the ontological quality of a picture (which is what we are concerned with), that in regard to a picture there is no such thing as an 'institution' in the same sense.

By 'institution' is meant the origin of the sign or of the symbolic function. The so-called 'natural' signs also, e.g. all the indications and presages of an event in nature are, in this fundamental sense, instituted. That means that they only have a sign function when they are taken as a sign. But they are only taken as a sign on the basis of a previous relationship between the sign and what is signified. This is true also of all artificial signs. Here the establishment of the sign is agreed by convention, and the originating act by which it is arrived at called 'institution'. On the institution of the sign depends primarily its indicative significance; for example, that of the traffic sign on the decision of the Ministry of Transport, that of the souvenir on the meaning given to its preservation, etc. Equally the symbol has to be instituted, for only this gives it its representative character. For it is not its own ontological content which gives it its significance, but an institution, a constitution, a consecration that gives significance to what is, in itself, without significance: for example, the sign of sovereignty, the flag, the crucifix.

It is important to see that a work of art, on the other hand, does not owe its real meaning to an institution of this kind, even if it is a religious picture or a secular memorial. The public act of consecration or unveiling which assigns to it its purpose does not give it its significance. Rather, it is already a structure with a signifying-function of its own, as a pictorial or non-pictorial representation, before it is assigned its function as a memorial. The setting-up and consecration of a memorial – and it is not by accident that we talk of religious and secular works of architecture as of architectural monuments, when historical distance has consecrated them – therefore only realizes a function that is already implied in the proper import of the work itself.

This is the reason why works of art can assume definite real functions and resist others: for instance, religious or secular public or private ones. They are instituted and set up as memorials of reverence, honour or piety, only because they themselves prescribe and help to fashion this kind of functional context. They themselves lay claim to their place, and even if they are displaced, e.g. are housed in a modern collection, the trace of their original purpose cannot be destroyed. It is part of their being because their being is representation.

If one considers the exemplary significance of these particular forms, one sees that forms of art which, from the point of view of the art of experience

Gadamer

(*Erlebniskunst*), are peripheral, become central: namely, all those whose proper import points beyond them into the totality of a context determined by them and for them. The greatest and most distinguished of these forms is architecture.

A work of architecture extends beyond itself in two ways. It is as much determined by the aim which it is to serve as by the place that it is to take up in a total spatial context. Every architect has to consider both these things. His plan is influenced by the fact that the building has to serve a particular living purpose and must be adapted to particular architectural circumstances. Hence we call a successful building a 'happy solution', and mean by this both that it perfectly fulfils its purpose and that its construction has added something new to the spatial dimensions of a town or a landscape. Through this dual ordering the building presents a true increase of being: it is a work of art.

It is not a work of art if it simply stands anywhere, as a building that is a blot on the landscape, but only if it represents the solution of a building problem. Aesthetics acknowledges only those works of art which are in some way memorable and calls these 'architectural monuments'. If a building is a work of art, then it is not only the artistic solution of a building problem posed by the contexts of purpose and of life to which it originally belongs, but somehow preserves these, so that it is visibly present even though the present manifestation of the original purposes is strange. Something in it points back to the original. Where the original intention has become completely unrecognizable or its unity destroyed by too many subsequent alterations, then the building itself will become incomprehensible. Thus architecture, this most 'statuary' of all art forms, shows how secondary 'aesthetic differentiation' is. A building is never primarily a work of art. Its purpose, through which it belongs in the context of life, cannot be separated from itself without its losing some of its reality. If it has become merely an object of the aesthetic consciousness, then it has merely a shadowy reality and lives a distorted life only in the degenerate form of an object of interest to tourists, or a subject for photography. The work of art in itself proves to be a pure abstraction.

In fact the presence of the great architectural monuments of the past in the modern world and its buildings poses the task of the integration of past and present. Works of architecture do not stand motionless on the shore of the stream of history, but are borne along by it. Even if historically minded ages seek to reconstruct the architecture of an earlier age, they cannot try to turn back the wheel of history, but must mediate in a new and better way between the past and the present. Even the restorer or the preserver of ancient monuments remains an artist of his time. The especial importance that architecture has for our enquiry is that in it too that element of mediation can be seen without which a work of art has no real 'presentness'. Thus even where representation does not take place through reproduction (which everyone knows belongs to its own present time), past and present are brought together in a work of art. That every work of art has its own world does not mean that when its original world is altered it has its reality in an alienated aesthetic consciousness. Architecture is an example of this, for its connections with the world are irredeemably part of it.

But this involves a further point. Architecture gives shape to space. Space is what surrounds everything that exists in space. That is why architecture

Gadamer

embraces all the other forms of representation: all works of plastic art, all ornament. Moreover, to the representational arts of poetry, music, acting and dancing it gives their place. By embracing all the arts, it everywhere asserts its own perspective. That perspective is: decoration. Architecture preserves it even against those forms of art whose works are not decorative, but are gathered within themselves through the closedness of their circle of meaning. Modern research has begun to recall that this is true of all works of plastic art whose place was assigned them when they were commissioned. Even the free-standing statue on a pedestal is not really removed from the decorative context, but serves the representative heightening of a context of life in which it finds an ornamental place.[13] Even poetry and music, which have the freest mobility and can be read or performed anywhere, are not suited to any space whatever, but to one that is appropriate, a theatre, a concert-hall or a church. Here also it is not a question of subsequently finding an external setting for a work that is complete in itself, but the space-creating potentiality of the work itself has to be obeyed, which itself has to adapt as much to what is given as make its own conditions. (Think only of the problem of acoustics, which is not only technical, but architectural.)

Hence the comprehensive situation of architecture in relation to all the arts involves a twofold mediation. As the art which creates space it both shapes it and leaves it free. It not only embraces all the decorative aspects of the shaping of space, including ornament, but is itself decorative in nature. The nature of decoration consists in performing that two-sided mediation; namely to draw the attention of the viewer to itself, to satisfy his taste, and then to redirect it away from itself to the greater whole of the context of life which it accompanies.

This is true of the whole span of the decorative, from municipal architecture to the individual ornament. A building should certainly be the solution of an artistic problem and thus draw to itself the wonder and admiration of the viewer. At the same time it should fit into a living unity and not be an end in itself. It seeks to fit into this unity by providing ornament, a background of mood, or a framework. The same is true for each individual piece of work that the architect carries out, including ornament which should not draw attention to itself, but fulfil its accompanying decorative function. But even the extreme case of ornament still has something of the duality of decorative mediation about it. Certainly, it should not invite the attention to linger and be itself noticed as a decorative motif, but have merely an accompanying effect. Thus in general it will not have any objective content or will so iron it out through stylization or repetition that one's eye glides across it. It is not intended that the forms of nature used in an ornament should be recognized. If a repetitive pattern is seen as what it actually is, then its repetition becomes unbearably monotonous. But on the other hand, it should not have a dead or monotonous effect, for as an accompaniment it should have an enlivening effect and in this way must, to some extent, draw attention to itself.

On looking at the full extent of decorative tasks given to the architect, it is clear that it is the downfall of that prejudice of the aesthetic consciousness according to which the actual work of art is what is, outside all space and all time, the object of an aesthetic experience. One also sees that the usual distinction between a proper work of art and mere decoration demands revision.

Gadamer

The concept of the decorative is here obviously conceived as an antithesis to a 'real work of art' from its origin in 'the inspiration of genius'. The argument was more or less that what is only decorative is not the art of genius, but mere craftsmanship. It is only a means, subordinated to what it is supposed to decorate, and can therefore be replaced, like any other means subordinated to an end, by another appropriate means. It has no share in the uniqueness of the work of art.

In fact the concept of decoration must be freed from this antithetical relationship to the concept of the art of experience and be grounded in the ontological structure of representation, which we have seen as the mode of being of the work of art. We have only to remember that, in their original meaning, the ornamental and the decorative were the beautiful as such. It is necessary to recover this ancient insight. Ornament or decoration is determined by its relation to what it decorates, by what carries it. It does not possess an aesthetic import of its own which only afterwards acquires a limiting condition by its relation to what it is decorating. Even Kant, who endorsed this opinion, admits in his famous judgment on tattooing that ornament is ornament only when it suits the wearer.[14] It is part of taste not only to find something beautiful in itself, but also to know where it belongs and where not. Ornament is not primarily something by itself that is then applied to something else but belongs to the self-presentation of its wearer. Ornament is part of the presentation. But presentation is an ontological event; it is representation. An ornament, a decoration, a piece of sculpture set up in a chosen place are representative in the same sense that, say, the church in which they are to be found is itself representative.

Hence the concept of the decorative serves to complete our enquiry into the mode of being of the aesthetic . . . What we mean by representation is, at any rate, a universal ontological structural element of the aesthetic, an ontological event and not an experiential event which occurs at the moment of artistic creation and is only repeated each time in the mind of the viewer. Starting from the universal significance of play, we saw the ontological significance of representation in the fact that 'reproduction' is the original mode of being of the original art. Now we have confirmed that painting and the plastic arts in general are, ontologically speaking, of the same mode of being. The specific mode of the work of art's presence is the coming into representation of being.

NOTES

All notes for this article have been reproduced verbatim.

1 This is the sense of occasionality that has become customary in modern logic. A good example of the discrediting of occasionality by the aesthetics of experience is the mutilation of Hölderlin's *Rheinhymne* in the edition of 1826. The dedication to Sinclair seemed so alien that the last two stanzas were omitted and the whole described as a fragment.

2 Plato speaks of the proximity of the seemly (*prepon*) and the beautiful (*kalon*) *Hipp. maj.* 293e.

3 J. Burn's valuable book *Das literarische Porträt bei den Griechen* suffers from a lack of clarity on this point.

4 Cf Appendix II, p. 453, *Truth and Method*.

5 Cf p. 76, *Truth and Method*.

6 Karl Justi, *Diego Velasquez und sein Jahrhundert*, I, 1888, p. 366.

7 Cf Friedrich Heer, *Der Aufgang Europas*.

8 W. Kamlah in *Der Mensch in der Profanität* (1948) has tried to give the concept of the profane this meaning to characterize the nature of modern science, but also sees this concept as determined by its counter-concept, the 'acceptance of the beautiful'.

Gadamer

9 Translator's footnote: The German word *Frevel* is today rarely used except in the phrase *Kunst-Frevel*. *Frevel* = sacrilege, outrage; *Kunst* = art.

10 Above all in the first of E. Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen*, in Dilthey's studies on the *Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt* (Dilthey, VII) which are influenced by Husserl, and in M. Heidegger's analysis of the 'worldhood' of the world in *Being and Time*, sections 17 and 18.

11 I said above that the concept of a picture used here finds its historical fulfilment in the modern framed picture (p. 119, *Truth and Method*). Nevertheless, its 'transcendental' application seems legitimate. If, for historical purposes, mediaeval representations have been distinguished from the later 'picture' by being called *Bildzeichen* ('picture signs', D. Frey), much that is said in the text of the 'sign' is true of such representations, but still the difference between them and the sign is obvious. Picture signs are not a kind of sign, but a kind of picture.

12 Cf pp. 64–73, *Truth and Method*. The distinction, in terms of the history of the two ideas, between 'symbol' and 'allegory'.

13 Schleiermacher rightly stresses (as against Kant, *Ästhetik*, p. 201) that the art of gardening is not part of painting, but of architecture.

14 Kant, *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, 1799, p. 50, Meredith p. 73.