

Notes for Kandinsky on Vol. II Intro

- Biosophic form or obstruction of life form
(in late period, post 1930)
- Reliance on biological iconography, mostly Haeckel or Haeckel's Derwent (Encyclopedia der Biologie)
- Receptive to principle in its therapeutic interp.
(check article cited by V. Eschscholtz Boonett)
- Points the volume begins with

are connected to a overall description of life as a passive/contingent phenomena.

The various chapters deal with:

- Contingent life, aka contingency in biology
- An abstract model of contingent life
- An extension of the model to mental life
- The issue / challenge the introduction must deal with is how to extract or rather hint to these few mentioned themes through a poetic "reading" of Keesen's painting
- Tentative outline:

Φ. Brief description of
the printing (still to be
done...)

1. The background: book
Cf. ferns obstacle
from (wood legs) Hechel's
descriptions / strategies
(see article cited above)

2. P/H Brief mention of
H's receptive principle

⇒ Problem: No obvious way to
link passivity /
contingency to
either K's images
or H's principle.

Except: Perhaps per via
negative: Hechel's pr.
or pl. the therapeutic
interpretation of it as
the epitome of active
life (see / links to

Hebrew motifs,
see above mentioned
article)

Thus, K's biomorphic
abstraction can be
read as a collage,
or plh as a pastiche
work: Does life
in general as he
depicts it point
necessarily to an
inevitable, necessary
development guided
by activity?

Do we see the future
man (it's dross &
even) prefigured in
the oeuvre?

Is the embryo
a recapitulation
of K's movement?

And is the fact that
embryos seem to
disappear from K's
active works post 1936
an indication that
he / he should
be seen, as he did,
the linear progression
in favor of a multiplicity
of Coenobite-like
forms continually present
(violet Babel?)

Books to use:

- Haeckel's Die Welt Rätzel
- Steiner on Haeckel
- D'ANNA on Keatsusky
- Kojève on ^u
- Keatsusky's Spiritual
+ Punk/Gie

Again, more detailed

- 1.) Brief description of the figure, the painting, it comes from, and Kierkegaard's path toward delectation

K's books
D'Anna

[See D'Anna's book on Spiritual in Art, + Kierkegaard's own book(s) on the Spiritual]

- 2.) Initial biomorphic representations are usually embryos or similar, taken, or abstracted from, Haeckel's (-like) illustrations in the "Encyclopédie der Geowissenschaften" in K's possession

Haeckel

- 3.) Link to Haeckel's recapitulation principle and the teleological view of biological life

H's
Die
Haeckel

[Read up on and of Haeckel.
- Check out also (again!) SSF's pages on Haeckel's book in his

first book out in the morning]

3.1 Link to the Steiner interpretation of Heidegger's principle. [Read up on Steiner on Heidegger]

Steiner

3.2 Link up to Heidegger's teleology and to Hölderlin or Kierkegaard

Hölderlin

3.3 Kierkegaard's late paintings (or 322) would be a translation/reformulation and synthesis of Heidegger's historical teleology into biological life.

4) Switch to the passive-contributor view:

4.1) The later paintings (ie the Blue Sea 1911 and later, composition IX, and the one I'm looking

any cover from) seem to harbor
their teleological-dogmatic view
(the embryo as epitome of
recapitulation) and view
it as a representation of
life in the abstract that
does not show nor imply the
movement that is going
on in the embryo
but rather put together
abstract figures that are
assemblages of bio-morphic
components.

In other words, life does not
seem to go in one direction
any more (i.e. tail, fins,
legs, arms, fingers, for instance)
but in "all" directions
[cf. Cambrian explosion
from 556]

402 This is a prefiguration,

to a certain extent, if life has become "contingent" and "passive" b/c it tends to respond (i.e. it passively accepts) to the events coming from the outside (i.e. contingently generated) by developing into whatever generation is ~~overly~~ possible, etc.

Today a big, tomorrow a
civian, yesterday an over...

Need
not
accept
from
Heckel!!!

4.3) In other words, Kierkegaard hints of the "flip", the reversal that may suddenly occur when life as whole is reactivated and the attitude is focused on the end point.

I'm not seeing this well

of all.]

[5) I want to end on K's as a kind of poetic-artistic suggestion and challenge.

The abstract figure of his very late pinning asks whether it is possible, after having tried to read life teleologically to leave that framework behind as "consumed", as "exhausted", etc., and read as retroactively non-teleological.

6. This is the challenge the present addresses. Not in the poetic register of the artist, of course, but in the critical-scientific register of the philosopher.

6.1 Chapters summarize
followed. 7



Open issues

- Resolving aside, the fuzzy point (a point I can't afford to fuzz over, as it is crucial to my project) is the "flip" / "inversion" of point 4.3
- Perhaps the rescripts will help...