

42 - 2013

sztuka i filozofia

■ Uniwersytet Warszawski Instytut Filozofii

■ Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper®

## ▪ advisory board!

---

Arnold Berleant, Andrzej Bronk, Alicja Kuczyńska (chair), Jerrold Levinson,  
Iwona Lorenc, Andrzej Póltawski, Władysław Stróżewski, Grzegorz Sztabiński,  
Irena Wojnar, Anna Zeidler-Janiszewska

## ▪ editorial staff

---

Ewa D. Bogusz-Bołtuć, Magdalena Borowska, Kamilla Najdek,  
Bogna J. Obidzińska (secretary, sztuka.wfis@uw.edu.pl), Piotr Schollenberger  
(editor-in-chef), Małgorzata A. Szyszkowska, Anna Wolińska (co-editor)

## ▪ reviewers

---

Jan Berdyszak, Maria Bielawska, Jolanta Dąbkowska-Zydroń,  
Dobrochna Dembińska-Siury, Janusz Dobieszewski, Anna Grzegorzczyk,  
Jan Hartman, Alicja Helman, Jan Hudzik, Jacek J. Jadacki,  
Anna Jamroziakowa, Alicja Kępińska, Leszek Kolankiewicz, Teresa Kostyrko,  
Piotr Łaciak, Jacek Migasiński, Anna Pałubicka, Teresa Pękala, Robert Piłat,  
Ewa Podrez, Hanna Puszek-Miś, Ewa Rewers, Stefan Sarnowski,  
Grzegorz Sztabiński

## ▪ contact

---

Instytut Filozofii UW, Zakład Estetyki  
Krakowskie Przedmieście 3, 00-927 Warszawa  
[www.sztukaifilozofia.uw.edu.pl/english/](http://www.sztukaifilozofia.uw.edu.pl/english/)

## ▪ special issue editor

---

Ewa D. Bogusz-Bołtuć (Ewa Bogusz-Boltuc)

## ▪ graphic design

---

Jan Modzelewski

## ▪ publisher

---

Uniwersytet Warszawski, Instytut Filozofii,  
Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper®  
ul. Mariensztat 8, 00-302 Warszawa  
tel./fax 22 538-92-03  
[www.semper.pl](http://www.semper.pl), e-mail: [redakcja@semper.pl](mailto:redakcja@semper.pl)

ISSN 1230 – 0330

Published with assistance from The Lanckoroński Foundation  
and The Ministry of Science and Higher Education

# table of Contents

<b>Editorial</b> .....	5
------------------------	---

## ■..... Interpretation and Evaluation

Noël Carroll: <b>Criticism and Interpretation</b> .....	7
James Grant: <b>The Aims of Art Criticism</b> .....	21
Simon Fokt: <b>A proposal for a dualistic ontology of art</b> .....	29
Iris Kapelouzou: <b>Conservation, value, and ontology</b> .....	48
Dorota Folga-Januszewska: <b>Museum vs. Neuroesthetics</b> .....	67
David Carrier: <b>The World Art History Museum</b> .....	79
E. M. Dadlez: <b>Poetry Is What Gets Lost in Translation</b> .....	86

## ■..... Art and Philosophy from Poland

Alicja Kuczyńska: <b>The Paths of Early Pluralism. Polish Aestheticians Between Eras</b> .....	93
Wojciech Włodarczyk: <b>Why not national? (“Novelty” and nationality in Polish art of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries)</b> .....	104
Ewa Izabela Nowak: <b>Magdalena Abakanowicz</b> .....	119
Krzysztof Musiał: <b>Collection and Its Meaning</b> .....	127
<b>Contributors</b> .....	132
<b>Notes for contributors</b> .....	134
<b>Acknowledgment</b> .....	137



The claim that art needs interpretation has become commonplace. There is no doubt among the majority of philosophers of art, art critics, artists, curators and conservators that interpretation is indispensable to making sense of an artwork and to allowing the content of a work to become apparent. Moreover, how works of art are perceived is not only a theoretical matter. Curatorial practices and art conservation-restoration choices instantiate our understanding of what art is and what is significant in artworks.

However, some philosophers may still oppose the interpretation of art. They usually dismiss interpretational inquiries for two reasons. Firstly, they claim that theory driven interpretation, such as psychoanalysis, feminism, or social radicalism, impose their own particular values on artworks. Consequently, cultural interpretation does not primarily promote the attitude of art appreciation; neither has it tried to establish standards for art. But, in this situation, even if some particular interpretational theories are refuted, the general idea of interpretation – epitomized by the cliché, “being true to artworks” – may still be acceptable. The second reason why interpretation has been questioned is heavier in assumptions and consequences. Namely, philosophers, who urge us to give up the idea of interpretation per se, claim that there is no such a thing as the nature of art or the intrinsic meaning of an artwork. Hence, we can only describe a work according to what we find useful for our own purposes. Thus, our pragmatic purposes seem to guide our encounter with artworks which, in turn, are supposed to help us to rearrange our life. One of the main problems with this view is that artworks are treated as blunt incentives, without their own rights, but at the same time they are, miraculously, supposed to change our existence. Nonetheless, even those philosophers, who are against interpretation and just opt for pragmatic uses of a work, are not inclined to embrace the radical arbitrariness of critical judgment.

So, we must face the non-arbitrary normative aspects of assessing the correctness of interpretation and, perhaps, even the correctness of use. So far, no one has justified that all interpretations are equally good. At any rate, art interpretation is a powerful and complex activity that cannot ignore simple questions such as: How are we going to assess the epistemic validity of interpretation? Which interpretation is correct or true, better or worse? Does the interpretation alter the meaning of an artwork? Is interpretation constitutive to the identity of an artwork?

I’m grateful to all Contributors to *Art and Philosophy* who decided to provide us with their answers to those disturbing questions.

Ewa D. Bogusz-Bołtuć