Teresa Pękala
 https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7609-7596
Maria Curie-Sklodowska University
tpekala@bacon.umcs.lublin.pl

DISCOURSE AND "SOMETHING MORE"

Abstract: The starting point and pivot holding the article together is an attempt to explain what the enigmatic "something more" means as an expression of theorists' expectations of discourse. The words that constitute the leitmotif, taken from Michel Foucault's theory and repeated by Mieke Bal, perform the role of "miniature theory" in the text, in the meaning assigned to the concepts by the Dutch scholar. The author of the article tries to interpret their meanings in the context of the foregoing conceptions, and compares semiotic and phenomenological approaches. The research tool that she uses is Pierre Bourdieu's theories of art rules and the art field as well as the proposals of contemporary German theorists: Andreas Reckwitz, Dieter Mersch and Stephanie Schmidt. Following Grzegorz Sztabiński, she recalls the problem of distinguishing theory from discourse and ponders the validity of this distinction, and the consequences of the proposition that discourses are only forms of expression for theory. Changes taking place in discourses are analyzed as the result of transformations in the late modern society, defined by Reckwitz as singularism. Guiding discourses towards "something more" than denoting the states of things changes their function and allows speaking of the "effect of truth", "effect of meaning", current "use of work", performative power of concepts and embodiment of the language of art. Expecta-tions of "something more" have always focused on the problem of identity and disproportion of heterogenic discourses. In the conclusion, the "something more" of discourse is shown as the contemporary form of metaphysical questions asked from the perspective of philosophy of finiteness.

Keywords: discourse, theory, esthetics of "something more", singularism, figurality, effect of meaning, effect of truth, metaphor, semiotics, phenomenology.

The connection between the concepts of "discourse" and "art" is not obvious. Their origins place them in different areas of meaning, the boundaries of which had been marked by history before the concepts themselves were subject to analysis. Discourse (Latin *discursus*), literally

meaning "walking, running back and forth" means negotiating meanings in a dialog, discussion, or conversation. It is originally related to the Logos, to the word, reason, being, sense and unity. The aim of discourse is to search for the unifying principle, the basis of communication, agreement, i.e. "reaching accord" about concepts; it is "mutual understanding" that follows "re-conciliation". In the context of intuitively accepted meanings, the question arises whether it is necessary to agree at all levels of the communication process to reach consensus? Which of them are indispensable and which are only sufficient for agreement to occur? The genealogy of concepts does not come to the aid of contemporary "discourse on discourse". While the metaphorical going back and forth, and negotiating meanings still takes place, the aim of discourse is not necessarily agreement and it is certainly not guided by the principle of unity. Unity associated with the word, the meaning of which refers to the states of affairs, is traditionally assigned to theory. Replacing theory with discourses is also observed in reflection on art. Some consider it a natural response to the change in "discourses of art" themselves, while others warn against a new form of oppression of the word against the matter of art. The transformation of theory into discourse should be considered in the broad context of changes in culture and philosophy, described as a transition from modernism to postmodernism or from modernity to postmodernity. Some theorists directly connect these phenomena and describe the change in question as progressive "separation of the modernist and the postmodernist community in the semantic context and not on account of reality"[1]. The consequences of replacing theory of art with discourses on art in the Polish literature on the subject were analyzed by Grzegorz Sztabiński. This problem was, among others, the subject of an erudite paper delivered by the Professor during the Polish National Scientific Conference on *Art Discourses. Discourses on Art* in June 2017. In the broad context, he recalled the history of separating scientific discourses as theoretical statements from other discourses, including aesthetic discourse. He considered the legitimacy of distinguishing theory from discourse and the consequences of saying that discourses are only forms of expression for theoretical statements. I do not wish to recapitulate the Professor's presentation, as it was summarized in an article published in 2018[2]. I refer to this situation not only for substantive reasons, as it was

---

[1]   S. Schmidt, *Postmoderne Ästhetik - Das Verhältnis von Ästhetik, Kunst und Natur*, "Tabularasa, Zeitung für Gesellschaft &Kultur", No. 62 (4/2011) , (tabularasa-jena.de/artikel/artikel_2581/), [accessed: 20.11.2020].

[2]   G. Sztabiński, *Teorie sztuki a dyskursy o sztuce*, [in:] *Dyskursy sztuki. Dyskursy o sztuce*, ed. T. Pękala, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2018, pp. 35-57.

the last time that I had an opportunity to listen to Grzegorz Sztabiński during a scholarly debate. Subsequently, we talked several times about the divergence of art discourses and discourses on art which he, being an artist and aesthetician, found disturbing. Many art theorists who are critical of narratives dominating in the world of art share this opinion. Is this anxiety justified and does it really result from the causative nature of discursive statements? In the context of constructivist theories and the optics of postmodernism, the following question is brought into consideration: "Thus, the problem 'is this the truth?' is replaced by the question 'what are the effects of the truth of this discourse?'"[3] It would be naive to reduce the issue expressed in this way to the semantics or practices of art institutions. The changes occurring in theory and specialized discourses of art institutions are a consequence rather than a cause of transformations in late-modern society, in which the general loses its advantage to the "social logic of the special"[4]. In the context of this process, which Andreas Reckwitz called singularism, one can speak of the truth effect. Adopting such an assumption in relation to discourse would mean that the criterion of its value does not result from the meaning established in relations with reality, with what is general and commonly accepted, but from the effect of this meaning. As Stephanie Schmidt claims, such a categorical assignment to axiological and historical meaning becomes redundant and "instead, a multitude of semantic and explanatory premises is recognized, which causes discourse to be currently continued as a linguistic game"[5]. In my opinion, the battle is neither about defining the truth in the philosophical sense, nor about specific forms of theoretical statements or artistic criticism. I would not reduce their impact to a linguistic game, as its effects can be purely pragmatic. Mutual expectations of artists towards theorists and vice versa have always focused on the problem of identity and the disproportionate nature of their discourses. In the context of considerations on the shape of contemporary relations between them, a balanced consideration of the impact of the singularization process on the theory of communication is expected and so is an answer to the question of what currently determines the specificity of discourses. What is the role of non-semantic factors in their creation? We are not in a position to consider all the consequences of late-modern processes of the shape of discourse on art. We will mainly consider the

---

3   Ibid., p. 54.
4   A. Reckwitz, *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten. Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*, Suhrkamp Verlag, Berlin 2017, 11.
5   S. Schmidt, op.cit.

conceptions that are aware of the limitations of discourse, that explain it differently and that refer to varying degrees to philosophical assumptions.

From the time of Alexander Baumgarten to Jacques Rancièr, the specificity of aesthetic forms of expression seems obvious, although it is understood in really different ways. The protagonist, apart from ascribing cognitive value to it, defined aesthetics, inter alia, as the aestheticologic, the art of beautiful thinking, while Rancičre, in turn, saw in it the policy of dividing the visible. The sources and contemporary expectations towards aesthetics have a common feature: assigning to one's own discourse the possibility of having real impact on what the discourse goes beyond. The going beyond was understood in various ways and we will return to this issue later in the paper. In a sense, the historically understood art of beautiful thinking and the hopes associated with deep aestheticization as understood by Welsch are similar in the expectation of "something more". Likewise, one can interpret the simplification of aesthetics into the sensual appropriation of reality and the contemporary forms of return to *aisthesis*. Mastering the art of beautiful thinking and seeing what is not visible on the surface of discourse, directing attention to the areas of noiselessness are among several distinguishing features of aesthetic statements. However, a doubt may arise whether the special attention with which we turn our eyes to the distinctive forms of aesthetic discourse is just a consequence of the time of singularization.

Is concentration on aesthetic discourse itself, i.e. something distinguished, not "a complicated striving for the unique and the extraordinary, the deliberate achievement of which has become not only a subjective wish, but paradoxically a community *expectation*"[6]?

Today, if we ask in this context what the truth of discourse is, we should also ask about our expectations towards it. If we expect agency instead of theory, then agency is probably the criterion of truth. It is worth remembering that the answers and hints where to look for solutions did not start with the performative turn. Ever since philosophy conceptualized the human experience of the world, and particularly the experience of art, this topic has kept recurring. Theory and discourse theory have always been expected to offer "something more" than they have been able to provide. The present text also refers to the expectations and the proposition of explaining what this "something more" is, and partly is a continuation of my considerations of this issue expressed on another occasion – not accidentally mentioned here[7].

---

[6]   A. Reckwitz, op. cit., p. 9.
[7]   Cf. T. Pękala, *Dyskurs o dyskursie*, [in:] *Dyskursy sztuki. Dyskursy o sztuce*, op. cit., pp. 21-33.

The expectation of "something more" from discourse explicitly appeared in Michel Foucault's classic monograph *The Birth of a Clinic*. When he talks about the role of commentary limiting the randomness of discourse, about the role of the author who brings coherence to it through "identity play", about the limitations of discourse by scientific disciplines, he repeats the phrase: "but it is about something more"[8]. This excess of sense, a reference to the unifying principle, is no longer provided by metaphysics, the absence of which is noticed by the French philosopher and sociologist, and many other scholars. The departure from the philosophy of the first principles accords well with the assumptions of Foucault's methodology "allowing introducing chance, discontinuity and materiality to the very roots of thinking"[9]. The need to rethink "the very roots of thinking" as a paradigm of knowledge changes over time is perhaps more interesting than detailed discourse analyses. This does not mean underestimating or ignoring the assumptions of the origins which draw attention to the need of taking into account the conditions of the actual formation of discourse, its external limitations and the rules self-limiting it from within. In this sense, methodology has not lost its relevance, guided by the following principles: discontinuity, i.e. abandoning the search for a single discourse in favour of many, intersecting and even conflicting with one another; specificity, particularly in the belief that discourse is something more than a play of meanings on the surface of the pre-discursive significance of things; externality, that is, accepting the fact that it is cognitively unproductive to seek the essence of discourse and that the analysis of the external conditions of its constitution tells us much more about it. Foucault outlines a research program which, in his opinion, is aimed at eliminating the classical opposition between "words" and "things".

"We don't step back to stand in front of discourse – where nothing has been said yet and where things barely loom in an uncertain light; nor do we stand behind it to find the forms that it established and left behind: we remain – we try to remain – at the level of the discourse itself. [...] Their (discourses' – T.P.) operation consists in something more than labelling things with signs. [...] It is this 'more' that should be shown and described"[10].

---

[8] M. Foucault, *Narodziny kliniki*, trans. by P. Pieniążek, Wyd. "KR", Warszawa 1999, pp. 23-24.
[9] Ibid., *Porządek dyskursu,* trans. by M. Kozłowski, Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2002, p. 42.
[10] Ibid, *Archeologia wiedzy*, trans. by A. Siemek, PIW, Warszawa 1977, p. 76.

In the genealogy program we remain at the discourse level, and it is its internal rules that determine how much "more" the world will be allowed to materialize. The original levels/ fissures/cracks of what happens between words and things make the limits of discourse more precise. In this sense, we can talk about the dynamic movement of meanings and the changeability of discourses in specific areas, also in the discourses on art lying within the scope of our interest. Does not thinking focused on what happens between words and things seem too narrow to describe the "discourse of art", despite a whole range of the "in between"? What are the relationships between art theories, interpretations and discourses? How are the relationships between discourses determined by art institutions and other participants in the world of art? So, how do "fields of art" arise? Determining the boundary of a field, its structure and value is, in the conception of its author, Pierre Bourdieu, closely associated with rules. The concept of a field is intuitively associated with cultivation, which implies domination rather than a relationship. Such "gardening" metaphors are readily used because they refer to "something more", both semantically and pragmatically. Metaphorical cognition allows us to say that the subject re-introduced to the theory of literary research is admittedly the doer/agent, the one who tills the field, at the same time remaining only the one who sets the tools in motion according to established rules. Despite the fact that the rules binding in art are specific and filtered through individual experience, this subjective excess of "something more" in Foucault and Bourdieu remains limited by the rules of discourse, and does not go beyond its surface. Before we start considering the possibility, need or necessity of agreement between heterogeneous discourses, some attention should be paid to what determines the identity of discourses and what gives them specific features that allow or prevent agreement and reconciliation with other discourses in communication processes.

As the subject of our reflection is the way of speaking about art, we will not be interested in specialized discourses, but mainly in the forms of expression that we cover with the general term "aesthetic discourse". They are not confined to the academic discipline of aesthetics, but, like its utterances, characterized by a certain degree of generality. Philosophical discourse on art is most representative, and although it is not the only one to be taken into consideration, it is in the philosophical discourse that the features of a "different way of speaking", specific to art, are most apparent, or – as Dieter Mersch claims (referring to Martin Heidegger) – most often there is "an occurrence of different speaking" in it[11]. Mersch refers to poetic speech and uses Hans Blumenberg's concept

of "absolute metaphor" to define the meaning that Heidegger assigned to its language. The term "absolute" refers to figurative irreducibility to logical categories and a lack of conceptual translatability that characterize this type of metaphor. This issue goes beyond the scope of our considerations, but on another occasion it would be worth looking at Blumenberg's metaphorology in the context of the theory of discourse accompanying art[12]. Philosophical discourse on art surpasses other ones in using metaphors, which is perfectly demonstrated by, for example, Heidegger's writing. While the use of metaphorical language alone is difficult to be considered a specific distinguishing feature of discourse, it would be more cognitively promising to consider the role of absolute metaphors in seeking and deciphering the conceptually irreducible or difficult-to-translate figures that organize thinking about a given thing or phenomenon. In this aspect, the function of absolute metaphors is fulfilled in attempts to grasp the most general and, at the same time, dreadful realities such as fate, the world and history, because of their incomprehensibility. Art and philosophy explore these areas and, in this sense, their discourses intertwine. Regardless of whether we treat metaphor as a semantic surplus to concepts, allowing "something more" in philosophical and aesthetic discourse, or as an attempt to indicate an area beyond discourse, the figurativeness of discourse is undeniably part of its history. Absolute metaphors extend the concept of figurativeness to include an important cognitive aspect. Only answering general questions about different variants of the communication process can determine the places where paths of the conceptions of discourse diverge. The problem is complex, even when the subject of analysis is limited to linguistic conceptions of discourse. The differences between the hermeneutic and semiotic conception of discourse may provide an example here. The process initiated by post-structuralism revealed the weaknesses of semiotic discourse theories and, subsequently, of hermeneutic theories which were related to them in different ways. The reality of signs, inherent in communication, perceived more and more commonly as a dynamic reality, gradually blurs the boundaries of discourses, giving them a "nebular character" – using a phrase from the book by Wojciech Kalaga[13]. Interdisciplinarity resulting from the changes re-strengthens this state

[11] D. Mersch, *Sprache und Aisthesis. Heidegger und die Kunst*, [in:] S. Peters, M. J. Schäfer (Hg.), *Intellektuelle Anschauung. Figurationen zwischen Kunst und Wissen*, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2006, p. 125.

[12] Cf. H. Blumenberg, *Paradygmaty dla metaforologii*, trans. by B. Baran, Aletheia, Warszawa 2017.

[13] W. Kalaga, *Mgławice dyskursu. Podmiot, tekst, interpretacja,* Universitas, Kraków 2001.

of affairs and contributes to a gradual loss of the identity of discourses. On the other hand, the process of blurring the boundaries of discourses and the movement of "wandering concepts" confirmed Foucault's words that the operation of discourses is more than just marking things and more than pointing to the area of uncertainty. Currently, the operation of discourse, its ability to do "something more" is most often associated with the performative turn. I will use Mieke Bal's conception in order to illustrate the change in discourses and their theories between the narrative and performative turn, rather than discuss it in detail. Her attempts to reconcile variously shaped approaches to art within the framework of a very broadly understood semiotic theory seem to be a significant case study of the humanities in the time of turns. Bal, being a theoretician and critic as well as a video artist, perfectly represents the phenomenon (important in the origin of late-modernity discourses) of changing roles in the world of culture and directly in space around art. It is all the more interesting for our considerations, as the researcher does not abandon her desire to combine the various discourses that she practices herself.

Bal explains the problem of the operation of discourses raised by Foucault in the following way: "Concepts are tools of intersubjectivity: they facilitate a conversation on the basis of colloquial language. They are generally considered abstract representations of an object. Like all representations, however, they are neither simple nor adequate in themselves. They bend an object, deprive it of stability and distort it [...] Concepts are **actually something more - and they certainly *do* something more** (T. P). If you think about them carefully, they contain miniature theories that, in this guise, help you analyze objects, situations, states, and other theories"[14]. The focus on the agency of concepts, on the fact that concepts do something, introduces the discourse on discourse into a new stage, whose identifying sign has become the performative turn. Many works inspired by the classic work of Erika Fischer-Lichte[15] have recently appeared on the subject of how specific semiotics arises in the course of theatrical and other artistic activities. The problem of discourse in the context of performativity is also addressed. Taking into consideration the ferment that Bal caused in methodology with her conception of narratology, a subdiscipline with interdisciplinary ambitions, going beyond the study of literature towards the sciences of other arts, anthropology

---

[14] M. Bal, *Wędrujące pojęcia w naukach humanistycznych. Krótki przewodnik*, trans. by M. Bucholc, Narodowe Centrum Kultury, Warszawa 2012, p. 47.

[15] E. Fischer-Lichte, *Estetyka performatywności*, trans. by M. Borowski, M. Sugiera, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2008.

and cultural studies, it can be concluded that it was a necessary step to close one stage and open the next one, not only in semiotics, but also in cultural sciences in general. The Dutch cultural critic and theoretician started from the experience of art and referred to the value of metaphorical cognition to support her views. Furthermore, she emphasized the metaphorical status of concepts in both the humanities and natural sciences[16].

Fischer-Lichte associated changes in theory with the marginalization of her claim for intersubjective communicability and verifiability. In theory in general, and in narratology as its representative form, the researcher emphasized "not the pursuit of objectivity or certainty" but "subjective character and at the same time [its] susceptibility to cultural limitations"[17]. The metaphorical nature of cognition, and the study of relationships between cultural rules and subjective factors bring her conception closer to discourse than to the concept of theory established in science, although theories, as Blumenberg carefully examined the issue, did not avoid metaphor. Bearing in mind the fluidity of boundaries and the ambiguity of the concepts of theory and discourse, we should contrast them with great caution. The non-linguistic semiotic approach proposed by Bal, applied in research on visual culture, can be considered one of the important elements in the process of replacing the theory of art/arts with discourses of art/arts described by Grzegorz Sztabiński. "The culture in which works of art and literature appear and function does not make a sharp distinction between the verbal and visual domain"[18]. It is worth noting that only language and image are mentioned here, while other non-verbal forms of communication have not yet aroused as much interest as is the case today. In general, it can be said that while the efforts of theory in the traditional sense aimed at defining the identity of the studied object as accurately as possible, the strategies proposed by Bal focus on the "meaning effect"[19]. Focusing attention on the contemporary cultural context of interpretation with its current social determinants as well as on the rhetorical dimension of visual culture

---

[16]   These studies still confirm the great influence of linguistic and particularly interactionist concepts of metaphor. The work of Georg Lakoff and Mark Johnson, also known in Polish translation, is considered an iconic item in the literature on the subject, which initiated a new period of research on non-literal communication. Cf. G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metafory w naszym życiu*, trans. by P. Krzeszowski, PIW, Warsaw 1988.

[17]   M. Bal, *Narratologia. Wprowadzenie do teorii narracji,* Wydawnictwo UJ, Kraków 2012, p. 10.

[18]   M. Bal, *Reading "Rembrandt": Beyond the word–image opposition: The Northrop Frye lectures in literary theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 1991, p. 5.

[19]   Ibid., p. 17.

allows Bal's theoretical assumptions to be used in order to explain co-
nversational strategies related to the concept of discourse. In a work of
art, the Dutch researcher is interested in "not so much the meaning of
a work itself as the frames" and in being focused on "its current uses"[20].
If we add interpreting a work of art through "extraordinary" detail and
the interpreter's affectivity to the intellectual tools favoured by Bal, the
term "methodological amalgam" seems to be accurate[21]. "The complica-
ted methodological edifice erected by Bal-theoretician is not necessary
to construct the interpretations of Bal-interpreter, on the contrary – it se-
ems to undermine their status"[22]. Perhaps the attempt to reconcile what
Bal-artist and Bal-theoretician have to say is about something more?
Perhaps, following Gianni Vattimo, we should ask about the limits of
interpretation, and probably even about what lies beyond interpretation?
Considering whether Bal's conception justifies similar questions would
require a separate discussion. The foregoing rather superficial juxtapo-
sition of the assumptions of Foucault's and Bal's conceptions was only
intended to outline the philosophical tensions within the theory of se-
miotic origin. In spite of attempts to reconcile subjectivity with cultural
codes, within which a work communicates with the world, when asked
"what actually is a work of art?", these theories (referring to the title of
Joseph Margolis's book[23]) respond as if a work of art was or primarily
was a theoretical object. Foucault's statements contain the words that
confirm this supposition "[...] in countless words spoken by people [...]
the meaning has been embodied; it weighs on us, leads us blindly and
waits in the dark for our consciousness to grasp it [...]"[24]. The embodi-
ment of the sense of art's speech in concepts, even if their performative
power is perceived, no longer satisfies discourse theorists, and attempts
are still being made to reconcile identity with difference. This problem
has long been known in philosophy and, thanks to sociologists, cultural
experts and practitioners active in the public sphere, it translates into
specific interpretations of social behaviour. The change produced by
genealogy, narratology and performativity still leaves many unresolved
problems which focus on issues related to "embodiment" but in a sense
closer to the original meaning of this concept. While the aim of discour-

---

[20] M. Maryl, *Sztuka czytania? Mieke Bal w teorii i w praktyce*, "Teksty Drugie" 2013/4, p. 325.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid.
[23] J. Margolis, *Czym, w gruncie rzeczy, jest dzieło sztuki. Wykłady z filozofii sztuki,* trans. by
K. Guczalski, Universitas, Kraków 2004.
[24] M. Foucault, *Narodziny kliniki*, op.cit., p. 13.

se in consensus- seeking approaches was to "reach agreement" on concepts belonging to the field of art, in discourses that takes corporality into consideration, the area of possible concurrence is definitely wider. Sometimes one has the impression that this already goes beyond the discourse which Foucault himself tried to avoid. The attempts to capture what appears on the surface and focus on aesthetic phenomena both indicate the insufficiency of the existing solutions and draw the attention of researchers to the need to apply phenomenological studies. With regard to a work of art, this does not mean a renaissance of the classic version of phenomenology and attempts to build a discourse competing with research approaches predominating today. On the contrary, there are many issues shared by the conceptions of semiotic origin and phenomenological aesthetics in, among others, research in the field of *visual studies*, focused on the relationship between discursive, conceptual and visual order.

Difficulty in reconciling the perspective faced by an interpreter of visual arts and art theorist, shown on Bal's example, was the subject of reflection by the classics of French phenomenological aesthetics, such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty. In the frequently quoted works by this author (*The Eye and the Mind; Perception, Expression, Art*), the problem of reconciling individual expression (Bal's "interpreter's affectivity") and artistic expression finds a solution through locating both orders in corporality[25]. From a different perspective, the issue is addressed by postmodernists who negate depth and do not want to reach the roots. While Bal was looking for a way to find contiguity points between words and images in the rhetorical dimension of visual culture, Jean-François Lyotard argues for the figurative nature of discourse. The Dutch researcher builds the conception of new semiotics on the assumption of the rhetorical character of visuality, while the French aesthetician, assuming the figurative nature of language, formulates a thesis about the inability of language to reveal the visual order. Although it refers to philosophical conceptions of metaphor in terms of the figurative nature of language and examples of its use in the theory of the sublime, at the same time it goes beyond them and undermines the possibility of interpreting a work of art using only linguistic procedures. The "something more", recurrent in contemporary conceptions, at times brings the order of discourse closer to the visual order, and at other times leaves them in a state of conflict. In this respect,

---

[25] Cf. M. Merleau-Ponty, *Oko i umysł: szkice o malarstwie,* Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 1996; Idem, *Postrzeganie, ekspresja, sztuka,* [in:] ipse, *Proza świata. Eseje o mowie,* trans. by S. Cichowicz, Czytelnik, Warszawa 1976.

a different proposition of explaining what a discursive "something more" could be is to consider what underlies the artistic expression and reception of a work, and what Foucault feared, declaring to stay "on the surface of discourse". Writing about the age of reason, Lyotard notices the dangers of narrowing the concept of *logos* to conceptual utterance and finds a solution in expanding the space of discourse. In interpretations of the aesthetics of the sublime, it is appreciated that in legitimizing various types of discourses and opting for the "justice of contradiction", its author accepts (following Kant's example) the existence of states that undermine the order of discursive thinking and indicate the powerlessness of intentions to reconcile the relations between the sensory and the extra-sensory within this order. In the conceptions of discourse, focus on the dispute: non-representability versus presence is a temporary solution[26].

Lyotard, therefore, does not follow the path set by Heidegger's search for reconcilement between understanding and the unspoken. This path was followed by Emmanuel Levinas, Jacques Derrida and Merleau-Ponty, whose views, generally speaking, aimed at broadening the sphere of discursive rationality to cover the "silent logos". This is not the place to elaborate on the conceptions of the philosophers of deconstruction[27]. I mention the category of "silent logos" because, even in the approach of its authors, it did not mean the possibility or even will to directly reach the "otherness" of things. According to the assumption, we are interested in a conviction recurring in various conceptions, or rather in an expectation of the possibility of extending discourse by another "something more". In contemporary aesthetics, not only art is treated as an important area for restoring sensitivity and reconstructing the foundations of thinking. It was only the theories of Lyotard and Wolfgang Welsch that opened a debate in aesthetics, aimed at creating its new shape. An example of the new aesthetic discourse is the post-phenomenological writing of Henry Maldiney. The style of his statements was described by Monika Murawska as post-narrative, a kind of a little story whose features differ from academic discourse in the search for "the moment of 'between', between the strength of a philosophical concept and its absolute helplessness"[28]. Among the contemporaries, there are also sceptics of the

---

[26] Cf. S. Schmidt, op.cit.
[27] These issues were thoroughly discussed in the cross-sectional monograph by Iwona Lorenc. Cf. I. Lorenc, *Logos i mit estetyczności,* Wydawnictwo UW, Warszawa 1993.
[28] M. Murawska, *Fenomenologiczna post-narracja. Szkic o fenomenologii Henriego Maldineya*, "Argument" , vol. 3 (2/2013), p. 386

exceptional role assigned to aesthetic discourse in creating a model of a new way of thinking[29]. Paradoxically, the process of disseminating theory and discourse did not completely reject the idea of the possibility of agreement and reconciliation. In the phenomenological approach, the issue of aesthetic reconciliation is an interesting attempt to address the problem of intersubjectivity.

From the perspective of contemporary French phenomenology, the theoretical field of this standpoint is marked by the following questions: "What is the specific kind of understanding that binds me and the artist when I experience his/her work? What is the nature of this unspoken communication between me and the others who experience this work? Whether and how does this experience confirm the continuity of my relationship with the world and the worlds of those who built the cultural codes used by the artist? I know that this communication takes place because I understand the artistic message in my own way, I "enter" the world s/he proposes; I feel its closeness or hostility, it moves, attracts or deters me; I struggle with the codes of this message. I realize and express my opinion on the artist's work and the quality of my experience, I communicate with others on this matter. Whether and how, through my experience, do I become a member of a community of understanding: acceptance or contestation of what was "said" in the work?[30] The surface of discourse on which Foucault wished to remain was a flickering surface of meanings, but reconciliation required diving deeper or shallower into the senses whose brilliance had faded to make room for other senses. Aesthetic reconciliation, which Iwona Lorenc writes so convincingly about, offers an opportunity for agreement at the level of socio-cultural phenomena without deep foundations. This kind of thinking certainly requires a reconstruction of the field of art, taking into consideration change in the relationship between the discourse of art and the discourse on art. The roles of those who create the discourses have changed and are often difficult to distinguish. Incidentally, note that aesthetic reconciliation is accompanied by the phenomenon of aesthetic differentiation in the context of cultural processes. It is difficult to predict whether new solutions in discursivity will arise within conceptions derived from semiotics and phenomenological conceptions. Will conceptions of the limits of the discourse accompanying art emerge somewhere at the inter-

---

[29] Cf. S. Schmidt, op.cit.

[30] I. Lorenc, *Estetyczne uzgodnienie jako temat współczesnej fenomenologii francuskiej*, [in:] *Fenomen i przedstawienie. Francuska estetyka fenomenologiczna. Założenia/Zastosowania/Konteksty*, eds. I. Lorenc, M. Salwa, P. Schollenberger, Wyd. IFiS PAN, Warszawa 2012, p. 24.

section of the two research strategies which (strategies) would simultaneously define the area of the possible discursivity of art itself? There are several arguments to support this assumption. Both in narratology (in Bal's approach) and in contemporary phenomenologists' conceptions, a work of art is treated dynamically and processually, whereas the nature of relations arising in the world of art is described as an event. There are also significant differences resulting from philosophical assumptions, with the fundamental and, as yet insurmountable, difference between a phenomenon and performance. The dividing lines between contemporary theorists interested in visual art and culture, the sensory and the discursive, confirm – just as reconciliation vectors do – the presence of metaphysical questions, although asked from a different perspective, from the position of modernity which has departed from the aspirations of reaching the first principles. "Contemporary culture thinks about the finite, starting from the finite"[31]. This hence results, on the one hand, in particular caution of the theorists who self-limit the field of inquiry, and on the other hand, in an unlimited number of discursive practices.

From a distance, which is still possible in the philosophy of art, questions about language and discourse in opposition to image and broadly understood materiality of art can be treated as a contemporary form of metaphysical questions, going back to the roots of Western culture. The post-modern perspective can be seen in the discourse on art. In contemporary semiotic conceptions, it is considered anachronistic to treat language as an absolute system or structure that dominates those who use it. Examples include the abovementioned conceptions of Foucault and Bal. Contemporary phenomenological aesthetics is also reluctant to "attribute to the field of the aesthetic the eschatological mission of saving the remnants of depth"[32]. Rather than that, theorists avoiding metaphysical assumptions represent the way of thinking typical of the "philosophy of finiteness" to the extent and in the meaning in which this concept is used by Włodzimierz Lorenc after Odo Marquard. This form of thinking is not free from a tendency to fall into absolutization and one-sidedness, except that rather than into what is relevant and present, as can be observed in Foucault's views[33]. This corresponds to the desire, described by Reckwitz, to distinguish various forms of singularization comprising the activities of individual subjects and communities. Contemporary con-

---

[31]   M. Foucault, *Słowa i rzeczy. Archeologia nauk humanistycznych*, transl. T. Komendant, vol. 2, Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2005, p. 134.

[32]   I. Lorenc, *Estetyczne uzgodnienie...*, op. cit., p. 108.

[33]   W. Lorenc, *Filozofie skończoności,* Wydawnictwo UW, Warszawa 2016, p. 251

ceptions, i.a. advanced by the German researchers quoted here, firmly embedded in social studies, perfectly show that a critical theory is still possible. "It is not a logical contradiction, but a real paradox that one can analyze common practices and structures that revolve around producing singularity (Singularität)"[34]. Theory has become a kind of a regulative idea and even in discourses that are mainly concerned with the effect of meaning (as in Bal), the concepts are referred to as "miniature theories".

In the history of human thought, the desire to go beyond the current and the present has always been an expression of seeking "something more". The experience of the finite, which is characteristic of our time, "allows us to grasp the unpredictable present not as a deficit of meaning or being, but as an opportunity to understand ourselves – an opportunity that we must decline in consistent thinking and acting"[35]. Self-conscious discourse is necessarily a discourse of resigning from galactic journeys to the land of meanings; however, it does not give up the pleasure of contemplation and does not avoid fear in the face of their presence. Mersch, referring to Antonin Artaud's interpretation of a 1853 poem by the French poet Gérard de Nerval, with the meaningful title "El Desdichado" (the unfortunate, disinherited, uprooted), writes about a thinker and an artist not as being brothers in experimentation (Lyotard) but as two unfortunate people disinherited from a not fully recognized inheritance whose fate is marked by tragedy. The thinker lacks words in the face of destiny; the artist produces only an inarticulate sound in the face of fear. "Thinking and language lead us into silence: the tangibility of art bluntly shows the nakedness of the world"[36]. Crossing the border river to reach for "something more" is the source metaphor for what happens between discourse and *aisthesis*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bal M., Narratologia. *Wprowadzenie do teorii narracji*, Wydawnictwo UJ, Kraków 2012.

Bal M., *Reading "Rembrandt": Beyond the word – image opposition: The Northrop Frye lectures in literary theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 1991.

Bal M., *Wędrujące pojęcia w naukach humanistycznych. Krótki przewodnik*, trans. by M. Bucholc, Narodowe Centrum Kultury, Warszawa 2012.

---

34 A. Reckwitz, op. cit., p. 13.
35 M. Seel, *Estetyka obecności fenomenalne*j, Universitas, Kraków 2008, p. 25.
36 D. Mersch, op. cit., p. 112.

Blumenberg H., *Paradygmaty dla metaforologii*, trans. by B. Baran, Aletheia, Warszawa 2017.

Fischer-Lichte E., *Estetyka performatywności*, trans. by M. Borowski, M. Sugiera, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2008.

Foucault M., *Archeologia wiedzy*, trans. by A. Siemek, PIW, Warszawa 1977.

Foucault M., *Narodziny kliniki,* trans. by P. Pieniążek, Wyd. "KR", Warszawa 1999.

Foucault M., *Porządek dyskursu*, trans. by M. Kozłowski, Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2002.

Foucault M., *Słowa i rzeczy. Archeologia nauk humanistycznych,* trans. by T. Komendant, vol. 2, Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria Gdańsk 2005.
                                                                                                      "
Kalaga W., *Mgławice dyskursu. Podmiot, tekst, interpretacja*, Universitas, Kraków 2001.

Lakoff G., Johnson M., *Metafory w naszym życiu*, trans. by P. Krzeszowski, PIW, Warszawa 1988.

Lorenc I., *Estetyczne uzgodnienie jako temat współczesnej fenomenologii francuskiej*, [in:] *Fenomen i przedstawienie. Francuska estetyka fenomenologiczna. Założenia/Zastosowania/Konteksty*, eds. I. Lorenc, M. Salwa, P. Schollenberger, Wyd. IFiS PAN, Warszawa 2012.

Lorenc I., *Logos i mit estetyczności*, Wydawnictwo UW, Warszawa 1993.

Lorenc W., *Filozofie skończoności*, Wydawnictwo UW, Warszawa 2016.

Margolis J., *Czym, w gruncie rzeczy, jest dzieło sztuki. Wykłady z filozofii sztuki*, trans. by K. Guczalski, Universitas, Kraków 2004.

Maryl M., *Sztuka czytania? Mieke Bal w teorii i w praktyce*, "Teksty Drugie" 2013/4.

Merleau-Ponty M., *Oko i umysł: szkice o malarstwie*, Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 1996.

Merleau-Ponty M., P*ostrzeganie, ekspresja, sztuka*, [in:] ipse, *Proza świata. Eseje o mowie*, trans. by S. Cichowicz, Czytelnik, Warszawa 1976.

Mersch D., *Sprache und Aisthesis. Heidegger und die Kunst*, [in:] S. Peters, M. J. Schäfer (Hg.), *Intellektuelle Anschauung. Figurationen zwischen Kunst und Wissen*, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2006.

Pękala T., *Dyskurs o dyskursie*, [in:] *Dyskursy sztuki. Dyskursy o sztuce*, ed. T. Pękala, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2018.

Reckwitz A., *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten. Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*, Suhrkamp Verlag, Berlin 2017.

Schmidt S., *Postmoderne Ästhetik – Das Verhältnis von Ästhetik, Kunst und Natur,* "Tabularasa, Zeitung für Gesellschaft &Kultur", no. 62 (4/2011) , (tabularasa-jena.de/artikel/artikel_2581/), [accessed: 20.11.2020].

Seel M., *Estetyka obecności fenomenalnej*, Universitas, Kraków 2008.

Sztabiński G., *Teorie sztuki a dyskursy o sztuce*, [in:] *Dyskursy sztuki. Dyskursy o sztuce*, ed. T. Pękala, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2018.

DYSKURS I „COŚ WIĘCEJ"
(streszczenie)

Punktem wyjścia i osią spajającą artykuł jest próba wyjaśnienia co oznacza enigmatyczne „coś więcej" jako wyraz oczekiwań teoretyków wobec dyskursu. Słowa będące leitmotivem zaczerpnięte z teorii Michela Foucaulta i powtórzone przez Mike Bal pełnią w tekście rolę „miniaturowej teorii" w znaczeniu jakie pojęciom nadała holenderska badaczka. Autorka próbuje odczytać ich znaczenie w kontekście wymienionych koncepcji, porównuje ujęcia semiotyczne z fenomenologicznymi. Jako narzędzia badawcze wykorzystuje teorie reguł sztuki i pola sztuki Pierre'a Bourdieu oraz propozycje współczesnych teoretyków niemieckich Andreasa Reckwitza, Dietera Merscha, Stephanie Schmidt. Przypomina za Grzegorzem Sztabińskim problem odróżnienia teorii od dyskursu i rozważa zasadność takiego odróżnienia oraz konsekwencje twierdzenia, że dyskursy są tylko formami wypowiedzi dla teorii. Zmiany zachodzące w dyskursach analizowane są jako następstwo przemian w społeczeństwie późnonowoczesnym określanych przez Reckwitza syngularyzmem. Ukierunkowanie dyskursów na „coś więcej" niż oznaczanie stanów rzeczy zmienia ich funkcję i pozwala mówić o „efekcie prawdy", „efekcie znaczenia", bieżącym „użyciu dzieła", performatywnej mocy pojęć i ucieleśnieniu mowy sztuki. Oczekiwania „czegoś więcej" zawsze koncentrowały się wokół problemu tożsamości i niewspółmierności heterogenicznych dyskursów. W podsumowaniu „coś więcej" dyskursu pokazane jest jako współczesna forma pytań metafizycznych zadawania z perspektywy filozofii skończoności.

Słowa klucze: dyskurs, teoria, estetyka „coś więcej", syngularyzm, figuralność, efekt znaczenia, efekt prawdy, metafora, semiotyka, fenomenologia.

Teresa Pękala – Professor of Philosophy at the Institute of Philosophy at Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS) in Lublin and the Head of the Department of Aesthetics. Her interests focus on the problems of contemporary aesthetics and art, postmodern culture, processes of aestheticization of the past and Polish aesthetics. She has published ca. 130 articles and is the author or editor of eight books:
Secesja. Konkretyzacje i interpretacje [*Art Nouveau. Concretizations and Interpretations*] Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin 1995; *Estetyka otwarta Mieczysława Wallisa* [*The Open Aesthetics of Mieczysław Wallis*] Instytut Kultury, Warszawa 1997; *Awangarda i ariergarda. Filozofia sztuki nowoczesnej* [*Avant-gardes, Ariere-gardes. Philosophy of Modern Art*] Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2000; *Mieczysław Wallis. Wybór pism estetycznych. Wprowadzenie, wybór i opracowanie* [*Mieczysław Wallis. Selected Aesthetic Writings.* Introduced, Selected and Edited by...] Universitas, Kraków 2004; *Przyszłość Witkacego* [*Witkacy's Future*] (ed.), Universitas, Kraków 2010; *Powrót modernizmu* [*The Return of Modernism*] (ed.), Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2013, *Estetyczne konteksty doświadczenia przeszłości,* [*Aesthetic Contexts of Experience of the Past*] Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2013; *Konstanty Troczyński. Wybór pism estetycznych. Wprowadzenie, wybór i opracowanie* [*Konstanty Troczyński. Selected Aesthetic Writings.* Introduced, Selected and Edited by...] Universitas, Kraków 2014, *Witkacy w kontekstach* [*Witkacy in the context*], (ed.) Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2015, *Teatr, teatralizacja, performatywność,* [*Theatre, theatralization, performativity*] (ed.), Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2016, *Przestrzenie autonomii*

– sztuka, filozofia, kultura, [*Spaces of Autonomy – Art, Philosophy, Culture*] (ed.), Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2017, *Dyskursy sztuki. Dyskursy o sztuce,*[*Discourses of Art. Discourses about Art*] (ed.), Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2018, *Zapomniana sztuka. Sztuka pamiętania*, [*Forgotten Art. The Art of Remembering*] (ed.), Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2019, *Dystynkcje estetyczne – wyróżnienie i wykluczenie*, [*Aesthetic Distinctions – Merit and Exclusion*] (ed.), Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2020.