

# International Journal of Human Sciences Research

## EPISTEMOLOGICAL QUESTIONS ABOUT ART

---

*Marcos H. Camargo*

Master in Communication and Languages (UTP, 2003). PhD in Visual Arts (IAR-UNICAMP, 2010). Post-doctorate from the School of Communication (UFRJ, 2015). Undergraduate Professor of Cinema and Audiovisual, Performing Arts, Music and Dance (Curitiba II Campus – UNESPAR, since 2006). Stricto sensu Postgraduate Professor of the Professional Master's Degree in Arts (Curitiba II Campus, UNESPAR, since 2018) GIIP/Unespar

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



**Abstract:** For a long time, it was customary to place art within the scope of doxa, while science and philosophy fit within the universe of episteme. Recent studies related to cognitive sciences and contemporary epistemology suggest that art also needs to be considered from the point of view of the episteme, as the knowledge produced by art contains specific truths that contribute to the understanding of the objective reality of the world and the subjective reality of humanity.

**Keywords:** Aesthetic cognition, knowledge, epistemology, art.

## RESEARCH MODES

For half a century, scientists have been paying attention to the fact that knowledge is much more than objective, visible, explicit news that can be expressed in language. Karl Polanyi (1886-1964), Austrian chemist and philosopher, explained in his book *Personal Knowledge* (1958) the insignificant, tacit and implicit aspects of knowledge. For Polanyi, the act of knowing is an exchange, a relationship between the personal (the knower) and the real (the object of knowledge). However, if the real or the object is that which is allegorically outside the knower, knowledge will never be completely objective, because it can only be grasped by a personal act.

“Human beings can only inevitably see the universe from a center that is within ourselves and we speak about the world from a human language formatted by the demands of our intersubjective communication. Any rigorous attempt to eliminate the human perspective from knowledge about the world will lead to absurdity,” said Polanyi. In this sense, artistic research owes nothing to the objective methods of scientific research, even because it is impossible to affirm the degree of objectivity of each statement dictated by science. At the base of the most objective conception there is a subject.

The history of scientific thought narrated by Thomas Khun (1922-1996), especially in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962), brought science closer to art, by recognizing movements found in the schools and styles of science in the evolution of science. arts (periods of normality and paradigm shifts).

While for science the shortest distance between two points is a straight line, for art the best distance between two points is a curve. Straight lines and right angles are human inventions, idealities transplanted into the world, easily recognizable as traits of rational intelligence. A quick look around the world is enough to realize that reality, nature, prefers curves as the best trajectories to achieve objectives. Imposing a rectilinear design on the world can serve to obtain some solutions, although it is an anthropologization of reality. Human knowledge, however, cannot simply limit itself to the exercise of humanizing the world, but understand the world as it really presents itself to us.

## GNOSIOLOGICAL PARAMETERS OF ART RESEARCH

In this century, the understanding has expanded that human knowledge is based on two cognitive bases (aesthetics and logic), which operate simultaneously between consciousness and the unconscious, in a mixed way.

When considering the two bases of human knowledge, artistic research must be included in the processing of gnosiological research, in order to build a fruitful relationship with its counterpart: philosophical-scientific research. In this sense, we present below some gnosiological qualities, present in aesthetic and logical cognitions, which logocentric culture has always believed to be in opposition, but which are in fact complementary, as they act within a cognitive arc that goes from the

aesthetic to the logical, with no solution. of continuity.

### PRESENTIFICATION – TELEOLOGY

At least five thousand years ago, the invention of writing concluded the prehistoric period and became the beginning of the history of civilizations and the model, by extension, of human thought. The technological character of writing, well documented by scholars such as Walter ONG (1998), promoted a separation between the forms of knowledge from the oral period and the forms of knowledge constituted from writing, which gained a word from Jacques DERRIDA (1973) to describe its influence on our cognitive operation: “logocentrism”.

It is writing that will allow the West to overcome the auditory matrix of orality, producing thoughts determined by the semantic and grammatical forms of the texts’ spelling. Words written on surfaces (stone, clay, papyrus, leather, etc.) begin to gain their own independent existence, giving the impression of constituting a separate world, dominated by humans, as opposed to the chaotic and complex existence of reality. Writing becomes the raw material that conceives this abstract world in our minds, beyond the real world – a metaphysical world, a place where humans can escape from reality and build their utopias.

Western teleology appears as a strong side effect of the ability to record facts and thoughts through writing. When writing, for example, about the acts, achievements and life of a king, such written records will become past (history) when they are read by his descendants. And these descendants also record their own deeds which, for the first king, are future events. Likewise, for current sovereigns, their stories will become past when their descendants are reading about them in the future. With this, it is clear that the past and present (when recorded in stories)

necessarily create the future. The need for the story to continue highlights the importance of everything for the future. This is how teleology is born, that is, the kidnapping of the present time, due to the importance of perpetuating the project with a view to the future.

The arc of time (past – present – future) is a side effect of writing. The passage of time becomes history and overcoming it becomes the personal and collective goal of the Western world. “Being here” loses value, while we search for “being for”. The Westerner is someone who is always “about to...”. He is for happiness, he is for love, he is for work, he is for duty, he is for death, as the consummation of his time in the future.

But, the Westerner is almost never “here”. He almost never recognizes himself in the present moment, because his consciousness has been hijacked by the purpose (teleology) of his action, of his thought – which is always pre-occupied with the future. In other words, we learn that everything we do, feel and think must have a purpose, some reason outside what we are doing, a purpose that makes our action part of a project that will only be completed in the future (which is always distant and never is consumed).

The “being for” takes us to a meaning (in the direction of...). So that everything begins to demand a meaning, that is, the direction that must be taken towards the future, what will occur as a result of our actions, feelings and thoughts. Thus, everything has to make sense (sense, direction, purpose). In the West, people believe that there are no fortuitous events, because everything has a meaning, even if it is hidden – it is there, giving purpose to the event, even if we cannot understand it.

The idea that everything has meaning leads us to consider “nonsense” things as having no value. Something that does not lead towards an idea has no meaning. The notion that knowledge is the product of the translation of

a sign into one or more meanings practically prevents us from perceiving the senselessness of the world.

The idea of “presentification” challenges current Western thinking. “Presentifying” is refusing the formation of a meaning, which sends our mind to some place, and affirming the sensitive experience of the presentified thing, without giving it purpose, without providing it with any collective meaning. This is a counter-intuitive exercise, as the almost irresistible tendency is to provide the thing with a connection with some representation – the almost automatic attempt to project onto the thing the Western precept of “being for...”.

The game between the powers of presentification and teleology forms the foundations of the relationships between art and science, respectively, insofar as science aims at the meaning and meaning of phenomena, while art develops its knowledge from the presentification of the material and concrete thing, which forms the body of the artifact. If for science, the phenomenon is a mere starting point that must lead to the knowledge of the general laws that cause it, while for art, the aesthetic experience and the artistic work contain within themselves the knowledge to be produced for/by the user.

## CREATIVITY – GENERALIZATION

The traditional idea of knowledge is linked to verbal and mathematical languages, both systems of signs, whose syntaxes allow an ordering of the chaotic reality, which is always on the verge of subjugating weak human reason, under the sea of absolute diversity and the nameless abundance of knowledge. world.

‘Intelligible’ is a word that in its Latin origin means “to read from the inside” – inter+legere. It is a metaphor, a figure of speech to designate the interpretation of signs – “reading from the inside” means understanding the content that must be extracted in a symbolic way, although

this operation does not occur like this in the brain: when perceived by the senses, the symbolic form activates an already existing memory, so that the sign is always a re-presentation, a redundancy.

Linguists prefer the definition of a sign that is formed from a signifier (perceptible and codified form: word), which allows one or several meanings (idea or content attributable to the word). ‘Intelligence’ is a specific type of knowledge that is acquired, reproduced and communicated through the interpretation of words and equations (signs). The syntax of these languages (verbal and mathematical) produces such security in the definition of things in the world, which gives the clear impression that reality can be controlled by humans. The power of verbal language is demonstrated by the capacity that a noun word (‘chair’) has, when referring to all existing chairs in the world, generalizing through its concept.

Generalizing is the essential role of language, since a single word (‘chair’) has the power to name all existing and thinkable chairs throughout the world. A genre, therefore, accommodates many more things under a single label (word), thus allowing verbal language to encompass a large part of what humans can know.

However, when generalizing (putting similar things in the same set), verbal and mathematical language generate an identification process (idem = equal) that neglects and excludes all existing differences between the things in a set, to focus only on that that equals them (chair: furniture element, with legs, seat, back, whose purpose is to accommodate the human body).

But, can a chair exist containing only its general qualities? The safest answer to this question is ‘no’. The general qualities that form the concept of chair are abstractions, they are ideas that need to be “materialized” by real,

concrete and existing forms that are found in the world. A chair is actually made of wood, stone, iron, plastic, etc. Its material form can contain a thousand and one variations, such as three legs, an inclined seat, an angled back, etc.

The scientist is not interested in possible variations in shape between two leaves of the same tree, as they must all contain a general and recognizable shape, which can tell the botanist, for example, what the species or genus of a given plant is. As a counterpoint, art searches precisely for what differs, differentiates and distinguishes one thing from another. Thus, through of creativity, art builds unique things. The main effect of creativity is the disruption of identities. While science is interested in causes, art is interested in things. While science seeks what it identifies, art seeks what it distinguishes.

The fact of striving for what is permanent, supported by rules and laws, prevents logic from being creative. Any system based on logic must exclude creativity in its application, as this would cause the collapse of its organization. Let's imagine an engineer being creative with the equations that define the structure of a bridge? Let's imagine an accountant who is creative with credit and debit items? Imagine a linguist creating his own grammatical rules for the language?

But then, why be creative, if creativity can be dangerous for society? This was why Plato expelled artists from his ideal republic. Plato always feared the creative power of art, which could break rules that he considered eternal and immutable, both in mathematics, in the word, and in society.

This is the importance of creativity: when the logic of systems is no longer useful or efficient in producing the results that society expects from it, the time comes to change the rules, to break paradigms to create other solutions. When studying the phenomenon

of creativity, artistic research uncovers the process through which systems (scientific, technical, social, political, cultural, etc.) degenerate and demand transformations, which are proposed through the creativity of specialists (of any art or science).

## SUBJECTIVITY – OBJECTIVITY

Here we find one of the traditionalists' favorite oppositions, used as a division between art and science, suggesting that when dealing with subjectivity, art does not achieve the objectivity necessary for the formation of effective knowledge. Traditional philosophy and science believe that they have methods and means to deal with reality, from an objective view, that is, independent of human opinions and impressions. For these traditionalists, artistic knowledge is very dependent on the subjectivity of the artist, as well as the viewer, making it impossible to generalize knowledge in the same way as philosophical or scientific universality. For traditionalists, there is only general science. In other words, they believe that the function of philosophy and science is to produce concepts about the general laws that cause things, independently of the things themselves.

Thus, they imagine acting beyond any personal ties with things in the world, avoiding contact with what exists.

The idea of objectivity, however, is older than science and independent of it. It arose whenever a nation, a tribe or a civilization identified its means of life with the laws of the universe (physical and moral) and it became noticeable when different cultures with different objective views confronted each other. (...) More belligerent nations used war and killed to eradicate that which did not fit into their vision of Goodness. (FEYRABEND, 2010, p. 12)

Firstly, we need to come to terms with the inescapable fact that philosophers and scientists are people, subjects who act in the



real world, without being able to escape their subjectivities. Behind every alleged objectivity of the philosopher or scientist there is a load of subjectivity inherent to human existence. The illusion that philosophy or science can be completely objective masks an inevitable subjectivity, as such a formulation of thought is human, therefore coming from a subject.

Against the illusion of objectivity espoused by traditional philosophers and scientists, only art contains the cognitive antidote, as research and artistic creation have always dealt with the subject and their subjectivity.

There can only be philosophical and scientific objectivity, to the extent that the degree of subjectivity of the philosopher and scientist involved in the processes is recognized. Contemporary epistemology recognizes this personal interference on the part of the researcher, even alerting them to such phenomena when analyzing research objects.

Art, in turn, deals with the subjectivity of the artist himself, as well as the viewer of works of art. Instead of belittling the subjective dimension of knowledge, artistic research has its means to highlight the subject's participation in the unveiling of the work of art, the unique way in which each viewer relates to the artifact.

The relativity of the knowledge acquired by the subject does not allow any claim to pure objectivity, but invites us to dialogue between art and philosophy/science. A certainly fruitful relationship, in which art teaches philosophy/science how to deal with the subject hidden in its theories.

## COMPLEXITY – SIMPLICITY

For millennia, philosophy and science have taught that truth comes from simple statements, as a complex proposition<sup>1</sup> may contain elements that do not meet the necessary and sufficient characteristics to define a phenomenon. Until recently, in the middle of the 20th century, romantic movements and their interpreters still prayed the song of simplicity, as was the case of Antoine de Saint Exupéry, who said in one of his books that “perfection is not achieved when there is nothing left.” to add, but when there is nothing more that can be taken away.” Phrases like this, from the creator of *The Little Prince*, serve to frame trends in thought that became known as “positivism”, “functionalism”, “minimalism”, whose idea of simplification aimed to return to the One, refusing any idiosyncrasy in phenomena, decoration, ornament, adornment that was accused of being superfluous.

The search for perfection is combined with the desire for eternity, the same dream of accuracy and rigor that is found in philosophical and scientific formulations. Here lies one of the errors pointed out by Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), when he denounced the mistake that began with Socrates: the idea that everything can be summarized within the One.

When thinkers and scientists invent propositions and equations to translate the phenomena they study, they seem not to realize that the signs of verbal and mathematical languages do not create reality, but only precariously represent it. As a human creation, languages are also imperfect and are subject to cultural evolution that transforms

---

1 From Latin, we receive the terms: *plici/plica/plicare*, which mean ‘preach’, ‘preach’, ‘fold’, generating the French term: *plissé*, which reaffirms the idea of ‘pleat’, ‘fold’. The words that contain this Latin root (*plici*) refer to something that contains folds, protuberances, surfaces that are difficult to overcome. When they want to mean something difficult to execute or rarely understood, they use the word ‘complication’, whose Latin prefix: *cum*, means ‘together with’ or ‘gathering’, allowing us to designate something ‘with many folds’ or some type of event, thing or idea that is difficult to access, due to its multiple characteristics. On the contrary, the reduction or elimination of incomprehensible ‘folds’ leaves out (ex) or eliminates: ‘*plici*’ – the word ‘explanation’ means to smooth, flatten, unfold, abstract the complications of a problem, to make it easily accessible to the intellect

them over time. Contrary to what idealist's dream, the real world is too complex to fit into languages.

Instead of pursuing the deceptive purpose of simplifying the world, in search of a non-existent essence, it is necessary to face the abundant complexity that characterizes reality. So, let's indulge in its idiosyncrasies to learn more about its intricacies. Instead of dealing only with the handful of causes that supposedly govern the world, artistic research aims to study the abundance of things that inhabit reality. A work of art is not a concept – there is no such thing as “abstract art” – but a thing existing in the real world. For this reason, artifacts will always be, like reality itself, resistant to any explanation.

Once and for all, we need to understand that if we want to build knowledge about the part of the world that is perceptible to us, we must accept the inherent complexity of reality. Complex thinking is one that does not disregard things, in favor of causes, but takes into consideration, the asymmetric and conflicting relationships that emerge from the inconstant friction between existing ones. Artistic research is better equipped to think about complexity, because it is unaware of definitions, categories, genres and classes that artificially separate things.

Traditional philosophy and science still try to simplify (sim+plex – unfold) the world, smoothing, planning its phenomena in the form of a representation. This world created by systematic thinking and verbal and mathematical languages is not real, but its pale representation.

Artistic research, in turn, also does not cover the totality of information and data that could be learned from reality, however, it opens up other cognitive perspectives that go beyond words and numbers, allowing us to expand the horizons of human knowledge.

## DIVERSITY – IDENTITY

The tradition of Western thought tends to see the world as composed of identities (species, classes, categories, genders, etc.). From the Latin *identitatem*, the word ‘identity’ comes to Portuguese, as the set of marks common to all units of a group.

Among the main sociocultural tools that serve to support identities is verbal language. For example, when we speak, hear, read or write the word ‘hat’, we know that this term refers to all hats in the world, as it names a finite set of qualities that must be present in all things that can be called ‘hat’ (a piece of clothing that protects the head, with an oval-shaped covering and brims). With just one word (hat), verbal language allows us to name millions of items, because they all have those minimum qualities necessary and sufficient to be a ‘hat’ - this is what we call identity.

We have few names and few definitions for an infinite number of singular things. Thus, the appeal to the universal is not a force of thought, but a disease of discourse. The drama is that man always speaks in general while things are singular. Language names, obfuscating the irresistible evidence of the existing individual. (...) But the drama of being is not just an effect of language. It's just that not even language defines it. There is no definition of being. (FEYRABEND, 1998, p. 28)

Thinking in terms of identities is equivalent to thinking in terms of concepts. Every concept is a recipe for identity. In human cultures, things have always been grouped based on physical, structural, functional and/or genealogical similarity, even though they are not the same. This strategy of controlling the natural and social environment allowed humans to reduce the extreme diversity existing in the real world, and classify it by species, categories, genera, etc. With the help of verbal language, each of these identity groups were given a name of their own, bringing vast sectors of the world into the human domain.

A source that produces identity, the concept of species is related to groupings of individuals (specimens) with great physical, structural, functional and/or genealogical similarities, which gives them marked collective uniformity. For example: humans are a species because their specimens have similarities that give us a strong psychobiological identity.

However, even today, due to the nonsense of thinking in terms of identities, the logical principles of non-contradiction and the excluded middle still apply against people who do not conform to general definitions, as is the case with people with disabilities, ethnicities, foreigners and gays. Classes and species are part of the way we organize conceptual knowledge in a common language, so that we can reach agreement within the social group to which we belong – however, classes and species are nothing more than human cultural conventions, invented by society to generate identities. Therefore, to speak, identification is an activity of nullifying the differences between things, to list only what they have in common, neglecting what is different about them.

According to Emilia STEUERMAN, for Jean François Lyotard:

... reason and the discursive capacity of language have become the evils responsible for the domestication and repression of creativity, while the dimension of rhetoric, exemplified by artistic expression, symbolizes what reason tries by all means to oppress and repress, which, in its own definition, cannot be known: the 'otherness' of reason. (2003, pp. 35-36)

Diversity is the natural state of the actually existing world. Because nothing remains what

it is, everything that exists is in an inconstant state of differentiation, not only in relation to other things, but also in relation to itself. Traditional rationalism, which still prevails in common sense, does not deal well with diversity, because it thinks only in terms of species, class, category, gender, etc. The importance of artistic research also serves to overcome this idealistic nonsense, which imagines the world always composed of identities. In fact, it is the opposite: the world is difference and to know the world we need to learn to deal with the diversity inherent in the things that really exist.

### INEFFABILITY – DISCUSIVITY

Part of the properties of things cannot be signified in words, and is therefore ineffable<sup>2</sup>. As it is impossible for linguistic logic to deal with the ineffable, aesthetics comes into play, which has the ability to perceive, read and communicate the unnameable, as aesthetic symptoms do not manifest themselves through concepts. The ineffability of the real world is its characteristic of being only partially discourseable. Everything that does not fit into speech; everything that has not yet been named, or cannot be named, belongs to the aestheticity of things.

The famous 'About that which one cannot speak, one must remain silent' (Wittgenstein) can in effect be interpreted as the arrow that pierces the rigid rigor of logic and shows its vanity or at least its limit: art, to believe in this interpretation, it would be fair to remain silent, as it cannot be spoken of correctly. Art beyond discourse, trans-logical, trans-grammatical art. (CAUQUELIN, 2005, p. 125)

---

<sup>2</sup> Originating from Latin, *Inexfabillis*, this word is a formation that includes the particle: *in* (negation), associated with the particle: *ex* (outside), and added to the declension: *fa* (of the verb: *fari* – speak), and the suffix: *billis* (ability to...) and literally means "inability to be translated into words". This is a limitation of verbal language already known among scholastics and classics. In the 20th century, when they became convinced that words cannot translate the world, the disappointment of many philosophers was portrayed in Ludwig Wittgenstein's famous phrase: "About that which one cannot speak about, one must remain silent". For this reason, philosophers must remain silent in the face of everything that the verb cannot represent, for example the field of aesthetics.



We do not need to stop before the ineffable, because the one who remains silent is the logos. The inability to overcome the ineffability of things makes logic find its definition (definis = limit) and understand himself in the finite extension of his *techne* (verb and number) – making the universality he believed he possessed precarious. This does not mean that we must limit the construction of human knowledge, just because words and numbers do not reach ineffable cognitions. Here some languages come into play, such as imagery, kinesthetic, musical, among others, which give rise to different forms of non-verbal, non-mathematical thoughts and knowledge.

Imagery language, for example, represents through the iconicity of appearances, being able to communicate something that words cannot interpret. Ineffability is found even in the perception of music, in the sensation of an aroma, in the enjoyment of a work of art, as much as in capturing the presence of singular things.

Not only the paintings, but even the plants and the proverbial beetles are all individuals, all supposedly unique; The scholastic cliché applies to all of them: “*individuum est ineffabile*”, the individual cannot be captured by the network of our [verbal] language, as it is essential to operate with universal concepts and propositions. (GOMBRICH, 1990, p. 106)

It is necessary to pay attention to a certain intelligent blindness that insists on submitting the real world to the network of linguistic interpretations, including denying the existence of that which cannot be interpreted in discourse. The verb is not the currency of exchange for all knowledge gained by humans, because the world cannot be completely interpretable through words. Linguistic operations are very useful for communicating socially relevant knowledge, but sometimes they lead to the illusion that the entire world can be contained in their network of

meanings, leading us to make serious errors in evaluating reality, a mistake that can be minimized with the help of artistic research, since art deals with that which cannot be interpreted by logical languages.

Ours is a time in which the project of interpretation is largely reactionary, suffocating. (...) In a culture whose classic dilemma is the hypertrophy of the intellect to the detriment of energy and sensory capacity, interpretation is the intellect's revenge on art. More than that. It is the revenge of the intellect on the world. To interpret is to impoverish, to empty the world – to raise, to build a ghostly world of “meanings”. (SONTAG, 1987, p. 16)

### FOLLY – SENSE

The notion of meaning understood as ‘reason for being’, ‘destiny’, ‘direction’, comes from the ancestral habit of searching for the regularities of reality, in order to predict how things will happen in the future. Hence comes the common sense that the world has a meaning, which is intelligible, with a cosmic purpose as its goal. Therefore, the logical understanding of things must take into consideration, their conformity to ends. On the other hand, a direction (sense) not only indicates its end, but also its cause (or beginning).

The apprehension of causality (principle of finality) through logical concepts provides the subject with the meaning of things. Conformity to ends is revealed in the entire sequence of causes and effects, with the links in this chain of meaning functioning as means that lead to ends. The meaning is the direction in which the sign leads the interpretation of its object. For logocentrism, the text only makes sense when it directs understanding towards a true idea. When there is no text, there is also no meaning.

Since all the actions of men depend on the search for an end, their knowledge is spontaneously reduced, therefore, to the knowledge of final causes: they consider everything that surrounds them only with reference to such an end, since they conceive everything that exists in nature only as means to achieve what is useful to them. Just as they think their eyes were made to see, they will think the fish are made to feed them. Every finalist vision is at the same time an anthropocentric conception of the world since in the end the pursuit of one's own interest prevails over all others in nature. (MIQUEU, 2009, pp. 128-129)

“Non-sense (nonsense) is at the same time what has no meaning, but which, as such, opposes the absence of meaning, operating the donation of meaning. (...) meaning is never a principle or origin, it is produced” (DELEUZE, 2006, p. 74/75). This quote from the philosopher

French alerts us to logic's habit of “producing” causes and effects to justify meaning of things.

The teleological principle of intellectual knowledge is at the foundation of concepts about things, giving them meaning, purpose, a reason for being, which is only found in the abstract scope of the mind. While a representation is defined as ‘something that is in the place of something else’, artistic facts are not representable, because they do not reverse meanings in the direction of other things – in this case, some works of art contain a marked degree of nonsense.

All signs (from which texts are formed) have a teleological nature, as they always fulfill a purpose, a telos, which takes place in leading the interpreter to a certain deduction about the object. On the other hand, the aestheticity of things does not transport us beyond themselves, as aesthetic cognition is not a deduction, but a perception – it only communicates its knowledge when present to the perceiver's sensitivity. Works of art are

not teleological, their representative function is collateral, the artifact cannot be understood as a sign indicating a meaning because, as an existing thing, the work of art is senseless, ineffable, inconceivable.

In coded systems, signs are representations of ideas about things that may or may not be present. When reading the sign, the mind leads us to the idea of something, towards something – this is its meaning. However, the sensations awakened by the aesthetics of the works are constructed by those who are affected by their presence. Thus, in the case of the arts, the work is only complete in the singular relationship it establishes with the perceiver. This “singular relationship” is not representable, not conceivable, not significant – it is an aesthetic experience.

The real world has no purpose, no meaning, no destiny, it moves in Darwinian evolution, producing an environment in constant transition. A closer understanding of reality implies this way of seeing:

aesthetic experience no longer embodies the utopia of experience, works of art are no longer tasked with transcending current reality and anticipating an infinitely good, beautiful and redeemed life. From this point of view, aesthetic interest resides solely in itself, devoid of any ulterior purpose (GUIMARÃES et alii, 2006, p. 23).<sup>3</sup>

Intelligent thought has a direction, a meaning, the purpose of addressing the world in order to say what it is, mastering its material existence through logical languages. The perception of the senselessness of artifacts demands an abolition of the sense of logic, so that one can be patient with their affections and, thus, aesthetically know the kaleidoscopic manifestation of reality. Folly is not the lack of meaning, but the refusal of a univocal meaning, typical of logic, which prevents the experience of the multiple meanings that the perception of the world offers us. What is creativity if not an attack of foolishness that clashes against the single voice of logic?

Far from being negligible, foolishness is one of the symptoms to consider in artistic research, as a constituent of sensitive cognition, as it inhabits various things and events that circulate in the natural and social environment.

The seven parameters of gnosiological research mentioned above and summarized in “Table 1” below are just a part of the border between art and science, which needs to be opened, so that knowledge gains transit, and frees itself from traditionalist prejudices, in order to may its complexity coincide with the indefinable abundance of the world.

PARAMETERS OF GNOSIOLOGICAL RESEARCH	
Aesthetic-Artistic Research	Philosophical-Scientific Research
Presentification	Teleology
Creativity	Generalization
Subjectivity	Objectivity
Complexity	Simplicity
Diversity	Identity
Inefabilidade	Discursivity
Insensatez	Meaning

Table 1, author (2021).

## REFERENCES

CAUQUELIN, A. **Teorias da arte**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005.

DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. **O que é a filosofia**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, 2009. DERRIDA, J. **Gramatologia**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1973.

FEYERABEND, P. **A conquista da abundância**. Editora Unisinos, São Leopoldo, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Adeus à razão**. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2010.

FREUD, S. **A interpretação dos sonhos**. Companhia das Letras, S. Paulo, 2019. GOMBRICH, E. H. **Norma e forma**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1990.

GUIMARÃES et al. **Comunicação e expressão estética**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2006.

KIRCHOF, E. R. **Estética e semiótica: de Baumgarten e Kant a Umberto Eco**. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2003.

MIQUEU, C. *in*: MARTINS, A. (org) **O mais potente dos afetos: Spinoza & Nietzsche**. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2009.

ONG, W. **Oralidade e cultura escrita: a tecnologização da palavra**. Campinas, SP. Papyrus, 1998.

SONTAG, S. **Contra a interpretação**. Porto Alegre: L&PM, 1987. STEUERMAN, E. **Os limites da razão: Habermas, Lyotard, Melanie Klein e a racionalidade**. Rio de Janeiro: Imago Editora, 2003.