Origin of the work of art

just an essay in aesthetics? No —> deeply connected to Ontology / Truth

Truth as revealing / not correctness /not necessarily good/evil

Origin in a genetic sense: what and how it is what it is
Origin is the source of the essence

Origin —> Essence —> Essential Source of Art

traditional/unreflective view: Artist —> Artwork
    does making art make you an artist —> or is art something more?
        of course we live in an age after art
        Artwork is also the origin of the artist

Art mediates artist and artwork —> it is the origin of both

what even is art (even BAD art)?

the question of the origin of art asks about the essence of art

art unfolds in the artwork (not really the artist)

circular arguments vs. hermeneutic circle
no single foundation in hermeneutics we follow the circle and come back to the
starting point where we find more there than we left (earth becomes a new world)

artworks are things (actual objects)
works have aa thingly character (as do instruments/sounds)

phillistine sees only the thingly nature

art is "higher" than this —> the artistic nature that supervenes on the thing
allo alegore - allegory: art tells a story with (dead) things —> it brings them to life

as though the thing is the sub-stance of the art

we need to focus both on the thing and the artly nature

What is a thing?

whatever is not simply nothing
but this is too broad
but we resist calling some things things: people, god, even pets other animals

traditional metaphysics takes things as ontologically primal

3 Interpretations:
Subject / Predicate
the thing is what undelies properties (what is proper to the thing)
hypokeimenon —> substance
HEIDEGGER THINKS TRANSLATION IS ALWAYS DISTORTION — THERE IS NO NEUTRAL   THOUGHT OUTSIDE OF SPECIFIC EXPRESSIONS
people transfer the propositional structure of language into the being of things itself

What is perceptible
Hume: subjects are just bundles of sensations
experience is never first a blooming buzzing confusion — we see Gestalten not
assemblages of properties

Formed matter
Aristotle hylomorphe
the thingly nature is the matter of which the artwork is made

this is the traditional ontology of artistic criticism

what determines the form of the thing is really its use - not its shape

formed matter conception gets in the way of bringing the essence of artworks to light

to understand the essence of equipment we need to look at how they are normally used — not as art works, etc. The less we notice them the better they are functioning as equipment.

Earth / World
usefulness the for what of equipment telos/form
what is the "work" in the art work that reveals the shoes as what they are in our world

Heidegger rejects the notion of artworks assharing the essence of equipment, i.e.,

formed matter. Manipulation of a material substructure
 roughening of use to revel the world of uses within which it functions

sub-ob = an attentiveness to how the world works on us
the world gives itself to us

the Being of beings undergirds all other being —> gives the capacity to be

art has everything to do with truth —> revealing

art is not about mere imitation but about revealing

What truth is happening in the Roman Fountain poem?
truth comes into being in time —> it is temporal not static
can truth in itself be historic?

what is the working of the artwork?

The question concerning technology

summary:

-how technology affects us / works on us
Heidegger's view of modernity
late modernity/late capitalism/

Question of essence

Heid thinks that unreflective use/consumption of technology conceals more than
it reveals to us

how is Dasein intimately connected with technology?

techne / episteme (tension?)

is modern technology (mechanized) radically different from previous
technologies/tools
Aristotle talks about the hand as tools / slaves as tools

archaic / industrial / post-industrial societies
Bestand: stock-piles / 'resource' notion of existence
"questioning builds a path' answer is not necessarily the goal

true questioning
let the text work on you —> be patient
developing a free relationship to technology
free relationship: opens our existence to the essence of technology
how does my existence as human being get revealed in the essence of technology?
heid—>what makes us human/dasein is the questioning activity

1. Technology as human activity is a means
    1. correctness of the correct —> vs. hermeneutic / what is interesting?
        1. what does the interesting tell us about what we value in the world
        2. showing us what the essences of things are
2. Technology is not = to the essence of technology
    1. individual instances of tech are not yet the essence of tech
    2. that (secondary) substance by virtue of which a particular may be subsumed into a general class
    3. not looking for paradigm examples
    4. what does all technology have in common?
        1. the essence is the human comportment —> making meaning of technology
        2. not of the order of problem solving
        3. evading tech also doesn't get us any further
        4. when we regard tech as neutral —>
            1. tech is NOT neutral
            2. not a pure means

Metaphysics —> means? YES. human activity? YES.
positing means for ends is a distinctly human activity —> technology becomes an aid to human activity

modern condition —> shapes every approach to technology. Instrumental approach is not adequate.
Will to Mastery: becomes all the more urgent as it slips from our control
e.g., iPhone aborbs us — makes us get lost — makes us 'dumber'' in many respects

What if technology is no mere means? —> from physics of the apparent to metaphysics

the merely correct is not the true

what is the instrumental? from means/ends to cause and effect
Aristotle: 4 causes

material / efficient / formal / final
Heid: let's say that things are not as simple s Aristotle tells us.
—> perhaps the 4 causes are NOT what we take them to be
  1. why are there only 4 causes?
  2. what does cause really mean?
  3. efficient cause becomes dominant - telos fades away
  4. what does cause really mean? causa - cadere - to fall
      1. aitia: that to which something is indebted / being responsible to/for
      2. the chalice is co-responsible for the chalice / it is indebted to
         1. why is form imposed on matter? the telos
         2. backward causality
      3. silver smith is not the efficient cause of the chalice
         1. he is a maker —> he is involved in a background situation
         2. someone creates technology through coping
      4. what is common to the four causes? such that we call them all causes?
         1. heidegger wants to bring making to lichtung

4 causes are 4 ways of 'being responsible'
occasioning: let it come into appearance —> lets things appear as the things they
are as a   certain thing with a certain context, a certain meaning,
let what is not yet present come forth into presence (not forcing, but coaxing)
set it free, set it on its way into its complete arrival
bringing forth what is potential in the material, latent dormant

nature — upswinging/blooming/flourishing is a sort of poesis

think about your experience of bringing a new piece into existence.
from concealment —> unconcealment
the chalice is in the silver, but it takes the smith to allow it to come forth
aletheia - veritas - truth

so how did we get to truth from technology.
truth is not about correctness/correspondence/pragmatism but about revealing to
us our relationship/responsibility to the world.

to allow the concealed to come into being/presence
causa —> occasioning —> bringing into presence
so then what is technology? —> a mode of revealing of introducing meaning
where things were inchoate || it structures life/sense/reality

Techne: ability/capacity of activity
Episteme: knowledge —> e.g., rhetoric

Aristotle tried to distinguish them
techne brings forth that which is not yet, it gives determinacy to it
the telos is already there before the activity, develops together with the activity.

is this true of contemporary tech? previous tech had a closer integration w/nature
— situation. The current tech attempts to be situationless.
art driving tech / tech driving art

what about improvisation???
but the telos is not the form / so the telos of an improvisation might not be the
form of the music, but its purpose/why improvise/why write music? probably
becuase there is a life project at work. A way of making meaning. so that even if
you are trying to find a new approach to art the telos of the art practice precedes
to a certain extent. But of course, the more we think about it it, we may think that
our life is going in a certain way but that we are wrong —> life happens, things go
in other directions than what we plan. But as life goes on we do learn, we do make
meaning, we do become who we are. And so maybe the end is the search, the
struggle to make meaning —> see Kierkegaard on the self.

modern technology is a driver: techne is not just an instrumentum —> it reveals
(aletheia) **tech reveals not only what does exist, it suggests possibilities for
what could exist**

traditional technology does not consume - it does not transform essences. at
least not on a massive scale (but it's not clear to me that it is fundamentally
different)
modern technology consumes - it aims to extract the maximum resource out of
the world with minimum effort. And even before this it treats the world primarily as
a resource not as an object of contemplation or of wonder or of gratitude, but of
potential energy to be extracted.

expediting (Fördern): unlocks, exposes, extracts
maximum yield at minimum expense
in the case of a hydro electric dam - the river's being is revealed as something
new - a pure resource - the river is transformed by the power plant

it is not a philosophical approach / i.e., an approach that loves wisdom, it is not
loving, it is exploitative.

Nature
Energy —> unlocked —> transformed —> stored up —> distributed
Regulating: gives a rule to, continuous ruling over (beherrschen) Verwalten
everything is ordered to stand by for further use/distribution

Standing Reserve: Bestand: stock-pile
not just stock, not just things, but energy
no longer an object for us — it is a capacity

tech reduces things to standing reserve (Bestand)
we don't have complete control over alethetia/revealing it is something that works
on us
the essence of technology is that aspect of technology that prompts humans to
see the world interms of standing reserves/problems to be solved - perhaps with
the technology — every problem looks like a nail to one with a hammer
so that even human beings come to be seen as nothing more than resources (HR)
Logistics as an industry - human activity becomes standing reserve in data
farming
compare modern farmer to situation 100 years ago (part of a vast market
apparatus)

we are never TOTALLY transformed into a resource — we can always ask why
the modes in which we think present a world that is already set up in the interests
of late capitalism — everything we see, every action we take is thought interms of
our lives as a resource to be extracted to the maximum level.

gathering — mood
Gestell: enframing —> Gerüst —>

Enframing means the gathering together (intensification) of the setting upon
(challenging) that sets upon man
—> symbiosis of humanity + technology (product of human activity in the world)
—> becomes objects (specific technologies) that become standing reserve, which
can reveal other things (including humans) as standing reserve
this makes us lose sight of anything that resists falling into the category of
standing reserve

reciprocal relationship technology <—> physics
physics used to drive tech, now tech drives physics —> reveals the world as
calculable, whatever falls outside this does not count as truth/knowledge

physics thinks of itself as neutral transparent , but it is also a projection of a world
on the earth

chronological / historical
modern physics is the herald of enframing (Galileo/Newton)

the more sophisticated the representational system (e.g., theoretical physics /

string theory - Hodge conjecture) the further it is from images/representations. It becomes a virtual world unto itself — pure logic, etc.

this system is determined by a causality (causa aitia) changed into calculation - reporting - quantification - what can be (~unambiguously) reported/communicated/replicated by receivers(listeners) etc.
the way tech reveals the world to us also conceals alternate ways

Destining : Geschick —> Geschichte
modern tech comes to take on a shadow life of its own - its revealing is not only done through human activity, it reveals the world in its own way
we are already involved in this - whether we like it or not

capitalism is always looking for new things to turn into standing reserve
managerial science, etc.
our tools can cause us to see the world in a particular way

Freedom:
humans are radically free - we have a sort of freedom that is prior to volition/free will -
whenever we have aletheia we have freedom - a capacity for things to go differently - all revealing comes out of the free - e.g., when we find something new in an artwork we thought we already knew well. the work is revealing something new to us about itself ourselves the relationship of self to work and of self to world (and of work to world?) - objects are not exhausted by the system of uses - we can always find something new in them. Which means that they have some property that is concealed and comes into focus. not "anything goes" but a vanishing interpretive horizon - vanishing point. point at infinty
We are free to make meaning our own project

Danger/Threat:
technological revealing can make us start to see everything in terms of standing reserve and only in terms of standing reserve

but this is true of any sort of revealing

HH: the true for Heidegger is the mythic for Nietzsche - reveals/expresses our situation

two false images of humanity : Lord over nature (master of tech)/resource (standing reserve)
true image of humanity —> what it actually is for itself, what it means to be a fucking human being

the false images cut us off from ourselves —> from an involved relationship to making (cf Marx "state of nature") vs. division of labor

HH: cut us off from our future as well - alternative paths / views on what it is to be human in the world
strange because tech always presents itself as oriented toward the future (but notice not futuring, or futures, or a future) but THE FUTURE as though there is a single univocal future and we are just along for the ride.

Heid is not pessimistic —> Hölderlin where danger grows the saving power grows also
Tech - harbors within itself this saving power —> the ability to imagine other worlds we have missed.

how to develop a communicative system that is not oriented toward standing reserve...
ART!!!!!!

art not as commodity but as the creation of meaning-granting worlds

questioning is the piety of thought — the way we do justice to the divine as that which is more than us.

the saving power within the very threat

don't confuse artistry with technical innovation/change
often technical innovation is actually retrograde (in a bad way, e.g., pop) - but perhaps in good ways also.

Eidos —> the thing beheld
Idein —> to see / behold

So we do see directly into the reality of the world, just not with the eyes
Logic corresponds to reality Aristotle/Plato —> no subject/object dichotomy
Aristotle has a 1-world onto-epistemology: epistemology is a subfield of ontology