

Introduction

Gioia Laura Iannilli

University of Bologna
gioialaura.iannilli2@unibo.it

Stefano Oliva

Niccolò Cusano University
stefano.oliva@unicusano.it

The reflection on the relationship between Aesthetics and Philosophy of Language is often confronted with a double commonplace. On the one hand, aesthetic experience seems to be reducible to its sensual and perceptual side and therefore its nature appears to be entirely pre-linguistic. On the other hand, this reduction is often based on the idea that language is entirely equivalent to the propositional form. In order to overcome this double commonplace, or rather, shortcoming, it may be useful to approach the aesthetic and linguistic import of experience from the point of view of practices.

In fact, the aesthetic, which cannot be reduced to the realm of art, is actually and more extensively carried out in the wider framework of everyday practices, so much so that everydayness, in particular from the 1990s onwards, has become an explicit and crucial aspect for many aesthetics' sub-disciplines. In this view language, which from Wittgenstein onwards has been considered as an open set of language games, equally presents itself as a constellation of practices.

In this framework, of particular importance is the role played by those hybrid phenomena in which the two elements find themselves connected and harmonized in many respects. For example, one can observe a kind of chiasmus between aesthetics and language, in all those aesthetic experiences that presuppose the faculty of language and, conversely, in those linguistic practices that are conducive to aesthetic experiences.

In order to develop this comparison, it is useful to identify three, not mutually exclusive, privileged points of view. The stance of the producer (project, composition, ideation, design, etc.), that of the user (judgment, evaluation, recognition, understanding, engagement, etc.) and that of a recent figure referred to as the prosumer (new use, remediation, cooperation, etc.). In fact, in all these three cases, some sort of competence is at stake, and it is apparent how this competence entails both aesthetic and linguistic aspects learned and carried out in practices, according to a sort of circularity where the aesthetic and the linguistic are nourished by each other.

The idea of being competent aesthetically and linguistically, in fact, affords the possibility to prove how both the aesthetic and the linguistic possess an effective component which can make a difference in our current life context, especially when they fully become tools to manage and make sense of experience.

In the contributions here collected, the topic at the center of this issue of RIFL has been addressed in rather heterogeneous manners spanning different perspectives,

traditions and testbeds, by showing how the relationship between aesthetic and linguistic practices, especially today, proves to be a philosophically productive theme and problem.

The ‘practical’ take on the aesthetic and the linguistic is clearly pivotal in Bernd Herzogenrath’s article, where he thematizes the concept of «practical aesthetics». The author distinguishes it from previous scholarly proposals, and characterizes it on the one hand in terms of an approach that fully embraces the twofold origin of the aesthetic as both science and art, and on the other hand in terms of a dynamic and variable set of practices. More specifically, it is connoted as a «thinking with» art and media that is performed in a non-writerly and non-propositional manner aimed at relationally finding new ways to perceive, experience and create the world.

Gioia Laura Iannilli’s article is informed by a specifically pragmatist perspective. She proposes a reconceptualization of the notion of ‘familiarity’ in terms of a complex spectrum that spans what she defines «the familiar-family resemblance-problematicity» in which, by resorting to a specific Deweyan lens, it is possible to identify both a root and a testbed capable of making emerge the productive tension that exists between aesthetic and linguistic practices, especially when the aim and responsibility of a competent aesthetic subject should be preserving and intensifying the qualitiveness of experience.

The article by Stefano Oliva focuses on a specific aesthetic-linguistic practice, the seminar, starting from a reflection by Michel de Certeau on this typical activity of the academic world. Conceived by Certeau as a *caquetoir*, a place for chatting, the seminar is neither the occasion for a simple communication of scientific contents nor, on the other hand, does it aim to create a new specific form of knowledge, but it offers the opportunity to collectively create a new ‘sense,’ a possible line of flight from the rigid separation of disciplines.

Just as there are practices that are both aesthetic and linguistic, there are spheres that appear to be apart of both aesthetic consideration and linguistic expression. An emblematic case, according to Marco Mazzeo, is that of ‘olfactory beauty,’ investigated from some observations provided by the Italian philosopher Gianni Carchia. In his article, thanks to a rich archeological investigation, Mazzeo highlights the availability of the sense of smell to an aesthetic investigation and its privileged connection with an externalized conception of the mind.

In any case, aesthetic and linguistic practices seem to be not merely distinct and alternative to each other: one can, for example, consider the exercise of language itself as an aesthetic practice. In this perspective, Francesco Vitali Rosati’s article discusses some linguistic and aesthetic reflections of the Russian philosopher and mathematician Pavel Florensky focusing on the theme of naming and on his interpretation of religious icons: image and name reflect the same meaningfulness, sharing an analogous ability to reveal the real.

Among the possible paths between aesthetics and philosophy of language, a special place belongs to film practices. In his contribution, Alessandro Calefati starts from Peirce’s well-known distinction between symbol, icon and index to show how in some films dedicated to the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear disaster the interruption of the symbolic chain and the collapse between the three Peircean sign types lead to the production of a post-symbolic image. Film practice is finally defined as an action of *camérer*, according to the expression used by Deligny, that is, as a deactivation of symbolic logic and the subject.

Another artistic practice is at the center of Davide Dal Sasso’s article: performance. In his contribution, Dal Sasso tackles performance’s exemplary role on the one hand in interfering with conceptual application, namely, the ability to find the ‘right concepts’

and, on the other hand, in fostering imaginative activity, namely, an activity that eventually fuels assumptions on the limits and potential of the human. All this thanks to the inhering influence of an aesthetic reflexivity which is in force when human beings experience with performance itself.