



ART FRONTIER

An International Art Journal / Vol.2, No.2 Apr.-Jun., 2024

A Logical Inquiry into History and Art: On the Internal Relationship Between 'Logical History' and 'World Relational Aesthetics'

Congcong Bi

To cite this article: Congcong Bi, "A Logical Inquiry into History and Art: On the Internal Relationship Between 'Logical History' and 'World Relational Aesthetics'," *Art Frontier* 2, no.2 (June 2024): 66-76, <https://doi.org/10.64212/OPAB2857>.

DOI: 10.64212/OPAB2857

ISSN: 2835-5490

EISSN: 2836-841X

© 2024 Frontier Press.

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). For full license details, please visit: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

This article has undergone double-blind peer review.

Website: www.artfrontier.org

Email: artfrontier2023@outlook.com

Publishing Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)



A Logical Inquiry into History and Art: On the Internal Relationship Between “Logical History” and “World Relational Aesthetics”

Congcong Bi

Translated by Chloe Chen

Abstract

The concept of poetic history distinguishes the two elements of existence in the tradition: history and art. Through the analysis of philosophers and poets, the history that represents the reality and the art which represents generation are finally integrated into the process of spiritual life. As two aspects of art as a psychic mode of being, the aesthetic activity which inclines to form is not only closely related to the emotional experience of living; it even refers to logic itself. On the other hand, aesthetics is often seen as the result of reflective reason, the knowledge of aesthetic activity's self-adjustment. Finally, aesthetic activity and aesthetics are historicized into human speech in the direction of artistic value, and their academic discipline are logic-history (luojilishixue) and world relational aesthetics (Shijie guanxi meixue). Through the medium of relations, people can pay tribute to the glory in the presence of the holy, which is the common meaning of history and art.

Key Words

History, art, logic, aesthetic activity, aesthetics

1. Introduction

The fusion of history and art normally leads to either of the following consequences: either art is seen as a vessel for history, transforming the history of objects into a form of art history; or art embellishes history, where the art of history becomes an aesthetic reception of historical effects. This combination of words initially carries a biased meaning. The predominance of “existence” over “form” manifests as a secondary aesthetic. It is difficult for people to transcend the basic to consider the comprehensive connotation of structural synthesis. Hence, the compound term “poetic history”—the unity of history and aesthetics in a broad sense—can only be found among great poets and philosophers.¹ In this context, the definition of history equates to history itself, where embellishment is not an external collage but a fundamental sensation. “Poetry, in essence, is the pursuit of contact with reality. This awareness and sensation of reality are the epic's most fundamental qualities.”² The most fundamental integration of history and art is precisely the epic. Hai Zi extends the spirit of the poet

infinitely within history, while philosophers tend to merge history into art.

Fundamentally, rather than art, history is formless, and history accommodates all forms through its formlessness. The form of art is clearly visible: the highest effulgence of intuitive knowledge, the pinnacle of radiant far-reaching, is called art.³ There are two pure or fundamental forms of knowledge: intuition and conception, which respectively correspond to art and science (or philosophy). History falls somewhere in between, as if it were the product of intuition alongside concepts: accepting some scientific (or philosophical) distinction on the one hand, while remaining concrete and individual works of art on the other.⁴ Furthermore, the content of history and the content of art in a narrow sense differ as follows: in intuition, everything is real, so nothing is real. Only at a later stage does the mind distinguish between external and internal, desired and imagined, subjective and objective concepts. Only at this later stage does the mind distinguish between historical and non-historical intuitions, between real and non-real, between imaginings with real grounds and pure imaginings.



Figure 1. Zhang Lanpo. *Chibi*. Photograph, 280×590cm, 2020.

Even the inner, desired, and imagined things—such as castles in the air, imagined landscapes—have their reality, and the mind has its own history. Each person’s illusions, as real facts, form part of their life history. The distinction of history from pure fantasy, much like one intuitive object differs from another, lies in the fact that history is based on memory.⁵ Artists shape the history of their works based on the memory of life. Experience is generative. History cannot exist as a purpose before it is generated, which precisely constitutes the paradox of formless history’s purpose. Therefore, the true objectivity of a work of art can only be preserved in the efficacy of the cultural era and its fidelity to history. In these two respects, one should not emphasize one to the detriment of the other. The proper approach is: the precision of the purely historical nature of external things such as local folklore, moral habits and institutional systems should be subordinate to content that is both true and still significant to modern culture (meaning that does not pass away), this is Hegel’s interpretation of the historical content inherent in works of art.⁶ At this moment, history is clearly delimited by works of art as either the object being expressed or the intended expression. And it is precisely within the latter that purpose gains vitality through its process of realization.

Thus, the result of attempting to unify the essence of history and art is necessarily a form of a priori art theory. Within this, “history as art” needs to be presented in three aspects: the art object, artistic language (a form of expression), and the mission (purpose) of art. Zha Changping’s view is that the a priori nature of the art object implies the commonality of all artistic activities

and all art texts in terms of their objects. Here, the otherworldliness of the emotional experience of living constitutes the growth in humanity’s psychic mode of being. There is no pre-existing emotional experience of living awaiting to be expressed, nor are there ready-made techniques and languages awaiting to be used by artists; art is fundamentally not an expression of pre-existing emotional experience of living. The characteristic of the emotional experience of living is the unity of its subject and the referred object. The otherworldly emotional experience of living precisely lead the art-lovers to unite with their beloved object. The priori nature of artistic language refers to art bearing the universal self in a sensory symbolic language. Art-lovers feel the otherworldly emotional experience of living in the art texts, because this kind of emotion is retained in artistic text in the art activity. The way it is retained is through the symbolic speech of the art-lovers. The distinction between art and non-art in artistic language lies in symbolism, where symbolic language transforms the flow of the eternal emotional experience of living into form. As for the a priori nature of the artistic mission, that is, art as a form of human spiritual self-presentation, internalized in the art texts and activities. It indicates that the essential demand of art for form does not stem from the observation of many artistic phenomena; on the contrary, it has a deeper basis. This is the original schema it is based on. The individuality of the artist lies in his unique reception of the original schema universal to all art-lovers. Each artist has only their original schema. The series of works by an artist in a particular period also have a corresponding original schema. However, the common trait of these original

schemas is that they are the present display of the genuine original schema; through their forms, they all reveal spiritual information that transcends.⁷

Thus, “many connections of art become apparent: between art and the psychological structure which constitutes a person, between art and the psyche of an individual person, between art and the universal self of humanity, between art and ultimate existence itself. What mediates these connections is the unique artistic language of every single work of art. This implies that the history of art is the history of how the human psyche discloses itself through form. As any art form must adhere to materials of physical matter, the history of art is then also a history of how physical matter has been deployed as material for the purposes of art, in other words, a history of how designated physical matter has come to be imbued with the psyche.”⁸ Art incorporates all physically (or spiritually) related things into a transcendent form, which is also called beauty or freedom. “Only by its freedom does the art of beauty become true art, only when it is on the same realm as religion and philosophy, becoming a way and means of recognizing and expressing divinity, the deepest interests of humanity, and the broadest truths of the soul, does art fulfill its highest duty.”⁹ As the deepest interest, art is rooted in history and aestheticizes history.¹⁰ The result is that art becomes a psychic mode of being for humans,¹¹ and aesthetics permeates and nourishes the spiritual life of human beings.

2. Human Beings, Aesthetic Activity, and Aesthetics

When distinctions between history and art are to be made, especially when art is considered a form of intuitive knowledge, a significant requirement becomes apparent. That is, art can be seen as intuition itself, as a representation of intuitive knowledge, but it is by no means knowledge of the intuited nor a historical description related to the intuited. It is a form with content, not simply (spiritual) content. Therefore, Croce proposes that “art is illusion or intuition”¹², and Collingwood asserts that “art is not contemplation, it is action”.¹³ Art is precisely this way of integrating the event and the represented in the spiritual activity of the subject. More specifically, “Art is the psychic mode of the individual self foregrounding the emotional experience of living within the objectification of human existence, feeling the ultimate faith in form. It gives the individual self a universal form (original form). Art is rooted in human feelings and is expressed in the form of feelings”.¹⁴ Through some sensory symbolic language, the emotional experience of living is communicated

to the object of expression with the ultimate purpose in mind. Therefore, art mediates two more specific things: aesthetic activity is the form of art that has been subjectivized—the aspect of expression, while aesthetics is a synthesis of the represented after intellectual reflection.¹⁵ “The aesthetics fact... has passed from the position of subject to that of object, that is to say, from the moment of its birth, until gradually it becomes changed for the spirit into historical argument.”¹⁶ Aesthetics is thus seen as “the science of expressive (representational, imaginative) activity”.¹⁷ “Aesthetic, then, as the science of expression, has been here studied by us from every point of view... the linguistic science sought for, general Linguistic, in so far as what it contains is reducible to philosophy, is nothing but Aesthetic. ... Philosophy of language and philosophy of art are the same thing.”¹⁸ Art is recognized as a language in the spiritual world, and the history of the spiritual world is the history of human culture broadly.

Zha Changping refers to the cultural types presented in the cultural traditions of human history as the manifest structure of culture. On this basis, he differentiates them into rational culture, emotional culture, and volitional culture. Each type includes an academic discipline and a psychic mode of being; science and metaphysics belong to rational culture; ethics and art belong to emotional culture; aesthetics and religion are classified as volitional culture. Moreover, each cultural type contains elements of the other types, such as rational culture having elements of emotional and volitional, emotional culture containing rational and volitional elements, and volitional culture comprising rational and emotional elements, with the integration of elements presenting the subjective condition of the cultural whole. A more detailed explanation is that rational culture foregrounds the I-thinking faculty of the intellectual experience of living within the conscious organism, with one’s I-loving faculty of the emotional experience of living and one’s I-acting faculty of volitional experiences of living in the background, structurally presenting as a conceptual knowledge system and an ideological thought system; emotional culture foregrounds the I-loving faculty of the emotional experience of living, with other origins of existence in the background, structurally presenting as an ethical, moral system and an artistic form system; volitional culture foregrounds the I-acting faculty of volitional experience of living, with the I-thinking faculty of intellectual experience of living, and the I-loving faculty of the emotional experience of living in the background, structurally presenting as a system of aesthetic intuition and a system of religious belief.¹⁹ The psychic mode of being of the emotional experience



Figure 2. Zheng Weigang, *Broken Wing No.1*. Photograph, 200×156cm, 2020.

of living and the academic discipline of the volitional experience of living are respectively considered art and aesthetics, with the aesthetic mode more closely related to intuition encompassed within the knowledge system of aesthetics, while art, due to its expressive desire, is regarded as the inherent condition of one's emotional experience of living. "Aesthetics employs intuitive imperative language as a mode of discourse, leading the human will to live towards the will of existence. The will to live in self-consciousness is distinct from the instinctual life activity of plants in terms of their growth outcome instinct. The will to live moves towards the will to exist, and, in the process, constitutes the self as an individual being. It safeguards the meaning of life established by rational culture in differential intuition and the form of life felt by emotional culture in related intuition, avoiding death's engulfment of human survival. Life is endowed with meaning in human

existence. Through this, individuals attain their existentiality."²⁰ "Aesthetic activity" rather than "aesthetics" is the intermediary of volitional culture—the transcendental function.

Therefore, the expressive activity of humans can be seen as the manifestation of art within the individual; aesthetic transcendence is achieved through the presence of the aesthetic subject. "In my aesthetic activity, the aesthetic subject concentrates all elements of my conscious life on the aesthetic object, with my existence manifesting within the aesthetic object. It unfolds in the corresponding psychological time. Some old aesthetic theories refer to this as the state of forgetting both things and the self in aesthetic activity. However, the aesthetic object is not like the ready-made being of things as interpreted by the old aesthetic theories because it is born in the manifestation of the aesthetic subject. Moreover, the greatest outcome of aesthetic activity

is to generate a new aesthete out of the horizon of nothingness. My aesthetic process is the existence that I can and do embody.”²¹ Thus, the process the subject generates from the universal emotional experience of living through aesthetic activity is the embodiment of art, with human presence emerging as a landscape in the spiritual panorama, and aesthetics becomes a reconceived cognition. “This spiritual process, if viewed on its own, is the essence and concept of the general spirit; thus, for consciousness, it is a universal history that needs to be reenacted in the consciousness of every person. Because consciousness, as it appears in the minds of many individuals, is the actual existence of the universal spirit. However, since the spirit takes its actual existence in individuals as a stage of its essential development, the aforementioned universal history must start from the figure of an individual, manifesting as the history of this individual’s birth, suffering, death, and resurrection. Even though it is the history of an individual, it still needs to maintain a broader meaning. It is also the history of the universal absolute spirit.”²²

In other words, human history is inevitably permeated by aesthetic transcendence, and aesthetic activity, as a mode of transcendence and subject manifestation, has become the very event of the infinite generation of individual history itself. Consequently, it is evident that aesthetics, as a reflective cognition, has acquired a mode of value. Historical knowledge, as an objective description, also becomes imbued with the writer’s emotions, attitudes, and value orientations during the process of description. Therefore, “any attempt to erase the value orientation in historical writing is essentially overlooking the difference between history and nature as generative factors of the world”²³, and historical writing itself can be seen as objective aesthetics. The distinction between human existence and natural existence lies in whether individuals can be recorded in historical texts in the form of individual life (i.e., his unique thoughts, concepts, actions, characters, beliefs, etc.), whether the psychic life manifested by individual life in society can be transformed into a cultural life, whether this cultural life can be isomorphic with the universal values of humanity, and thereby partially function in the continuing human life.²⁴ The emergence of aesthetics signifies the self-adjustment of the subject’s aestheticism, and this adjustment is directed towards the universal spirit and the whole of life.

Therefore, the locus of a cultural organism is neither the finite world of individual consciousness nor the living (e.g., tribal) or academic (e.g., scientific community) spaces of specific communities.²⁵ It is the

poetic history in which the entire spiritual body coexists. The psyche is the place where the conscious organism exists. Society is where those simultaneously present coexist, and history comprehensively encompasses the spiritual images of consciousness organism that were, are, and will be coexisting at the moment of aesthetic occurrence. Moreover, since the cultural organism is generative, history is also a generative category; it does not manifest fixedly. There is no history waiting for people to enter, nor a history only for people to observe, speculate, and study, but rather a history related to individual life. Therefore, historical facts, which constitute the object of study in factual historical research, are not history itself. Historical facts become knowledge about objective descriptions through the value orientation of aesthetics. As long as the historical value logic subject—the cultural organism—is still in a state of generation, history is not yet over. The history of value logic is the coexistence process of the entire body of cultural organisms from creation to end.²⁶

Thus, the ultimate purpose, object, or even the end of art (as Hegel would say) of aesthetics naturally manifests itself as the transcendence of human history by the Absolute Being. All great artworks must, therefore, be religious, an act of paying homage to the glory of existence.²⁷ In this way, poetic aesthetics becomes a religious faith in the clear vision of the will, and its reception of revelation, and faith and aesthetics share the emotion and intellect of individual life. “If everything in the world that is fine and beautiful is epiphaneia, the radiance and splendour which breaks forth in expressive form from a veiled and yet mighty depth of being, then the event of the self-revelation of the hidden, the utterly free and sovereign God in the forms of this world, in word and history, and finally in the human form itself, will itself form an analogy to that worldly beauty however far it outstrips it.”²⁸ It is in this aesthetic process that the whole history constituted by individual history truly becomes integral.

3. Logic-history and World Relational Aesthetics

Indeed, within a rational framework, the discussion of poetic history compels a reevaluation of aesthetics. Here, aesthetic activity, understood broadly as a mode of transcendent and subjective manifestation, can also be termed the logic of world development. Giambattista Vico offers a profound description of this concept: “The distinction between metaphysics, or ontology, and logic lies in their respective objects of contemplation. Metaphysics contemplates the forms of existence inherent in all things, while logic considers the various

forms that all things can potentially signify.”²⁹ Through this lens, art becomes synonymous with the actualization of potential entities. Correspondingly, aesthetics can be grasped as the semantics of logic, providing a visual framework for its abstract principles. Consequently, adhering to the essence of poetry, one individual cannot simultaneously embody the roles of a brilliant poet and a brilliant metaphysician. This arises from the fundamental difference in their approaches. Metaphysics necessitates the withdrawal of the mind from sensory experience. Conversely, the function of poetry is to fully immerse the whole soul within the realm of the senses. While metaphysics aspires towards universals, poetry thrives upon a deep engagement with particulars.³⁰ Therefore, the inherent connection between logic and value becomes undeniable. The formation of individual identities represents the concretization of logic within difference. It embodies the self-generation of content from universal forms.

Therefore, an academic discipline that opposes metaphysics (or ontology) and logic is bound to create an aesthetic of value-logic, which will regard pure history as the basic thing with full content and no form. The theory of value-logic unfolds the relationships between individual value-logic ideas and universal values and between different individual value-logic ideas. It bases this unfolding activity on the exploration of the root of universal value and the investigation of the relationship between universal value and ultimate difference.

Among them, the rational stipulations and cognitive intuition inherent in logic give it the power to point towards ultimate difference. This ultimate difference pointing force, descends upon the world, allows people, through their commitment to differentiated existence, to engage with the world in a nuanced and differentiated manner. Furthermore, through aesthetic experience, individuals perceive logic as the catalyst for life’s growth. All beings integrate logic into the history of their individual lives, a phenomenon that can be understood as the poetics of life. Therefore, Zha Changping posits that the words (logoi in Greek) of logic represent God’s revelation of the world’s inherent differences, while the words of value represent humanity’s articulation of these differences. The former represents the world’s logic, while the latter embodies the world’s value theory. In this context, metaphysics now aligns with history. Moreover, it is believed that God’s revelation is simultaneously present within human receptivity. Consequently, the value theory of the world emerges as an extension of its logic theory. Within this framework, the value theory assumes a dominant position in the

value-logic theory.³¹ An aesthetic of value-logic is a form of history centered on humanity (and human words). Its form manifests as the poetic.

Therefore, logic-history, a form of knowledge that emphasizes intellect, must shift from time to history and from value to logic. It must open up the logic of world history based on the fundamental relationship between logic and history and explain to everyone who builds their life on ultimate faith and ultimate difference the reasons for the occurrence of world history up to now.³² History is the speech of “the entirety of humanity” (that is, all the individual human lives over history as a whole), and it is still being spoken. Logic is the speech of “the entirety of humanity”, and it is still being listened to. Historical logic is the value system generated by the encounter of this human speech and divine speech.³³ In logic-history, the study of the difference of individual time phases must be based on a deepening of the understanding of difference itself. In other words, people must first shift from a historical theory of time to a value-logic theory. In the discourse on logic, the return of the purposes of values will integrate the aesthetic individuals who differ in historical time. In this sense, the value-logic theory can also be called a value theology.³⁴ On the one hand, “the pre-existing time phase contains physical time, life-time, and physiological time. They all have absolutely constant and relatively finite periods in universal time. This period is given by universal time and has no necessary connection with human existence. The time orientation of the pre-existing time phase—the physical time’s tendency towards three-dimension, the lifetime’s longitudinality, and the physiological time’s transversality—is presented in a factual way. They are perceived by people, but their existence is not the product of human consciousness. The generative time phase is composed of psychological time, social time, and historical time. Its time orientation—the inwardness of psychological time, the otherness of social time, and the His-ness of historical time—is the direct product of human conscious life activity. Without human consciousness, these time orientations do not exist; moreover, their absolute and relative finite periods are related to human activity.”³⁵

On the other hand, the present in time, which is the presence of ultimate faith through universal time, is the absolute and relative finite period that presents ultimate faith. “The present always presents ultimate faith, and is therefore absolute; it must pass and embrace the future, and is therefore also relative. It bears within itself the ultimate faith in the transcendent, which is achieved through the people who exist in the present. Thus, the process of the self-presentation of ultimate faith forms



Figure 3. Zheng Weigang, *Palace No.3*. Photograph, 160×141cm, 2021.

history. In other words, history is the process of ultimate faith realizing its ultimacy from creation to the end of time, and it is also the process of ultimate faith showing its ultimacy to all non-ultimate faiths. If speaking of history from the bottom up, then any individual historical event is the result of human faith, it is the occurrence of human faith, only that such faith has the difference of ultimacy and non-ultimacy. The actions that people create in history are ultimately based on their faith rather than their ideas. Ultimate faith intervenes in history through human faith, because of the existence of human presence and its relationship to time.³⁶

In this way, the phase of generative time is inevitably born in the conscious life, psychic life, and cultural life of human beings, while the phase of pre-existing time simultaneously becomes the background of being-there (or *dasein* in German) who exists. "Physical time is the longest in the relative finite period of the pre-existing time, so it becomes the giver of the presence for the rest of the individual times; historical time is the longest in the relative finite period of the generative, so it is the giver of the generative for the rest of the individual times."³⁷ Metaphysics and logic thus become the foundation of other forms of knowledge, and history theory and value theory can be understood as history and ethics, science and art in a broad sense. Furthermore, those pre-existing objects are incorporated into the history of life due to the associative nature of values: the seven forming factors of individuals and the world form human-linguistic relationships, human-temporal relationships, human-self relationships, human-thing relationships, human-human relationships, human-history relationships and human-divine relationships, relationships of individual-to-individual, individual-to-time, individual-to-self, individual-to-object, individual-to-person, individual-to-history, and individual-to-divine. The interaction of these relationships then evolves into the world-picture logic.³⁸

Therefore, if people approach the discussion of poetic history from an aesthetic perspective, the knowledge-based discourse on history will inevitably create the world relational aesthetics, and history is preserved in language.³⁹ The world relational aesthetics coincides with the carrying of poetry by history. For the past dimension in time, human history is the inheritance of various human memories—a history of occurrence; for the future dimension in time, human history is the hope of various human imaginations—a history of expectation; for the present dimension in time, human history is the various activities of human existence—a history of a generation. Just as time has three dimensions of past, present, and future, so history also has three

dimensions of memory, tradition, and imagination. Furthermore, in order for a person to become a part of history, he or she first needs to perceive, reflect, and examine his or her own growth, survival, and existence as an individual life, thus forming his or her own unique psychological history. And when a person as an individual life dies, his or her connection with other living beings, which is presented in the form of psychic life (or interpersonal life) in society—mainly manifested as speaking, listening and reading—is immediately transformed into the historical narrative of cultural life—mainly manifested as writing. In other words, only when people perceive, reflect, and examine the language, time, individuals, nature, others, history, and God that they have encountered in their existential activities through writing, images, objects, etc., that can be passed on to future generations, and thus participate in the creation of culture, can they enter history and become a part of the entirety of humanity. Human history is formed in culture. As for the expression of the relationship between man and history at the natural and God levels, its content is that history can be said to be the second nature created by man, while nature is the first "history" created by God.⁴⁰ In this way, history unfolds in the spiritual dimension of man, and the duration of time in life is expressed through aesthetic activity.

Hence, world relational aesthetics and logic-history are unified,⁴¹ and the art from the bottom up and metaphysical discourse finally coincide with the illumination of the holy. This is the poetic connection between the down and the above. In the generation of human relationships, the words of value gradually have a clear signified. And the signified is precisely the unique meaning possessed by history-logic.

4. Conclusion

The intrinsic relationship between history and art can be understood at the levels of content and form, material and value, the pre-existing and the generative, the metaphysical and the logical. However, regardless, the history that carries art or the art viewed as history itself stems from the most fundamental understanding of human existence—an understanding that is both perceptual and aesthetic. Heidegger described the general condition of art as that of the common man. "As the common man revels, so do we revel; how the common man reads and judges literature and art, so do we read and judge; even how the common man withdraws from 'the masses', so do we withdraw; what angers the common man, angers us 'angrily'. The common man is not any specific individual, all people—yet not

as a sum—are this common man. It is this common man who dictates the mode of existence in everyday life.”⁴² Yet, it is within this common man’s understanding of life that the differentiation of heaven, earth, man, and divinity is placed into the spiritual backdrop, and the totality of existence reveals the values of death and the divine. History and art vitalize time, and in their ultimate orientation, it is difficult for them not to carry a meaning of reality.

Sichuan Normal University

Dr. Congcong Bi (1994-) is a lecturer at the School of Philosophy, Sichuan Normal University. His research areas are religious philosophy, cultural criticism, and Western Marxism. He is the author of *Acting with Faith: The Meaning of Religious Belief in the Postmodern Context* (3 Volumes, 2024) and *The Promise of the Subtle: A Philosophical Interpretation of Daily Phenomena* (2024).

Editor: Yao Xiao

ENDNOTES

1. This means that philosophers and aestheticians who discuss the topic of art and history are of the same lineage, metaphysically articulating beauty. Their definitions of history and art have more in common than they differ. In current study of aesthetics, successors of this academic tradition are rare. The theory of Professor Zha Changping, mentioned in the following text, is particularly valuable as he attempts to further integrate the two within the framework of World Relational Aesthetics.

2. Haizi 海子, “Seeking Contact with Reality,” [尋找對實體的接觸] in *The Complete Poems of Hai Zi* [海子詩全集], ed. Xi Chuan (Beijing: China Writer Publishing House, 2009), 1017.

3. Benedetto Croce, *Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic and Breviary of Aesthetics*, trans. Zhu Guangqian (Beijing: Foreign Literature Publishing House, 1983), 32.

4. Ibid., 36. Li Zehou’s theorization of the three levels of art - form, image, and meaning—is a concrete manifestation of art in history. (Li Zehou 李澤厚, *Three Treatises on Aesthetics* [美學三書], (Anhui: Anhui Literature and Art Publishing House, 1999), 557.

5. Croce, *Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic and Breviary of Aesthetics*, 35-36.

6. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on Aesthetics (Volume 1)*, trans. Zhu Guangqian (Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2009), 337-343.

7. Zha Changping, *The Cultural Logic of Humanology: A Comparison among Metaphysics, Art, Religion, and Aesthetics* [人文學的文化邏輯——形上、藝術、宗教、美學之比較], Revised edition, (Taipei: Huamulan Culture Publishing Company, 2021), 136-145.

8. Zha Changping, *A History of Ideas in Pioneering Contemporary Chinese Art, Volume 1: World Relational Aesthetics* [中國先鋒藝術思想史第一卷世界關係美學], (Shanghai: Shanghai Joint Publishing Co., 2017), 32.

9. G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures on Aesthetics (Volume 1)*, 10.

10. “Except from associating with the history of art, the most meaningful contemporary approach to art is that it stands in a position of active intervention.” Wang Chunchen 王春辰, “‘Art Intervention in Society’: New Sensitivity and Reaffirmation” [“藝術介入社會”: 新敏感與再肯定], *Art Research*, no. 4 (2012): 28-29.

11. Zha, *A History of Ideas in Pioneering Contemporary Chinese Art, Volume 1: World Relational Aesthetics*, 31.

12. Croce, *Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic and Breviary of Aesthetics*, 209.

13. Robin George Collingwood, *The Principles of Art* (London & Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1938), 332.

14. Zha Changping, *History and Logic: Introduction to Logic-history* [歷史與邏輯: 邏輯歷史學引論], Revised edition, (Taipei: Huamulan Culture Publishing Company, 2022), 239.

15. For example, Baumgarten’s definition of aesthetics is: “Aesthetics (theory of liberal arts, primitive epistemology, the thinking method of beauty, method of rational analogy) is a discipline of sensory knowledge.” (Benedetto Croce, *Autobiography*, trans. Tian Shigang (The Commercial Press, 2015), 81.)

16. Croce, *Aesthetic: as Science of Expression and General Linguistic and Breviary of Aesthetics*, 152.

17. Benedetto Croce, *History of Aesthetics*, trans. Wang Tianqing (The Commercial Press, 2018), 1.

18. Croce, *Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic and Breviary of Aesthetics*, 153.

19. Zha, *History and Logic: Introduction to Logic-history*, 314.

20. Zha, *The Cultural Logic of Humanology: A Comparison among Metaphysics, Art, Religion, and Aesthetics*, 207.

21. Ibid., 48.

22. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on Aesthetics (Volume 2)*, trans. Zhu Guangqian (Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2009), 298.

23. Zha Changping, *A History of Ideas in Pioneering Contemporary Chinese Art, Volume 1: World Relational Aesthetics* [中國先鋒藝術思想史第一卷世界關係美學], (Shanghai: Shanghai Joint Publishing Co., 2017), 1.

24. Ibid., 1.

25. This means that the beings of art are fundamentally pluralistic. “The objective structure of the art world has historically revealed itself to now need to be defined by an extreme pluralism. I feel it’s an urgent issue to understand this because it means that some kind of radical revision should be made in some way, and the whole society will instinctively think about art and confront art in this manner.” Arthur C. Danto, *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Limits of History*, trans. Wang Chunchen (Jiangsu: Jiangsu People’s Publishing House, 2007), Preface 1-2.

26. Zha, *History and Logic: Introduction to Logic-history*, 316.

27. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics vol. IV: The Realm of Metaphysics in Antiquity* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989), 12f.

28. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics vol. II: Studies in Theological Style: Clerical Styles* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1984), 11.

29. Giambattista Vico, *The New Science*, trans. Zhu Guangqian (Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1989), 197.

30. Ibid., 458.

31. Zha, *History and Logic: Introduction to Logic-history*, 141.

32. Ibid., 26.

33. Ibid., 331.

34. Ibid., 127.

35. Ibid., 18.

36. Ibid., 20.

37. Ibid., 17.

38. This is an ontology based on relational theology. Zha, *A History of Ideas in Pioneering Contemporary Chinese Art, Volume 1: World Relational Aesthetics*, 52.

39. “‘Art must be language.’ The activity which generates an artistic experience is the activity of consciousness.” (R. G. Collingwood, *The Principles of Art*, 273.)

40. Zha, *A History of Ideas in Pioneering*

Contemporary Chinese Art, Volume 1: World Relational Aesthetics, 316-318.

41. Bi Congcong 畢聰聰, “The Logic of World-Relational Aesthetics: On a Holistic Aesthetics” [世界關係美學的邏輯——論一種整全的美學], in *Perplexity Resolved: Essays in Honor of the 40th Anniversary of the Founding of the Institute of Religious Studies in Sichuan*

University [了然不惑: 四川大學宗教學研究所成立四十周年同仁文存], ed. Gai Jianmin (Sichuan: Bashu Publishing House, 2020), 661-670.

42. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. Chen Jiaying and Wang Qingjie (Shanghai: Shanghai Joint Publishing Company, 2014), 147.

歷史與藝術的邏輯探究——兼論“邏輯歷史學”與“世界關係美學”的內在關係

畢聰聰

摘要：詩性歷史的概念，在傳統中區別了歷史與藝術這兩種存在之要素。經由哲人和詩人的分析，代表現成的歷史和表徵生成的藝術最終統合於精神生命的歷程。作為藝術這一精神樣式的兩個方面，傾向於形式的審美不僅與生命情感緊密相關，它甚至意指邏輯本身；而與之相對的美學通常被視為反思著的理智的結果，它是有關審美自我調整的知識。最終，審美和美學在藝術的價值指向中歷史化為人的言說，而其學問形態正是邏輯歷史論和世界關係美學。經由關係的仲介，人得以在神聖者面前致意榮耀，此即歷史與藝術的共同意義指向。

關鍵詞：歷史；藝術；邏輯；審美；美學