

Campana, the ‘End of Art’, and Hegel’s Philosophy of Literature

Chunge Liu

Abstract

Based on Hegel’s thesis of the ‘end of art’, this paper aims to explore how to study Hegel’s philosophy of literature by carrying out a dialogue with Francesco Campana. In his recent book, *The End of Literature, Hegel, and the Contemporary Novel* (2019), Campana demonstrates how literature resists its end by continuous self-transformation and provides a framework of ‘philosophization’–‘poetry’–‘ordinariness’ in understanding the contemporary novel. While, to some extent, I agree with him on the understanding of the ‘end of art’ thesis, I object to his idea that ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are two poles between which poetry moves. I defend the view that, from the perspective of Hegel’s absolute and taking Hegel’s philosophy as a totality, ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are inseparable. Furthermore, I emphasize the significance of Hegel’s thesis of the ‘end of art’, which I argue lies in revealing the problem of modern subjectivity. Literature, as a unique form of art, also reveals this problem and helps to solve it. Therefore, in the study of Hegel’s philosophy of literature, I insist on adopting the perspective of Hegel’s absolute and taking Hegel’s philosophy as a whole so that we can build connections among different disciplines and among different art-forms and art-types. With this perspective, I make some proposals, which include several paradigms for the study of Hegel’s philosophy of literature. Finally, in terms of the thesis of the ‘end of art’, I maintain that the study of Hegel’s philosophy of literature is to address the problem of modern subjectivity.

I. Introduction

The ‘end of art’ thesis seems to be a never-ending topic in the areas of philosophy of art and aesthetics. There are plenty of books and articles contributed to it and we believe that more discussions are still underway. We have to ask: why is this thesis or topic so significant? Obviously, whatever situation art is in nowadays, it does not end, and we may hope that more artworks are still to be produced. However, especially when we come to modernity, the ‘end of art’ thesis becomes a more urgent problem. So, the question becomes this: why is it so important



for modern people to consider the ‘end of art’ thesis? Although Hegel never used the phrase ‘end of art’, it is a tradition that scholars date the ‘end of art’ thesis back to Hegel’s aesthetics (or philosophy of art). Hegel’s consideration of the ‘end of art’ is also closely related with problems of modernity, especially with the problem of modern subjectivity. Habermas holds that Hegel is the first philosopher who takes modernity as a problem (1985: 57).¹ So, what kind of role does Hegel expect art to play? Why, for Hegel, can art not function any more in modern times?

Before we delve into these questions, first we need to ask about the relationship between Hegel’s aesthetics and his overall philosophy, and to what extent we can rely on Hegel when we come to modern art, particularly modern and contemporary literature? For Gadamer, Hegel’s aesthetics is ‘a history of worldviews—i.e., a history of truth, as it is manifested in the mirror of art’ (Gadamer 1975: 84). Heidegger believes that a ‘decision’ on Hegel’s judgement (which concerns the ‘end of art’ thesis) can only be arrived from a revelation of ‘truth of beings’ to which Western thinking corresponds since the Greeks. However, it remains a question for Heidegger as to the meaning of ‘truth’ and its relationship with ‘beauty’ (Heidegger 2002: 51–52). As we can see, both Gadamer and Heidegger hold that Hegel’s aesthetics and his ‘end of art’ thesis are important and that they cannot be separated from Hegel’s overall philosophy, whether it be ‘a history of worldviews’ or ‘Western thinking’. It is also the emphasis of this paper that connections and relationships between Hegel’s aesthetics and his other ‘philosophies’ need to be stressed in order to study Hegel’s ‘end of art’ thesis.

In Hegelian studies, there has been a large amount of research on the significance of Hegel’s thesis of the ‘end of art’ and its relationship with modernity. Moreover, quite different perspectives are adopted, multiple aspects are analysed and various conclusions are drawn.² The purpose of the present paper is not to argue for or against this thesis, but to limit itself to the thesis’ significance in revealing and solving modern problems. I agree with those scholars who take modernity or modern spirit as the focus when they come to the thesis, but may differ from most of them in approach—namely, I take modernity not only as a historical epoch, but also as a logical stage. I argue that the ‘end of art’ thesis and its significance should be discussed by combining historical and logical considerations. Particularly, I defend the close relationship between Hegel’s thesis of the ‘end of art’ and the problem of modern subjectivity.

Based on Hegel’s ‘end of art’ thesis, this paper aims to explore how to study Hegel’s philosophy of literature. This paper is greatly inspired by a recent book, entitled *The End of Literature, Hegel, and the Contemporary Novel*, written by Francesco Campana. I intend to develop a dialogue on certain points with him, especially on his framework of ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ both

in understanding the 'end of art' thesis (together with the 'end of literature' thesis and the 'end of the novel' thesis), and in understanding contemporary literature. First, I expound certain aspects of Campana's ideas about the 'end of art' thesis and his framework (section II) and then I provide a different interpretation of his framework by adopting the perspective of Hegel's absolute (section III). Based on this dialogue, I further clarify the significance of Hegel's 'end of art' thesis in addressing the problem of modern subjectivity and I make several proposals about how to study Hegel's philosophy of literature (section IV). Finally, I summarize briefly the difference between Campana's approach and my approach in the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature (section V).

II. Campana's understanding of the 'end of art' thesis and his framework

In his recent book, *The End of Literature, Hegel, and the Contemporary Novel*, Francesco Campana gives an excellent analysis of the 'end of art' thesis generally, the 'end of literature' particularly, and the 'end of the novel' especially. His main idea is that literature (or *Poesie*) has an exceptional place among different kinds of arts (namely architecture, sculpture, painting, music, etc.). Therefore, the 'end' of literature is different from other 'ends' of arts. Literature resists its end by renewal, transformation and reconfiguration. When discussing the 'end of the novel', Campana believes that it is 'a simulated end' and that it is 'an end that means a new beginning, a new way for the novel to face and survive its own end' (2019: 113). The same also holds true for literature as a whole, which always seeks 'to transform this end into a new beginning', especially 'to transform the end of modernity, which is also its own end, into a proper renewal' (2019: 117). As we can see, Campana attaches great importance to the connection between literature (and especially the novel) and modernity.

In rereading the 'end of art' thesis, and based on Hegel's aesthetics, Campana provides an interpretative framework for the end of literary artwork, namely the 'end of art' as 'philosophization' and the 'end of art' as 'ordinariness'. When illustrating 'the exceptional character of poetry and its peculiar role compared to the other arts', and after quoting a paragraph from Hegel's *Aesthetics*, Campana writes, 'poetry, namely literature, seems therefore to be caught between two poles: on the one hand, the "prose of scientific thought", that is a scientific discourse of a certain philosophical kind (through "religious representation as such") and on the other hand, the "prose of finitude and commonplace thinking", which describes the use of speech and words in everyday life' (Campana 2019: 143). The 'prose of scientific thought' mainly concerns 'reflection, reasoning and thinking'. 'Literary language turns out to be more

technical, scientific and cognitive' (2019: 145). The 'prose of finitude and commonplace thinking' is the narration and description of the 'prose of the world' and is 'the tendency of art to approach everyday life ever more closely' (2019: 144).

Campana indicates that the pole of the 'philosophization' of art has much to do with 'the systematic aspect of Hegelian philosophy', while the other pole, the 'ordinariness' of art is chiefly from 'a socio-historical point of view' (2019: 149). As to those poles, their characteristics and their embodiment in modern and contemporary literature, Campana gives many detailed analyses and sufficient examples. Especially, Campana expounds how this interpretative framework works on one peculiar genre of literature, namely the novel. Moreover, for him, the two poles are tendencies that modern literature or the modern novel heads towards, without completely becoming either pole. There are multiple possibilities 'in between' (2019: 214–20).

In terms of modern, postmodern and contemporary novels, Campana gives a lot of examples to demonstrate how the novel resists its end. On the pole of 'philosophization', Campana discusses experimentalism, meta-fiction and maximalist novel. Novelists with an experimentalist tendency challenge traditional ideas about the novel, and the novel as a genre gains a status of self-reflexivity. Especially, novelists experiment themselves with new techniques. Representatives are the modernists, such as Joyce, Woolf or Musil. Meanwhile, their 'philosophization' tendency also lies in other aspects, including innovations in theme, style, language and structure (Campana 2019: 188). Furthermore, not only does the novel itself become more conscious concerning its ontology, but authors or novelists also display a great interest in their authorship. Readers are invited into the process of reflection on the novel, too. Apart from self-reflexivity, another tendency of the 'philosophization' of novel 'is about the ability, within the genre of the novel, to include topics and formal elements typical of nonfiction essayistic treatment', thus making it an 'encyclopedic mode' or 'writings of excess' and novels becoming 'Mega novel' or 'maximalist novel' (Campana 2019: 196, 195, 200). As Campana analyses, this kind of novel is the 'prose of thought' from the perspectives of language, style, content, form and structure. It uses multiple ways, like footnotes, references, allusions, quotations, etc., to make it seem more scientific, and thus requires more cerebral activity (2019: 199–200).

On the pole of 'ordinariness', novelists tend to depict more and more about everyday life. It is the world that is brought into the novel (Campana 2019: 206). One representative is the nonfiction novel, which according to Campana can date back to the New Journalism in America during the mid-1960s. It emphasizes 'facts', the 'truth-novel', and the 'reportage novel'. It tends to be realistic by adhering to facts and truth, just like newspapers and news reports. Campana also

gives several examples, such as investigative reports, feature stories and court reports (2019: 201–10). What is worth noticing is that at this pole, the subject, the writer or the author also plays an important role. This kind of novel means not to invent anything, but ‘everything that is told has *really* happened’ (Campana 2019: 205). However, ‘it is still through the very particular voice of the writer that these facts are reported’. ‘The subjectivity of the author has not disappeared behind the “facts”; on the contrary, it is more present than ever: it is the collector and the interpreter of the facts’ (2019: 209–10).³

In his book, Campana presents the persuasive framework of ‘philosophization’-‘poetry’-‘ordinariness’.⁴ For him, poetry moves between these two poles, without becoming either of them. ‘Literature tends in a direction that is not its own, but does not become completely different from itself’ (2019: 213). After all, literature cannot transform to something else completely. Within these two poles, multiple combinations of ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are possible. That is the main status quo of modern and contemporary literature for Campana.

In brief, Campana demonstrates how literature resists its end by continuous self-renewal and self-transformation. It is just the ‘fate’ of literature to have gone through such ‘ends’ and to survive.⁵ Meanwhile, Campana provides a framework in understanding the ‘post-end’ situation of literature. By placing modern and contemporary novels between two poles, Campana classifies them based on their distinct features.

III. Different interpretation concerning Campana’s framework

This paper generally agrees with Campana’s position on the ‘end of art’ thesis, especially on the ‘end of literature’. That is, literature does not really end, but resists its end by renewing and changing itself. Also, this paper agrees that Campana’s framework in understanding the tendencies of modern and postmodern literature is quite powerful. However, when it comes to Hegel’s thesis of the ‘end of art’, there exists some basic understanding that this thesis has much to do with his overall philosophy, especially his thought about absolute spirit and the absolute Idea.⁶ Therefore, from the perspective of Hegel’s thought about the absolute, I raise the following questions concerning Campana’s framework: if modern and contemporary literature tends towards the two poles—philosophization and ordinariness, as is explained by Campana—are they opposed? What is their relationship from the Hegelian perspective? What does ‘ordinariness’ mean in Hegel’s mind? Based on these questions, I intend to challenge Campana’s framework and provide a different interpretation, which I believe helps to clarify Hegel’s philosophy of literature.

To answer the above questions, the most important principle that this paper insists on is to take Hegel's thought as a whole or in totality.⁷ That means when we talk about his thesis of the 'end of art', we should contextualize it within his overall philosophical project, and take his philosophy of art as 'a philosophy' which has connections with his other 'philosophies'. Of course, for Hegel, there is only one philosophy, although it may take different forms. But for us, we still can talk about 'philosophies of____' just as Lamarque has once indicated (Lamarque 2009: 4; Campana 2019: 183), as long as we keep in mind that those 'philosophies' should not be separated and isolated in Hegelian studies. Wholeness or totality is also characteristic of his *Aesthetics*, especially Hotho's edition. From the very beginning, in the 'Introduction' part and also in 'Part I. The Idea of Artistic Beauty, or The Ideal', we can see that Hegel does not deal with issues concerning art separately, but he connects them with his philosophical system. When he talks about the object, the aim and the function of art or the role art plays, the overall philosophical problem of modernity is always in his mind. For example, in 'Part I. The Idea of Artistic Beauty, or The Ideal', there is a great amount of summarization about 'The Idea' which actually belongs to his logic (Hegel 1975: 108–10). In other words, Hegel deduces the Ideal or the Idea of the beautiful from the general 'Idea'.

Related with the wholeness and totality of Hegel's philosophy, I also advocate that we combine the logical with the historical in elaborating Hegel's philosophy of literature. In Hegelian studies, there are a lot of debates, which can be attributed to different attitudes towards the relationship between logic and history. For example, debates on the reliability of Hotho's edition of Hegel's *Aesthetics* and more and more discussions about students' manuscripts have something to do with the relationship between logic and history. Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert (Hegel 2004b: 9–39) and David James (2009) bring many doubts about Hotho's edition of Hegel's *Aesthetics*. They choose the historical approach in their studies, taking art mainly as a historical-social phenomenon. They emphasize the role art plays in a nation's ethical and political life. However, the logical approach also has its supporters, such as Stephen Bungay (1984) and William Desmond (1984). They try to relate art, beauty and other aesthetic issues with Hegel's logic, metaphysics and other parts of his philosophical system.

Apart from these opposite positions, there are also researchers who combine the historical with the logical in Hegelian studies. Two representatives are Rüdiger Bubner and Lydia L. Moland. When talking about the 'end of art', Bubner holds that the 'pastness' of art is both the evolution of art history and the development of spirit (Bubner 2003: 253–54). Moland believes that for Hegel, the 'end of art' thesis is both conceptual and historical (Moland 2019: 19). I also argue for the combination of the logical approach and the historical approach because it is characteristic of Hegel's thought.⁸ Unlike Croce's distinguishing of

‘what is living’ and ‘what is dead’ in Hegel’s philosophy,⁹ I believe that ‘the living’ and ‘the dead’ are related and are inseparable.¹⁰

In his study, Campana treats the historical and the logical separately. For instance, in Chapter 2 of his book, he illustrates ‘Literature and the Other Arts’ from the ontological perspective first and then from the historical perspective. Meanwhile, he seems to favour the historical perspective. He holds that ‘The purely ontological and philosophical analysis [...] is too general and abstract; it sometimes seems to bring up problems that are excessively technical or too far removed from our common perception of things’ (Campana 2019: 56–57). When we come to Campana’s framework, which is ‘philosophization’-‘poetry’-‘ordinariness’, it becomes more obvious that Campana takes the historical and the logical separately. For Campana, as I explained in section II, ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are two poles, between which poetry moves. Although they may not always be opposites, and Campana even deems those two poles to be dialectical and ‘interact with each other’ (2019: 217, 219), the two poles are analysed from the perspective of system and the perspective of history respectively.¹¹ When summarizing the two broad categories (which refer to ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’), Campana distinguishes between ‘an epochal derivation, where the end is the tendency to ordinariness and the prose of life, and a systematic derivation, where the end is philosophization’ (2019: 83). Therefore, Campana understands ‘philosophization’ from the perspective of logic and system, while his understanding of ‘ordinariness’ is from the perspective of history and society. In a word, Campana treats the historical and the logical separately, which also results in a certain opposition between ‘ordinariness’ and ‘philosophization’.

So, what does it mean to combine the logical and the historical in understanding Hegel? To answer this question, we need to return to Hegel’s absolute spirit and absolute Idea. For Hegel, the absolute Idea is the last stage of logic. It is the totality of all the previous stages. It is a unity of subjectivity and objectivity, as well as a unity of life and knowing. Absolute spirit is also the totality of all the previous development. Moreover, absolute spirit is the actuality of absolute Idea. As totality, neither absolute Idea nor absolute spirit lacks existence/reality/actuality/objectivity. Hegel believes that concepts in his logic have their counterpart in history, especially in the history of philosophy. Philosophy is time in thought; concepts are real and actual.

It is important to clarify that Hegel’s absolute (absolute spirit and absolute Idea) is a whole or totality, but it is not fixed and closed. The absolute is a never-ending process or activity. It has completed and is still completing itself. When ‘completed’, it has finished its work on this stage or in this period of time. When still completing, it is renewing and transforming. This is the paradox or contradiction of the Idea and spirit—both completed and is completing.¹² In a

similar way, we can consider Hegel's 'end of art' thesis to mean both having been completed and still being completing. Moreover, for Hegel, there is only one philosophy, and only one 'Idea'.¹³ Spirit is a constant development with no absolute fracture. Ancient time and modern time are two stages of spirit. But Hegel also recognizes that absolute Idea and absolute spirit complete themselves in modern time. It is in modern time that absolute spirit knows itself and realizes itself fully. It is also a time when art comes to an end. For Hegel, however, the totality or completion of spirit does not mean that the absolute is fixed and unchangeable. On the contrary, the absolute is always changing. As is said, it has completed and is always completing itself. The fixed point of view of abstract understanding is just what Hegel criticizes.¹⁴ In short, Hegel's absolute spirit and absolute Idea is a whole, a totality which is actual, and which is not fixed and closed.

The absolute (either absolute Idea or absolute spirit) is a totality, and it is comprised of different historical stages. Hegel, in his different 'philosophies' (such as philosophy of right, philosophy of history, philosophy of art, philosophy of religion and even philosophy of philosophy which is the logic) discusses them in different ways. In *Aesthetics*, Hegel divides the history of art into three stages—symbolic art, classical art and romantic art. Each represents one stage of the Idea together with its existence. In Hegel's mind, it is the Idea that determines the expression. Whether the Idea can find its appropriate shape, and whether the expression corresponds to the Idea or not, depends on the Idea. According to Hegel's analysis, when the Idea is insufficient, its realization in art is also insufficient, for example, symbolic art. We know that, for Hegel, it is in classical art that the Idea finds its appropriate expression. There, the Idea and its existence are in harmony. In romantic art, the Idea exceeds the artistic form and finds its proper realization first in religion and finally in philosophy. The above brief description about the three stages of art also demonstrates the close connection between history and logic in art's development.

Therefore, in Hegelian studies, it is better that we combine the logical and the historical, instead of taking them separately. As mentioned, in Hegel's philosophy, absolute spirit undergoes different stages, which means that it comes to perfection only at the last stage, historically and socially, in modern time. The same goes with the absolute Idea. But no matter what stage the Idea is in, it can always find its corresponding realization. That is, if the Idea is at a lower stage, it realizes itself in a lower form; if it is at a higher stage, it realizes itself in a higher form. Hegel divides his philosophical system into three parts: logic, philosophy of nature and philosophy of spirit. Although nature is low spiritually, it is one stage of the Idea's realization.¹⁵ From the perspective of history, Hegel considers that the Idea first finds its proper expression in the east, then in ancient Greece, and finally in modern Europe. Generally, Hegel holds a progressive attitude. As the Idea develops, its appropriate existence is found in a higher and

more advanced form. For Hegel, modern spirit is best understood in philosophy. From the above analysis, we can see that the Idea, in different stages, can always find its corresponding existence and realization, which further proves the unity of logic and history in Hegel's philosophy.

With Hegel's absolute and the logic-history approach in mind, I now intend to give a different interpretation about Campana's framework for understanding modern and postmodern literature, i.e. 'philosophization'-'poetry'-'ordinariness'. Based on the above analysis, we notice that in Hegel's philosophy, logic and history, concept and actuality are inseparable. Likely, I defend that 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' (although 'ordinariness' may not be a proper concept in Hegel's philosophy) are also inseparable. Especially, I disagree with Campana by holding that 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' are not two poles, between which modern and postmodern literature move.¹⁶ I claim that both are forms (adequate or not) in which the modern and contemporary spirit or Idea finds its expression. They are related, connected and not separated or isolated from one another. 'Philosophization', from a Hegelian perspective, does not mean abstract or thought experiment, lacking any reality or concreteness. 'Ordinariness', if it means everyday life, may not be welcomed by Hegel.¹⁷ For him, what is real or actual is not something sensible or perceptible only. Moreover, 'reality' does not necessarily refer to some given data or 'facts', which is also my disagreement with Campana's understanding.

To repeat my interpretation about Campana's framework, I hold that 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' should not be taken as two poles for they are the expression of the same spirit, namely, the modern spirit. 'Philosophization' and 'ordinariness' are not separated and opposed because both are manifestations of modern spirit.¹⁸ From the perspective of Hegel's thought on the absolute, philosophizing and becoming 'ordinary' (or real, actual) are compatible with one another.¹⁹

Despite taking 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' as two poles, Campana sometimes indicates their inseparability.²⁰ For example, he notices the centrality of subjectivity in both trends (Campana 2019: 187–92, 209–12). He takes the comic as characteristic of both 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' (Campana 2019: 152). In his analysis of *Don Quixote*, 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' are also combined (Campana 2019: 170). This evidence further demonstrates that modern spirit is a totality, finding its expression in different but related forms. Therefore, taking them as two poles, to some extent, Campana also recognizes that 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' in modern and postmodern literature are not separated phenomena.

In order to defend the inseparability of 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' and to make what is implicit explicit, I want to analyse two examples given by Campana. The first example is from the 'ordinariness' group. One type of

literature belonging to this group is the investigative report. Campana mentions Svetlana Alexievich and her novel *Voices from Chernobyl: The Oral History of a Nuclear Disaster*. She uses the methods of journalism, and ‘the premise is aimed at giving historical information and facts and is composed of a collage made of excerpts from articles, magazines and encyclopaedias’ (Campana 2019: 207–208). However, Alexievich also borrows techniques from journalism, displaying her experimental tendency. It is the way the novelist tries to be innovative and self-reflexive. In Campana’s analysis, experimentalism and self-reflection mainly deal with ‘the prose of thought’ or ‘philosophization’. But the example of Alexievich’s novel reveals that what appears as ‘ordinary’ turns out to be ‘philosophical’. The other example I want to mention is from the ‘philosophization’ group—Paul Auster’s *City of Glass*. It has a very complex plot and authorship, which indicate the reflection of literature on itself, ‘but in reality it reflects on real interpersonal relationships and practices of society in a figurative key’ (Campana 2019: 190). Thus, novels belonging to the ‘philosophization’ group also seek to present reality, just like those belonging to the ‘ordinariness’ group. The two examples further demonstrate that ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are inseparable. From the Hegelian perspective, the correspondence between concept and reality is what constitutes the Idea or truth. If ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are the ways in which modern spirit manifests itself, and as the reality of the modern Idea, they should be considered as closely related, not separated.

In short, this section emphasizes the importance of taking Hegel’s philosophy as a whole when dealing with his ‘end of art’ thesis. It is also important to combine the historical with the logical. This point is closely related to Hegel’s thought of the absolute, which indicates wholeness and totality. Based on these considerations, I provide a different interpretation about Campana’s framework concerning the relationship between ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’. I defend the view that ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ should not be opposites or two poles. From the perspective of Hegel’s absolute, they are inseparable and have correspondence with one another.

IV. Significance of the ‘end of art’ thesis and proposals for studying Hegel’s philosophy of literature

In section II, I mainly expounded Campana’s understanding of Hegel’s thesis of the ‘end of art’ and his framework for explaining contemporary literature. In section III, I provided a different interpretation concerning his framework, emphasizing the importance of taking Hegel’s philosophy as a totality. Based on the previous discussions, the purpose of this section is to further clarify the

significance of Hegel's 'end of art' thesis, especially its importance for addressing the problem of modern subjectivity, and then to make some proposals for the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature.²¹

Hegel's thesis of the 'end of art' is closely related to his ideas about modernity, especially the problem of modern subjectivity. With an ever-stronger sense of self-consciousness, modern people assert their subjectivity more and more, which leads to the opposition between the subjective and the objective, between the self and the world.²² According to Hegel's dialectic of the inner and the outer, when spirit retreats more and more to the inner, it is also more and more outside itself. That is to say, when the subject seeks its reconciliation and freedom more and more in the inner world, it is more and more bounded by the outer world. Inner certainty without confirmation from the outer world is illusory and lacks actuality. Hegel gives many examples of the types of modern subjects in *Phenomenology of Spirit*, in the *Encyclopaedia* and also in his *Aesthetics*.²³ In a word, the problem of modern subjectivity mainly lies in the separation and opposition between the self and the world. When separated and opposed, both the subjective and the objective are not true.

The close relationship between Hegel's thesis of the 'end of art' and modernity (together with the problem of modern subjectivity) has attracted much attention from later philosophers and contemporary scholars. They have drawn inspiration from Hegel and have expressed their thoughts about modernity and modern subjectivity. For example, Heidegger, in his effort to overcome metaphysics and to re-establish the role of art, values the significance of Hegel's thesis, discusses it in his article 'The Origin of the Work of Art' (Heidegger 2002), and advances his criticism of modern subjectivity. In his mind, art ends in modern time because of the traditional metaphysics and its subjectivist tendency. Thus, in order to save art from its end, it is necessary for modern people to maintain an anti-subjectivist comportment.²⁴ In recent studies, many scholars have also expressed their concern about modernity based on Hegel's thesis of the 'end of art'. For instance, Pippin disagrees with Hegel about art and modernity. He considers Hegel's understanding of 'romantic art as the beginning of the realization that *Geist* does not require a material embodiment to be fully realized *Geist*; it needs only to be reconciled "with itself" and 'this conclusion is not motivated by anything essential in Hegel's account and represents a misstep, not an inference consistent with Hegel's overall project' (2014: 22–23). For Pippin, modernity is still underway and art can still play an important role in modern times. However, Pippin acknowledges the importance of Hegel's *Aesthetics* for us to understand modern art.²⁵

The significance of Hegel's thesis of the 'end of art' to addressing the problem of modern subjectivity is closely related with romantic art. However, we need to clarify the goal of his overall philosophy first. One important concern of

Hegel's philosophy is about how people can acquire truth and achieve freedom in modern time. To realize such an aim, the subject needs to be self-conscious, free and rational so that it can build a critical reconciliation with the objective (Siani 2020: 346). For Hegel, it is only through philosophy (in the form of concept and thought) that such an aim is realizable. Hegel deems that art as a form of absolute spirit is inadequate for such a task. In his analysis of romantic art, with the internalization of spirit, the subjective and the objective, the self and the world become more and more estranged from each other. Hegel declares, 'In romantic art, on the contrary, where inwardness withdraws itself into itself, the entire material of the external world acquires freedom to go its own way and maintain itself according to its own special and particular character' (Hegel 1975: 594). The mutual independence of the inner and the outer is one important reason for the dissolution of romantic art.

However, when art ends or when romantic art dissolves, it maintains the function of revealing the problem of modern subjectivity. The separation of the spiritual inner and the external world is one manifestation of the problem, and this manifestation is helpful in solving the problem. As is mentioned, there are many studies devoted to expounding the importance of modern art or literature in addressing the problem, Campana's work included.²⁶ Here, based on the significance of Hegel's 'end of art' thesis, and the importance of modern and contemporary literature in dealing with the problem of modern subjectivity, I want to make some proposals for the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature.

The basic principle, as illustrated in section III, is to take Hegel's philosophy as a whole. The problems concerning art or literature, such as its nature, its object and its function, may not be separated from the other ideas in Hegel's philosophy. Especially, Hegel's thoughts on the concept, the absolute Idea and absolute spirit provide the general guideline. For example, the three elements of the concept—universality, particularity and individuality form a good paradigm for understanding not only art generally,²⁷ but also particular arts, like literature, and individual literary works.²⁸ Hegel has applied the 'universality-particularity-individuality' paradigm in his *Aesthetics*. The overall structure of *Aesthetics*, namely the three major parts—'The Idea of Artistic Beauty, or the Ideal'; 'Development of the Ideal into the Particular Forms of Art'; 'The System of the Individual Arts'—follow the paradigm closely. Except for few occasions, the discussions of each part follow the paradigm, too. In fact, Hegel has applied this paradigm not only in *Aesthetics*, but also in many other 'philosophies', such as his philosophy of nature, philosophy of right, philosophy of history, philosophy of religion, etc.²⁹

Furthermore, Hegel's absolute provides a whole vision. By adopting the perspective of the absolute, we can avoid external studies on art or literature.

Related with the previous point, although Hegel intends to apply his 'concept' to the understanding of art, he is against a certain kind of artistic theory or external reflection on art. He writes: 'The right of genius, its works and their effects, have been made to prevail against the presumptions of those legalisms and the watery wastes of theories', and 'the mode of reflecting on art, the theorizing we have been considering, has become out of date' (Hegel 1975: 20–21). It is important for us to avoid external research on art or on literature. That means, we should not apply theories to artworks or literary works externally. But how can we achieve that? Hegel's *Aesthetics* is a good demonstration. Based on the absolute and the concept, he clarifies the nature, the aim, and the role of art. Similarly, only from the perspective of the absolute, only by taking the varied phenomena as a whole, can we seek inner connections. Within the perspective of the absolute, nothing is outside, and all are related.

The reason why we should take Hegel's philosophy as a whole in studying his philosophy of literature also lies in that for Hegel, different disciplines are closely related.³⁰ For example, Hegel, in his *Aesthetics*, emphasizes the importance of imagination or poetic imagination (1975: 101). However, relationships between word and intuition, between imagination, representation and thought are also important topics in his philosophy of subjective spirit.³¹ Consider another example: appearance (*Schein*) is an important category in Hegel's *Aesthetics*.³² It is also an important concept in Hegel's logic. Hegel holds that appearance is the manifestation of essence, and is inseparable from essence, just like the reality of Idea is inseparable from the concept. Both Hegel's aesthetics and his logic attach great importance to the relationship between appearance and essence. 'Appearance-essence' can act as a paradigm in studying Hegel's philosophy of literature. In short, the close relationship between different disciplines makes Hegel's philosophy into a whole and totality, which allows us to find proper concepts and paradigms from his other 'philosophies' when we study his philosophy of literature.³³

In studying Hegel's philosophy of literature, not only can we build connections between his *Aesthetics* and his other philosophies, but we can also combine his thoughts on different artistic forms and individual types of art. For instance, in order to understand modern and contemporary art (romantic art generally), a deep understanding of symbolic art and classical art is important. Some scholars have suggested that the category of sublimity reasserts itself in romantic art although Hegel takes it mainly as one form of symbolic art.³⁴ Likewise, taking Hegel's philosophy of art as a whole, the features of other types of art are also helpful for us to understand literature.³⁵ Hegel takes poetry (or literature) as the last type of art and also the highest art. It integrates the features of other types of art into itself. 'Poetry, the art of speech, is the third term, the totality, which unites in itself, within the province of the spiritual inner life and on a higher

level, the two extremes, i.e. the visual arts and music' (Hegel 1975: 960). One obvious demonstration is that lyric poetry shares many similarities with music in the characteristics of rhythm, rhyme, tone, meter, etc. Also, reading a depiction of beautiful sceneries in literary works is just like seeing pleasant pictures. Therefore, in the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature, we had better take all the artforms and art-types together, because other forms and types of art can contribute to the understanding of literature.

The study of Hegel's philosophy of literature aims to understand the modern spirit, to address its problems, especially the problem of modern subjectivity, and to see the role literature plays in revealing and addressing this problem. In order to achieve these goals, we need to construct appropriate frameworks or paradigms, composed of key concepts. But how can we do this? Campana's book is inspirational. His framework of 'philosophization'-'poetry'-'ordinariness' has its basis in Hegel's *Aesthetics*, especially in Hegel's illustration of romantic art, together with the 'end of art' thesis. However, Hegel's philosophy as a whole is dealing with the modern spirit and its many problems. Other concepts in his logic and in his system of philosophy may also be useful. In the analysis above, I have explained the paradigm of 'universality-particularity-individuality' and the paradigm of 'appearance-essence'. In the following, I want to point out briefly three more paradigms—the 'inner-outer', the 'real-ideal' and the 'subjective-objective' as further proposals for how to study Hegel's philosophy of literature.

First, the 'inner-outer' paradigm can be applied in the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature. Hegel analyses the dialectical relationship between the inner and the outer in the *Science of Logic*. For him, the inner and the outer are only different in form, but they are identical in content. Moreover, the inner and the outer are united. 'Thus something which *is at first only an inner*, is for just that reason *only an outer*. Or conversely something which is *only an outer*, is for that reason *only an inner*', and 'each term is immediately its opposite, and each is their common reference *to a third* or rather *to their unity*' (Hegel 2010b: 461). In Hegel's *Aesthetics*, the 'inner-outer' paradigm is also applied. Hegel defines 'artistic beauty as the presentation of the Absolute' or as 'the pure appearance of the Idea to sense' (Hegel 1975: 70, 111). From this definition, we can see the combination of the inner and the outer. In the explication of the development of the three artforms, there is certain indication that the Idea, the spiritual and the content are something inner, while the shape, the sensuous and the form are something outer. Of course, taking artworks as a whole, the distinction of the inner and the outer is sublated. With the above considerations, the 'inner-outer' forms a good paradigm, which can be applied to the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature.

Second, we can apply the 'real-ideal' paradigm to the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature. For Hegel, the ideal and the real (or idealism and

realism) are closely related and cannot be treated separately. When analysing 'being-for-itself' (*Fürsichsein*), Hegel emphasizes the inseparability of the real and the ideal. 'Reality and *ideality* are often regarded as a pair of determinations standing over and against one another, each with the same self-standing character, and it is accordingly said that apart from reality there is *also* an ideality. However, ideality is not something that there is apart from and alongside reality. Rather, the concept of ideality consists expressly in being the *truth* of reality; that is to say, reality posited as what it is in itself proves to be ideality' (Hegel 2010a: 153). Hegel believes that ideality and reality can transform from one to the other. He also believes in their identity and unity. In his *Philosophy of Nature*, Hegel elucidates the relationship between force and its expression, writing that 'the *effect* of force is something real, appealing to sense, also that *force* and its *expression* have the same content and that the *real expression* of this force is achieved through the relation of its ideal moments, space and time' (Hegel 2004a: 42). In *Aesthetics*, beauty is considered to be ideal or the Ideal. But the Ideal also has its reality or realization, most manifestly in Greek sculpture. In the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature, it would be worthwhile if we adopt the 'real-ideal' paradigm to discuss and interpret literary works.

Third, the 'subjective-objective' paradigm can provide many insights for the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature as many parts of his philosophical system follow this paradigm. Hegel's philosophy of spirit is divided into the subjective spirit, the objective spirit, and the absolute spirit (which is the unity of the subjective spirit and the objective spirit). Hegel's logic is comprised of the objective logic (which includes the Doctrine of Being and the Doctrine of Essence) and the subjective logic (which is the Doctrine of the Concept). In his *Aesthetics*, especially in the discussion of poetry, comparatively speaking, the three genres—the epic, the lyrical and the dramatic—can be viewed as being objective, subjective and the unity of the subjective and the objective respectively. Moreover, Hegel distinguishes between the subjective humour and the objective humour. Thus, in the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature, the 'subjective-objective' paradigm is also conducive to the interpretation of literary works.³⁶

After making the above proposals both on the perspective and approach that we need to adopt and on several paradigms that we can follow in the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature, in the rest of this part I want to give some extra comments on the significance of Hegel's 'end of art' thesis and the study of his philosophy of literature.

The 'end of art' as a modern phenomenon is not singular. Nowadays, we also talk about the 'end of religion', the 'end of philosophy', the 'end of history', the 'end of theory' and many other 'ends'. 'End' comprises the being of humans and modern people are more aware of the 'end'. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger

makes lots of analyses about ‘being towards death’. We may also refer to it as ‘being towards end’ although ‘end’ does not mean ‘death’. In Hegel’s mind, it is in modern time that spirit is completed and forms a unity and totality.³⁷ Although for Hegel, this totality is not a fixed one as absolute spirit is always in activity (elucidated in section III), it shows why end becomes an important issue for modern people. ‘Being towards end’ becomes the way that modern people renew and transform many aspects of their lives. Or we may say that ‘being towards end’ is one important characteristic of modern spirit.³⁸ ‘Being towards end’ is also characteristic of literature as it is one form of spirit’s manifestation. Literary phenomena, either ‘philosophical’ or ‘ordinary’, are ways in which the modern spirit reveals itself.

Faced with the ‘end of art’ and the problem of modern subjectivity, what can literature do? The characteristic of modern spirit is its innerness and subjectivity. However, it can lead to problems. As spirit goes towards the inner, it is more and more alienated from the outer. The relationship between the inner and the outer, between the self and the world becomes less certain. The highest aim of spirit is to be free or to be at home with itself. In order to realize this aim, Hegel argues that the subjective and the objective need to be reconciled. The insistence either on subjectivity or on objectivity is one-sided and problematic. Literature is an important way for modern people to recognize these problems and literary works can present us some solutions in dealing with these problems.³⁹

It is also worth mentioning that with the ‘end of art’ thesis, Hegel deems that aesthetics or the philosophy of art surpasses art itself and becomes a better way to understand modern spirit and to address its problems. Hegel in his *Aesthetics* defends the legitimacy of this discipline. Especially, when spirit goes beyond the unity and harmony between the sensible and the spiritual, philosophy generally and philosophy of art particularly are the higher forms for spirit to recognize and know itself. Hegel declares in his *Aesthetics*, ‘it [art] has lost for us genuine truth and life, and has rather been transferred into our *ideas* instead of maintaining its earlier necessity in reality and occupying its higher place’ (Hegel 1975: 11). However, philosophy of art is different from philosophy proper. Philosophy of art is also different from art. It is neither pure concepts, pure universals, nor pure experiences. Instead, philosophy of art combines concept with experience. Hegel indicates that the way to deal with philosophy of art is to combine pure theoretical reflection with empirical observation, and to unite ‘metaphysical universality with the precision of real particularity’ (Hegel 1975: 22). In Hegel’s mind, if art still reveals the modern spirit, as one form of its realization, it is no longer self-explanatory. It needs help from the philosophy of art so that it can be better understood. Similarly, the study of Hegel’s philosophy of literature also aims to help people better understand modern spirit and address its problems.

Overall, in section IV, I defend the significance of Hegel's 'end of art' thesis and make several proposals for how to study Hegel's philosophy of literature. I claim that the significance of the 'end of art' thesis lies in its reflection of the problem of modern subjectivity. Literature, as a unique form of art, also reveals this problem and thus helps to solve it. When we study Hegel's philosophy of art, I suggest that we take Hegel's philosophy as a totality and adopt the perspective of Hegel's absolute. Guided by this perspective, in studying Hegel's philosophy of literature, we can find paradigms and concepts from other disciplines. Moreover, ideas concerning different artistic forms and individual types of art are also helpful. I further point out three paradigms, namely the 'inner-outer', the 'real-ideal', and the 'subjective-objective' as part of the proposals that I make about how to study Hegel's philosophy of literature. Finally, I argue that 'being towards end' is characteristic of modern spirit and also of literature. Based on the above discussions, the study of Hegel's philosophy of literature is to address the problem of modern subjectivity, with the possible result of reconciling the subjective with the objective, the self with the world.

V. Conclusion

In summary, Campana's purpose is not to follow Hegel and his philosophy closely. He is trying to apply the Hegelian thought to the analysis of modern and contemporary literature. His work is quite innovative and inspiring. He has constructed a very persuasive framework in understanding the situation of the 'after-end' of literature and has also put it into practice. In contrast, the present paper analyses the 'end of art' thesis and its significance more from a Hegelian perspective, emphasizing the importance of taking Hegel's philosophy as a whole and following Hegel's thought on the absolute. Thus, different from Campana, who takes 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' as two poles, I defend their inseparability. Also, taking Hegel's absolute as the main perspective, I argue that Hegel's 'end of art' thesis lies in its manifestation of the problem of modern subjectivity. Based on the thesis, I further make several proposals for how to study Hegel's philosophy of literature. Hopefully, the approach and perspective I expound and the proposals I make in this paper can provide insights for the future study of Hegel's philosophy of literature and for a continuing elucidation of his 'end of art' thesis.⁴⁰

Chunge Liu
Dalian University of Technology, China
liuchunge0403@dlut.edu.cn

Notes

¹ Habermas's original words are: 'Hegel ist nicht der erste Philosoph, der der modernen Zeit angehört, aber der erste, für den die Moderne zum Problem geworden ist' (1985: 57).

² Concerning Hegel's thesis of the 'end of art', there is a great deal of debate about its meaning. For Heidegger, great art is the absolute need and he believes that Hegel declares the end of such great art (which mainly refers to classical art). In his lectures on Nietzsche, he holds that 'The achievement of aesthetics derives its greatness from the fact that it recognizes and gives utterance to the end of great art as such' (Heidegger 1991: 84). Furthermore, when it comes to modern art (in Hegel's sense, romantic art), explanation of the 'end' is multiple and controversial. Robert Pippin believes that the development of modern art demonstrates Hegel's idea of 'the self-transcendence of art' (Pippin 2007: 262; Hegel 1975: 80). Benjamin Rutter claims that for Hegel, modern art does not end because Hegel takes *Humanus* (humanity) to be 'the absolute content [*Gehalt*]' of modern art (Rutter 2010: 46; Hegel 1975: 608). However, in Rüdiger Bubner's mind, the emergence of aesthetics announces the end of art. 'The establishment of a truly philosophical aesthetics simultaneously crowns and definitely concludes the age of art' (Bubner 2003: 254). As is mentioned, debates and controversies about the meaning of Hegel's 'end of art' thesis are multiple. The above are just some representative ideas.

³ Although Hegel takes the novel as the 'modern epic', the novel's emphasis on the subjectivity of the author may be taken as a difference between the novel and the epic, since for the latter, according to Hegel, the poet is hidden. However, as is analysed, the authors' voice is important to modern novels, no matter whether they belong to the pole of 'philosophization' or they belong to the pole of 'ordinariness'. This point reveals the importance of subjectivity in modern time. I will come to it in more detail in the following sections.

⁴ Campana's original words are 'the conceptual triad "prose of ordinariness"- "poetry"- "prose of thought"'. See Campana (2019: 226).

⁵ At present, literature still faces the upheavals of 'ends' or other forms of 'crises'. But it is still with us and hopefully it will be with human beings in the future. It is reasonable for Hegel to put literature (together with other arts) in the field of absolute spirit. It is also characteristic of the absolute spirit or absolute Idea which is completed and is still completing itself (I will come to this point in section III).

⁶ For Hegel, art is the form in which absolute spirit knows itself and realizes itself. Also, in his *Aesthetics*, Hegel defines the beautiful (or art) as 'the pure appearance of the Idea to sense' (Hegel 1975: 111).

⁷ Wholeness and totality are what distinguish Hegel's philosophy from others', especially those that take understanding as the main model of thinking. Understanding, for Hegel, represents isolation, opposition, one-sidedness and formalism.

⁸ The problem concerning different approaches towards Hegel's philosophy is not only about his aesthetics, but also about other disciplines. Allegra de Laurentiis in her recent study on Hegel's anthropology, also emphasizes the combination of the historical and the ontological.

Especially, faced with the negligence or denial of Hegel's system, logic, ontology and metaphysics, de Laurentiis acknowledges the importance of the latter for the study of Hegel's thought. See de Laurentiis (2021: xiii, xv).

⁹ Croce's distinction of 'what is living' from 'what is dead' in Hegel's philosophy concerns more about the debate on the relationship between system and method (1915). It is similar to Charles Taylor's study on Hegel. In the 1970s, Taylor in this representative work, said that 'his [Hegel's] conclusions are dead, and yet the course of his philosophical reflection is very much to the point' (1975: 570). However, in my opinion, the debate on the relationship between system and method is related to the debate about the relationship between logic and history.

¹⁰ More probably, there is no distinction of 'the living' and 'the dead'. It all depends on the perspective we adopt when we approach Hegel's philosophy.

¹¹ The relationship between 'philosophization' and 'ordinariness' is not so clear in Campana's book. When he holds that poetry moves between the two poles, what we can imagine is a line with 'philosophization' on the one side and 'ordinariness' on the other side. Therefore, can it mean that poetry is comprised of a certain amount of 'philosophization' and another amount of 'ordinariness'? For example, Novel A is, say, 30% 'philosophization' plus 70% 'ordinariness'? Novel B is, maybe, 70% 'philosophization' plus 30% 'ordinariness'? Although proportion may not be an appropriate category, here we can take it analogically.

¹² In his *Philosophy of Nature*, when explaining 'eternity', Hegel holds that eternity is 'the absolute present, the Now, without before and after. The world is created, is now being created, and has eternally been created; this presents itself in the form of the preservation of the world. Creating is the activity of the absolute Idea; the Idea of Nature, like the Idea as such, is eternal' (Hegel 2004a: 15). Also, in his *Aesthetics*, Hegel explains that the Idea is both 'the ideal unity and subjectivity of the Concept' and its objectivity 'in which the Concept relates itself to itself. On both sides, subjective and objective, of the Concept, the Idea is a whole, but at the same time it is the eternally completing and completed correspondence and mediated unity of these totalities. Only so is the Idea truth and all truth' (Hegel 1975: 110).

¹³ Hegel holds that there is only one Idea and one absolute. 'The idea itself is no more to be taken as an idea *of something or other* than the concept is to be taken merely as a determinate concept. The absolute is the universal idea and the *one* idea that, by *judging*, particularizes itself into a *system* of determinate ideas: ideas, however, that are only this, the process of going back into the one idea, their truth' (Hegel 2010a: 283). Besides, for Hegel, concept and its reality are one and the same totality, just like soul and body. See Hegel (1975: 119).

¹⁴ Unfortunately, when we come to Hegel, it is quite often that we take him as one philosopher whose thought is so abstract and fixed.

¹⁵ Of course, we should admit that for Hegel, nature as a whole is only Idea in its externality, and it is only the implicit Idea. Also, nature is the imperfect manifestation of the Idea. Even so, there is no denying that Idea at a certain stage reveals itself in nature or finds its existence in nature. In *Aesthetics*, it is worth noticing that Hegel discusses a lot about natural life before he enters the field: beauty of art (Hegel 1975: 123–29).

¹⁶ Hegel, in his *Philosophy of Nature*, takes poles as inseparable and as a unity. ‘The separable point, in opening itself to differentiation by the Notion, produces the poles. In the physical line which has in it the difference of form, they are the two live ends, so posited that each only is, in its connection with its other, without which it has no meaning’. ‘Each pole posits the other and also excludes it from itself. The terms of the syllogism cannot exist on their own, but only in union’ (Hegel 2004a: 165).

¹⁷ Campana’s understanding of ‘ordinariness’ is much like ‘reality’ in realism. This reality concerns more about the sensible and the perceptible. It is different from Hegel’s ‘reality’ and ‘actuality’, which have a rational sense and which are what is improved from the merely sensible. In fact, Hegel has a low opinion of such ‘ordinariness’ if it means ‘naturalness’ or close to ‘nature’. In his *Aesthetics*, Hegel criticizes the ‘naturalness’ of art. ‘In the theatre, for example, everyone has got sick and tired of commonplace domestic stories and their true-to-life presentation. A father’s moans about his wife and his sons and daughters, about income and expenditure, dependence on Ministers, intrigues of valets and secretaries, and then the wife’s trouble with maids in the kitchen, the sentimental love-affairs of daughters in the parlour—all this worry and bother everyone gets better and truer in his own home’ (Hegel 1975: 161). However, when Hegel talks about the Dutch painting, he claims that it ‘has recreated, in thousands and thousands of effects, the existent and fleeting appearance of nature as something generated afresh by man’, and ‘what at once claims our attention in matter of this kind, when art displays it to us, is precisely this pure shining and appearing of objects as something produced by the *spirit* which transforms in its inmost being the external and sensuous side of all this material’ (Hegel 1975: 162). Fred Rush analyses Hegel’s thought on ‘objective humour’, which ‘establishes a more substantial connection with extra-subjective reality’, and bestows ‘animation’ upon the ordinary (Rush 2010: 8, 17). In short, it is important for Hegel that the natural things are not kept as they are, sensible or perceptible, but are transformed and changed by spirit. Therefore, to some extent, Hegel holds a different understanding concerning ‘ordinariness’ from Campana.

¹⁸ It is true that in Hegel’s mind, opposition, separation and isolation are the main characteristics of modern spirit. For example, the opposition between the subjective and the objective becomes more obvious in modern time, which is also one important problem of modern subjectivity. However, it does not mean that ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are opposites or two poles. As I mentioned above, the Idea determines its realization. Both ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ are ways that modern spirit realizes itself. They can embody the characteristics of modern spirit which includes opposition, separation and isolation, but based on Hegel’s thought on the absolute, the two categories themselves should not be taken separately.

¹⁹ I think this is also the reason why, in Danto’s mind, there is a tendency of philosophization of art, and there are also the ‘indiscernibles’ of artworks from real objects. Campana also talks about Danto’s seemingly contradiction in his book. See Campana (2019: 24).

²⁰ However, as far as I can see, most of the time, Campana takes ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’ as counterexamples, as ‘two opposites’ and ‘two extreme ways’ and as ‘two

opposing polarities, between which infinite interconnections are possible' (Campana 2019: 31). For this reason, I come up with a different interpretation about his framework in this section.

²¹ The study of Hegel's philosophy of literature is a huge project and it is beyond the scope of a single paper. Campana's book is such an attempt, as he gives the framework and also applies it to the explanation of modern and contemporary novels. However, the present paper limits itself to presenting some views about how to study Hegel's philosophy of literature, instead of an attempt to elaborate on Hegel's philosophy of literature in a systematic way.

²² In fact, the contradiction between the subjective and the objective is always there. For Hegel, spirit goes out of itself and then returns to itself. So, there is always the process of externalization and internalization. It is the ideality of the spirit. But in modern times, this contradiction becomes more obvious. One possible reason is that in ancient times and the Middle Ages, the cycle of spirit's process is longer than that in modern times, thus less obvious.

²³ Rush summarizes some types of modern subject in Shakespeare's tragedies. For him, Macbeth represents the individuality who has a fixed and self-enclosed character. Such an individual does not worry much about the external world, which often leads to tragic results. Miranda in *The Tempest* is a seclusive, self-concealed and idealized type of character. She does not flee from reality, but understands it only from her limited and isolated experience. Hamlet is a kind of 'beautiful soul'. His pursuit of internal purity results in indecision to take action. See Rush (2010: 4–6).

²⁴ In the study of Heidegger's interpretation of Kant's aesthetics, Ingvild Torsen (2016) believes that, contrary to his common critical attitude towards modern aesthetics, Heidegger takes Kant's aesthetics as in line with his own ontological interpretation. Heidegger does not attack the subjective aspects, such as genius and taste, of Kant's aesthetics. On the contrary, He considers Kant's disinterestedness and purposiveness as somewhat 'anti-subjectivist'.

²⁵ For a more detailed comment on Pippin's idea about Hegel's thesis of the 'end of art' and modernity, see Siani (2020: 335, n.1). Siani mentions Eva Geulen's work *The End of Art: Readings in a Rumor after Hegel* (2006). Likewise, Geulen also emphasizes the close relationship between the 'end of art' thesis and modernity. 'At the end of the end of art one does not find an end, but a beginning: the discovery of the end of art as a discourse of modernity' (2006: 14).

²⁶ Campana (2021) tries to analyse the 'paradigm shift' in the nineteenth century in order to shed light on the many new forms and phenomena of art in the twentieth century. In his mind, there is a shift from 'poetry' to 'music' between the first and second half of the nineteenth century, with the former emphasizing system, science, concept, rationality and word, while the latter is mainly against system, science, rationality and imitation. As can be seen, the 'paradigm shift' also reflects the shift in spirit, in rationality and in logic. This shift shapes the general mentality of the contemporary world. Art is an important approach for us to encounter the world. The 'paradigm shift' in artforms not only reflects the changes in the artworld, but also reflects the change of way in which people see the world and the change of relationship between human beings and the world.

²⁷ Universality, particularity and individuality are not limited to the ‘concept as such’ in Hegel’s Doctrine of the Concept, but the other parts—judgement, syllogism, and those moments of objectivity, and finally absolute Idea, are all about the concept and are all about the relationship among universality, particularity and individuality. They can form a proper framework for understanding Hegel’s ‘end of art’ thesis, as well as other topics in Hegel’s philosophy. For instance, Westphal applies the paradigm of universality-particularity-individuality to the explication of Hegel’s concept of freedom (1992: 5–9).

²⁸ From the unity of universality, particularity and individuality, we can also derive the unity of ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’. Generally, ‘philosophization’ tends to be universal and ‘ordinariness’ tends to be particular. However, for Hegel, the three moments of the concept are united. In some of the postmodern realistic novels, we can also see the combination of ‘philosophization’ and ‘ordinariness’.

²⁹ Similarly, the *Science of Logic* and the *Encyclopaedia Logic* are not the only works for us to know Hegel’s thought on logic. Hegel’s other ‘philosophies’ and his entire system are also relevant. For example, Hegel’s *Aesthetics* contains many logical thoughts.

³⁰ Geulen in her monograph also emphasizes the relationship between different disciplines in the study of Hegel’s thesis of the ‘end of art’: ‘The end of art is not only the hinge between aesthetics and anti-aesthetics, but it also falls between the disciplines that have competence to address it. Art history and literary studies are each here as competent and incompetent as intellectual history and philosophy’ (2006: 16).

³¹ Campana emphasizes the importance of language in literature. When talking about the ‘exceptionality’ of literature among forms of art, he says: ‘The most relevant reason for this exceptionality lies in the medium that literature uses, namely the verbal language, which is shared by both religion and, above all, philosophy’ (Campana 2019: 142).

³² David James brings doubts to Hotho’s edition of Hegel’s *Aesthetics*, especially on the often-cited characterization of beauty as ‘the sensory appearance of the Idea (*das sinnliche Scheinen der Idee*)’ (James 2010: 84). However, there should be no doubt that ‘appearance’ as a logical category plays an important role in Hegel’s philosophy of art.

³³ Hegel holds that ‘the differences between the particular philosophical sciences are merely determinations of the idea itself and that it is the latter alone that presents itself in these several elements’ (Hegel 2010a: 46).

³⁴ Rush gives a detailed discussion about the application of the sublime in romantic art. However, what concerns him is that romantic art is also beautiful, necessarily beautiful (compared with the essentially beautiful in classical art). ‘My own view is that Hegel treats beauty and sublimity as dialectically related, as did Schiller and Shelling, and this would not impact adversely the claim that Romantic Art in its end-state is necessarily beautiful (it would be necessarily sublime as well)’ (Rush 2010: 20, n.28). From this statement, we can also see the close relationship among the three forms of art.

³⁵ Campana regards language in literature as what makes literature exceptional (2019: 142). I do not want to argue with Campana about the ‘particularity’ or ‘exceptionality’ of poetry (or literature) in Hegel’s *Aesthetics*, because Hegel himself also admits it. But we should recognize

that poetry shares many features with other types of art. Other art-types are helpful for us to understand poetry.

³⁶ The 'subjective-objective' paradigm sounds more general and comprehensive than the other paradigms discussed in this section, but it points to the problem of modern subjectivity (the separation and opposition between the subjective and the objective) more directly.

³⁷ Nowadays, Hegel's philosophy is confronted with many difficulties. One reason is the absolute and its totality and wholeness. For many people, the absolute and the totality is too compulsive. It gives too much pressure. Although spirit completes itself in modern time, it is also difficult for modern people to see the whole picture now. We would rather choose the fragments and concentrate on pieces and parts, rather than on the whole and the totality. It brings us comfort when we are satisfied with the parts and fragments, rather than pursuing the totality. However, if we cannot achieve a kind of system of ideas, nor a totality, it does not mean it is meaningless.

³⁸ It is interesting to note that Hegel in his *Philosophy of Nature* indicates that when seen from the totality, there is no question of beginning and end. See Hegel (2004a: 16).

³⁹ In his study of Hegel's philosophy of art, Albert Hofstadter emphasizes innerness and intimacy of the spirit in romantic art. He holds that romantic art, in its absolute negativity, reconciles with the objective in itself. He writes: 'The ground-principle of romantic art, says Hegel, is the rise of spirit to itself, by which it regains within itself the objectivity which otherwise it had to seek in the external and sensible mode of existence; now it can feel and know itself in this union with itself' (Hofstadter 1974: 94). As Hofstadter explains, romantic art presents disharmonies and disruptions between the inner world and the external, sensible world, but this is the way that spirit seeks the ultimate reconciliation within itself and also the way that subjectivity achieves its infinity and absoluteness.

⁴⁰ This work was supported by Liaoning Province Social Science Planning Fund under Grant (L21CWW001).

Bibliography

Bubner, R. (2003), *The Innovations of Idealism*, trans. N. Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bungay, S. (1984), *Beauty and Truth: A Study of Hegel's Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campana, F. (2019), *The End of Literature, Hegel, and the Contemporary Novel*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Campana, F. (2021), 'From Poetry to Music. The Paradigms of Art in German Aesthetics of the 19th Century', *Aesthetica Preprint* 116: 213–37.

Croce, B. (1915), *What is Living and What is Dead of The Philosophy of Hegel*, trans. D. Ainslie. New York: Russell & Russell.

- de Laurentiis, A. (2021), *Hegel's Anthropology: Life, Psyche, and Second Nature*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Desmond, W. (1984), *Art and Absolute: A Study of Hegel's Aesthetics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Geulen, E. (2006), *The End of Art: Readings in a Rumor after Hegel*, trans. J. McFarland. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1975), *Truth and Method*. 2nd ed, trans. J. Weinsheimer and D. G. Marshall. London: Continuum.
- Habermas, J. (1985), *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne. Zwölf Vorlesungen*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1975), *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Vols. I & II, trans. T. M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2004a), *Hegel's Philosophy of Nature*, trans. A. V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2004b), *Philosophie der Kunst* (Mitschrift von der Pfordten 1826), ed. A. Gethmann-Siefert, J.-I. Kwon and K. Berr. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2010a), *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Basic Outline. Part I: Science of Logic*, trans. K. Brinkmann and D. O. Dahlstrom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2010b), *The Science of Logic*, trans. G. di Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1991), *Nietzsche*. Vols. I & II, trans. D. F. Krell. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Heidegger, M. (2002), 'The Origin of the Work of Art', in *Off the Beaten Track*, ed. and trans. J. Young and K. Haynes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstadter, A. (1974), 'On Artistic Knowledge: A Study in Hegel's philosophy of art', in F. G. Weiss (ed.), *Beyond Epistemology: New Studies in the Philosophy of Hegel*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- James, D. (2009), *Art, Myth and Society in Hegel's Aesthetics*. London: Continuum.
- James, D. (2010), 'Art and Ethical Life: The Social and Historical Background to Hegel's Reflections on Ancient and Modern Literature in the *Mit-* and *Nachschriften* of his Lectures on Aesthetics', *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 62: 83–100.
- Lamarque, P. (2009), *The Philosophy of Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moland, L. L. (2019), *Hegel's Aesthetics: The Art of Idealism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pippin, R. (2007), 'What Was Abstract Art?', in S. Houlgate (ed.), *Hegel and the Arts*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Pippin, R. (2014), *After the Beautiful: Hegel and the Philosophy of Pictorial Modernism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Rush, F. (2010), 'Hegel, Humour, and the Ends of Art', *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 62: 1–22.
- Rutter, B. (2010), *Hegel on the Modern Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siani, A. L. (2020), 'Antisubjectivism and the End of Art: Heidegger on Hegel', *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 60:3: 335–49.
- Taylor, C. (1975), *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Torsen, I. (2016), 'Disinterest and Truth: On Heidegger's Interpretation of Kant's Aesthetics', *British Journal of Aesthetics* 56:1: 15–32.
- Westphal, M. (1992), *Hegel, freedom, and modernity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.