

Yvonne Dohna Schlobitten

***Could Esthetics Bear
L'estetico può possedere un senso veritativo?
Contemporaneità dell'icona, icone nella contemporaneità***

The specific destruction of images that lives in our time concerns a specific inability to see. There has been talk in this sense of a catastrophe of representation, not because the world is full of pictures, nor is it reduced to only images; rather, it is because art, overwhelmed by the consumption of images that produce medial imagery, has lost its original value.

The appeal to the icon is a useful shortcut to this creative impotence. In fact, what appears in the icon does not affect the appearance. It would thus exceed the nihilistic dualism that certifies the renunciation to express what is to be lost in appearance, following the extreme creative subjectivity that only obeys, paraphrasing Kandinsky, an "inner necessity."

It seems, however, that the route taken by modern meditation poses another problem, which concerns precisely the relationship between the visible and invisible, where the invisible becomes so "real" to be shown in the visible. Therefore, it is not in reference to an assumed sense of things that are no longer possible to show: it is the very materiality that speaks to us. The claim of an art that does not want to be significant, which does not want to represent anything, jealous of its autonomy, of its gratuity is to be able to watch without seeing: what we see is more true than what we're looking at. This is according to Derrida, and he invites us to do so: "We need to see what at first glance does not let itself be seen." It is indeed the same invisibility. In fact, what the first view is missing is the invisible. The mistake, the fault of the first sight is to see, and not perceive the invisible." It is an unprecedented, artistic expression that has the need to be expressed in new categories, such as those developed by Merleau-Ponty when he speaks of a "chiasmatic" relationship between the visible and invisible, in which "the invisible is the relief and depth of the visible, and the visible does not involve more pure positivity of the invisible".