Critique of Art Interpretation
– the possibility of Art-Science –

by

Teruaki Georges Sumioka, ph.D.

(Received OCTOBER 26, 2009)

Abstract

Do we need Art-Science that interprets art with word? Art should be by nature self-evident. However, in the face of an artwork that does not belong to us, we began to use Iconography to translate it into our culture. Such an interpretation depends on Structuralism. Although the Enlightenment believed the universality of human Reason, after the Revolution and Napoleonic hegemony we had to admit the relativistic schemes to each personality and nationality. However, as Hegelianism without the Progressivism, Iconology has divested authors of their prerogatives in interpretation and has reduced all to the Reception Theory of our culture-code. In the meantime, Freudianism developed Aristotle's Catharsis Theory into the Repression Theory. Although Structuralist claimes artists create only what is beforehand immanent in our culture-code, Foucault thought the very culture-code is the repression for us. It hides the thing itself. Nevertheless, we can see it by chance as something aweful. It exceeds our culture-code. Art does not show "sign" of our culture-code but such "shadow" of the truth. Indeed, Bricolage manages the thing itself regardless of the original purpose in order to make a new tool; but art has no purpose. It is an activity to show the awful existence with a unique exception and it breaks the repression of the dogmatic culture-code. Interpretation of an old artwork asserts its status as science and struggles against each other; however, it is by nature not science but artistic Bricolage with word; nevertheless, gathering and examining various interpretations will rather enable us to establish Art-Science.

0. Introduction

Once, art was to show and to see, neither to talk about nor to read. Even science or philosophy was to show within poetry or play in ancient times. However, nowadays we accept only the knowledge with words as "science". Moreover, we will evaluate any art within Art-Science (Kunstwissenschaft, Studies on Art) of Art-Experts with words. For these means, we need a certain operation: interpretation from art to word or reading art with word.

In this interpretation from art to word, we depend on the theory of Structuralism. It says that the Art-World and the Word-World have a same structure, and that we are able to map the element in the Art-World to the one in the Word-World that has the equal position on the structure common to the both worlds. However, it has been to question since a long time ago; what is the structure said by Structuralism? Is it just a new Idealism of the whole scale, namely "Ideology"?

Needless to say, the founder of Idealism is Plato. He thought that there is somewhere "Idea" for each thing and that the thing in this world is good and beautiful when it is similar to the Idea well. Therefore, each Idea is the reason of the goodness and the beauty of each

* 総合経営学部マネジメント学科准教授

thing. However, everything in this world is only the imitation of the Idea and no Idea belongs to this world. We can only guess the Idea by observing the good and beautiful things in this world.

As it was, Plato pointed out in addition that there is the true goodness and the false goodness in this world.[1] Indeed both have beauty, but the beauty of the false goodness is only superficial, while the one of the true goodness is essential. Therefore, we have to investigate each beauty. The way of the investigation Plato - or his master Socrates - invented is "Dialectic", the investigation through words. Describing and discussing with words, we probe what it was at all, namely the essence.[2]

To grasp the essence, the term "at all" is literally important. Our description with word is normally only from an aspect of it. However, we dare to describe the same thing from the various aspects here. Only through this way, we dimly catch a glimpse of the essence in the center of the many-faced discusses. Plato also called this as "the approach by the shadows".[3] For him, word is the shadow from one side. The essence itself is always over the any shadows or the any words, for the essence itself or the Idea does not belong to this world in the first place.

We have to distinguish art and work. Art is an activity to explore into the truth and the beauty, while all artworks belong to this world and it is only the means for the activity of art. It is an artwork only as long as it tries to show us the Idea. It can sometime stop to show it no more. Conversely, even a commodity in daily use can come to show the essence of thing suddenly. A certain situation turns even such an ordinary thing in this world into an artwork. Creativity is not making a thing, but arranging a situation where a thing becomes a signpost for the truth. Anyways, a work is not an art itself, but only a means for the art.

This explains that there are true artworks and false artworks. All artists insist that their works are art and they are exhibited as an "art". However, some are true art, while some are not art in fact. The latter are also beautiful, but tell us nothing or orate much irresponsible information of the truth. The former is not always beautiful, sometimes far from unpleasant, but tells us of some firm truth eloquently.

The true artworks are not the truth itself, but tell us of some truth directly, or at least tell us the direction to look for the truth in question as a signpost, because it is the shadow of the truth. However, is the talk linguistic? Can we write the talk of the true artwork down with words as interpretation? The answer is "No". Although art itself is a sort of interpretation, the true artwork has a power to break our culture-code. Therefore, in the face of a great artwork, we are at loss for a word rather. The interpretation as art always points outside our existing structure or our words. Artwork is different from the interpretation on artwork. I will explain it in this essay.

1. Art and Interpretation

In the imaginary ancient times, all things were self-evident. As well as the natural things, also the artificial things were as they were. However, we meet sometimes something that is not known what it is. Here someone tried to explain with words what it was at all. It was philosophy, in other words, their science and history. It was often handed down as songs and tales for generations and shown as poetries and plays to people.

Artworks were usually made as they were. Picture was a picture of somewhat and music was a music for somewhere. They painted a picture of the king as it seemed the king. They played requiem as it was a funeral. They made them or brought them with an intention and they could understand just as they saw and heard it. If else, it could not be an art. In this meaning, art itself were already a sort of philosophy on somewhat or somewhere as well as songs and tales with words. By artworks, they reminded and understood it deeper than somewhat or somewhere itself. With the portrait of the king, they were awed by the king and with the requiem, we miss the significance of the person. Artworks showed us what they depict clearer than itself. As it was, when did the interpretation of art with words begin? Why have we begun to need the interpretation of art?

Holding up a rusty shabby sword, they said "this is the true famous sword Excalibur, King Arthur's favorite!" It had to be a fake and the tale was also only a fantasy; however this situation tells us a side of our culture. Like this fake Excalibur, some artworks cannot be understood at a glance. They need a certain situation or stage to begin to tell us by itself. Namely, the very

staging was the first interpretation in the early times. A skull of God knows who becomes the one of the famous saint by exhibiting on the altar of an enormous cathedral. We find here that not the thing itself but the interpretation or staging is rather the primary art, like the tale of King Arthur. Since there is this tale, even a fake gets the meaning.

It was the Napoleon Age when we recognized the need of interpretation of art. As Napoleon brought back various things from Egypt, we embarrassed. We can see that these are brilliant artworks; however, we cannot see what these tell us. Fortunately, Ancient Egypt had letters Hieroglyph and it could be decoded. Although European letters are phonogram, Hieroglyph was once ideogram and it kept the nature in the part after that. Getting the new flash from it, translation of ideogram into the word expanded to the interpretation of artworks. It explained with word what the art shows, for example, "this is Maat, the goddess of justice and she weighs here the heart of the dead with her feather to judge whether his goodness was enough to go to the Heaven."

After the Revolution, the new bourgeois had to be confronted with the same problem. They had no education about ancient Greek and Roman culture to understand the artworks of loads in the former age. Almost no traditional artworks belonged to them. It was a so different culture for them that they needed the interpretation as well as ancient Egyptian artworks. The term "Classic" was derived from social "Class" and it meant consequently the aristocratic culture that is based on the Greek and Roman demanding some interpretations.

This sort of interpretation is called "Iconography". It appeared already in Renaissance to study ancient and Byzantine culture. It was however first in the 19th century that Iconography was systematized, so to speak, as a language. It had mainly two systems. One is the Greek mythology system covering ancient Greek, Roman and Renaissance artworks and another is the Christianity system treating Jewish, Medieval and Byzantine artworks. There are additionally various systems of Egyptian, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, African artworks and so on.

Incidentally, also modern artworks demand interpretation, to our surprise. This means that those do not belong to us in fact. Those are only of the art snobs. For ordinary people, modern artworks are quite different culture as well as Egyptian and Byzantine. Those tell us nothing without the special interpretation.

2. Structuralism

After that, Structuralism has swept over the all fields of culture. Although the name of Structuralism is certainly of 20th century and Ricoeur relates it to the establishment of Saussure's "General Linguistics", such approach was already arisen in the 19th century.

At the first place, when did we begin to use the architectural metaphor "structure" for our culture? We have no minute material about it. Indeed, in ancient Roma, the word "structura" was applied for the sentence in rhetoric, but even the Enlightenment believed the universality of human culture. Even if there are various savage cultures in the world, the culture of intellectual should be only one. All clergy and scholars speak Latin and all loads go around in French. Setting the vulgar folks aside, all sophisticated humans had actually the common sense of those days.

Herder (1744-1803) had learned under Kant, the typical enlightenment philosopher. However, he criticized Kant later. According to Herder, Kant misunderstands human reason as absolute inherent ability. Herder argued that human reason is formed by each language he lives in, so that it is different each other by language and that there is no universality of human reason. Against Enlightenment, he regarded the individual personality and nationality as important. Thus, he became the pioneer of Romanticism and Historicism. Nevertheless, his thought was too advanced to accept at the time.

As the Revolution by the thought of Enlightenment had been reduced to only one dictatorial person Napoleon and as Napoleon's attempt to spread the modern common sense or the belief in human reason to all over the Europe had been wrecked, we became conscious of personalities and nationalities at length. We could not say here one is advanced further than others. Therefore, we had to approve Relativism.

Schleiermacher (1768-1834) is known as the proponent of "Hermeneutics". Certainly, Hermeneutic itself is much older. We can see the term already in

Aristotle and the method to interpretation was so called as early as the 17th century. As Susan Sontag says, it was the makeshift way to accept the quite stale culture legacies with quibbles.[4] In opposition to this, Schleiermacher maintained understanding the works along the author. It means the interpretation based not on the present time, but on the personality and the period of the author. Similarly, Ranke (1795-1886) abandoned the progressionistic view of universal human spirit like Hegel and allowed the Relativism of each nation and each period. It was Ranke's nationalistic Historicism. This stream was succeeded to Max Weber (1864-1920) and the like. These thought gave us numerous relativistic schemes to understand the things of the different cultures.

On the other hand, also two new bigoted schemes were appeared in the middle of the 19th century. One was Marxism and another was Freudianism. Marx (1818-83) reread all as the class conflict and Freud (1856-1939) did as the sexual complex. Sontag says Marxism and Freudianism were full of the malicious intentions. Also Ranke was been in intimate terms with the King of Prussia and his Historicism intended Reactionism in the background. However, we would like to argue the intention no more. According to Nietzsche (1844-1900), even Christianity is an ideology of Ressentiment. Anyway, they invented the way to reread everything in their favorite ideology by condemning the existing culture as just an ideology. Those were already genuine Structuralism essentially.

Setting debatable Marx's philosophy on art aside, Freud talked often on art by himself. Freudianism made Interpretation based on the personality of the author psychologically deeper. Every fact in the personal history should be reread further as the fact in his own psychological world. Actually many artists have so marginal or critical mentality that it is needed to see every fact from their insides again in order to understand their histories and works.

Instead of old "Iconography", Panofsky (1892-1968) advocated "Iconology". While Iconography explains each symbol in a period, Iconology asks the mentality of the period that gave the symbols those meanings. However, it is not of Freudianism, but the revival of Hegelianism without the Progressivism. Every artwork is only the expression of the mentality of the period, not of the gifted personality of the artist, as well as the person Napoleon was only the symbol of the spirit of the Revolution. According to Iconology, even if the artist did not make the work, another artist would make it all the same, because it is the expression of the whole society of the period.

Thus, authors were divested of their prerogatives in the interpretation. Hermeneutic based on the personality of the author like Schleiermacher became out of date. The point should be the mentality of the period that made the artist make the work and that accepted the work as a good art. This is the so-called "Structuralism". It assumes a cultural code of the society like a language to interpret everything including artwork. It tries to reveal the code system by read out the commonness of various things in a same period. It ignores the unique personality of the author. It regards the fact as more important that the society of the period accepted it. This thought is also named as "Reception Theory".

A typical Structuralist Barthes (1915-80) says, rather the idea of "author" was only the fictional character in our modern interpretation.[5] When once the artist has published his work, it has no owner more. After that, the artwork talks us by itself without the artist, being based on the cultural code of us, not of the artist. In the first place, even the artist could make nothing without our code. Not only that, a work has various roots simultaneously as if a crossing and any of them could not assert itself to be the only absolute origin. Therefore, Barthes claims the superiority of the reader, because the reader is the very place where the various roots of the work converge.

However, this is only the cunning usurpation by snobs who make nothing. Even if a work could be understood variously by cone-heads, it does not mean it is a good art. Actually, those Structuralisms worked in art snobbishly after all. They despised every poplar entertainment with dirty interpretation, while they always talked around unintelligible rubbish and said, "It has the deep meanings." However, it is only that the work has no evident significance essentially. Speaking truthfully, we could neither understand nor be moved by such a rubbish even with their magnificent interpretations. It lacks something important.

3. Catharsis

In the meantime, Freudianism gave us a new aspect on art. Already we know Aristotle's Catharsis Theory of art and Freudianism explained the mechanism. We have many taboos in everyday life, but we are always trying not to be conscious of them. If we take them to heart incessantly, we are choked. However, even if we are not aware of them, it does not mean we are free, but we should not touch any taboo as ever. Freud named such invisible jail "repression". He said that some troublesome repression in the personal history makes psychological diseases. He advocated that awakening of the repression heals the diseases directly.

As Aristotle said, we get healing with seeing tragedy and crying over the misfortune. We meet sometime unreasonable misfortune. Nevertheless, it is blamed as childish to make a great fuss on it. However, on the misfortune of the character in the tragedy, we may wail out it without hesitating. In fact, we are prohibited not only crying but also laughing, getting angry and getting glad in public. Therefore, Indian philosopher Abhinavagupta in 10th century said that a play and show should contain always all nine tastes "Nava Rasa" to solve our various repressions; 1. Śṛngāram (love), 2. Hāsyam (humor), 3. Karuṇam (agony), 4. Raudram (vice), 5. Vīram (pride), 6. Bhayānakam (threat), 7. Bībhatsam (hatred), 8. Adbhutam (wonder) and 9. Śāntam (peace).

It has no meaning to count sorts of our repressions up. Anyways, it may be true an art has some healing effect. However, how can the art purify us? What relation is there between art and us? Does it work only by our self-projection or sympathy? Is it just a compensation for the deed that we cannot do by ourselves? Even if so, what does catharsis mean in the case of music and other abstract arts?

Barthes and his successors, snobbish Structuralists thought along the Reception Theory, that not we but rather artists create nothing but what we already know well. All artworks are beforehand immanent in our culture-code. According to Barthes, even Surrealism could only outwit the existing old culture and had given us nothing new after all. It was only unreal affected combinations of real things. Thus, it confused us in our reality, but that was all.

On the other hand, Foucault (1926-84) prosecutes the culture-code as very the repression on us. It hides the real thing itself, treats everything as only genus and ignores the individuality. In the first place, the culture-code is not ours, but of the authority. We have been disciplined to take it for it only because it seems it. For example, if a man has on the uniform of the police, then we trust him as a police officer with no doubt, because it is the culture-code. However, the uniform does not always guarantee that the man is a true police. Far from that, a liar always cashes on such an easy culture-code.

Husserl (1859-1938), the founder of Phenomenology, already had found our scheme that makes us recognize it as it. He named the scheme "Noesis". He thought that before our Noesis, all things have no identification. His pupil Heidegger (1889-1976) brought up the eerie "Ground (Erde)" before our world of tools (Zuhanden). Lacan (1901-81) used the "Schema RSI"; Real-, Symbol- and Image-World, too. He was one of the typical Structuralists. The Symbol-World is the culture-code while the Real-World is maybe of Kant's things themselves and the Image-World is maybe of Plato's Ideas. As well as Kant, the theorists who assume the some structures to recognize things have to tolerate simultaneously also the existence of the world of things themselves preceding the scheme. Things themselves have neither name nor regulation. They are quite elusive.

By the way, Kant discusses "Aesthetic Judgment" in the first half of his CRITIQUE OF JUDGMENT. It is not a normal Determinative Judgment in our life on the culture-cord. Determinative Judgment is the ability to judge whether the thing matches to the scheme or not. Therefore, it is explanatory. On the other hand, Aesthetic Judgment assesses how exactly the thing fits to the scheme. When the thing fits the scheme quite exactly, we feel pleasure and regard it as beautiful. That is, "Oh! It is very what it is! Beautiful!" It means that the thing is similar to "our" Idea extremely.

This explanation conforms to the Reception Theory, too. Also Kant terms the Judgment "subjective". Nevertheless, this subjective judgment is not personal but social, because the scheme is social as culture-code. In the Reception Theory's conclusion, the audience judges whether it is beautiful or not, according as whether it fits their own culture-code. Therefore, Structuralist says, artists should make their works by

grounding on the marketing of the culture-code of the period. Actually, such works sell much. However, are those true artworks?

4. Destructive Salvation

Kant however founded also another Aesthetic Judgment. It is the case when our subjective can anyhow find no scheme fitting the thing. It is because the thing is too magnificent or too intensive to make any schemes of us connote it. Kant says, in such case we judge it as sublime or awful. Being independent of us, the thing exists firmly. Only our culture-code falls in the functional disorder in front of such an awful thing. Therefore, the feeling of awe is social "subjective" as well as the feeling of beauty.

The feeling of awe exposes our aesthetic disease; the repression by our culture-code. In front of an awful thing, we can nothing. In the first place, we are not able to understand even what it is. We are only at a loss. Some dare to explain it with our existing scheme impertinently; however, very that it needs explanation shows that it does not belong to us absolutely.

Like Lacan and Barthes, also Structuralist Metz (1931-93) says, movies are the most vulgar entertainment made of only the existing culture-code.[6] There is nothing in movies but what we have told repeatedly. To say more exactly, movies themselves are the activity making the culture-code by telling again and again through trial and error. As Metz says, in movies "signifiant" (what shows it) and "signifie" (what it shows) stick each other by nature. However, it means rather that in the first place it is not a "sign" that has the arbitrary culture-combination between the signifiant and the signifie.

It is not a "sign" but a "shadow" of what it shows. It is tied up with the true reality absolutely before our culture. We would like to propose here the name "shadow" as a new technical term for the art-expression. It is not a "sign" by our culture-code convention. It shows itself by itself; however, we can never see it exactly. Shadow is only one of the temporal aspects of it, while the whole of it never appear for us. Aesthetic is the science of shadows. It does need neither interpretation nor translation. With other words, it already shows itself, so that there is no room for interpretation from the beginning. It is the problem before our Understanding or Reason, namely the matter of our own Sensitivity. We can do here nothing but strain our eyes.

Actually, the most part of the movie is made of vulgar common expressions as Metz says. The hero is white and the villain is black. It is indeed semantic. There is no reason in nature that a hero should be in white. It is just by our culture-code. However, a good movie perplexes us on the most important point; on the theme.

For example, the father in LADRI DI BICICLETTE has no piece of dignity as father. The man is poor and out of work. He gets a job at length, but he is stolen his bicycle that is needed for the job. The police do nothing for him. He looks for the bicycle-thief by himself and finds the thief, but there is not the bicycle in the house of the thief, so that he is rebuked by the people inversely. After all, he will steal others' bicycle. However, he is caught at once under his little son's nose. It is father, real father. The man has no father-dignity of common culture-code. However, does it lose him father-dignity? Seeing the father's tears, the little son takes fast hold of his hand back.

Also in KRAMER VS. KRAMER, the protagonist's wife will not go as a "normal" better half, but rather the fatal antagonist. Moreover, in action movie like DIRTY HURRY, THE FIRST BLOOD, DIE HARD, and THE FUGITIVE, the all engines of cars will not start, the police who should help him charge him with a bum rap and the true wrongdoer is often on the top of the police.

There is an interesting scene in DIE HARD. The protagonist uses a fire-hose as lifeline to jump out from the roof of the high building set a bomb. As he has barely escaped into the middle floor of the building, the same fire-hose will draw him by the weight out of the building. The fire-hose does not work here as a fire-hose and it is sometime lifeline but sometime dead-trap. That is to say, it is nothing but it only exists as what can be everything. It is the raw existence before the definition by our culture-code. Thus, a movie can show us by the shadow the raw existence itself of the Real-World or the Ground.

Although Lévi-Strauss (1908- 2009) is the radical Structuralist and it is thought that the "Savage Mind" means is the thinking way on a different structure

from us, he makes mention of Bricolage. Bricolage in French is only Do It Yourself originally; however, Lévi-Strauss gives the term a peculiar meaning. He says that Bricolage is the management work only with the materials to hand. He explains that the mythological thought is made of strange images to hand by Bricolage and that it is the Totemism.

However, we have to pay attention to the activity of Bricolage itself. In fact, we find it often in action movies. It is very Bricolage that the protagonist uses a fire-hose as lifeline in DIE HARD. Also in APOLLO 13, the astronauts and the staff think hard for such a wild work to solve the lack of the air in the cutting-edge space ship. In Bricolage, we manage only with the materials to hand. The all given are only those. Therefore, we have to reconsider the given materials as themselves apart from the original purpose. Tools are reduced again to the only existing things, searched for the other various possibilities and build up for the new purpose. It is a sort of the practical "Deconstruction".

Artists do the same. Then, is Bricolage an art? Bricolage is in the end the way to make a well-known tool in our existing culture-code by using the unusual materials. Therefore, it seems extremely eccentric; however, the function is quite banal. Such a medley is by nature inferior to the original tool for the purpose. Although Lévi-Strauss has interpreted and evaluated the Savage Mind as a coequal of ours; that it is made by Bricolage means after all that it is inferior to ours.

In contrast, artists make the quite useless junks. Those are not tools, not of our existing culture-code. Art is only a play in Huizinga's meaning. Not the work but the activity itself is their purpose. The work is only the means for the activity, so artists are willing to discard his work for the activity. They think performance arts like music and dance are the best at live. Even the pictures and sculptures are the means to express how he has seen it and how he has caught it and it has meaning to exhibit it in front of the encrusted people with common sense. It is a joke or pinprick against the culture-code.

Also Husserl suggests Phenomenological Reduction. According to him, we are with no doubt absorbed in our daily system that makes for us it as it. Then we cannot examine the system. However, as we once switch off the system as Epoche or stopping judgment, we can catch the system itself in our research field objectively. It is his first step, the Transcendental Reduction. Next, we add it Free Alteration by our imagination. After that, we can find the essence of it as the rest that never change. It is his second step, the Eidetic Reduction.

It is not so peculiar thinking operation, but we do daily in a movie theater and various museum. The movie story charges various situations to the same theme. It is a sort of trial or touchstone of the theme. After that, we rediscover the essence as the rest. For example, even if so and so, it is my dearest father as always!

However, what is the rest? What is the essence? Is it our pure concept definition, as Husserl said? Although Heidegger developed Husserl's Phenomenology to his original aesthetics, we cannot go with him. He says often, the existence is as dern as abyss with no bottom, while he maintains, the existence itself shines in arts as the universal essence of the thing. It is not only the problem of analogy. Do arts express the universal essence? Does the father in LADRI DI BICICLETTE express the universal essence of a father? No! However, just one exception can break our universal repression or unnecessary dogma. Those are from the beginning against the individual essence. We would like to pay attention, that also every art is rather quite individual. Although abstract artists express the abstract concept, all artworks are absolutely individual yet. Artworks are essentially individual, for the art-activities to make them have been unique and nonce.

5. Art as Activity

Wittgenstein (1889-1951) refers Jastrow's Duck-Rabbit to examine our aspect problem.[7] When we see here a Duck, a word of the interpretation as a Rabbit makes us find here Rabbit. However, it is just a flash. We see here only a Rabbit and miss the Duck more. After all, both of Duck and Rabbit are only our aspects, Husserl's Noesis or our culture-code. What there is here really is the Duck-Rabbit itself. It is from the beginning neither Duck nor Rabbit.

This is the function of art. Artwork is neither universal nor essential, but only one of other aspects of our reality. It breaks the excessive control of our dogmatic culture-code. However, it works only in a moment. Switching the aspects, we find instantaneously

the true reality with no prescript over the aspects. After that, we return to the normal aspect or the artwork becomes our new dogmatic aspect of the Establishment. Anyway, it is not artworks more, but at most the property of art history and investment.

Artists are so genius or idiot that they are not bound by the existing culture-code. They can go out our normal aspect, find the thing itself, and bring it back under another aspect as Bricoleur, the man who are good at Bricolage. This activity is art. The artwork is the result or mean of his activity.

Nevertheless, a good artwork can certainly provide us various aspects for our life by good interpretations repeatedly. In such a case, the interpreter reuses an old artwork as material for his own art activity in fact. The new meaning of the artwork is not what it has in secret from the beginning, but what the interpreter gives newly. Since we have already known well the aspect the original artist showed, the work was not more an artwork. It is like a chewing gum that lost the taste. However, an interpreter of artwork works like an artist. He digs out a forgotten artwork as his material and sets it to show a new aspect that the artist who made the artwork did not think anything about at the time. He is Bricoleur, too.

Then, why he does not make his own artwork? Artists make new artworks, while the interpreter comments with word on something existing. For the latter, the thing he refers to is not restricted within artworks, but also politics and social phenomenon. It is rather problematic that the interpretation takes an appearance of pseudo science. In case of art, it is same. Interpretation is quite original creativity of a new aspect on it; however, they talk in the name of the scientific authority of the field. Moreover, since they have pretended to be science and they believe themselves so, they will eliminate different interpretations each other. Thus, interpretation or art-science rather becomes repression for us.

Good interpretation works like art. Even with only a word, it gives us a flash to break the repression of our dogmatic culture-code and make us see the truth of thing itself or the raw existence. The truth is not so universal as Plato said, but it is enough to get the possibility of another aspect.

Any interpretation is not perfect. Any interpretation has no privilege as science to eliminate other interpretation. It is not possible to understand a thing, until good interpretations investigate the same thing from various aspects, because this is the Dialectic Plato mentioned and each interpretation is a only one-side shadow of the truth from a certain aspect. Therefore, no interpretation is science. However, when we gather various interpretations elaborately and examine them deliberately, we will be able to establish the basis of Art-Science to help the audience to find the unique meaning for him of an artwork by himself.

Notes

1) See Plato; *Gorgias* and *The Republic.*

2) The past tence is correct. See "to ti en einai" in Aristotle; *Metaphysics*.

3) See Plato; *ibid*.

4) Sontag, Susan; "Against Interpretation", in *Against Interpretation*, 1966.

5) Barthes, Roland; "The Death of the Author", in *Aspen*, No. 5-6, 1967.

6) Metz, Christian; "Le cinéma: langue ou langage?", in *Communications*, No. 4, 1964, et al.

7) Wittgenstein, Ludwig; *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, 1953.