

**Richard Kuhns, *Psychoanalytic Theory of Art: A Philosophy of Art on Developmental Principles*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1983**

Hardy George

Volume 17, numéro 1, 1990

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1073161ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073161ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (imprimé)

1918-4778 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

George, H. (1990). Compte rendu de [Richard Kuhns, *Psychoanalytic Theory of Art: A Philosophy of Art on Developmental Principles*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1983]. *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, 17(1), 80–81. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073161ar>

ing, then indeed we will have the beginnings of an art revolution.

VIRGIL HAMMOCK  
Department of Art  
Mount Allison University

---

RICHARD KUHN *Psychoanalytic Theory of Art: A Philosophy of Art on Developmental Principles*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1983.

For someone interested primarily in a theoretical work on the visual arts (painting, sculpture, and architecture) the title of Kuhn's book may at first seem deceptive. When concrete examples are cited to support philosophical abstractions, subjects from literature, rather than painting or sculpture, are generally chosen. The philosopher, Richard Kuhns, sees art history as accessible and open to his largely Freudian psychoanalytic theory of art. Kuhns writes in his final chapter ("Theory and Art History"): "Art history, I maintain, has an important contribution to make to the theory of psychic life." Kuhns feels that psychoanalytic theory and art history are complementary and support or "reinforce" one another. In general, of course, art historians do not feel this way at all, and psychoanalysts, while seldom exhibiting the same negative reaction, and sometimes acknowledging the importance of art therapy, rarely exhibit any great interest in art history. Therefore, on the whole, the link between psychoanalysis and the humanities has been left to philosophers to establish. Traditional aesthetic questions never seemed very compelling, but the questions philosophers are now asking might eventually challenge some firmly-established ideas about the meaning of style and the limitations of some of the conclusions associated with iconography and iconology.

The developmental approach, which includes the use of historical sequence, is an important issue in Kuhns' work. The term "developmental" is not restricted to the growth and maturation of the individual but is also used for the history of art objects. This may at first sound like *Principles of Art History*, but Wöflin it is not. The importance Kuhns gives history in his study of the development of art is particularly relevant to his theory of "enactments." The medium, the material quality of the work of art ("cultural objects"), is seen as essential to the development of a psychoanalytic theory of art.

Just as there are stages in the history of works of art, there are stages in the life of the artist. Kuhns sees the task of the philosopher of art as one which concerns the "theoretical justification of such affinities." For him, works of art, like theatre and literature, offer substitute gratification for the artist and a related sense of fulfilment for the participant or audience, and all can be reduced to forms of interpersonal acts with developmental histories. These lasting cultural symbols, which have recognized value and exert a meaningful and affective force in society, have been termed "enactments."

Kuhns' developmental theory is essentially based on the work of Freud and Freudian ego psychology. In

general, Kuhns is more interested in Freud's psychoanalytic theory of culture (*Totem and Taboo* and *Moses and Monotheism*) rather than the studies more directly associated with art (*Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood* and *The Moses of Michelangelo*). In *Totem and Taboo* and *Moses and Monotheism*, Kuhns finds methods of interpretation similar to analytic methods used in philosophy.

Kuhns reminds us that there are changes in art which have no more significance than annual variations in fashion, while there are other less frequent changes in style and content that can be associated with "revolutionary theory" marking profound reorientations in society. For example, the transformations that took place in nineteenth-century art, especially in the romantic period, are hardly superficial or the kind of "surface change" which Kuhns associates with the never ending parade of styles and theories. Whether or not Freud can be related to the pantheon of "revolutionary theorists" (Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Kant, and Hegel) is perhaps a philosophical problem rather than an art historical one. Philosophers have a different perspective and a different sense of proportion than art historians. In art history we sometimes lose sight of the fact that there were great and revolutionary thinkers who exerted a considerable influence on their epoch. We sometimes mistake a subtle change in style and subject matter for a radical change in thought.

The work carried out by Freud at the beginning of this century still offers a structure for further changes in the way art is assessed and understood. On the whole, however, the tradition of psychoanalytic interpretation has had a tendency to become doctrinaire and repetitive. Therefore, one of the most ambitious aspects of Kuhns' study is his desire "to enlarge the philosophical themes—sometimes latent—in Freud's own thought, and to search out contributions, by both philosophers and psychoanalysts, that will help psychoanalytic theory realize all of which it is capable." More attention must be given to the interaction of manifest and latent thought in the creation and understanding of the work of art. The way that visual messages are formulated, transmitted, received, and understood, as well as the ongoing need to preserve and reinterpret them, is a fascinating and complex process that challenges the interpretive skills of the art historian.

While we are quite aware of the fact that works of art are responded to differently at different periods in history, we generally attribute this phenomenon to changes in taste rather than to multidimensional interactions between persons and works of art. In fact, at times, rather than consider the complexity of these interrelationships, art historians have often seen individuals and works of art as having separate histories. Kuhns observes that Freud "concentrated on the history of the individual" and that the "art historian concentrates on the history of the object," and moreover Kuhns idealistically believes that a balanced study involving the two approaches is possible. If this marvelous amalgamation were possible, "individual and object" would be seen together under a "clarified and expanded psychoanalytic model of explanation."

Even though both psychoanalysis and art history therefore address the process of maturation, growth, and development, the former has been primarily con-

cerned with the development of the individual while art history has dealt principally with the evolution and development of style in painting, architecture, and sculpture. In the early development of both systems of analysis, outside cultural and historical forces were not given a great deal of attention. Both systems, however, have common origins in biology and nineteenth-century science, and more recently both psychoanalysis and art history have been influenced by the important developments that have taken place in sociology and anthropology.

One can hardly speak of a psychoanalytic school of art history, and considering the advantages of an acceptable and well-crafted system (iconography and stylistic analysis), it is probably just as well that methods associated with psychoanalysis have remained marginally off-limits. There is something unique and strikingly individual in the approach of art historians (and others from outside the discipline) who had in one way or another been influenced by psychoanalytic theory. Among these important contributions are Jack Spector's work on Delacroix, Meyer Schapiro's work on Cézanne, Jack Lindsay's recent book on Turner, Michael Podro's essay on Freud and the numerous and sometimes quite eccentric essays of Adrian Stokes. Much of psychoanalytical theory, however, with its emphasis on the treatment of neuroses and psychoses, is quite distant from the concerns of the art historian. Kuhns, nevertheless, has demonstrated that it can be taken out of its clinical setting and applied to aesthetics and theories of culture. While these philosophical generalizations might be applied in areas of cultural history and the history of ideas, it is doubtful (even with the aid of semiotics) they will penetrate the citadel of traditional art history. Perhaps psychoanalytic theory has contributed more to linguistics and the study of literature because it is preoccupied with language. Also, at times, psychoanalytic studies give more attention to the life of the author or artist rather than to the work itself. Kuhns recognizes this weakness and feels that it can be corrected: "the object itself and its own establishment of reality must be the focus of attention." Kuhns mentions the successful use of biographical material in the employment of psychoanalytic theory, and feels that this can be combined with a psychoanalytic interpretation of the work of art ("the integration of enactments with the lives of those who created them"). "The art-life," writes Kuhns, "is far more than a psychoanalysis of the artist; it must establish psychoanalytically properties of the object as a work of art in the total context of a life and a historical movement." This sounds convincing enough on the abstract philosophical level, but unfortunately when Kuhns demonstrates how this might work he turns to literature rather than to painting or sculpture. Perhaps this is because literature offers not only more suitable subjects, but also a more receptive audience. Ideas about what is appropriate and inappropriate, "what is required and what is not required, are learned from the study of art history, but art history tends to 'rationalize' the visual and acoustic images, treating them as remote from the psychic life in which they originate."

HARDY GEORGE  
*Concordia University*

---

JAROSLAV PELIKAN *Imago Dei: The Byzantine Apologia for Icons*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1990, \$39.95 (cloth).

The history of ideas resulting from the iconoclastic controversy in Byzantium is the subject of Jaroslav Pelikan's *Imago Dei*, based upon the 1987 A. W. Mellon Lectures in Fine Arts at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C. Pelikan, a noted historian of Christian theology, is eminently capable of illuminating the doctrinal complexities of Byzantine iconoclasm. It is little surprise, then, given his own specialties and the dearth of material remains, that Pelikan has disavowed any intention of presenting a history of art. Images, however, inevitably creep into his discussion, and despite Pelikan's confessed position, a caveat concerning the use of visual material in this book is perhaps in order. Pelikan sees a close "interrelation between document and monument" and this analogical formulation leads him to see images as largely dependent upon text and thus simply illustrative of written sources.

This is not to say that the book will not be of use to art historians—they should simply not turn to it for enlightenment in their own area of specialty. Pelikan's strength is that he provides a helpful synthesis of many of the primary sources of the period, presented in a clear fashion and cleaned of their eye-gouging rhetoric. These sources are chosen well and show the major developments of controversy that beset Byzantium in the eighth and ninth centuries. It is not until Photius's sermon inaugurating the apse mosaic of the Virgin and Child in Hagia Sophia in 867, 150 years after Leo III moved to eradicate religious images, that the iconoclastic threat was finally quelled.

Having these primary sources translated, accessible, and theologically contextualized can only be useful in the end. One further caveat, nonetheless: Pelikan is thoroughly versed in the modern literature and his text is peppered with quotations from secondary sources. This often becomes distracting, even dizzying, at times when quotations invade quotations, or when an extract from one scholar's work follows hard on the heels of another scholar's words. However, on the whole Pelikan leads the reader across this archipelago of primary and secondary sources with a clarity and assurance that emanates from his mastery of this often abstruse material.

Although Pelikan is primarily interested in plotting a history of theological ideas, he does not deny the fact that iconoclasm was not only a theological debate. In his first chapter he states that "the conflict over Iconoclasm was always much more than a political struggle; at the same time, it was certainly never less than political." It is often observed, and this book is no exception, that there was no distinct separation of church and state in the Byzantine empire. The emperor, in acknowledging his subservience to the Heavenly King, also indicated whence his worldly power derived. By this divine sanction the emperor was as closely involved in major ecclesiastical affairs as political.

The emperor's wide-ranging political might was at the centre of the outbreak of iconoclasm and the doctrine which is Pelikan's concern was not the determining factor. The ruling against images in the late 720s