

CHALLENGE TO A NATIONAL SCHOOL AT RISK:
MIKEL DUFRENNE'S *THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF
AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE* (1953)

For centuries the arts have played a central role in establishing French identity and reputation worldwide. Because the visual arts have played such a historic role it comes as no surprise that during a period of particular national upheaval and change, from 1945 to 1959, authoritative voices in France would continue to evaluate aesthetic efforts through the lens of artistic nationalism. Over the course of the Fourth Republic, state control over teaching and patronage continued to guide artistic taste and production along the lines of official, classical academic standards as had been true for centuries. Purveyors of a composite classical ideal, practiced in the name of the nation, reigned in the museums, art schools, critical press, administrative offices and even abstract artists' groups of Fourth Republic France. A distinctly Gallic sociological model prevailed in the field of Aesthetics as well. However, modern developments proved problematic for this national cultural model in the decades following the second world war. Important native painters such as Jean Bazaine, Pierre Soulages, Jean Fautrier, Georges Mathieu, Jean Dubuffet and André Masson pushed abstractionist approaches to a revolutionary edge, leading to violent polemics within the French art world over the course of the 1950's. Official prejudices in favor of a classical composite French ideal, despite divergent practices, led to numerous instances of "family quarrel" involving heated charges of cultural rupture amidst polarized views over conservative versus progressive stylistic tastes.

It was against this backdrop of "family quarrel" that Mikel Dufrenne's masterwork, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience* (*Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique*) appeared in 1953. By this time Paris had become known as the new center of the phenomenological movement following the death of Edmund Husserl in 1938 and the isolation of Martin Heidegger in Germany throughout the war,¹ yet before phenomenology in its French phase had taken up the phenomenon of art with great seriousness.² Thus Dufrenne's 1953 text represented nothing less than what has been called a "turning point of French phenomenological aesthetics,"³ "the culmination of earlier efforts to provide a distinctively

phenomenological treatment of art"⁴ in a text described as "not only the most voluminous but easily the most impressive achievement of the phenomenological movement in aesthetics so far."⁵ No phenomenological study of aesthetics compared in scope and comprehensiveness at the time of its publication in 1953.⁶ Just eight years after its publication Dufrenne would become co-editor of the professional journal of the French Society of Aesthetics, *La Revue d'Esthétique*, president of that society from 1971 to 1994, and honorary president at his death in June 1995. Over the course of the years 1947 to 1974 this "dean of French aesthetics" as he has been called⁷ taught Philosophy at the Sorbonne, the University of Poitiers, and the University of Nanterre (Paris X).

It has been suggested that it is all the more surprising that the realm of art was relatively neglected in the field of phenomenology given the striking affinity between phenomenological method and aesthetic experience.⁸ However, this is largely where the postwar French "family quarrel" lay. In the decade following the second world war, while the nation's leaders pursued postwar recovery and economic modernization, radical changes were ushered into traditional French society. A majority of art critics, scholars and fine arts officials could be found resolutely defending French classical tradition as much-needed familiar ground amidst the rapidly changing identity of French society. The majority of voices within the French art world treated art as a haven of classical continuity – despite facts to the contrary – and characterized it as a realm guided by classical doctrine and standards. Throughout the 1950's classical norms of premeditated order, technical discipline and heroic sensibility were regularly discussed and promoted as "truly French" norms and rational reflection as a "truly French" mode of appropriation. In 1953 Dufrenne warned against placing doctrine (in this case classicism) above the sensuous presence of the work. "We may believe that the doctrine is the key to the work, and, under the pretext of searching for this key, we may distance ourselves from the work. Then reflection would separate us from the work by putting a doctrine in the work's place."⁹ Within Dufrenne's phenomenological system the virtue of a work of art was to be found rather in its potential as an aesthetic object – its potential to exert its sensuous presence upon a viewing subject. "An object must be created which will demand perception rather than interpretation, an object before which all the commentaries of the Académie Royale – commentaries which insist on finding symbols everywhere – will seem ridiculous."¹⁰

Central to a phenomenological understanding of art is the notion that the meaning of a work of art is constituted through multiple, cognitive

acts of perception – meaning accorded over the course of numerous, individual experiences in linear time. Dufrenne disputed the notion of totalized meaning, contending that a work of art becomes an aesthetic object once aesthetically perceived. Aesthetic experience rests upon the intersubjectivity of subject and object, of spectator and work. In its original French edition *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience* appeared as two volumes, offering a lengthy study of the aesthetic object in volume one and a less lengthy discussion of aesthetic perception in volume two. The two-volume presentation emphasized both the fundamental dichotomy as well as fundamental interdependence of aesthetic object and aesthetic perception.¹¹ In taking up a systematic presentation of the inter-subjective relationship of aesthetic object and aesthetic perception Dufrenne significantly challenged traditional notions as to the location of meaning in a work of art. Principles of phenomenological method applied to the features of aesthetic experience thus represented nothing less than a break with traditional paradigms in place among official and critical circles in mid-century France. Dufrenne entered the French “family quarrel” over modern art in pointing out the striking affinity between phenomenological method and aesthetic experience and in emphasizing sensuous perception over classical doctrine.

Presupposed here is a new idea of both art and perception. Art must be considered as a will to creation and not to imitation. And . . . it must be admitted, with respect to perception, that appearances can present a truth which differs from but is no less than the rational truth attained by understanding. Perception must be rehabilitated – if not as the homeland of all truth, at least as capable of a certain truth. At the same time, credit must be given to aesthetic significations (whether affective or practical) which are immanent in perception and which are left unaccounted for by rationalism.¹²

The year *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Perception* was published was also the year the French were introduced to American abstract expressionism. The first major show of contemporary American art brought to France appeared in an exhibit opening June 7, 1953 at the National Museum of Modern Art in Paris (Musée national d'art moderne, then housed at the Palais de Tokyo), organized by the International Programs division of The Museum of Modern Art (MOMA), New York. For the first time Parisians were able to see the work of such contemporary American artists as Stuart Davis, Arshile Gorky, Morris Graves, Edward Hopper, Ben Shahn and Jackson Pollock. The French came in droves. Record attendance for this visit, a total of 8,500 visitors, was reported as “higher than any other non-French show held at the museum

since the war.”¹³ However, the overwhelming perception of a majority of French critics and state cultural administrators in response to the abstract expressionists (and the work of Jackson Pollock in particular) was one of tremendous cultural rupture – the antithesis of all that was, artistically, French. The defensive and persistent posture by which French cultural professionals defended a notion of French painting endowed with classical qualities of premeditated order, technical discipline and heroic sensibility against the expressive spontaneity of Pollock and the other abstract expressionists – work viewed as “pure, raw” – a rather “American” display of “vitality”¹⁴ – is striking. Critics representing a wide ideological and stylistic spectrum preached the healthy virtues of French painting, bound by good classical sense before the unfortunate American “exuberance” and “disorder” represented by the paint-dripping, lasso-throwing Jackson Pollock and his abstract expressionist friends. Numerous critics and cultural authorities trusted that while Dionysian impulses had taken over the New York School, good French taste would render it non-contagious. In her article entitled “Jackson Pollock in the Land of Descartes” Françoise Choay claimed Pollock’s work would find appeal only in “a universe where human reasoning has no value.”¹⁵ “Our Western vision, inherited from a past civilization which insisted on harmony, bristles at this sort of “spontaneous lyricism” destined to compositional failure” argued another critic.¹⁶ The French school, another explained, was wedded to “the Cartesian love of order . . . solid construction . . . skillfully orchestrated contrasts.”¹⁷ Only a handful of observers recognized in the apparent “disorder” of American abstract expressionists works a “pleasing disorder, which even a Frenchman with his head full of seventeenth-century classicism and rationalism would have to recognize as artistic.”¹⁸

Georges Boudaille, art critic for a Communist weekly, affirmed the notion of order as an indigenous quality in French art, reproaching artists who employed such “foreign” approaches for “leaning toward bad taste in expressionism.”¹⁹ The American abstract expressionists, in choosing to follow unhealthy “Teutonic” examples, he explained, had featured temperament at the expense of discipline. Artists in France working in like manner were similarly marginalized. Such was the case of French gestural painter Pierre Soulages, who, like Pollock, approached his canvas with a certain degree of existential impulsivity and who once explained of his method, “I don’t know what I am going to do when I begin a painting . . . And I find out what I am looking for as I paint.”²⁰ The expressive spontaneity characteristic of the American abstract expressionist painters and the existential spirit of contemporary French painters

like Soulages, professed to be "less than French" by the majority of French critics and cultural administrators in the 1950's, was in fact labeled by some as decidedly "German" and by others as "Jewish." Critics reviewing abstract expressionists commonly contrasted German "l'expressivité" in contrast to French "l'expression," associating romantic outpouring of feeling with less-than-French, "Teutonic" or "American" exuberance.

Dufrenne's emphasis on the sensual immediacy of aesthetic objects in his 1953 publication challenged the very canon by which the majority of authoritative voices in the French art world found abstract expressionism lacking.²¹ Dufrenne countered the majority of authoritative voices in the French art world in the 1950's with the suggestion that Pollock's works, for example, offered opportunity to enter into an instinctual, profoundly imaginative state of being. "Si nous pouvions descendre vers un état plus originaire d'une subjectivité encore prise dans la Nature . . . nous rencontrerions l'"imaginaire profond" là où "le désir, au lieu de se mettre en scène, abolit toute scène, comme sur une toile de Pollock, dans un texte de Joyce ou dans la musique de Cage." If Pollock appeared an uncivilized "savage" to the majority of French critics, he was a "noble savage".²² Dufrenne challenged his French peers to the sort of aesthetic expression that "bursts the bounds of understanding and rejects rational rigor,"²³ calling for a phenomenological orientation by which "the being of the work of art yields itself only through its sensuous presence, which allows me to apprehend it as an aesthetic object,"²⁴ in a process referred to as the "humanization of the sensuous." In presenting the affinities between aesthetic experience and the principles of phenomenological method, that is, the inter-subjective relationship of aesthetic object and aesthetic perception, Dufrenne set himself against traditional French notions of art and entered a "family quarrel" which pitted traditional French classical virtues against purportedly "foreign" aesthetic values of sensuous vitality and exuberance.

Nevertheless, a certain kind of art, which one may call "classical" and whose traditions are still alive, has striven to turn the beautiful into a definite and even a paramount and exclusive aesthetic category by stressing certain dominant qualities, like harmony, purity, nobility and serenity – of which a Raphael *Madonna* a Bossuet *Sermon* and Mansart building, and a *sonata da chiesa* ("church sonata") give us a clear enough idea. And the prestige of admittedly beautiful works which are inspired by this conception has long included aesthetic inquiry toward the theme of the beautiful. However, this inquiry has not sufficiently considered the possibility that the beautiful, thus positively defined by a particular content, may be a special aesthetic category, or else a combination of several categories proper to certain works only, rather than being the property of every aesthetic object. The beautiful as a symbol of perfection has been confused with the beautiful as a special characteristic.

Because of this confusion, a particular aesthetic theory and practice have been absolutized . . . We see at once that too narrow an understanding of the term "beautiful" is dangerous: it leads to an arbitrary and sterilizing dogmatism.²⁵

Controversy within the official French art world at mid-century arose not only over competing aesthetic virtues of classical versus less-than-classical presentation, but over the merits of abstract art as well. Contemporary abstract art raised many questions within a milieu historically embracing premeditated order, technical discipline and heroic sensibility as national aesthetic virtues. Champions of abstract art wrestled with notions of "cultural rupture" associated with abstract expressionist approaches which appeared to sacrifice French "l'expression" for foreign "l'expressivité." The quest for a "properly French" sort of abstraction was taken up by the group *Jeunes Peintres de Tradition Française* (JPTF) who had originally banded together in 1941. Despite common diatribes against the "decadent" nature of abstract art from aesthetically conservative circles in the French art world, these Young Painters in the French Tradition sought to prove that one might paint in a manner at once "French" yet fully abstract, avoiding *Beaux Arts* academicism on the one hand, and "Teutonic exuberance" on the other. Led by artist Jean Bazaine, they exhibited in the years following the war, calling artists to Gallic distinctiveness within a decidedly modernist aesthetic.²⁶ Together, JPTF artists challenged the French academic style in painting by taking up abstraction in a manner altogether different than that of the American abstract expressionists. They sought to adhere to the lessons of native French modern masters Cezanne, Braque, Matisse and Bonnard by the practice of premeditated compositional order, a quality much discussed in the process of determining what constituted "truly French" art. Jean Bazaine and other JPTF members provided for their native French audience an apologetic for abstract art by pointing to the "French" roots of cubism, the lessons of Cezanne, and the example of the French fauves, "the exact opposite of the sort of approaches seen in surrealism and a good deal of abstract art, superficial and contrary to the principle of invention."²⁷ The deliberate ordering of canvas surface space characteristic of the abstract or semi-abstract approach of JPTF artists, whether in cubist or fauvist mode, was considered a call back to good French taste, ensuring that "l'expression" would not be overshadowed by "l'expressivité".

Dufrenne recognized the difficulty in the West of associating aesthetic value with a work's sensual immediacy and it was this difficulty, he

explained, that accounted for mid-century prejudices against abstract art. Dufrenne championed fully abstract art on the basis of his contention that the purpose of an aesthetic object was not to depict, but to express. He hoped that "the death of art proclaimed by Hegel . . . perhaps means the resurrection of an authentic art which no longer has anything but itself to declare."²⁸ Emphasis on the sensual immediacy of aesthetic objects in his 1953 text thus provided a defense of abstract art at a time and milieu in which abstract art was still viewed by many in France with suspicion. In a discussion of the sensual immediacy of color, for example, Dufrenne addressed the prejudice towards imitation. "This prejudice controlled painting in the West for a long time. Western art found it extremely difficult to admit the importance of the element of color by which it finally gained its autonomy." Dufrenne went further to associate the cultural predilection for representational art with the predilection toward rationalistic thought. "During the debate between colorists and draftsmen, the apostles of drawing have always had the support of rationalistic thought. It is in Descartes's time, at the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture and during discussions in which the works of Titian and Poussin were compared, that we can find the most solemn affirmations of the primacy of drawing."²⁹ Dufrenne's text goes on to explain that to the extent the viewer remains unshaken by a work of art perception of the work is not true; its sensuous truth has not resonated within the spectator so that "it can finally be given its sensuous truth . . ."³⁰ To the degree the witness ". . . allows himself to be won over and inhabited by the sensuous, he thereby penetrates into the work's signification . . ."³¹

In addition to entering the French family quarrel over perceived challenges to classicism and suspicions about abstract art, Dufrenne's text also challenged the sociological orientation of the field of Aesthetics as it was practiced in France at the time. A relatively young academic discipline in the hexagon, Aesthetics had developed around a positivist methodological base. *Revue d'Esthétique* editor Charles Lab had played a crucial role in its formation. With the 1948 opening distribution of *Revue d'Esthétique* by the French University Press, co-editors and founders of the journal aestheticians Charles Lalo, Étienne Souriau and Raymond Bayer provided a ten-page introduction to the principles distinguishing the new professional journal of the French Society of Aesthetics. The journal would not espouse a particular doctrine, the editors explained, but would proceed from a consistently rational methodological base of inquiry. At Lalo's death in 1953 fellow editor Étienne Souriau described Lalo's role played in transforming the field of Aesthetics, one begun in

Germany, into a “French discipline.” By abandoning the German practice of “sympathetic imagination” and in its place employing a more positivist approach, he explained, Lalo had given to the discipline a more analytical, French character, tempering the “aesthetic mysticism” of the Germans. Exploring societal determinants in good analytical fashion, the French had thus made the field of Aesthetics their own, he claimed, citing what he considered to be a distinctly French sociological approach based on eighteenth-century practices carried on into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.³² The preoccupation of nineteenth-century French writer Hippolyte Adolphe Taine with “influence de milieu, de la race et du moment” had greatly impacted the “sociological aesthetics” practiced by Lalo, according to Souriau. Raymond Bayer agreed, commenting on Lalo’s contributions to the field with his observation that “the work of the true aesthete lies in the realm of Cartesian rationalism applied to aesthetics.”³³

Since the eighteenth century the quest to discern natural laws at work in the social world had inspired thinkers to locate data accounting for the unique dispositions of particular societies. Interest in cultural diversity inspired eighteenth-century French Abbé Jean-Baptiste Du Bos’s *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, a study of aesthetic practices based on locale. More familiar is the late-eighteenth century work of German philosopher Johann Gottfried von Herder, in studies such as *On the Variation of Taste and Mentality among Peoples* and *Critical Groves* in which Herder expanded his concept of *Volksgeist*, ethnic culture arising from native roots, to include aesthetic individuation based on nationhood (a project incomplete at his death) and Alexander van Humboldt’s 1850 text *Kosmos* which also explored cultural diversity via tabulation of data. In the nineteenth century as mentioned above, Taine furthered positivist approaches to art and society, tabulating demographic and environmental factors by which cultures had developed distinguishing features. Differences in physical and social environment, Taine argued, produced discrete and varied tastes and approaches in art. In this manner he accounted for differences between “Latin” and “Saxon” artistic production.

Throughout the 1950’s French scholars continued to link art to national character while such notions had been largely discredited as politically dangerous given the case of Nazi Germany, or ideologically anachronistic, given the cosmopolitan nature of avant-garde art. However, notions of group soul, native school and racial constants, shelved as relics abroad, continued to characterize aesthetic discourse in France. Emphasizing the

reflexive subject-object relationship which constituted the aesthetic object, Dufrenne challenged his peers to a phenomenological rather than sociological orientation, redirecting the French approach to Aesthetics by challenging the distinctly analytical, positivist orientation of the field.³⁴ In the process Dufrenne challenged long-standing notions of national aesthetic individuation. Focusing on the sensual immediacy of aesthetic objects, Dufrenne provoked an evolution in French Aesthetics, opening inquiry to multiple realities by which to investigate the impact and meaning of art.³⁵

Dufrenne's system obviated notions of "collective consciousness" and "native soul" in art by privileging the sorts of meanings accorded a work of art over the course of numerous, individual experiences in linear time. From a phenomenological perspective the strength and perpetuity of works of art was to become equated with divergent, singular possibilities of meaning rather than with broad, culturally cohesive signification. Dufrenne acknowledged societal affinities for particular styles but preferred to associate these stylistic preferences with what he termed "aesthetic sociability" arising out of shared experiences before works of art rather than "collective consciousness" or "group soul". Thus Dufrenne directly challenged the notion of national cultural idiom in *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, pointing out parenthetically that contemporary art had come to express a deeper, more fundamental relation, one which is "pre-historical, pre-cultural, of 'man' with the world."³⁶ As Dufrenne explained, the aesthetic object existed for the public, requiring the public's participation for its fulfillment. Yet this harmony "is not a pre-established, 'societal' one, even though the primordial rootedness of the world is still a necessary and essential element within all experience, and can thus be applied specifically to aesthetic experience."³⁷

Modern artistic developments have often proved problematic for the national cultural model long promoted by arts officials and cultural elites in France. The distinctly modernist route represented by Dufrenne's phenomenological model of aesthetic experience represented a significant challenge to the curious reluctance on the part of many French art authorities to accept twentieth-century modernism as late as the 1950's. Modern art has historically been supported not by long-standing, official institutions but by individuals; its expression and interpretations are supremely personal; it has been said to cultivate "the only or surest realm of freedom – the interior world of their fancies, sensations, and feelings, and the medium itself," as opposed to an entity larger than the individual.³⁸ For the French in particular, where government has distinguished

itself by a certain “dirigisme” in the arts, and where the visual arts have played such a historic role in establishing national identity and repute, modern art has encountered especial difficulty. By challenging notions of national aesthetic individuation through reference to the sensual immediacy of aesthetic objects, Mikel Dufrenne’s *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience* played an important role in guiding the French art world back to a place where this bastion of national repute might reclaim its strength.

Asbury College

NOTES

- ¹ Edward S. Casey in Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, trans. Edward S. Casey (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974), p. xv.
- ² “It is a striking fact that, with the sole exception of Sartre’s *Saint Genêt* (itself largely an exercise in existential psychoanalysis), phenomenology in its French phase had not taken up the phenomenon of art with the attentiveness it deserved – especially in Paris, where so much of modern art had been born.” Edward S. Casey in Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. vxi. Casey also notes that Husserl himself neglected this important realm. Ingarden, a student of Husserl, did singularly focus on the phenomenology of aesthetics though he did not present as comprehensive a theory of aesthetics as did Dufrenne.
- ³ Maryvonne Saison, “Le tournant esthétique de la phénoménologie,” *Revue d’Esthétique* 36 (1999), p. 131. Saison refers to a similar claim made by Dominique Janicaud in *Le Tournant théologique de la phénoménologie française* (Editions de l’Eclat, 1991).
- ⁴ Edward S. Casey in Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. xxi.
- ⁵ Herbert Spiegelberg quoted in Edward S. Casey, Translator’s Foreword, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. xxi.
- ⁶ Herbert Spiegelberg, *The Phenomenological Movement. A Historical Introduction*. Volume 2 (The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff; 1965), pp. 579–585. Spiegelberg notes Sartre paid only “passing attention” to the work of art in his study of the psychological phenomenology of imagination, and Merleau-Ponty wrote only a small number of essays on the subject of phenomenology and art.
- ⁷ Reference to Dufrenne made by Hugh Silverman in a review of Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience* in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 33 (summer 1975), p. 462.
- ⁸ Edward S. Casey, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. xviii.
- ⁹ Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. 32.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 286–287.
- ¹¹ Edward S. Casey, Translator’s Foreword, Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. xxii.
- ¹² Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. 287.
- ¹³ Museum of Modern Art, New York (MoMA) Archives V.5.1.
- ¹⁴ Jean Cassou, “Introduction,” in *Jackson Pollock et La Nouvelle Peinture Américaine* (Paris: Éditions des Musées Nationaux, 1959), MoMA Archives V.35.

- ¹⁵ Critic Françoise Choay in "Jackson Pollock au pays de Descartes," *France Observateur*, January 29, 1959, MoMA Archives V.37. MoMA translation.
- ¹⁶ Critic Jean-Jacques Leveque in "Signification de Jackson Pollock," *L'Information*, January 27, 1959. MoMA Archives V.37.
- ¹⁷ Critic Georges Boudaille in "Why do Japanese painters come to Paris?" *Cimaise* 5 (May–June 1958), p. 45. English translation provided. *Cimaise* is a Communist weekly.
- ¹⁸ Critic Pierre Guégen in *Aujourd'hui. Art et architecture* 21 (March–April 1959). MoMA Archives V.37.
- ¹⁹ Critic Georges Boudaille, "L'art hollandaise depuis Van Gogh," *Cimaise* 5 (March–April 1958), p. 33.
- ²⁰ Cited by critic Michel Ragon in *Cimaise* 3 (January–February 1956), pp. 17–21. Ragon complained that while Soulages held one-man shows each year in New York, and exerted tremendous influences on young painters, he had not had a one-man show in France in years.
- ²¹ It has been suggested that emphasis on the perceiving subject generally accounts for the nature of contemporary art. Joan Catherine Whitman, *Intentionality: An Inquiry into Mikel Dufrenne's Phenomenology of Aesthetics*, Ph.D. Dissertation, The American University, 1982.
- ²² Mikel Dufrenne, *Esthétique et Philosophie*, vol. 2 (Paris: Klincksieck, 1976), p. 128; Daniel Charles, "Le dernier mot," *Revue d'Esthétique* 30 (1996), p. 33.
- ²³ Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. 323.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. lix.
- ²⁶ For further discussion of Jeunes Peintres de Tradition Française see Laurence Bertrand Dorléac, *L'art de la défaite, 1940–1944*. (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993).
- ²⁷ Jean Bazaine quoted in Alain Bonfand, *L'art en France* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Françaises, 1995), p. 130.
- ²⁸ Mikel Dufrenne, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*, p. liii.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 284–285.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 298.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- ³² Étienne Souriau, "La Place de Charles Lalo dans l'Esthétique Contemporaine," *Revue d'Esthétique* 6 (1953), pp. 188–189.
- ³³ Raymond Bayer, "Le Méthode Socio-Esthétique de Charles Lalo," *Revue d'Esthétique* 6 (1953),
- ³⁴ "La voie ouverte par Mikel Dufrenne se laisse à mid-chemin entre la philosophie critique et la phénoménologie, entre une attitude ouverte aux enquêtes scientifiques et historiques et un rejet de la positivité. . ." Maryvonne Saison, "Le tournant esthétique de la phénoménologie," p. 134. Saison describes this as a path taken solely by Dufrenne at the time.
- ³⁵ Dominique Noguez, "Éloge de Mikel Dufrenne," *Revue d'Esthétique* 30 (1996), p. 11. Noguez in his eulogy to Dufrenne described his legacy as having transformed the field of Aesthetics from a rigid university discipline caught up in concepts to one free to embrace multiple realities springing forth from contemporary art.
- ³⁶ Joan Catherine Whitman, *Intentionality: An Inquiry into Mikel Dufrenne's Phenomenology of Aesthetics*, pp. 51–52.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 78.
- ³⁸ Meyer Schapiro, "The Introduction of Modern Art in America: the Armory Show," in *Modern Art, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Selected Papers* (New York: George Braziller, 1978), p. 176.