ROCZNIKI HUMANISTYCZNE
Tom LXIII, zeszyt 5 – 2015
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/rh.2015.63.5-12

KAMIL RUSIŁOWICZ

SPATIAL ONTOLOGIES OF (NEO)BAROQUE CULTURE

A b s t r a c t. The present article attempts to look at space from the vantage point of neobaroque theory. Its aim is to investigate how such Baroque strategies as framing and de-framing transform surface into space staged within the subject. It also analyzes how breaking the frame of representation may be seen as an ontological act dependent on the body and desire, the act allowing for the aestheticization of reality.

Key words: body, frame, neobaroque, ontology, postmodernism, space.

Contemporary academic discourse has witnessed a proliferation of texts reevaluating the importance of space for various scholarly disciplines. As if fulfilling Michel Foucault's premonition, thinkers from diverse branches of the academia embarked on a task whose main goal was to reinstate space within the context of the conditions of late capitalism, making space probably one of the most vivid metaphors of the second half of the twentieth and the beginning of twenty-first century. The term "metaphor" is not used accidentally here, for the cornucopia of writings devoted to the reexamination of space lacks the unifying clarity that Newton was able to provide at the dawn of modernity. While it was possible (as it must have seemed necessary for the involved parties) for Newton to emerge victorious from his quarrel with Leibniz over the calculus, for centuries overshadowing the opponent's writings on space, nowadays various manifestations of spatial thinking seem to coexist, if not in a perfect symbiosis, then at least in a nonviolent tolerance: Harvey's space of flexible accumulation, Deleuze and

KAMIL RUSIŁOWICZ, M.A. — assistant, Institute of American Literature and Culture, Institute of English Philology at KUL; address for correspondence: Al. Racławickie 14, 20–950 Lublin; e-mail: krusilowicz@gmail.com

Guattari's rhizomes, Foucault's heterotopias, Augé's non-places, Diken and Laustsen's camps, or Hardt and Negri's metropolis, to name only a few prominent examples, even when criticized, do not lose their impact on the humanities and contribute to the nebulae of interdisciplinary reevaluations of spatial thinking attempting to map out the geography of contemporary world. If one were to look for the lowest common denominator the aforementioned theories share, their view of space as intrinsically bound to human activity—space as both socially constructed and having social effects—could probably serve such a purpose. In fact, numerous reexaminations and critiques of the concept of abstract, intelligible space, space that could be measured with the application of Euclid's geometry and could serve as a container for objects and human agents (whose spatial significance seemed restricted to the positions in which they were situated toward each other), stem from the dissatisfaction with the social consequences of modernist architecture, which made the idea of Newtonian space one of its main premises.

For instance, in one of the opening passages of his now classic work, Fredric Jameson admits that his views on postmodernism as the cultural logic of late capitalism were formed as a result of the debates among architects, who already in the 1960s began recognizing the failure of functionalist, modernist architecture (Jameson 2) based on the idea of abstract space on which it was possible "to impose rational order ('rational' defined by technological efficiency and machine production) for socially useful goals" (Harvey, *Condition of Postmodernity* 31). In Jameson's reading, the idea of erasing the border between high and mass culture, expressed in *Learning from Las Vegas*, becomes one of the cornerstones of postmodernism, testifying to the change in socio-economic order of the world that simultaneously called for new modes of representation and novel means of analysis and critique. As a result, "every position on postmodernism in culture … is also at one and the same time, and necessarily, an implicitly or explicitly political stance on the nature of international capital today" (Jameson 3). And even though the purpose of the present work is not to embark on a detailed survey of postmodern theories of spatiality and various political agendas they attempt to deconstruct, it would be impossible to write about neobaroque space without pointing to the spatial junctions these trends share.

Probably the most often commented upon similarity between the neobaroque and postmodernism is the attention they both pay to the visual excess of contemporary culture. Yet instead of following Baudrillard's chronological analysis of the "procession of simulacra" as a devolution of human

belief in the accuracy of representation (*Symulakry i symulacja* 11-12), thinkers arguing the return of the Baroque in contemporary culture often draw comparison between the poetics of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century art and late cultural productions. Thus, while in his analysis of postmodernism Brian McHale argues for the change of the dominant in late twentieth-century fiction from modernist, epistemological questions investigating the possibility of knowledge, posed by the modernist literature of the first half of the twentieth century, to ontological ones, examining ontological foundations of the represented world and the stability of boundaries between various ontological levels (9–10), William Egginton dates this phenomenon back to the birth of the modern theatre in the sixteenth century.

Egginton distinguishes between two strategies applied by contemporary movie industry in order to "seduce" the viewer into believing in the accuracy of representation: illusionism and realism. The former, made possible by technological progress that contributed to the development of high definition image, special effects, and—recently—3D cinema, creates a subjective vision of reality framed by the medium it applies. The latter, "more or less independent of technological progress" ("Reality is Bleeding" 212), makes the medium part of the reality it represents. Therefore Egginton claims that "whereas illusionism reinforces the viewer's sense of his or her own space as ontologically distinct from the diagetic space of the screen, realism does the opposite, undermining this ontological security" ("Reality is Bleeding" 212). The technique of interpenetrating frames that Egginton calls "bleeding" operates through establishing at least two ontological levels whose stability is subsequently undermined. But contrary to McHale, Egginton does not see the "bleeding of realities" as a specifically postmodern phenomenon, instead considering it a consequence of the Reality principle that underlies the modern epistemology initiated by Descartes and mirrored by the modern theatre. As Descartes dismissed the validity of sensory perception, making a disembodied, rational subject the judiciary of modern philosophy, the modern theater, contrary to the homogenous visions of Medieval plays, provided viewers with an ontological level different from their own, thus making ontological uncertainties possible. As Egginton states,

> The spectators . . . may doubt the validity of the actions they see represented on the stage, or the fact that they are present in the audience watching the performance. But it is precisely this separation that constitutes the idea of Reality as such, because the very act of negating the potentially viable space of our perception produces the notion of an ultimate, true Reality against which the various alternate realities are to be weighed" ("Reality is Bleeding" 228).

Egginton's view seems to coincide with Walter Benjamin's remarks on the function of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. Benjamin, juxtaposing the work of a painter with that of a cameraman, claims that the application of technology in cinema industry creates an illusion of reality free of technological manipulation, while the distance a painter must take from the object of his work is never erased. Therefore, claims Benjamin, "for contemporary man the representation of reality by the film is incomparably more significant than that of the painter, since it offers, precisely because of the thoroughgoing permeation of reality with mechanical equipment, an aspect of reality which is free of all equipment" ("The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" 234). Yet in Benjamin's reading the distance between the painter/viewer and a picture—whether painted or cinematic—that establishes an unquestionably stable border between Reality and representation is never crossed. For even though Benjamin notices that technological manipulation makes it possible to hide the means by which such a creation is possible, the fact that the cinematic fragments "are assembled under a new law" ("Work of Art" 233) establishes a border between the law of Reality and law of cinematic representation that becomes the basis for illusionism discussed by Egginton.

At the same time, Benjamin notices the growing social significance of mechanically reproduced art which can be experienced by the masses in a homogenous spatio-temporal junction, thus becoming a vehicle of mass manipulation ("Work of Art" 234–235). As Freud's psychoanalysis brought into light previously unexamined unconscious impulses, the camera in a similar manner has expanded the realm of human perception, making it possible to guide the viewer's gaze towards the extended space of cinematic spectacle. No longer is pictorial art a matter of representation or even subjective presentation (as, for example, in the case of a cubist painting), but it has become entangled in rhetorical co-dependence with the audience, both shaping and being shaped by its taste. Thus, similarly to a seventeenth-century spectator, anxiously facing a baroque façade, the viewer has once again become the subject of "technical and rhetorical strategies employed to possess and manipulate the emotional body of the spectator" (Lambert, *The Return of the Baroque* 13). And even though Benjamin did not formulate the thesis about interpenetrating ontological levels, when discussing the effect cinematic images have upon the viewer, he shifts the register of his essay from impersonal, detached "man" to personal, first-person plural, as if himself both seduced by the world beyond the surface of the screen and

made part of a larger social unit: "Our taverns and our metropolitan streets, our offices and furnished rooms, our railroad stations and our factories appeared to have us locked up hopelessly" ("Work of Art" 236). The cinema experienced by Benjamin, then, seems to be one of longing, arousing desire through the awareness of the unbreachable barrier between spaces, a desire for reality that lacks mediation, yet is the result of modern techniques of representation. Perhaps when Benjamin wrote his essay realities could not bleed self-consciously, both due to the novelty of the medium to which viewers had not yet become anaesthetized and socio-political conditions of the Western world which was yet to experience two major totalitarian regimes. But it does not necessarily mean that no bleeding took place. While the contemporary cinematic techniques discussed by Egginton bring the viewer's attention to the only seemingly distinct spatial orders occupied by representation and the spectator, early cinema analyzed by Benjamin creates an impression of the stability of the ontological level of the viewer, thus making mass-manipulation easier to orchestrate. Both texts, however, bring into the foreground the matter of limits and operations cultural products conduct on them at different historical moments.

Discussing neobaroque poetics of contemporary culture, Omar Calabrese asserts that although cultural systems need borders to distinguish between the inside and the outside, "[c]ases of a rigid and absolute closure to whatever does not belong to the system are somewhat rare" (47-48). Consequently, Calabrese does not perceive a border as that which separates two distinct spaces, but sees it as a point of transition where differences between two contradictory orders are negotiated, rarely without a tension (49). In unison with Eugenio d'Ors, "responsible for the dislocation of the baroque from its identification with a unique historical period" (Lambert, *Return of the Baroque* 39) by recognizing two contradicting trends in constant struggle throughout the history of Western civilization: the classical and the baroque (d'Ors 89), Calabrese notices that at certain historical moments limits of a given cultural system tend to get destabilized, while at others trends responsible for establishing clear limits around a homogenous system prevail (Calabrese 49). Postmodernism, similarly to the historical Baroque, claims Calabrese, is an example of a culture that made excess a centrifugal force pressing from within on the limits of the system (58). In contrast, Horkheimer and Adorno open *Dialectic of Enlightenment* with the statement that dispelling myths with knowledge was the major objective of the Enlightenment (1). In a similar manner, Habermas posits "the myth as the other of

reason" (86). The nature of the myth, as specified by Horkheimer and Adorno, consists in the fear of that which the system is not capable of assimilating. Therefore they claim that "Enlightenment is mythical fear radicalized. The pure immanence of positivism, its ultimate product, is nothing other than a form of universal taboo. Nothing is allowed to remain outside, since the mere idea of the 'outside' is the real source of fear" (11). Thus the Baroque, seen from the vantage point of the new classicism of the second half of the eighteenth century which expressed values of a culture preferring order and systematic, rationally organized knowledge, seemed like a style "into which the Renaissance degenerated" (Wölfflin, *Renaissance and Baroque* 15). Consequently, for thinkers advocating the return of the Baroque, discourses that have proliferated in the humanities since the second half of the twentieth century show numerous similarities with seventeenth-century overabundance of cultural products destabilizing classical views on harmony as the organizing center of art or social order.

While Calabrese distinguished between three types of excess: "excess *represented as content*, excess *in terms of the structure of a representation*, and excess *in terms of the fruition of a representation*" (59), the present article is primarily interested in the excess within (or rather without) the structure of representation. The discussed proliferation of frames serves as a case in point: by depriving viewers of conventional distinction between two frames, art becomes a rhetorical device aimed at destabilizing one's commonsensical view of the world, contrasting a rationally organized system of knowledge with an epistemology that posits a bodily subject in front of representation that acknowledges his presence by "reaching out" toward his desire. Johann Esaias Nilson's *Der liebe Morgen*, discussed by Karsten Harries, is an interesting example. The painting depicts a woman enclosed by a broken frame that allows for her – looking out from the window – and a cowherd greeting her from below, to meet on the same ontological level. "The broken frame," claims Harries, "might thus represent love's passage from aesthetic beholding to desire" (*The Broken Frame* 71). The frame in Nilson's painting seems to be projected onto the picture, an ornament seemingly detached from the scene it represents, becoming what Calabrese called an excess in the structure of representation; it seemingly has no function, but its ornamental nature becomes a comment upon the nature of representation itself. "In genuine ornament something dark, irrational manifests itself. It must not be permitted to subvert the rationalist foundation of modern culture" (Harries, *The Broken Frame* 44). The broken frame ana-

lyzed by Harries inserts desire and its subject—the body—into the experience of art, making them necessary conditions of aestheticization of reality. It is desire that breaks the frame between the girl and the cowherd, as it is desire that allows for realities to bleed.

Framing and de-framing are co-dependent cultural acts that bring to the foreground one of two d'Ors's eons: the classical or the baroque respectively. As noticed by Harries, the frame establishes "an aesthetic barrier that protects the artificial world created by the painter from the reality beyond and thus protects our collusion with the artist's fiction" (*The Broken Frame* 68), becoming an exemplification of classical reason that favors stability over disorder. Baroque *trompe l'oleil*, on the other hand, shifts the viewer's attention from that which is framed to the technique of framing. Therefore in order to break the frame, it has to be raised in the first place and established as an unexamined part of artistic creation. Whenever frames get broken, claims Harries, it is a symptom of a cultural change that undermines the hegemony of reason exemplified in representational art in favor of aestheticization of reality (74, 79). It should not come as a surprise, then, that Lois Parkinson Zamora and Monika Kaup open their edition of writings on the reappearance of the Baroque in the twentieth century with Nietzsche, who states that "[h]e who knows that he is not born or trained to master dialectic and the unfolding of ideas as a thinker or writer will unconsciously resort to rhetoric and dramatic expression" (44). Interestingly, Nietzsche's re-evaluation of Baroque rhetoric seems to favor dialectics over rhetorical devices, acknowledging the frame of rational arguments that becomes a necessary basis for its subsequent breaking through rhetorical expression. Yet both strategies, although seemingly contradictory, reside within a human subject who either becomes skilled in rational argumentation (if he is not inherently endowed with such a skill) or resorts to that which is considered a lack only when juxtaposed with a logical argument presented within a frame of a classical culture.

"Crisis, doubt and experiment are features of the baroque. Certainty is classical," writes Calabrese (193), clarifying his view on the classicism by stating that it "consists in the appearance of certain underlying morphologies in phenomena endowed with order, stability, and symmetry; and … in coherence of value judgments made about these phenomena" (184). The idea of Newtonian, abstract space that by the end of the eighteenth century became a widely-accepted position within the discourse of physics and philosophy, removing all context-dependent views on place from serious

scientific debates (Casey 133), fits Calabrese's definition of a classical thought. In his search for a stable definition of space that would remove from scientific discourse the relativity of previous theories, Newton established the primacy of space that became a condition upon which all places depended, simultaneously in a truly Cartesian move binding place to the body that occupies it (Casey 144). Thus even immovable, absolute places which Newton accounted for in his theory, are devoid of any inherent qualities, ultimately "self-dissolving" (Casey 146) into space. "In their very immovability and absoluteness, places are locked into a pattern of mutual relativity from which they are not allowed to escape" (Casey 145). Interestingly, Casey notices that the only existence places are granted in Newton's writings is strictly textual; deprived of metaphysical qualities, they serve as rhetorical devices used to reaffirm the primacy of space, proving a complete repression of placial terms impossible. I would argue, then, that Newton frames his theory of absolute space with the stable limit of interconnected places that become the ultimate frontier of his theory: they are accounted for, yet never investigated due to their assumed scientific irrelevance. Dismissed, yet impossible to be completely eradicated, they create a limit that mapped out the range of spatial thinking for centuries. In addition, place became associated with the body – a connection strengthened by Cartesian theory of extension and evaluated negatively by his epistemology – and thus was often dismissed as accidental and not fit to fulfill the criteria of Western logic. For if place was a condition of bodily experience, it consequently had to face the same accusations as the body in philosophical discourse that followed Cartesian quest for epistemological certainly: it had to be dismissed as contingent, "the insignia of doubt and error" (Judovitz 16). Therefore the reevaluation of the bodily subject as the inhabitant of space, as well as the renaissance of writings reexamining the role of places in contemporary world[1] are the natural consequence of the retreat from absolute space in the second half of the twentieth century.

The contemporary reevaluation of placial thinking is yet another point of convergence between postmodernism and the Baroque, one that includes the

[1] See, for example: Marc Augé, *Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity*; Edward S. Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*; J. Nicholas Entrikin, *The Betweenness of Place: Towards a Geography of Place*; Derek Gregory, *Geographical Imagination*; Jeff E. Malpas, *Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography*; Doren Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*; Eric Prieto, *Literature, Geography, and the Postmodern Politics of Place*; Edward C. Relph, *Place and Placelessness*; John Urry, *Consuming Places*.

matters discussed so far: visual excess, rhetoric, and the body. The three came together in baroque art: the body of the spectator (opposed to the mind) as the recipient of art, rhetoric (opposed to a syllogism) as a strategy of seduction, and visual excess (opposed to clarity of philosophical definitions) as an aesthetic method that bound the three together. In his book on law in the age of digital baroque, Richard K. Sherwin notices that "[t]he Cartesian legacy, with its anti-rhetorical animus and its repudiation of embodied forms of knowing, which is to say, with its dismissal of emotional knowledge and the creative power of the imagination, is ill equipped to cope with the challenges of visual culture" (5). In a similar manner Dalia Judovitz discusses Montaigne's *Essays*, criticized by Malebranche for the rhetorical, physical impact they exert on the body of the reader. Instead of following Cartesian notions that give primacy to reason, Montaigne places the body of the reader as the target of his writing. For him it is the body that experiences reality, the text being part of that material experience. Recognizing matter as less distant from lived experience than ideas, in an understanding closer to Leibnizian idea of the fold than Cartesian division between *res extensa* and *res cogitans*, Montaigne follows baroque strategy of seducing the reader by acknowledging that desire, an intrinsic element of the art of seduction, resides within the body. Thus in Montaigne's writings the body is redefined as

> a scriptorial entity. As the site of inscription and transcription, the modality of the body emerges in the mode of communication or speech, that is, a transitional figure constituted through dialogue or exchange. Lacking definition as a stable entity, the transitive logic of the body reflects its shifting complexions in a process of perpetual becoming. Its multiple embodiments trace the outline of its encounters with alterity, the discovery of the otherness of the self as script and representation (Judovitz 17).

In Judovitz's reading of Montaigne the body becomes a site of remediation, a material limit of the system operating according to the rules of Baroque reason that favors discontinuity, motion, and becoming over the classical reason organized around the ideas of perfection, closure, stability, and harmonious beauty. Consequently, the baroque body experiences a different space than the one theorized by Newton, breaking the limits of abstract places in search of an experience of space materialized in places. Accordingly, the illusion of movement becomes one of the main features of the baroque painterly style (Wölfflin, *Renaissance and Baroque* 29-30); anamorphosis literally forces the spectator to move in front of the painting, simultaneously testifying to the impossibility of total representation and

reaffirming the importance of the bodily spectator capable of movement and physical experience; *trompe l'oeil* breaks the frame of the painting, creating an illusion of interpenetrating realities; and Montaigne writes the subject "whose life and activity involve movement and change" (Judovitz 18). As stressed by Eugenio d'Ors,

> movement by its very nature remains outside the realm of reason; movement is absurd. Any introduction of movement into human affairs, if it is to be successful, requires the abandonment of reason. If the amount of movement admitted is minimal, marginal, or episodic . . . it requires mere tolerance. But if the movement is substantial, if its invasion is serious, if it usurps the foreground and accentuates or prolongs its power, it requires extreme abasement. The attitude of the classical spirit fits the first case: it is willing to tolerate a minimal amount of movement ironically, accepting it, whether reluctantly or smilingly, as a lesser evil necessary to escape death. The Baroque attitude, on the contrary, wants the abasement of reason (84).

Thus movement is not a mere ornament of baroque art but becomes a statement regarding co-dependence of epistemology, representation, and knowledge. Baroque paintings, positioning the body simultaneously in front of space and within it, in a manner similar to the cinema experienced by Benjamin offer an illusion of reality that extends beyond the surface of the representation. Thus spaces get multiplied and connected, for if successful, such a representation offers a promise of a different ontological level, undermining the stability of the surface that seemingly separates one from another. No longer is representation considered a one-sided mirror that reflects that in front of which it is placed, presupposing both the stability and primacy of reality it mirrors, but it testifies to the impossibility of a unified vision, reflecting the world in which harmony seems an unattainable ideal, a world that may be a reflection of yet another mirror. Thus for Foucault in Velázquez's *Las Meninas*

> all that representation presents or exhibits is what the subject is not, or could ever hope to become – self-present, identical to its labour, its discourse or its experience – and this becomes a cause of anxiety that surrounds every act of representation (Lambert, *Return of the Baroque* 89).

Similarly, Maravall comments upon the socio-political situation of the seventeenth-century Spain, stating that

> all reality possessed this condition of not being done, of not having been finished, which undoubtedly facilitates our understanding of this new baroque taste for lines of loosely related words, unfinished painting, architecture that

> eludes its precise outlines, emblematic literature that requires the reader to bring the development of a thought to an end on his or her own account (169).

While Maravall's remark may seem like a description of a simple act of representation that testifies to a vision of reality which has lost its firm ground, baroque art was meant to serve a specific political purpose. Once again, Egginton's terminology proves useful. He distinguishes between two baroque strategies: the major and the minor. The former, applied by two major authoritative bodies of the time, the King and the Church, promises the viewer "fulfillment beyond the surface, his or her desire ignited by an illusory depth, always just beyond grasp" (*The Theater of Truth* 3). At the time of a severe political crisis, when the King starts losing his God-given authority and the position of the Church becomes undermined by the Reformation, baroque politico-religious spectacles seduce the subject into submission with a vision of reality behind the veil of appearances, one where all that he or she is denied in the so-called real world gets materialized. But, notices Egginton, the moment such a vision is presented to the spectator, it starts working against itself. Hence the minor strategy "nestles into the representation and refuses to refer it to some other reality, but instead affirms it, albeit ironically, as its only reality" (*The Theater of Truth* 6). A perfect example of such a political illusion is the baroque balcony discussed by Walter Benjamin. Although elevated and reaffirmed by monumental columns suggesting authority and power, it turns out an empty space, the Sovereign-God standing on the balcony a mass hallucination induced by the monumentality of the spectacle (Stewart 70). The depth promised by representation remains a promise, yet one which in a moment of perfect seduction is granted a virtual existence. In a "miraculous" act that defies reason, surface becomes transformed into space, staged within the spectator and made possible by the desire aroused in his or her embodied subjectivity. Thus one could conclude, in a manner similar to Baudrillard's discussion of the contemporary world of simulacra, that during the Baroque

> [t]echniques of representation produce objects that are more real than the real, more truthful than the truth. In this way the distinguishing features of certainty are transformed. They no longer depend upon the security of our own subjective apparatus of control, but are delegated to something that appears to be more objective. Paradoxically, however, the objectivity reached in this way is not a direct experience of the world, but the experience of a conventional representation (Calabrese 55).

One the one hand, then, neobaroque space is a monumental stage, orchestrated by reactive forces that employ excessive measures to hide the decay of the world order. On the other, however, it is a space that resist such a unification: the space of the ruin, the labyrinth, endless corridors of reflecting mirrors. Thus it is a space of contradictions, where excessive visions of the world made whole again and decaying landscapes seem elements of the same picture; it is a highly politicized space of social disorder reflected in art, either one that promises salvation or that which straightforwardly denies it, presenting the world as debris. What is more, it is a space that resist the economy of exchange and communication, instead overabundant in signs (Sarduy 287) that add up to the baroque topoi: the madness of the world, the world upside down, or the world as a confused labyrinth (Maravall 150-153). But most of all, it is a space which, due to the excess of representation, questions the foundations of that which it supposedly mirrors. It cannot be measured, for it extends beyond the surface of the painting or takes into account a mirrored reflection. And if measurement and geometry are human attempts at taking control over boundless space (Harries, "Space, Place and Ethos" 163), then it is a limitless space that resists domestication, resulting in the fear of the void. Thus it is not a space of nostalgia which would seeks to restore a lost balance, but one which is deeply melancholic, as it cannot come to terms with the loss of that which newer was. Devoid of transcendental referents that can be only hinted at by the central absence within representation, it is a space of multiplied surfaces and excessive ornamentation that seduce the bodily subject by creating a space of illusion, a self-referential simulation. It is a space that testifies to the crisis of representation by multiplying images, in a frenzied pursuit of certainty replacing the unattainable experience of true reality for its conventional representation (Calabrese 55). It is a space which, instead of erecting clear divisions (e.g. matter and spirit, inside and outside) accounts for opposites, folding one into another, thus destabilizing the classical desire for harmony and symmetry. And finally, it is a space which, once described, is ready to become something else entirely.

WORKS CITED

Baudrillard, Jean. *Symulakry i symulacja.* Translated by Sławomir Królak. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sic!, 2005.

Calabrese, Omar. *Neo-Baroque: A Sign of the Times.* Translated by Charles Lambert. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Casey, Edward S. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

d'Ors. Eugenio. "The Debate on the Baroque in Pontigny." Translated by Wendy B. Farris. In *Baroque New Worlds: Representation, Transculturation, Conterconquest*, edited by Lois Parkinson Zamora and Monika Kaup, 78–92. Durham: Duke UP, 2012.

Egginton, William. "Reality is Bleeding. A Brief History of Film from the Sixteenth Century." *Configurations* 9 (2001): 207–229.

Egginton, William. *The Theater of Truth: The Ideology of (Neo)Baroque Aesthetics*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2010.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Translated by Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998.

Harries, Karsten. "Space, Place and Ethos: Reflections on the Ethical Function of Architecture." *Artibus et Historiae*. 5.9 (1984): 159-165.

Harries, Karsten. *The Broken Frame: Three Lectures*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1990.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change.* Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992.

Horkheimer, Max and Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso, 1991.

Judovitz, Dalia. *The Culture of the Body: Genealogies of Modernity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Lambert, Gregg. *The Return of the Baroque in Modern Culture*. New York and London: Continuum, 2004.

Maravall, José Antonio. *Culture of the Baroque: Analysis of a Historical Structure*. Translated by Terry Cochran. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On the Baroque." Translated by Monika Kaup. In *Baroque New Worlds: Representation, Transculturation, Conterconquest*, edited by Lois Parkinson Zamora and Monika Kaup, 44–45. Durham: Duke UP, 2012.

Sarduy, Severo. "Baroque and Neobaroque." Translated by Christopher Winks. In *Baroque New Worlds: Representation, Transculturation, Conterconquest*, edited by Lois Parkinson Zamora and Monika Kaup, 270–291.. Durham: Duke UP, 2012.

Sherwin, Richard K. *Visualizing Law in the Age of the Digital Baroque: Arabesques and Entanglements*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Stewart, Elizabeth. *Catastrophe and Survival: Walter Benjamin and Psychoanalysis.* New York: Continuum, 2010.

Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Renaissance and Baroque*. Translated by Kathrin Simon. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

PRZESTRZENNE ONTOLOGIE (NEO)BAROKOWEJ KULTURY

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Celem artykułu jest spojrzenie na przestrzeń przez pryzmat teorii neobaroku. Artykuł próbuje pokazać, jak barokowe strategie obramowywania i przełamywania ram przekształcają płaszczyznę w przestrzeń usytuowaną wewnątrz podmiotu. Artykuł analizuje również sposób, w jaki przełamywanie ram reprezentacji może być postrzegane jako akt ontologiczny uzależniony od ciała i pożądania, akt, dzięki któremu możliwa staje się estetyzacja rzeczywistości.

Streścił Kamil Rusiłowicz

Słowa kluczowe: ciało, neobarok, ontologia, postmodernizm, przestrzeń, rama.