

An Aspect of Undoing Aesthetics: On W. Welsch's Aesthetics of Sport

HIGUCHI Satoshi

Hiroshima University, Hiroshima

Introduction

Wolfgang Welsch's argument that the academic discipline of aesthetics should be based on the concept of *aisthesis*, whereby the field of inquiry would include broader issues – such as everyday life, science, politics, arts and ethics – is already well-known [1]. One of the propositions of his theory to broaden the scope of aesthetic inquiry beyond the conventional art to include aspects of daily life has led, he posits, to the “aestheticization” of daily life. Welsch focused on sport as a specific case study of this in a paper he presented titled, “Sport – Viewed Aesthetically, and Even as Art?” [2] at the 14th International Congress of Aesthetics held in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Welsch sees sport as a primary example of today's aestheticization of daily life. During the process of formulating his argument, he came up against the problem of whether sport ought to be considered as art or not. At first he dismissed the claim that sport should be viewed as art, even though modern sport certainly has aesthetic attributes. However, he found that he was having surprising difficulty explaining why sport should not be viewed as art. This can be seen as an indication of how precarious our common sense understanding of aesthetics has become. In the end, Welsch concluded that sport, indeed, should be viewed as art and explains the reasons why in his paper.

Welsch's interest, rather than in sport itself, is in what he calls “Aesthetics beyond Aesthetics,[3]” which is nothing less than the transformation of the field of aesthetics. Why does Welsch use sport in the context of the transformation going on in aesthetics? And, what is motivating his idea to view sport as art? And, was Welsch's argument successful? The purpose of this paper is to examine the problems inherent to Welsch's argument and to then present an aspect of the transformation we are seeing in aesthetics today [4].

In section 1, I examine Welsch's “aestheticization,” which was the theme of the symposium where he delivered the paper. Then I take a look at the position of sport as a theme for approaching the issue. In section 2, in order to make clear that Welsch is not the first philosopher to view sport as art, I will discuss the background of the “sport as art” argument. In section 3, I point out a vacillation in the concept of art as seen in Welsch's discussion of sport as art. Finally, in the last section, I will discuss the significance of Welsch's aesthetics of sport, including this vacillation in the concept of art, and examine the transformation we see today in aesthetics – which becomes clear when understood from within the context of contemporary trends in aesthetics.

1. The Issue of “Aestheticization” and Sport as a Theme

Welsch delivered his paper at a symposium held on the theme of “aestheticization,” during the 14th International Congress of Aesthetics. What was his reason for choosing sport? And, how is aestheticization related to sport? Welsch explains that sport can be seen as an outstanding example of today’s aestheticization. Therefore, he uses sport as a kind of case study for exploring the more complicated theme of aestheticization [5].

What does Welsch say about aestheticization? In another paper [6], he describes today’s aestheticization as having two aspects, which he calls “surface aestheticization” and “deep-seated aestheticization.” Welsch describes our contemporary condition whereby everything is undergoing a prettification. This superficial aestheticization is not only concerned with the beautification and stylizing of our urban spaces and individual life styles, but Welsch also sees “experience” as becoming a keyword in this; so that in the process of enhancement and prettification, our daily lives are now designed to be an “active experience,” in which experience and entertainment form the framework of our contemporary culture. In addition to this superficial aestheticization, he also points to a deeper aestheticization. This deeper aestheticization pertains to today’s issues of technology and the media and represents a conscious or “epistemological aestheticization,” whereby reality for us becomes a virtual reality in which things are aesthetically modeled [7].

Can this picture of aestheticization be reconciled with a view in which sport can be held up as an outstanding example of the aestheticization process of today?

In the past, Welsch says, sport was praised as demonstrating and realizing the domination of the body by the mind, and sport was a kind of profane triumph of the metaphysical conception. Hegel, for example, admired the ancient Olympic Games for being a display of freedom in transforming the body into an “organ of the spirit [8].” In modern times, an ethical view was taken so that sport was praised for its benefits toward self-control and enhanced productivity, and was seen as a means for building character. Welsch sees that such ideologies are mainly absent from today’s sport and that there has been a definite shift from ethics to aesthetics. As examples, Welsch points out the highly aestheticized styles of sports clothing; the aesthetic elements of performance; a new direction from the control over the body turned into a celebration of the body. Finally, Welsch points to the erotic elements of sport which show the way in which sport is no longer governed by ascetic, discipline/training models [9].

Taking the above description of the way modern sport is conceived and linking it to that of modern aestheticization as argued by Welsch, can we then say that aestheticization has developed to move beyond the conventional art to include everyday phenomena, such as sport? The above descriptions of sport only make the claim that sport is aesthetic, which is a claim that has been repeated numerous times up till today (including that of Riefenstahl’s *Fest der Schönheit* about half of a century ago [10]). It is not that sport is only now being considered as having undergone an aestheticization, but rather that this has not been sufficiently discussed in the field of aesthetics till now.

Moving beyond Welsch’s “surface aestheticization,” what about what he calls a “deep-seated aestheticization”? Bringing up Finland’s gold medal-winning cross-country skier, Mika

Myllylä, Welsch discusses the recent phenomenon where top athletes are turning away from scientific training, instead putting stress on their own knowledge and feelings which are concerned with “listening to the body.” Welsch sees this as being connected with the contemporary trend that stresses the aesthetic aspects of sport, such as admiration and emancipation of the body [11].

However, it is this admiration and emancipation of the body that serves as the underlying ideology justifying modern sport. Indeed, with today’s state-of-the-art scientific research and technology, top-level marathons, for example, are turning into competitions of raised hemoglobin levels in the blood or for judging which athletes are better at controlling their brains (where in the past it was brains which were meant to control body). We are even seeing DNA manipulation being discussed in top-level sports [12]. These kinds of issues should be seen as examples of the “deep-seated aestheticization” that Welsch is positing as virtualization of reality.

Aestheticization is defined as that which has become aesthetic. Hence, the moment we consider aestheticization, the concept of the aesthetic becomes an issue. Welsch too must address this issue and in his paper discusses the semantic aspects of the aesthetic [13]. Among them, Welsch discusses the term *aisthesis*. Considering the relationships between the concepts: aesthetic, *aisthesis*, and aesthetics, Welsch refers to aesthetics as the “science of sensitive cognition,” as propounded by Baumgarten. One of the main points of Welsch’s discussion is that when the study of aesthetics is taken to be that which is concerned with *aisthesis*, then it follows that the target objects should not be limited to the so-called conventional art. Particularly conscious of German academism, he says: “There are no good reasons for it [aesthetics] to restrict itself to artistic. One may, of course, do this in one’s own research – just as other aestheticians may primarily refer to non-artistic aspects. But *as a discipline* aesthetics should comprehend the *full* range of such endeavours [14].”

If we only consider the paper Welsch presented at the International Congress, it is clear, I think, that he is not making an argument for sport being an exemplary model of aestheticization, but rather that he is using sport to show the manner in which aesthetics – when it is taken to include *aisthesis* – should not be limited to the study of art. Sport, while having some similar attributes to art, has long been treated outside the realm of aesthetics, and it is precisely this position that Welsch seeks to explore.

2. Background of the “Sport as Art” Argument

Why does Welsch, who seeks to broaden the subjects beyond art treated by aesthetics, try to consider sport as art?

He first starts by describing the contemporary transformation that our concept of art has undergone; the vagueness of the border of the arts; the popularization of the arts. By both examining the transformation seen in art as well as that seen in sport, Welsch argues for the understanding of sport as art by refuting the arguments against it. He does this by discussing the symbolic status of sport; its form of work or *œuvre* as performance; the autonomy of its aims; its rules and creation; fascination with the event; its dramatic aspect; the feeling of unity

between the athletes and the spectators; celebration of contingency, etc.

In Japanese, the conventional notion of aesthetics (*bigaku*) can be easily distinguished from the science of sensitive cognition (*kanseigaku*). However, Welsch only has one word, “aesthetics.” Welsch is not trying to establish a new field of *aisthesis* while leaving the conventional field of aesthetics as is. Therefore, the varied understandings of aesthetics are being taken to their logical extensions. It cannot be denied that art remains central to Welsch’s understanding of aesthetics. In this way, Welsch compares sport and art, while criticizing the narrowness of an aesthetics which limits its subject to art. Furthermore, he considers sport as art.

Certainly, Welsch, from his perspective of trying to broaden the subject of aesthetics while still firmly situated in that tradition, will take art as central to his examination. I think, however, we can find several problems in the way he arrives at his “conclusion” that sport is *art* – vis-à-vis his understanding of the *aesthetic* aspects of sport.

Welsch says that although the conventional art still occupies the significant position in “the aesthetic,” the realm of the aesthetic is broader than that of art, and art is just one area. “Formerly, the artistic provided the basic definition of the aesthetic. ...In recent times, however, things have changed,” so that, “the definition of the aesthetic is no longer to be taken from art, rather art’s definition is to be established within the framework of the aesthetic” or “*aisthesis*. [15]”

Suppose, as Welsch argues, that if we redefine our definition of art basing it on the concept of *aesthesis* – then our concept of art would then need to be re-worked as well. Rather than doing this, however, Welsch posits that sport should be included in art as a new aesthetic example, because “now everything which is emphatically aesthetic has better chances of counting as art than before.[16]” In this way, Welsch, rather than re-defining art, instead makes his sport as art argument by linking his argument to contemporary trends such as new artistic forms in contemporary art; the disappearing borders between genres of arts and between art and daily life; as well as evaluations concerning the popular arts [17].

One of the main problems with Welsch’s argument is his insufficient examination of the work of past scholars. Indeed, the issue of whether sport is art has been already argued; and moreover, there stands radically conflicting views. A debate occurred between American philosopher Spencer Wertz and British aesthetician David Best during the late 1970s into the 1980s, and the discussion involved various other people as well [18]. Welsch is himself well aware of this debate and briefly mentioned it in a footnote of his paper [19]. He seems to be intentionally avoiding committing to the debate, since, in my opinion, he does not think framing the question in a yes or no manner (as is evident even in the titles of their papers) is appropriate. Welsch insists that he is proving that sport ought to be considered art by disproving why it shouldn’t be. His conclusion is inappropriate, for he neglected to sufficiently examine implications of the arguments as developed by various philosophers who tackled this very same problem before him. In particular, he didn’t take into account the “Wertz-Best debate,” and therefore he misinterpreted the important fact that – contrary to what Welsch states, many people already view sport as art in the same way Welsch does [20].

Underlying this “sport as art” argument is the politics of culture. Whether one accepts this view of sport as art or denies it, both seemingly contradictory views are informed by the same

deep-rooted, firmly-held belief that art is a form of high culture. Because art is viewed as inherently high culture, those who advocate sport as art tend to stress the artistic aspects of sport. And likewise, aestheticians who defend the high level of cultural value in art are then unable to accept sport as art. Both types of arguments, in fact, go nowhere.

While affirming that sport is art, Welsh does not appear to be attempting to categorically raise the position of sport to that of art as high culture. His interest in and attention to sport is instead coming from the awareness of the changes that have occurred in our concept of art and in the field of aesthetics. This is a big difference between Welsh and other sport scholars, and I think it is the essential point if one wants to take a positive view of Welsh's argument. From this revision of our concept of art and aesthetics, I think Welsh's argument should be developed further, as we are already standing at a place to look over the problems. One of the problems we can see from this viewpoint is the ambiguity in Welsh's concept of art. Indeed his concept of art vacillates.

3. Vacillation in Welsh's Concept of Art

Welsh concludes his paper with the following statement: "Ultimately my intention was not to decide the question as to whether sport *is* art or not. This would, in my view, be phrasing the question too essentialistically. What I tried instead was to offer some reasons why – in today's conditions of art as well as of sport – many people find it highly plausible to call sport an art. ... When, towards the end, I suggested complementarity between art and sport, I did not mean to question sport's status as art. Sport is *one* kind of art. Art (in the usual sense) is another one. That is all. [21]"

The "complementarity between art and sport" that is referred to above is that of the "unyielding art" described by Welsh just before his conclusion (quoted above) on the one side and the arts of entertainment on the other. Welsh points out that the former refers to our traditional concepts of high culture art, which is usually thought of as inaccessible, elite and/or experimental. This "unyielding art" is usually viewed as being out of touch with the non-elite, and is distinguished from the arts of entertainment. That both of these types of "art" have a complementarity is essential [22]. Traditional or the conventional art has an avant-garde status, and so it is clear that sport is being treated as an art of entertainment.

When encountering this statement, one cannot help but question the consistency of the argument. Is not Welsh arguing that sport should be viewed as art? In other words, after the development of the argument, Welsh then makes a move to posit two kinds of art: "art-art" and "sport-art". Sport is not art-art but sport-art. This was the conclusion that Welsh reached.

In fact, we can find a similar statement that sport is not genuine art but a different kind of art already in the history of aesthetics. In the 1930s, Collingwood was saying much the same thing, when, in his *The Principles of Art*, he questioned what is art?[23] He put forth this question in order to criticize the state of affairs in which "art" is being used to designate things that originally would not deserve to be called art. Of the so-called "falsely called" arts, Collingwood posits something called "magical art," and sees sport as being one of these magical arts [24]. For Collingwood, magic is the means of arousing certain emotions for

practical values, and he found this sense of magic in the sports of the 1930s. In general, I think one would agree that sport, which once was a practice defined by educational concerns, is viewed as “magic” in modern times. Furthermore, our modern sports are those practices which can be characterized as being performed and consumed as entertainment; and therefore yield such so-called magical effects. In this way, according to Collingwood, sport is a magical art, not “art proper.”

Collingwood’s argument is first concerned with issues of terminology concerning “art.” Suppose that there is, in fact, something which can be termed “art proper,” which coexists and has some ambiguous relation with “magical art” and “amusement art.” If Collingwood is not arguing for an absolute metaphysical existence for Art proper (with Art used with a capital A) [25], then he is, in fact, using the term art in such a way that sport is implied within the meaning of the word [26]. The underlying logic of his view is the same as Welsch’s. If we take this to be an accurate understanding, then Welsch’s argument that sport ought to be considered as art is clearly inappropriate. Rather, his argument should be seen as the formulation of a comprehensive view of both art and sport, from the perspective of “aesthetic as *aisthesis*,” through a consideration of the similarities and differences of the conventional art and sport. That comprehensive field should not be necessarily re-defined as “art.”

4. Transformation of Aesthetics

What is implied by Welsch’s thesis is neither that sport is aesthetic, nor that sport can be considered art. Staying within the confines of his argument, because sport has already been characterized as having aesthetic aspects, then Welsch’s argument can really only be said to have contributed another example (i.e., sport) to the existing unquestioned position of aesthetics. From the early stage of aesthetics, in which practices like sport were completely neglected, we next came to sport being taken up as an example of the aesthetic; and this was followed by a stage in which aestheticians described sport using the academic language of the field of aesthetics. In this evolution, Welsch’s attempt suggests a new stage of possibilities for using sport as a means for considering the concepts, practices, and phenomena of *art*. In this way, we can gain a fine view of one aspect of the transformation of aesthetics [27].

However, I think that the discourses that have been generated by this transformation seen in aesthetics do not necessarily need to be termed “aesthetics” in the same way. As Welsch says, in modern society, the arts are involved with the market to such an extent that aestheticians cannot help but become involved in maintaining the art market, which requires a clear conception of art [28]. This results in a condition whereby the position of “aesthetics” is determined by the market. Welsch, however, stands by his concept of “aesthetics” as something based on the concept of *aisthesis*, and then attempts to examine sport in this light.

The movement to intentionally broaden the academic field of aesthetics to include other areas of inquiry beyond art is one of the overall trends we are seeing in the field today. I will conclude my paper with several examples that can be understood in parallel with Welsch’s experiment. First, we find one example in the *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics* (ed. Michael Kelly) [29], which was published in 1998, by Oxford University Press.

In his preface to the *Encyclopedia*, Editor Michael Kelly discusses possible skepticism concerning aesthetics as an academic subject, as well as addresses possible questions over the enormous effort involved in creating such a large encyclopedia at present time. Some of the principles used in compiling the *Encyclopedia* include various critiques of aesthetics, discussions of postmodernism, composite (multi-article) entries so topics could be analyzed from several perspectives, and representations of virtually all the disciplines involved with art and culture beyond conventional aesthetics. The definition of aesthetics in this *Encyclopedia* is “critical reflection on art, culture, and nature.[30]” The *Encyclopedia* includes sport as one of its entries.

University of Chicago Professor of Philosophy Ted Cohen was the scholar who wrote the entry on sport. Cohen has also served as president of the American Society for Aesthetics. In the entry devoted to sport, Cohen explains the affinity between sport and art in terms of aesthetic enjoyment, describing the two practices of art and sport as being like cousins. However, the point we should pay particular attention to is not that there exists a similarity, but rather his statement that our understanding of art can be deepened by understanding how and in what way art differs from sport by way of comparison [31].

Another recent important work is the *Lexikon der Ästhetik* edited by Wolfhart Henckmann and Konrad Lotter. The *Lexikon* also includes sport as an independent entry. First, the concept of sport which is associated with work and play is pointed out, along with the close kinship that exists between sport and art as shown in festivals, magical rituals, edifying aspects that can be seen in ancient Greek athletic ceremonies or in Plato’s *The Republic*. Then, Johan Huizinga’s theory on plays and issues surrounding the emotional response affected by both are also discussed, and the position of sport in modern society is considered in terms of psychological, political, and economic functions [32].

In terms of today’s standards of sport philosophy and sport sociology, the discussions above do not contain anything all that new. What we want to pay attention to is not that sport itself is evaluated as an independent aesthetic area, but rather the situation whereby sport could be taken up as a relevant subject for aesthetic consideration, as well as used as a keyword for aesthetics in the context and under the relation with various notions including play, festivals, magical rituals, mass culture and arts.

Indeed, Welsch’s attempt can be placed within the context of these trends happening within the contemporary transformation of aesthetics.

Conclusion

Why did Welsch choose the topic of sport for his paper? I think it is clear that he chose sport in order to relativize the historical position of aesthetics whereby the subject has been limited to art up till this time. His framework is an understanding of aesthetics based on *aisthesis*, in which subjects for study are not limited to the conventional art.

Why did Welsch seek to try and view sport as art? Because his framework of defining aesthetics as science of *aisthesis* is also an extension of conventional aesthetics, in which here too the conventional art is positioned centrally in the argument. Welsch, then, took up the

problem of sport in relation to art for his project of the aesthetics of sport.

His experiment itself is appropriate. In addition, through the comparison with art, Welsch's insight into the aesthetic aspects of sport, such as symbolism and creativity, was right on the mark. However, Welsch ran into problems when he then concluded that sport is art in the end. Welsch could not help but become involved in the "sport as art" debate, contrary to his early intentions. Welsch himself, however, realized the problem and tried to avoid it by bringing up the two concepts of art in the latter part of his paper.

The implications from the examination of Welsch's aesthetics of sport allow us to then gain an understanding about the possibilities inherent within the new approach to the concept of art. This new understanding assumes a field where "aesthetic is *aisthesis*;" something which is inclusive of both art and sport. At the same time, his paper should be taken as evidence for the process of transformation that is occurring in the field of aesthetics which allows such a view to take form.

Notes

- [1] Welsch, W. *Undoing Aesthetics*, London: Sage Publications, 1997. *Grenzgänge der Ästhetik*, Stuttgart: Reclam, 1996. *Ästhetisches Denken*, Stuttgart: Reclam, 1990.
- [2] Welsch, W. "Sport – Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?" *XIVth International Congress of Aesthetics Proceedings Part I*, 1998, pp.213-236.
- [3] Welsch, "Aesthetics beyond Aesthetics: For a New Form to the Discipline" *Undoing Aesthetics*, *op.cit.*, pp.78-102.
- [4] I have discussed Welsch's sport as art theory previously from a slightly different point of view in, "A Critical Point of Aesthetic Knowledge: Transformation in Aesthetics and the Theories of Sports Culture," (in Japanese) *The New Century's Theory of Sports Culture*, edited by Hideo Kondo et al; published by Times, 2000. In this essay, I brought up Welsch's theory, in reference to the problem of discourses in the "theories of sports culture" and "the aesthetics of sport," as one of the movements to undo the closed area of the aesthetics of sport.
- [5] Welsch, "Sport – Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?" *op.cit.*, p.213.
- [6] Welsch, "Aestheticization Processes: Phenomena, Distinctions and Prospects" *Undoing Aesthetics*, *op.cit.*, pp.1-32.
- [7] *Ibid.*, pp.2-6.
- [8] We see this in Hegel's *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte* (1822-31). Examining the manner in which humans seek to ornament or shape their own bodies, the Ancient Greeks have sought to alter or shape the organ closest to themselves. The ancient Greeks strove to turn their bodies into ideal vessels for mind, and this, says Hegel, was the subjective beginnings of Greek art, in which art work (Kunstwerk) based on the human body (Körperlichkeit) was established via athletic events (Hegel, G.W.F. *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*, Sämtliche Werke Bd.11, 4. Aufl. der Jubiläumsausgabe, 1961, S.316-319.). Is Welsch's argument appropriate, based on Hegel's theory, to posit sport as the domination of the body by the mind was something akin to the secular realization of metaphysical concepts? On the other hand, Gunter Gebauer, a professor of philosophy at the Free University of Berlin, suggested that the power to evoke the aesthetic in the god-like images of athletes' bodies was eliminated after the concept of "psyche," ("which was the first ever framework to externalize and formalize the internal world") had taken hold in ancient Greece around 500-400 B.C. After that, the artistic became something cut off from things like sport. At the same time, though sport came to hold its own aesthetic characteristics as

separate from those of the arts. Gebauer is critical in the successive research on the topic of sport is art. (Gebauer, G. "Oralität und Literalität im Sport - Über Sprachkörper und Kunst" In: Gerhardt, V. und Wirkus, B. (Hrsg.) *Sport und Ästhetik*, Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 1995, S.15-29.)

- [9] Welsch, "Sport - Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?" *op.cit.*, pp.214-215, 217.
- [10] Aesthetic considerations of sport were already being done as early as the 1930s, when Masakazu Nakai came out with his three articles on sport (in Japanese): "Aesthetic Elements of Sport," "The Structure of Sports Aesthetic," and "The Structure of Sports Mood." It was also in 1930s when Collingwood's reference to sport, which will be discussed at some length later in this paper, in his *The Principles of Art* was published. The situation of the 1930s, which included the popularization of sports and great popular success of the Olympics, encouraged philosophers and other scholars to take up this topic of sport. It was in the 1970s when the aesthetic consideration of sport was taken up by academia. Rather than in aesthetics, however, the early aesthetic considerations of sport occurred in the field of sports science (*Sportwissenschaft*). It was at the Philosophic Society for the Study of Sport, established in 1972, where the aesthetic examination of sport was first developed. The establishment of the academe was tied to the Olympics, and Hans Lenk, a German philosopher at the University of Karlsruhe, was one of the early key persons, who organized the scientific congress held during the Munich Olympics in 1972. In addition, Paul Weiss, a distinguished philosopher in US, was also involved in the establishment of the PSSS and served the Society's first president. During the 1970s, the following works which contained aesthetic examinations of sport was published: Grupe, O. et al (Eds.) *Sport in the Modern World - Chances and Problems: Papers, Results, Materials, Scientific Congress Munich, August 21 to 25, 1972*, Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1973. Gerber, E.W.(Ed.) *Sport and the Body: A Philosophical Symposium*, Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1972, 2nd Ed., 1979. Osterhoudt, R.G.(Ed.) *The Philosophy of Sport*, Springfield Illinois: Charles C Thomas-Publisher, 1973. Whiting, H.T.A. and Masterson, D.W.(Eds.) *Readings in the Aesthetics of Sport*, London: Lepus Books, 1974. Lowe, B. *The Beauty of Sport: A Cross-Disciplinary Inquiry*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977. All of these works took the position that sport can be viewed aesthetically, and then looking at sport from a variety of perspectives described the rich aesthetic characteristics of sport which are related to art. In 1987, my book, *The Aesthetics of Sport* (in Japanese), which was a comprehensive work concerned with the structure of the aesthetic of sport, was published.
- [11] Welsch, "Sport - Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?" *op.cit.*, pp.217-219.
- [12] Shinbo, A. "Merits and Demerits of the Olympic Motto," (in Japanese) Nakamura, T. (Ed.) *Considerations on the Olympic Motto*, Tokyo: Sobunkikaku, 2002, pp.130-131.
- [13] Welsch, *Undoing Aesthetics*, *op.cit.*, pp.9-15.
- [14] *Ibid.*, p.90.
- [15] Welsch, "Sport - Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?" *op.cit.*, p.220.
- [16] *Ibid.*, p.220.
- [17] *Ibid.*, pp.220-223.
- [18] See Higuchi, S. "Is Sport Art? - A Debate between Wertz and Best," (in Japanese) *Playing Body*, Okayama: Daigaku Kyoiku Shuppan, 1994, pp.147-171. The details of the debate are shown in the following articles. Wertz, S.K. "Toward a Sports Aesthetic (Essay Review)" *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 11(4), 1977, pp.103-111. Wertz, S.K. "Are Sports Art Forms?" *JAE*, 13(1), 1979, pp.107-109. Best, D. "Art and Sport" *JAE*, vol.14, 1980, pp.69-80. Wertz, S.K. "A Response to Best on Art and Sport" *JAE*, vol.18, 1984, pp.105-108. Boxill, J.M. "Beauty, Sport, and Gender" *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, vol.11, 1984, pp.36-47. Kupfer, J. "A Commentary on Jan Boxill's 'Beauty, Sport, and Gender'" *JPS*, vol.11, 1984, pp.48-51. Postow, B.C. "Sport, Art, and Gender" *JPS*, vol.11, 1984, pp.52-55. Wertz, S.K. "Sport and the Artistic" *Philosophy*, 60(233), 1985, pp.392-393. Wertz, S.K. "Representation and Expression in Sport and Art" *JPS*, vol.12, 1985, pp.8-24. Best, D. "Sport

- is Not Art” *JPS*, vol.12, 1985, pp.25-40. Best, D. “Sport Is not Art: Professor Wertz’s Aunt Sally” *JAE*, vol.20, 1986, pp.95-98. Roberts, T.J. “Sport, Art, and Particularity: The Best Equivocation” *JPS*, vol.13, 1986, pp.49-63. Roberts, T.J. “Sport and Representation: A Response to Wertz and Best” *JPS*, vol.13, 1986, pp.89-94. Cordner, C. “Differences Between Sport and Art” *JPS*, vol.15, 1988, pp.31-47. Higuchi, S. “From Art toward Sport: An Extension of the Aesthetics” *Aesthetics*, No.6, 1994, pp.113-122. Higuchi, S. “Rethinking the Relationship between Sport and Art” *Sport and Values: Proceedings of the 22nd Conference of the PSSS*, 1994, pp.75-85.
- [19] Welsch, “Sport – Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?” *op.cit.*, p.219.
- [20] Sport is considered art in the following researches. Osterhoudt, R.G. “An Hegelian Interpretation of Art, Sport, and Athletics” In: *The Philosophy of Sport*, Springfield Illinois: Charles C Thomas-Publisher, 1973, pp.326-359. Miller, D.M. And Russell, K.R.E. “Sport and the Arts” In: *Sport: A Contemporary View*, Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1961, pp.91-115. Toynbee, L. “Artist and Sport” In: Gerber, E.W. (Ed.) *Sport and the Body: A Philosophical Symposium*, Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1972, pp.305-306. Fisher, M. “Sport as an Aesthetic Experience” In: *Sport and the Body*, 1972, pp.315-322. Kovich, M. “Sport as an Art Form” *Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 42(10), 1971, p.42. Jokl, E. “Esthetic Evaluation of Human Movements” In: *Medical Sociology and Cultural Anthropology of Sport and Physical Education*, Springfield Illinois: Charles C Thomas-Publisher, 1964, pp.29-32. Carlisle, R. “Physical Education and Aesthetics” In: Whiting, H.T.A. and Masterson, D.W. (Eds.) *Readings in the Aesthetics of Sport*, London: Lepus Books, 1974, pp.21-31. Pendergast, H.A. “Art and Activity” *Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 8(2), 1937, pp.67-70, 124-125. Aaken, E.v. “Die sportliche Hochleistung als Kunstwerk und absoluter Wert: Ein Ansatz zu einer Philosophie des Sports” *Olympisches Feuer*, Nr.12, 1955, S.7-10. James, C.L.R. “The Relationship between Popular Sport and Fine Art” In: *Readings in the Aesthetics of Sport*, 1974, pp.99-106.
- [21] Welsch, “Sport – Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?” *op.cit.*, p.236.
- [22] *Ibid.*, p.235.
- [23] Collingwood, R.G. *The Principles of Art*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- [24] *Ibid.*, pp.73-74.
- [25] *Ibid.*, p.vi.
- [26] See Higuchi, S. “Art and Non-Art,” (in Japanese) *Symbiosis of Arts*, Hiroshima: Keisuisha, 1995, pp.403-415.
- [27] Briefly looking back on the history of Japan’s aesthetic examination of sport; in addition to above mentioned Masakazu Nakai’s works in 1930s, the following can also be mentioned: First, we had Yoshinori Onishi’s *Aesthetics* (in Japanese) (Kobundo, 1958), which presented a rather negative understanding of the aesthetic experience in sport; and this was followed by Toshio Takeuchi’s essay, “The Issue of Aesthetics in the Era of Technology” (in Japanese) (*Lectures in Aesthetics; Shin-Shicho 4: Arts and Technology*, published by Bijutsu Shuppansha, 1966), in which he presented the aesthetics of sport in terms of the aesthetics of technique. Both Mamoru Watanabe, in his *The Science of Art* (in Japanese) (Tokyo University Press, 1975) and Junzo Kobata, in his *Logic of the Aesthetic and the Arts* (in Japanese) (Keisoshobo, 1980) present sport as one example in their theories of aesthetics; and then both Takashi Masunari, in his *Aesthetics/Arts Education* (in Japanese) (Keisoshobo, 1985) and Soichi Masubuchi, in his “Aesthetic of Sport” (in Japanese) (*Seiron*, 1984), included a comparison of sport and art as part of their arguments. In addition, we have Toshio Takeuchi’s slightly different interest in the subject, in his *Anthology of Japanese Poems* (in Japanese) (Kobundo, 1981), in which the aesthetic of athletic events was praised. Ken-ichi Sasaki’s *An Invitation to Aesthetics* (in Japanese) (Chuokoron, 2004) includes a treatment of sport as a topic of aesthetic consideration.
- [28] Welsch, “Sport – Viewed Aesthetically, and Even As Art?” *op.cit.*, p.221.
- [29] Kelly, M. (Ed. in Chief) *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics* (four volumes), New York: Oxford University

Press, 1998.

[30] *Ibid.*, vol.1, pp.ix-xvii.

[31] *Ibid.*, vol.4, p.306. In 1991, Cohen formulated his thesis in his essay, "Sports and Art: Beginning Questions," which was published in the collected work, *Rethinking College Athletics* (Andre, J. and James, D.N. Eds., Temple University Press). This book, which included my article, "Liveliness and Personality: The Content of the Aesthetic Object in Sport," was an anthology compiled of 18 papers written by researchers from various fields, including philosophy, ethics, aesthetics, sociology, cultural anthropology, linguistics, and economics. The majority of essays contained in this book was written by US scholars in the early 1990s working outside the field of sports science and took a critical position of contemporary university athletics. These writers sought to clarify the basic meaning of sport and discuss what the meaning of sport is. Aesthetician Cohen's thesis was an important voice of this trend.

[32] Henckmann, W. and Lotter, K. (Hrsg.) *Lexikon der Ästhetik*, München: Verlag C.H.Beck, 1992, S.226-228.