

EDITORIAL

Since its relaunch as an international journal of aesthetics in 2008, *Estetika* has grown into one of the central forums for work on aesthetics and philosophy of art, seeking to cross the traditional boundaries between Anglo-American and central European traditions of thought. A particularly important period in the development of *Estetika* into its current form was when Fabian Dorsch was Editor-in-Chief from 2012 until his unexpected and untimely death in 2017. Under Fabian's leadership, *Estetika* started publishing articles exclusively in English, adopted the triple-blind peer-review process, and fostered a close relationship with the European Society for Aesthetics – a society whose very formation owed a lot to Fabian's initiative. It has been an honour for me to assume the duties of Editor-in-Chief of *Estetika* from Zoltán Papp, who led the journal in the interim since 2017. I feel extremely lucky to be able to begin my work with the original, experienced, and dedicated editorial committee of *Estetika*. We are pleased to pay tribute to Fabian's work in this first issue of 2019 by publishing the winning essay of the Fabian Dorsch European Society for Aesthetics Essay Prize, 'Tales of Dread' by Mark Windsor.

Estetika strives to be a generalist journal in the field of philosophical aesthetics. Our ambition is to build bridges not only between anglophone and Continental traditions of thought but also between historical and contemporary views, between aesthetics and other fields of academic research, and indeed between aesthetics and other areas of philosophy. For aesthetics does not have to be the untidy 'stepsister' in the house of philosophy, unable or unwilling to 'make herself generally useful around the house', as Monroe Beardsley suggested in his *Aesthetics*. In fact, the contributions published in this issue testify to the opposite.

The issue opens with an interdisciplinary dialogue between Peter Lamarque and Nigel Walter on the conservation of historic buildings and whether these could be understood as 'ongoing communal narratives'. The dialogue provides an interesting exchange on the benefits and potential dangers of appealing to narrative in the context of architectural conservation, highlighting the differences of emphasis within the disciplines of philosophy and architecture respectively. Another perspective on the construction of stories, albeit one formulated by reference to fiction, is given by Patrik Engisch's article 'Patchwork Puzzles and the Nature of Fiction'. Focusing on the composition of and the reader's engagement with fiction, the article sets out to dissolve the tension Kathleen Stock has identified in Gregory Currie's account.

The dialogue between Lamarque and Walter also provides an opportunity to reflect on the practice of philosophy itself by reference to the notion of

conservation. Could the church that ‘wishes to remove pews to accommodate greater liturgical flexibility or additional communal uses’, to borrow Walter’s example, be compared to Beardsley’s ‘house of philosophy’ that may wish to get rid of Kant’s transcendental method of philosophy and still sustain the key insights of Kant’s account of pure judgements of taste? The book symposium *Is Psychology Relevant to Aesthetics?*, discussing Bence Nanay’s and Murray Smith’s recent monographs on the interface between aesthetics and psychology, relates to this very question. For as noted by Elisabeth Schellekens and as acknowledged by Nanay himself, Nanay’s account of aesthetic experience emerging from the contemporary study of perception has noticeable affinities with Kant’s position in spite of obviously rejecting the Kantian conception of philosophy as methodologically distinct from the empirical sciences.

The views presented by Nanay, Smith, and Sherri Irvin underscore the promise that work in psychology and neuroscience holds for aesthetics. Schellekens, while sympathetic to the overall project, worries whether the naturalized approach can count for aesthetic value and aesthetic normativity in general. Nanay’s response, that aesthetics is as closely related to metaphysics, epistemology, and philosophy of mind as it is to value theory, is a point that cannot be emphasized enough. Yet one may ask whether the question of normativity does not arise in epistemology as well. For Kant it certainly did. Mojca Kuplen’s article ‘Cognitive Interpretation of Kant’s Theory of Aesthetic Ideas’ approaches the relationship between aesthetics and cognition from the opposite direction by bringing Kant’s historical notion of aesthetic ideas to bear on the question of grasping abstract concepts. In doing so, the article also casts light on the normative question at the centre of Kant’s epistemology: how is it possible to combine sensible content with a general concept, which Kant takes to be necessary for cognition?

On behalf of the editorial committee and myself, I thank the authors for their contributions as well as the scholars who have contributed by serving as referees. We trust that this issue of *Estetika* will provide our readers with interesting and stimulating reading.

Hanne Appelqvist
Editor-in-Chief
hanne.appelqvist@helsinki.fi