Aufklärung Revista de Filosofia

AUFKLÄRUNG, João Pessoa, v.12, n.2, Ago., 2025, p.29-44
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18012/arf.v12i2.75605
Recebido: 25/10/2024 | Aceito: 30/06/2025

POETICS BETWEEN CLASSICAL AND MODERN: THE INFLUENCE OF ARISTOTLE'S UNDERSTANDING OF POETRY ON MODERN ART THEORIES

[A *POÉTICA* ENTRE OS CLÁSSICOS E OS MODERNOS: A INFLUÊNCIA DA COMPREENSÃO DA POESIA EM ARISTÓTELES E NAS TEORIAS DA ARTE MODERNA]

*Ayşe Acarer**
Süleyman Demirel University, Türkiye

ABSTRACT: Aristotle's *Poetics* presents the perspective of classical logic on the nature, purposes, and functions of art in literary theory and aesthetics. Through his analysis of tragedy, in particular, Aristotle attempts to explain the impact of art on the human psyche and how it reflects universal realities. The concept of mimesis, which Aristotle explores in this context, refers not to the simple copying of the external world but rather to the expression of the universal and general through specific forms and situations. Thus, rather than simply imitating nature as it is, art reveals the meanings behind it, human actions, and emotional experiences. Furthermore, in the context of tragedy, the concept of catharsis enables the audience to both purify and educate themselves emotionally. In this respect, Aristotle's Poetics fosters the development of an understanding of art that can be examined not only in aesthetic but also in ethical and psychological contexts.

In the modern period, particularly with developments in logic and the philosophy of language, the structure, logical relationships, and meaning-making processes of art and literature have been approached from different perspectives. Ludwig Wittgenstein's theory of language games argues that the meaning of a work of art is formed within the social context and cultural environment in which it is used. By emphasizing that meaning is not fixed or universal, the interpretation of art becomes flexible and polysemic. Nelson Goodman, on the other hand, developed a systematic approach to how art functions through language and symbol systems. His "language-changing" theory of art views works of art as logical symbol systems and aims to analyze these structures. Arthur Danto, on the other hand, focuses philosophically on the conceptual dimension of art, arguing that the meaning of a work of art is constantly reshaped by its surrounding theoretical framework and cultural context.

RESUMO: A *Poética*, de Aristóteles, apresenta a perspectiva da lógica clássica sobre a natureza, propósitos e funções da arte na teroia literária e estética. Através da análises da tragédia, em particular, Aristóteles tenta explicar o impacto da arte sobre a psyché humana e como ela reflete a realidade universal. O conceito de mimesis, o qual Aristóteles explora neste contexto, refere-se não à simples cópia do mundo externo, mas, antes, à expressão do geral e do universal através de situações e formas específicas. Desse modo, antes de que uma simples imitação da natureza, a arte revela os significados por trás dela, as ações humanas e as experiências emocionais. Além disso, no contexto da tragédia, o conceito de *cathasis* aumenta a audiência tanto para purificá-las quanto para educá-las emocionalmente. A este respetio, a *Poética*, de Aristóteles, propicia o desenvolvimento de um entendimento da arte que pode ser examinado não apenas pela estética, mas também pela ética e por contextos psicológicos.

No período moderno, particularmente com desenvolvimentos na lógica e na filosofia da linguagem, a estrutura, relações lógicas e o processo de gerar-significados da arte e da literatura se aproximaram em diferentes perspectivas. A teoria dos jogos de linguagem, de Ludwig Wittgenstein argumenta que o significado do trabalho da arte é formado dentro do contexto social e ambiente cultural no qual é usado. Destacando que o significado não é fixo ou unviersal, a interpretação da arte torna-se flexível e polissêmica. Nelson Goodman, por outro lado, desenvolveu uma aproximação sistemática sobre como a arte funciona através da linguagem e de símbolos. Sua teoria dasvisões da arte "mudança-da-linguagem" funciona como um sistema lógico de símbolos e tem por objetivo analisar estas estruturas. Arthur Danto, por outro lado, busca, filosoficamente, no conceito de deimensão da arte. Argumentando que o significado

* *Faculty of Theology, Department of Philosophy and Religious Sciences, Süleyman Demirel University, Türkiye. E-mail: aysesavkliyildiz@sdu.edu.tr*

This article compares the understanding of tragedy and mimesis in Aristotle's Poetics with the theories developed by modern logical philosophers on art, meaning, and logic. It examines how both approaches address fundamental problematic debates, such as whether art is universal or contextual, and whether meaning is fixed or relative. Consequently, the interaction of classical and modern perspectives allows for a more comprehensive and interdisciplinary understanding of both the logical structure and aesthetic functions of art.
Keywords: Logic; Aristotle; Mimesis; Catharsis; Poetry; Art

de uma obra de arte é constantemente reformado por sua teoria envovlvente de uma moldura teórica e pelo contexto cultural.
Este artigo compara as compreensões de tragédia e mímesis na *Poética*, de Aristóteles, com as teorias trabalhadas por filósofos da lógica moderna sobre arte, significado e lógica. Ele examina como ambas visões se ligam a debates problemáticos fundamentais, tais como se a arte é universal ou contextual, e se o significado é fixo ou relativo. Consequentemente, a interação entre as perspectivas clássica e moderna favorecem um entendimento mais comprrensivo e interdisciplinar de tanto a estrutura lógica como funções estéticas da arte.
Palavras-chave: Lógica; Aristóteles; mímesis; catarse; poesia; arte

AUFKLÄRUNG, João Pessoa, v.12, n.2, Ago., 2025, p.29-44

Introduction

Aristotle's Poetics, a fundamental source of literature and the philosophy of art, shaped the aesthetic understanding of the ancient period and shaped subsequent centuries. With its comprehensive analyses of tragedy, Aristotle's Poetics laid the foundations for the Classical Era in the fields of aesthetics and the philosophy of art. In this context, it offered a unique perspective on the nature, purposes, and functions of art (Aristotle, 2020). The discourses on tragedy discussed in the work, particularly concepts such as mimesis and catharsis, have been central not only to discussions of art and literature but also to psychology, ethics, and social thought. Aristotle views mimesis not as a superficial copy of direct reality but as the reinterpretation and reflection of the universal through specific and concrete situations. Thus, art mirrors the universal experiences of both the individual and society, demonstrating the meaningful impact and function of artistic production (Aristotle, 2020; Bywater, 1900).

The logical structure through which Aristotle conceived art is also a part of his general philosophical and scientific approach. Aristotle tended to explain nature and humanity in light of universal principles and, accordingly, based his aesthetic theory on logic (Grigoriou, 2018). For Aristotle, the elements of language, action, and character used in tragedy are organized within specific logical relationships, and thus, the work of art is seen not only as an aesthetic object but also as a logical structure that accesses universal truths. In this respect, Poetics reveals that art has not only an emotional but also an intellectual function (Nussbaum, 2010).

On the other hand, developments in the fields of logic and philosophy of language, particularly in the 20th century, have brought theories of art and literature to new and more complex ground. Ludwig Wittgenstein's concept of language games and his theory of meaning emphasized the idea that the meaning of the art object and artistic expression is not fixed and universal, but rather changes depending on the social and cultural context in which language is used (McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). In this context, Wittgenstein argues that the meaning of art arises from the interaction between the artwork and its audience, and from the "language games" that take shape within this context. Thus, meaning goes beyond a logical system and is determined according to principles of practical

and social use (Wittgenstein, 2009). This approach is important because, unlike Aristotle's search for universal principles, it reveals that meaning and art are relative, dynamic, and contextual.

Nelson Goodman, on the other hand, offers a different perspective on the structure of art and meaning. Goodman's 1976 classic work, Languages of Art, defines artworks as symbolic systems, stating that these systems possess codes, sign systems, and logical rules that function like language (Goodman, 1976). According to him, artworks not only depict the world but also alter and transform its systems of meaning. The concept of "art that changes language" reveals that art is not a fixed and uniform structure but possesses multiple codes that organize meaning and reality in various ways. This perspective goes beyond Aristotle's emphasis on mimesis and universality, highlighting the pluralistic and constructive role of art in the production of meaning (Goodman, 1976; Shiner, 2001).

Arthur Danto, as a philosopher, examines the process and context of art from a conceptual perspective. According to Danto, the art object cannot be fully understood without the theoretical and cultural contexts surrounding it. Because the work of art is constantly reconceptualized in terms of its meaning and ontological status, as well as its content and form (Danto, 1981). This approach questions traditional aesthetic understandings by emphasizing the fluid nature of art within historical and conceptual contexts and establishes a modern philosophy of art.

This study will compare Aristotle's approach to tragedy and the concept of mimesis in his Poetics with the theories developed by modern logical philosophers on art, meaning, and logic. The nature, function, and meaning of art in both paradigms will be examined, and mutual evaluations will be made, particularly on fundamental problematic issues such as universality and relativity, and the stability and contextuality of meaning. Thus, the contributions of both classical aesthetic theory and contemporary philosophy of logic to the field of art will be revealed from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Reinterpreting the classical concepts of tragedy and mimesis within the context of contemporary logic and philosophy of language demonstrates that art is not merely an object of imitation or aesthetics. Art is a phenomenon that functions within a context of meaning, logic, culture, and society. Thus, the comparison made in this article aims to both deepen the historical roots of art theory and enrich it in light of the new insights offered by modern thought.

1.The Concept of Art and Mimesis in Aristotle's Poetics

Aristotle's Poetics is considered one of the foundational texts of the philosophy of art and, in particular, presents a theory on the nature and function of art. According to Aristotle, art is achieved through mimesis, the imitation of nature, human actions, and emotions (Aristotle, 2020). However, this concept of imitation does not imply superficial copying or merely reflecting appearances as they are. On the contrary, Aristotle emphasizes that art is not merely a copy of directly observed reality, but rather the manifestation of universals -general and enduring truths about human nature- through specific, concrete situations. In this sense, art is seen not as

AUFKLÄRUNG, João Pessoa, v.12, n.2, Ago., 2025, p.29-44

mere copying, but as a creative activity aimed at understanding the essence of nature and human existence (Bywater, 1900).

Art, particularly in the context of tragedy, stands as the highest form of mimesis. In tragedy, as defined by Aristotle, the dramatic structure, characters, and events reveal the universality of human experiences, triggering specific emotional and mental processes in the viewer. The most important of these processes is the concept of catharsis. This concept involves the viewer experiencing a spiritual purification and renewal through intense experiences of emotions such as "pity and fear" (Aristotle, 2020; Nussbaum, 2010). Tragedy, therefore, is not only an aesthetic experience but also a functional tool for the individual's moral and psychological development.

Aristotle's understanding of art in his Poetics is also consistent with his scientific way of thinking. Based on the idea that the universe operates according to orderly and rational principles, Aristotle evaluates art within certain logical structures. In this context, a work of art is not merely an object that evokes emotions, but also a form capable of expressing universal truths through logical structures (Bywater, 1900; Grigoriou, 2018). Aristotle's studies in logic and natural philosophy form the basis of his aesthetic thought, enabling him to consider the meaning, structure, and function of art within a rational framework.

For Aristotle, art, and especially tragedy, are important areas of social and individual development. Through art, universal human characteristics are demonstrated, creating a process of learning and awareness in the viewer through familiarity and internalization (Nussbaum, 2010). In this context, Aristotle's understanding of mimesis unites the intellectual and emotional dimensions of art, thus enabling the work of art to convey both knowledge and experience.

On the other hand, this logical foundation in Aristotle's understanding of art demonstrates that art is not merely a desire for aesthetic pleasure and beauty. Aesthetic values and ethical functions are integral parts of art. The cathartic experience shaped by tragedy fosters interactions such as empathy, moral reasoning, and emotional balance in the viewer. Therefore, art both enriches the individual's inner world and contributes to the cultural and moral fabric of society (Bywater, 1900; Halliwell, 1987).

Aristotle's Poetics also addresses the linguistic structure and theoretical dimensions of art. The dramatic language of tragedy is structured in a measured and symmetrical form, which ensures that the work acquires meaning in accordance with logical and moral norms (Aristotle, 2020). Idealized art thus becomes not merely a representation but a logical and interactive system in which the elements of reason (logos), character (ethos), and emotion (pathos) are balanced. This system enables the work of art to represent reality not only on an individual and temporary scale, but also on a collective and universal scale (Halliwell, 1987).

Poetry is considered in this context, reflecting universal human nature and behavior through concrete individual events and personalities (Aristotle, 2020). This perspective allows art to function beyond its aesthetic scope and serve an epistemic function; through art, universal realities can be grasped and ethical and practical lessons can be learned. Poetry not only presents knowledge through

imitation, but also transforms this knowledge into a unique experience by transforming it into the viewer's life.

While poetry, tragedy, comedy, and epic are considered genres in the Poetics, poetry, in its broadest sense, encompasses all literary genres that represent human actions and characters (Aristotle, 2020). Aristotle considered tragedy the highest poetic genre in his time. This is due to tragedy's ability to create intense emotional and intellectual impact on the audience. The language and structure used in tragedy ensure the unity of action within a logical order, which increases the work's effectiveness (Aristotle, 2020).

Aristotle also places great emphasis on the linguistic structure of poetry. According to him, poetry achieves both meaning and harmony through verbal expression and metrical patterns (Aristotle, 2020). The linguistic features favored by different genres, such as tragedy and epic poetry, are carefully selected and crafted to enhance the work's impact. In this context, Aristotle states that the language of poetry serves both a logical and an emotional function. Thus, language both enables the communication of the narrative's logic and elicits an aesthetic and emotional response in the audience.

In Aristotle's Poetics, mimesis is a process of "creation" and "rearrangement" that goes beyond imitation. Instead of simply reflecting elements taken from nature, the artist shapes them to create universal meanings and create the desired effect on the viewer (Aristotle, 2020). In this respect, art is both a creative and informative discipline. A work of art transcends individual realities and becomes an expression of universal human nature.

Aristotle also places significant emphasis on the logical structure of poetry. For poetic works to be successful, logical consistency and unity are essential; especially in tragedy, actions must be linked by cause-effect relationships, and the work must have a purpose or outcome (Aristotle, 2020). This unity not only strengthens the aesthetic effect but also creates conceptual clarity and meaning for the viewer.

In conclusion, Aristotle's understanding of art, poetry, and mimesis in his Poetics presents the nature of art within a comprehensive perspective based on creative reorganization, the representation of universal reality, and the harmony of logical and aesthetic integrity and emotional impact. Mimesis is not simple imitation, but the poetic expression of universal principles and human nature. The logical structure of poetry, and especially tragedy, reveals the effectiveness of art on the viewer through emotional and intellectual means. These contributions of Aristotle laid the foundational conceptual foundations that remain valid in the philosophy of art and served as a reference point for contemporary thought. Aristotle's understanding of art, he argued, is that mimesis is the foundation of art, enabling universal truths to be expressed through specific situations. Thus, art is based on the principle that art provides social and individual benefits by creating emotional catharsis in the viewer. This understanding allows us to argue that art is not merely a visual or aesthetic object, but also an activity linked to logical rules and universal truths, producing ethical and psychological effects (Aristotle, 2020; Bywater, 1900; Nussbaum, 2001; Halliwell, 1987). These fundamental insights enable the discussion of mimesis as a concept within the philosophy of art and the

connection between Aristotle's contribution and contemporary art theories.

2.Modern Logical Philosophers' Approaches to Art and Meaning

AUFKLÄRUNG, João Pessoa, v.12, n.2, Ago., 2025, p.29-44

In the modern period, particularly from the second half of the 20th century onward, developments in the fields of logic and the philosophy of language have influenced the philosophy of art. During this period, the relationship between art and meaning began to be discussed again, beyond traditional understandings of aesthetics and mimesis, through the structure of language and logic. During this period, philosophers such as Ludwig Wittgenstein, Nelson Goodman, and Arthur Danto explored the logical and linguistic foundations of art, reshaping art theory.

Ludwig Wittgenstein, in his views on the meaning of art, particularly utilizes the concept of "language games," which he introduced in his Philosophical Investigations (1953). According to Wittgenstein, meaning is not a fixed, objective, and universal property; it varies depending on the social use of language (McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). Art can also be considered a type of language game; its meaning emerges within the social and cultural context in which the work is used, rather than the artist's intention, the work's structure, or its aesthetic value. Wittgenstein argued that the meaning of works of art can only be grasped by understanding the context in which they are performed and the rules by which they are evaluated (Wittgenstein, 2009). In this context, art is not confined to a narrow logical structure or a fixed system of aesthetic meaning; on the contrary, it is a dynamic phenomenon that can be interpreted in various ways by different social groups, cultural settings, and individuals.

This approach of Wittgenstein contrasts with Aristotle's understanding that art can be defined by universal principles. While Aristotle sought mimesis and universality in art, Wittgenstein argued that meaning is based on social and cultural conventions and therefore variable (McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). The meaning of an art object is determined by those who use, interpret, and manipulate it. This demonstrates that art is not merely a phenomenon consisting of the artist and the work, but a phenomenon that emerges through social interaction.

Nelson Goodman further systematized this linguistic and logical approach. In his 1976 work, Languages of Art, Goodman considers works of art as symbolic systems that organize the world (Goodman, 1976). According to him, works of art function within specific "languages"; these languages operate through symbols, codes, and sign systems. Goodman's theory transcends the limitations of Aristotle's concept of mimesis, arguing that the meaning of art is subject to the rules of logical language and is a structure containing symbolic correspondences. Art is considered not merely an imitation of nature or reality, but also a set of systems that transform, reshape, and express it in different languages (Goodman, 1976; Shiner, 2001).

The concept of "art that changes language" is important in Goodman's approach. This view posits that artistic works not only exist within existing linguistic codes, but also trigger a cultural and epistemological transformation by creating new sign forms and worlds of meaning (Goodman, 1976). Art is thus viewed as a field replete with codes, possessing logical and linguistic

characteristics, and therefore becomes an indispensable object of research for logicians and philosophers of language. This code structure of artworks necessitates logical and semiotic analyses in the processes of their understanding and interpretation.

Arthur Danto, with his critiques and contributions to the philosophy of art, is one of the most important thinkers of the modern era. According to Danto, the existence and meaning of a work of art are not limited solely to its physical structure or traditional aesthetic qualities. A work of art is determined by the meanings attributed to it and the conceptual contexts within which it exists (Danto, 1981). In Danto's thesis of "the end of art," he argues that contemporary art has broken down the traditional boundaries between art and the object, and that art is a phenomenon shaped by historical and conceptual contexts. Art is constantly being modified, reconceptualized, and given meaning (Danto, 1981; Carroll, 2012).

Danto's view is that the status and meaning of art are determined by conceptual processes rather than by objectivity. Thus, the importance of historical changes, cultural contexts, and theoretical approaches has increased in the philosophy of art. Art objects acquire their true meaning only through the historical, social, and cultural contexts that surround them (Danto, 1981). This perspective allows for the conceptualization of works outside of traditional criteria of form, technique, or beauty, and demonstrates that the interpretation of art must be evaluated within a much broader framework.

Consequently, modern philosophers such as Wittgenstein, Goodman, and Danto have addressed the meaning of art not through purely aesthetic and superficial concepts, but through linguistic, logical, and conceptual contexts. Wittgenstein relatively rejects Aristotle's understanding of universal principles, arguing that meaning emerges within the context of use and within social language games. While Goodman views works of art as systems of symbolic logic and associates the meaning of art with systems governed by logical linguistic rules, Danto argues that the meaning of art is constantly reinterpreted and conceptually shaped.

The common thread among the philosophers mentioned above is their recognition that, rather than art carrying a fixed and universal meaning, meaning depends on dynamic, contextual, and semiotic complexities. Thus, contemporary philosophy of art enriches aesthetic approaches based on classical works, creating a more holistic and interdisciplinary field of study. These perspectives require examination of the theoretical, logical, and social-scientific dimensions of works of art and develop deeper understandings of the nature of art (Wittgenstein, 2009; Goodman, 1976; Danto, 1981).

It is clear that in the modern period, the meaning of art, and particularly poetry, began to be addressed not only as an aesthetic problem but also within the framework of linguistic, logical, and signifying theories. In this context, discussions on the meaning and logical structure of works of art have moved beyond traditional aesthetic approaches and assumed a more systematic and interdisciplinary character. Differing from the universal logical structures presented by Aristotle in classical tragedy, modern logical philosophers have analyzed the structure of artistic meaning as bound by linguistic, social, and logical rules,

developing new perspectives on how the inherent structures of poetry and other art forms operate.

Charles Peirce's work in semiotics is a fundamental starting point for understanding the relationship between modern art and meaning. Peirce explains meaning through the three-way relationship between signs and the objects they represent, classifying this relationship with the categories of icon, index, and symbol (Peirce, 1934). Artworks carry both iconographic (visual or formal similarity) and symbolic (meaning through cultural and linguistic codes) meanings within Peirce's framework of sign types. Peirce's semiotic approach facilitates an understanding of the structure of poetry's meaning, and his structural model, which aligns with Aristotelian logic, paves the way for a systematic examination of poetic meaning. Peirce's contributions emphasize the importance of logically structured sign systems in the production of meaning in art, providing a theoretical bridge between formal and contextual analyses of poetry (Houser & Kloesel, 1992).

Susanne Langer, on the other hand, adopted a more phenomenological and philosophical approach to the meaning of art. Langer argued that works of art, especially poetry, represent emotions and human experiences through "symbolic forms" (Langer & Langer, 1953). According to her, art is language, but unlike a logical language, this language is a "symbolic language" and conveys meaning not directly conceptually, but at a sensory and experiential level. Langer's theory posits that the meaning of art and poetry is not merely logical or conceptual explanations, but rather a complex production of meaning through formal symbolism and emotional expression. In this understanding, poetry is composed of pluralistic symbolic systems and bridges the gap between logical structure and experiential meaning (Langer & Langer, 1953). Thus, Langer positions the meaning of art as a phenomenon of "symbolic expression" that transcends logical structure.

Roman Jakobson's views on poetic language and functional linguistics are also important examples of modern logical approaches. Jakobson considers poetry as an autonomous and prominent function of language; according to the poetic function, the meaning of language focuses on the message itself (Jakobson & Sebeok, 1960). This perspective analyzes how the logical structure of language is used for different purposes in poetry and positions poetry as a special subsystem within the logical diversity of linguistic functions. Jakobson's theory focuses discussions of logic and meaning on the structure and functioning of poetry, enabling more technical and structural analyses.

Michael Dummett, in the context of philosophy of language, has questioned the logical foundations underlying the meaning of poetry and art, emphasizing in particular that meaning is shaped by usage and rules (Dummett, 1993). Dummett's argument that language should be interpreted based on the social rules and usage of language, rather than viewing it as a statement based on the truth conditions of sentences, is a methodological approach to analyzing the logical structures of art forms such as poetry. His perspective is based on the idea that the meaning of works of art differs from ordinary language uses, yet is also logical and rule-bound. Thus, poetry is considered a field where logical structures and sociocultural contexts intersect.

Harold Bloom's writings on aesthetics and meaning also represent a

AUFKLÄRUNG, João Pessoa, v.12, n.2, Ago., 2025, p.29-44

different approach to understanding logical structures in the interpretation of art, and particularly poetry. Bloom argues that poetic meaning emerges from the dynamic relationship between the author's linguistic creativity and the reader's perception of it (Bloom, 1997). According to him, poetry is shaped not by logical, linguistic formulas, but by the historical and cultural interactions of preceding literary texts. The meaning of poetry is not fixed; it is constantly reproduced within the logical and rhetorical complexities of interpretation. Bloom's views reveal how mental processes and the logical structure of poetic meaning develop together, emphasizing the relativity of meaning.

A common theme among modern logical philosophers' approaches to art and meaning is that the meaning of art, and particularly poetry, is not a fixed and universal structure; rather, it is shaped by complex and contextually variable logical divisions. This understanding requires an interdisciplinary methodology for analyzing both the linguistic and logical structures of art and poetry. The dialogue established between fields such as semiotics, philosophy of language, logic, and literary theory has enriched reflections on the meanings of modern art and poetry.

Consequently, the theories of art and meaning by modern logical philosophers, which depart from the classical understanding of universal logic, have added new dimensions to the logical analysis of works of art. This broad perspective, extending from Peirce's semiotics to Langer's symbolic expression approach, from Jakobson's linguistic functions to Dummett's usage-based theory of meaning, and from Bloom's literary historical logic, provides the basis for understanding the multifaceted and dynamic nature of the logical structures of modern art and poetry. Within this framework, art and poetry should be considered as a rich system of meaning production shaped not only by universal aesthetic principles but also by logical, linguistic, and cultural conditions.

3.Differences Between Aristotle and Modern Philosophers in the Context of Universality and Art

The universality and logic emphasized by Aristotle in Tragedy share similar foundations with modern logical philosophers' discussions of the logical structures of art. However, in contrast to Aristotle's approach based on universal truths, thinkers such as Wittgenstein and Goodman argue that meaning is relative and contextual. This difference raises the question of whether art is an objective "imitation" or a culturally and socially shaped sign system. In this context, Aristotle's concept of catharsis parallels modern thinkers' views on the psychological and social functions of art, but differs in terms of use and function. Modern logical approaches expand the classical understanding of mimesis by considering the meaning of art within the framework of logical analysis and semiotics.

Aristotle's understanding of art, presented in Tragedy, is built upon the foundations of universality and logic. In his aesthetic understanding, tragedy is not merely a dramatic form, but also a logical and structured process of action that reveals the universal realities of human nature (Aristotle, 2020). In Aristotle's

perspective, art achieves meaning by affirming common human conditions and revealing universal principles, beyond random and individual experiences. The work of tragedy, constructed within the framework of these universal structures, evokes universal emotional reactions and insights in the viewer through moral and aesthetic values (Nussbaum, 2010). Thus, the quest for universality inherent in Aristotle's thought is theoretically reinforced. Tragedies, organized within a logical structure, enable the process of emotional purification and mental cleansing, called catharsis, in the audience as a whole created by the harmony of episodes, characters, events and language (Aristotle, 2020).

On the other hand, views developed in the modern period in the philosophy of logic and language, particularly those of thinkers such as Ludwig Wittgenstein and Nelson Goodman, address the logical structure and meaning of art on a much more contextual, social, and semiotic basis. Wittgenstein's concept of language games emphasizes that meaning is not fixed but shaped by social uses and contexts (McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). In this framework, a work of art is a dynamic phenomenon that acquires meaning not within rigid logical structures but within the surrounding social and cultural context. Meaning is not fixed and universal, but rather varies with time, culture, and environment. Therefore, it is argued that there is no universal truth to a work of art (Wittgenstein, 2009).

Nelson Goodman, on the other hand, systematically examines the symbolic structure and logical codes of art, understanding artworks as "sign systems" (Goodman, 1976). According to him, art not only imitates the objective world but also constructs new structures of meaning and reality through social and cultural codes. Thus, Goodman's approach expands Aristotle's concept of mimesis and reveals that the meaning of art not only reflects nature but also constantly changes and evolves, creating new "languages" and symbolic systems (Goodman, 1976; Shiner, 2001). From this perspective, art, beyond the quest for universal truth, is a sign system shaped by cultural and social dynamics.

In this context, Aristotle's understanding of universality and logic, highlighted in tragedy, bears both similarities and fundamental differences with modern logical philosophers' discussions of the logical structures of art. While both perspectives believe that art should be examined through logical structures, Aristotle's concern to uncover existing universal truths contradicts modern philosophers' argument that structure and context of use, not meaning, are relative and pluralistic. This difference constitutes a fundamental distinction, particularly regarding the question of whether art is an objective "imitation" or a "sign system" (Aristotle, 2020; Goodman, 1976).

The view that art is objective imitation is based on Aristotle's concept of mimesis and is based on the "accurate" and logical transmission of reality or universal truths in the work of art. In contrast, modern logical thinkers argue that meaning becomes specific through social and cultural practices, and therefore the structural features of art must be reinterpreted within these contexts (McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953; Danto, 1981). Thus, the meaning of art is not fixed, but rather variable, dynamic, and dependent on cultural and historical conditions.

Aristotle's concept of catharsis emerges as an important conceptual bridge in this debate. This process emphasizes the psychological and ethical functions of art

(Aristotle, 2020; Nussbaum, 2001). Modern thinkers also draw attention to the social and psychological functions of art, but they approach the concept of catharsis from different perspectives. For example, Wittgenstein emphasizes the dependence of art's meaning on social language games and practices, while Goodman describes how art creates innovative meanings within individuals and society through its symbiotic and codified structure (Goodman, 1976; McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). Danto, on the other hand, argues that art creates a space for social change through its constant conceptual redefinition and reinterpretation (Danto, 1981). These approaches reveal that catharsis is not merely an individual purification but a complex process that also impacts the social context.

Modern logical approaches, by considering the meaning of art within the framework of logical analysis and semiotics, both deepen and limit Aristotle's classical understanding of mimesis. Wittgenstein's theory of language games undermines the fixity of meaning and emphasizes the contextual and pluralistic nature of art; Goodman, on the other hand, reveals the existence of art's own logical and symbolic languages (Goodman, 1976; McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). Danto's conceptual philosophy of art, on the other hand, places these structures within a broader historical and cultural context. Thus, these three modern philosophers demonstrate that art cannot be interpreted solely according to universal principles; on the contrary, meaning is in constant transformation within the framework of multiple social, cultural, and conceptual structures.

In conclusion, the universality and logic emphasized by Aristotle in tragedy provide a fundamental foundation for understanding the logical and aesthetic dimensions of art, while the views of modern logical philosophers enrich this foundation with contextual and social practices. Thus, the contrast between classical and modern approaches generates an intellectual debate centered on the question of whether art is objective imitation or a socially and culturally constructed sign system. This contrast facilitates the development of different perspectives on both the logical structures and meaning-producing processes of art, broadening the interdisciplinary scope of the philosophy of art.

Aristotle's understanding of tragedy, presented in Poetics, is a classical aesthetic, arguing that art is a logical and orderly structure reflecting universal realities (Aristotle, 2020). Tragedy is constructed in accordance with specific rules and logical principles; through these principles, the fundamental realities of human nature are revealed within the context of actions and consequences. Aristotle defines the purpose of tragedy not only as providing aesthetic pleasure but also as the emotional and mental cleansing of the audience through the experience of "katharsis" (spiritual purification through pity and fear) (Nussbaum, 2001). At this point, the importance of tragedy's logical structure and its shaping by universal principles become clear.

The principle of universality, as set forth by Aristotle in tragedy, is based on the idea that art should express realities that are valid for everyone, independent of time, space, and individual experiences. According to him, a work of art should express universal truths while narrating specific events and thus carry meaning for all human experiences (Aristotle, 2020). This forms the cornerstone of tragedy's logical structure: Actions and characters are organized within logical cause-and-

effect relationships, so that the resulting aesthetic experience is both coherent, instructive, and universal (Bywater, 1900).

This understanding of universal and logical structure has been addressed in various ways in the modern period, and some perspectives have developed that radically differ from Aristotle's. Firstly, discussions on the logical structure of works of art in modern logical aesthetic approaches have primarily focused on formalist and structuralist approaches. For example, Roman Jakobson's studies on the aesthetic elements of communication theory have revealed that poetic language has a specific logic and structure. According to Jakobson, poetry emphasizes the "message" function of language, and this function emphasizes its internal structure or order (Jakobson & Sebeok, 1960). In this context, the logical structure of poetry, unlike Aristotle's cause-and-effect relationships in tragedy, is organized through the structural properties of language itself. Elements such as repetition, metaphors, and sound plays used in poetic language demonstrate the existence of a patterned logic. Therefore, in the modern understanding of poetry, logical structure is not only related to the content or semantic level but also to structural and formal arrangements.

In addition, Stephen Ullmann, focusing on the linguistic aspects of poetry, argues that poetic meaning is logical and systematic, both lexically and structurally (Ullmann, 1962). According to him, the language used in poetry is a complex structure in which meaning is organized by a universal and logical system, not solely dependent on individual experiences. This conclusion can be considered parallel to Aristotle's principle of universality; however, Ullmann points out that this universality is achieved through symbolic structures operating within the logic of language.

When examining John Searle's discourse theory within the context of modern logic and philosophy of science, the logical structure of works of art and literature is interpreted more closely in terms of social sciences. Searle argues that linguistic expressions acquire meaning within the framework of specific discourse rules and logical structures, and that these rules also apply to the production of meaning in works of art (Searle, 1969). From this perspective, works of art are not merely aesthetic objects but also social activities and language games. The crucial element here is that logical structure is contextual and rule-based, rather than being absolutely universal in the classical sense.

On the other hand, unlike Nelson Goodman, David Kaplan's semiotic and logical analyses also reveal the logical foundations of artistic structures. Kaplan argues that artworks function as "signs" and that their meaning changes depending on context. He argues that this context can be logically analyzed, thus understanding the structural logic of art (Kaplan, 1989). This paves the way for the development of approaches similar to the synthesis of Aristotle's philosophical logic with modern semiotics.

While the principles of holism and causality that Aristotle defined as logical structure in Tragedy also lie at the foundation of modern logical aesthetic theories, in modern understandings this logic has been redefined more within the framework of symbol systems, linguistic functions, and contextual interpretations. While Aristotle viewed Tragedy as a logical storyline, modern aesthetic theorists have

considered poetic structure and the linguistic structure of art as systems possessing specific and autonomous logics (McGann, 2016).

The key difference lies in Aristotle's emphasis on universal truths in the relationship between art and logic, and modern philosophers' argument that meaning and logic operate within social and cultural contexts (Aristotle, 2020; Scholes & Scholes, 1974). While the modern approach recognizes that meaning is shaped by the interactions within the context in which the artwork is produced and perceived, Aristotle's perspective is grounded in the universal and necessary truths underlying meaning. This represents a paradigmatic shift in which the logical structures of art shift from universality to contextuality.

In conclusion, there are both significant intersections and fundamental differences between Aristotle's understanding of universality and logical structure in Tragedy and the theories of logical structure developed by modern logical philosophers on art and poetry. While both approaches examine the meaning-generating and logical dimensions of art, Aristotle focused on logical totality and universality, while modern thinkers defined the problems of logic and meaning more flexibly around context, code, and communicative functions. This distinction has enabled the mutual enrichment of classical and modern perspectives on art and aesthetics and a deeper understanding of the nature of art.

Conclusion

Aristotle's understanding of art and mimesis, established in his Poetics, is a classic in the history of aesthetic thought, grounded in the universal and logical structure of art. According to Aristotle, the fundamental nature of art is not to imitate nature and human actions, but to reveal the universal realities and logical order behind these concrete and individual experiences (Aristotle, 2020). In this context, a work of art is not merely a visual or emotional representation, but also the artistic expression of reasoning and logical processes. Tragedy stands as one of the most prominent examples of this universal and logical structure, providing the viewer with both emotional and mental purification through catharsis (Nussbaum, 2010).

This classical approach represents a paradigm that generalizes the meaning and function of art, relating it to fixed, universal, and objective truths. Aristotle's theory of aesthetics encompasses the ethical and psychological dimensions of art, pointing to its social function and its power to transform the human soul. Thus, art is viewed as a tool for the production and realization of meaning at both the individual and collective levels (Bywater, 1900; Halliwell, 1987).

On the other hand, developments in the modern period, particularly in the fields of logic, language, and semiotics, have led to a more flexible, dynamic, and contextual understanding of the meaning and functional structures of art. Ludwig Wittgenstein's theory of language games argues that meaning is not fixed and objective, but emerges within the social use and context of language (McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). Therefore, the meaning of a work of art is closely tied to the social practice and cultural context in which it is embedded. This strengthens the

AUFKLÄRUNG, João Pessoa, v.12, n.2, Ago., 2025, p.29-44

understanding that the meaning of art can change according to historical, cultural, economic, and political conditions and is open to multiple interpretations. This approach, as an alternative to Aristotle's search for universal truths, emphasizes the relativity and contextuality of meaning (Wittgenstein, 2009).

Nelson Goodman, on the other hand, considers works of art as complex symbolic systems, like language, and analyzes their function and meaning through the rules of codes and sign systems (Goodman, 1976). According to Goodman, art is not merely imitation, but also an activity that produces new systems of meaning and reality; therefore, art contains rich structures capable of transitioning between different symbolic languages. This perspective both deepens and expands Aristotle's understanding of mimesis, as Goodman sees art as a limitless system of signs that not only reflects nature but also gives it meaning and transforms it (Goodman, 1976; Shiner, 2001). Here, by highlighting the logical structure and semiotic functioning of art, it can be said that the complexity and diversity of meaning-production processes are understood.

Arthur Danto, on the other hand, argues that the meaning and status of art are shaped by the conceptual context and historical framework ascribed to it, rather than the work itself (Danto, 1981). Danto's "end of art" approach posits that art is undergoing a conceptual transformation beyond stereotyped aesthetic criteria and direct representation, and that art is open to endless interpretation and reinterpretation. This idea reveals the centrality of linguistic, social, and cultural structures in the production of meaning in art. Thus, art is a product not only of visual or formal values but also of ontological and theoretical foundations (Carroll, 2012).

Aristotle's understanding of art based on universality and logic, and modern logical philosophers' theories of meaning, developed around concepts such as context, usage, and semiotics, enable the nature of art to be understood from different perspectives. The former represents the view that art reflects truths independent of subjective interpretations and independent of society or time; the latter argues that meaning is constantly translated and reshaped through social practices, social interactions, and cultural contexts. These differences raise the question of whether art is an objective "imitation" or a socially and culturally shaped "sign system," and resolving this question remains a central problem in the philosophy of art (Aristotle, 2020; Goodman, 1976; McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953).

These two perspectives on the function of art present mutual complementarities and challenges. While the purgative function that Aristotle associated with catharsis in tragedy points to the balancing of emotion and understanding, modern theories consider art's social function and the production of cultural meaning within a broader framework. Art functions not only as an individual psychological transformation but also as a tool for creating collective meaning, challenging social norms, and shaping cultural identity (Nussbaum, 2001; Danto, 1981). In this context, modern thinkers consider universal and contextual dimensions together in their efforts to interpret the meaning of art through logical analysis, semiotics, and linguistic arguments (Goodman, 1976; McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953).

In summary, the theories of art by Aristotle and modern logical philosophers,

although developed in different periods, enable a continuous dialogue and comparison regarding the logical, functional, and meaning-producing aspects of art. While Aristotle's classical understanding emphasizes the enduring and universal qualities of art, modern approaches emphasize its variable and multi-voiced nature within historical, cultural, and social contexts. This interdisciplinary approach facilitates the development of new theoretical perspectives in the philosophy of art and enables a broader and more complex understanding of both art and aesthetics.

To advance the understanding of art and contribute to current debates, it is essential to consider these two main perspectives together. The interaction between classical and modern art theories not only fosters a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of art but also enables a more holistic approach to its social, ethical, logical, and aesthetic functions (Bywater, 1900; Goodman, 1976; Nussbaum, 2001; McVee & Wittgenstein, 1953). This integrated approach is crucial for increasing interdisciplinary research in the philosophy of art and fostering dialogue and integration between different fields.

In conclusion, Aristotle's theory of art, based on universal principles, and the innovative approaches of modern logical philosophers to language, logic, and semiotics are indispensable resources for a deeper understanding of both the logical and meaning-producing aspects of art. The intersection of classical and modern perspectives allows philosophy of art to remain true to its historical roots while also being enriched by contemporary thought. To better understand the nature and function of art, these interdisciplinary approaches must be considered together.

References

Aristotle. (2020). Poetics (S. H. Butcher, Trans.). Independently Published. (Original work published ca. 335 BCE)

Bloom, H. (1997). *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford University Press.

Bywater, I. (1900). Milton and the Aristotelian Definition of Tragedy. *The Journal of Philology*, 27(54), 267.

Carroll, N. (2012). *Philosophy of art: A Contemporary Introduction*. Routledge.

Danto, A. C. (1981). *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art*. Harvard University Press.

Dummett, M. (1993). *The Seas of Language*. Clarendon Press.

Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Hackett Publishing Company.

Grigoriou, C. (2018). Pity and Sympathy: Aristotle versus Plato and Smith versus Hume. *Journal of Scottish Philosophy*, 16(1), 63-78.

Halliwell, F. S. (1987). *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Duckworth.

Jakobson, R., & Sebeok, T. A. (1960). Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. *Semiotics: An Introductory Anthology*, 147-175. MIT Press.

Kaplan, D. (1989). *Demonstratives*: An Essay on The Semantics, Logic, Metaphysics and Epistemology of Demonstratives and Other Indexicals. (pp. 481–563). Oxford University Press.

Langer, S. K., & . Langer. (1953). Feeling and Form (Vol. 3). London: Routledge and Kegan

Paul.
McGann, J. (2016). Radiant Textuality: Literary Studies After the World Wide Web. Springer.
McVee, M. B. Wittgenstein, L.(1953). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Nussbaum, M. C. (2001). *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). Perceptive Equilibrium: Literary Theory and Ethical Theory. *A Companion to the Philosophy of Literature*, 239-267.
Peirce, C. S. (1934). *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce (Vol. 5)*. Harvard University Press.
Scholes, R., & Scholes, R. E. (1974). *Structuralism in Literature: An Introduction* (Vol. 276). Yale University Press.
Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
Shiner, L. E. (2001). *The Invention of Art: A Cultural History*. University of Chicago press.
Ullmann, S. (1962). *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Wittgenstein, L. (1990). *Ludwig Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius*. J. Cape.
Wittgenstein, L. (2009). *Philosophical Investigations*. John Wiley & Sons.

AUFKLÄRUNG, João Pessoa, v.12, n.2, Ago., 2025, p.29-44