

opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,
Linguística y Semiología, Problemas de Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 35, Abril 2019 N°

88

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales
ISSN 1012.1537/ ISSNc: 2477-9385
Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas
Maracaibo - Venezuela

George Santayana's Sense Of Beauty And Its Reflection In Contemporary Plastic Art

1Adel Abdul Munem Abdul Mohsin Shaabeth, 2Suhad Abdul Munem Abdul Mohsin Shaabeth, 3Turath Ameen Abbas Khafaji

Abstract

Plastics, herewith expected as materials dependent on natural polymers which can be controlled to frame films, strands, froths or three-dimensional articles, turned into a modern and family pertinent material amid the years between the world wars yet it is just since after the Second World War with the presentation of new classes of engineered polymers, and later during the 1960s as an outcome of monetary improvement, that polymeric materials have turned out to be inescapable in our day by day life. In the meantime, engineered and artificially altered characteristic polymer ancient rarities began to show up in accumulations and exhibitions, particularly since the improvement of present day historical centers (Carrier, 2018). Items in part or totally made of plastics might be found in practically all global accumulations gave to science and innovation, current history, plan and plastic arts, and their extent is probably going to increment with time

El Sentido De Belleza De George Santayana Y Su Reflejo En El Arte Plástico Contemporáneo

Resumen

Los plásticos, que se esperan como materiales dependientes de polímeros naturales que se pueden controlar para enmarcar películas, hebras, espuma o artículos tridimensionales, se convirtieron en un material pertinente moderno y familiar en medio de los años entre las guerras mundiales, pero es solo después de la Segunda La Guerra Mundial con la presentación de nuevas clases de polímeros de ingeniería, y más tarde durante la década de 1960 como resultado de la mejora monetaria, los materiales poliméricos han resultado ineludibles en nuestra vida cotidiana. Mientras tanto, las rarezas antiguas de polímeros característicos modificadas artificialmente y modificadas artificialmente comenzaron a aparecer en acumulaciones y exhibiciones, particularmente desde la mejora de los centros históricos actuales (Carrier, 2018). Se pueden encontrar artículos en parte o totalmente hechos de plástico en prácticamente todas las acumulaciones globales dadas a la ciencia y la innovación, la historia actual, el plan y las artes plásticas, y su extensión probablemente aumentará con el tiempo

Introduction

As exhibition halls keep on gathering materials which reflect current life and contemporary social legacy On the other hand, polymers, attributable to their inborn nature, are substantially more inclined to synthetic responses than most customary materials and worries about the life span of plastics are settled, from both the pragmatic and the logical perspectives Plastic articles may regularly need to confront difficult issues of either physical or compound maturing not just under outrageous states of sun oriented light or high temperature however even in very secured indoor situations, at moderately low temperature, for example, those normally found in historical centres amid presentation and capacity. (Lazzari, et. al, 2011).

Plastic Arts

In spite of the fact that plastics either as items in their own privilege or as segments of composite materials are available in various sorts of accumulations, particularly the solidness of essential bits of current and contemporary craftsmanship is specifically noteworthy. Furthermore, albeit poly-

meric materials have been utilized by specialists for the acknowledgment of the two works of art and models (counting arrangement and establishment craftsmanship), for the most part the later fine arts are corrupting quicker than had been normal. This is potentially because of the regular utilization of business materials created for applications and purposes far unique in relation to those implied by the craftsman, more focused on the tasteful rendering than on the toughness of the work of plastic art. Amid the most recent two decades conservators and material researchers began to concentrate on the degree of debasement of plastics in accumulations and the components causing their breakdown. Inside the perplexing synthesis of works of art, regardless of whether painting, model, collection or establishment, diagnostic strategies permit not just the recognizable proof of the principle parts just as added substances, yet in addition investigation of the wonders that happen at the interface between constituent materials and condition, consequently revealing and prompting comprehension of the changes endured amid maturing (McCormick, 2017). A few investigations on the strength of engineered varnishes and restricting media utilized by contemporary craftsmen or conservators might be found in particular writing, in which distinctive techniques. Conversely, just a couple examinations managing the weakening of mechanical plastics or other manufactured segments utilized for models, in its more extensive sense, have been accounted for up until now, typically centred around the investigation of the decay of a particular masterpiece, considered as a contextual analysis (Lazzari, et. al, 2011).

Santayana's Critique

The proposal that Santayana was unfit to affirm of the plastic arts, in light of the fact that

such endorsement would have incited irregularity in his rational idea what's more, framework, is maybe the main time it has been suggested that he was ever genuinely worried about consistency. Without a doubt, Santayana has frequently been seriously reprimanded for his absence of consistency; and however a lot of such analysis is either barely or erroneously established, it appears to be in reality considerably more just to the soul of his logic than the proposal that he could, and did, in the enthusiasm of consistency, convey badly established decisions and doubt to that territory of experience, the arts, which exemplified all around plainly to him a standout amongst the most positive estimations of human presence and attempt (Carrier, 2018).



Ghosts of Consumption (for Piet M.) 2011

It is valid, obviously, that Santayana often utilized the expression “art” in the broadest sense, after the way of the Greeks’ utilization of “techno,” to allude to the application of the techniques for reason and accomplishment of perfection in whatever activities man draws in; and absolutely convention and custom, if nothing increasingly normal what’s more, necessary to the different bearings of human action, render this utilization a real one. Nonetheless, this isn’t at all to state that Santayana thus disregarded the customary “plastic arts” or neglected to value their one of a kind qualities furthermore, capacities.

It is genuine likewise that Santayana proved unable, and did not, affirm of all that claims the name “art,” or “plastic art,” even as he did not affirm of all that goes for reason, science, ethical quality, and religion. In reality, there

is a sense in which Santayana doubted the cases of all the different zones of understanding, and certainly all cases to trustworthiness and pre-distinction. He was by personality a cynic, and here and there a lofty and solid one. In any case, on the off chance that he had brutal words to state about artists, and particularly the plastic arts, it was not in a general sense since he questioned their appropriate and most astounding capacities, but instead in light of the fact that he seen that the arts are often abused as methods of affectation or fraud and as ways to get out instead of as achievements of the individual life. The arts, he recommended, as different orders might be swung to short-extend, pointless, furthermore, baffling purposes. Thus, Santayana's essential qualification is not, as a scholar proposes, between sane art and plastic art, for balanced art incorporates plastic art. He does, be that as it may, recognize the fundamental and discretionary arts, or among modern and liberal (Carrier, 2018).



Beach: A Book of Treasure, Josie Iselin. 2013

There are two headings in which it appears to be fitting that plastic art ought to continue, on the premise which a restricted encounter can give it. Art may come to support a particular type of life, or it might come to express it. All that we call industry, science, business, profound quality, supports our life; it educates us about our conditions and changes us to them; it prepares us forever; it spreads out the ground for the diversion we are to play. This fundamental work, however, need not be servile. To do it is additionally to practice our resources; and in that activity our resources may develop free, - as the creative energy of Lucretius, in following the course of the molecules, moves and takes off generally amicably. One augmentation of art at that point would be in the direction of doing artistically, blissfully, thoughtfully, whatever we need to do (McCormick, 2017).

There is a second type of sound art, that of communicating the perfect towards which we would move under those improved conditions. For as we respond we show an internal principle, communicated in that response. We have a nature that chooses its own heading, and the course in which viable arts will change the world. The external life is for the internal; discipline is for opportunity, and victory for presence of mind (Lazzari, et. al, 2011).

This internal life is brilliantly excess; there is, in particular, especially more in it than a consciousness of those demonstrations by which the body modifies itself to its surroundings and each sense has its self-assertive quality, every language its discretionary musicality and prosody; each amusement has its inventive laws, each spirit its very own delicate resonations and mystery dreams (Santayana, 1955). Life has a edge of play which may become more extensive, if the continuing core were all the more solidly established on the planet. To the art of functioning admirably an acculturated race would include the art of playing well. To play with nature and make it brightening, to play with the hints of life and make them awesome, is a kind of art. It is a definitive, the most artistic kind of art, yet it will never be drilled effectively insofar as the other kind of art is in a retrogressive state; for on the off chance that we don't have the foggiest idea about our condition, we will confuse our fantasies with a part of it, thus ruin our science by making it phenomenal, and our fantasies by making them obligatory. Santayana likewise some of the time alluded to this refinement as between the material what is more, otherworldly arts, the monetary and human sciences, and the mechanical and plastic arts (Carrier, 2018; Sprigge, 2012).



Tien Pirot (2017)

The plastic arts, at that point, are discretionary, otherworldly, and liberal, just as judicious, insofar as their training and creations do not straightforwardly influence the material conditions or on the other hand term of man's life, however serve to free his resources from the weight of necessary works and carry with them an enjoyment that is absolutely characteristic and non-instrumental. In any case, as showed in the statement over, their discretionary, profound, and liberal status upgrades as opposed to reduces their esteem. Santayana additionally recognized reasonable art from aestheticism, not on the grounds that aestheticism is a type of art, but since it often results in a depravity of plastic art (Lazzari, et. al, 2011).



Khalil Chishtee (2018)

“Aestheticism,” said Santayana, “is a refined arousing quality, the endowment of finding an prompt delight in the obvious.” The person of good taste, he proceeded, “is basically a novice, a beautiful soul listening as opposed to making (Santayana, 1955). Be that as it may, in the cutting edge world, where no one knows where he has a place, it has jumped out at him to act like an artist.... He would become flushed to admit himself a unimportant person of good taste becoming tended to and not to serve; he wishes to demonstrate that he has an open function, and to legitimize his reality by doing some work, regardless of how terrible or unnecessary. For a devotee about erotic beauty, he proposed, is not really more to be lauded than different devotees. It is the capacity of art, Santayana accepted, to decipher

and transmute all the essential parts of life, and not just to increment and strengthen the exotic delights. The artist must serve the comprehension and instinct just as the sensibility; he should know about the profundity of human conventions, expectations, and issues. In any case, “The connoisseur furnished with his self-important reasonableness and transcendental opportunity, meddles into the workshop of the plastic arts with his nose noticeable all around; yet he remains a beginner in his art, plays a round of feign with the barlic (a diversion which for a period is often fruitful), yet diminishes and before long evaporates from the scene in result of his characteristic vacuity.” Thus, Santayana in no way, shape or form distinguishes the plastic artist with the person of good taste, what is more, his analysis of aestheticism is in no regard an analysis of plastic art or the energy about plastic art (McCormick, 2017).

Santayana, be that as it may, is not as unsympathetic to the stylish experience as the abovementioned, removed from the setting of his all out work, may propose. In *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*, one of his most punctual distributed works, he expressed (Sprigge, 2012). The tasteful frame of mind is not the good, yet it is not thus ill-conceived. It gives us refreshment and a preview of that ideal adjustment of things to our resources and of our resources to things which, might it be able to reach out to all aspects of experience, would establish the perfect life (Richards, 2018). And he had effectively composed, that “On the off chance that we endeavour to expel from life every one of its shades of malice, as the prevalent creative energy has done now and again, we will discover little however stylish joy staying to establish unalloyed joy. Indeed, even the learning of truth, which the calmest scholars made the substance of the rapturous vision, is a stylish pleasure; for when truth has no further handy utility, it turns into a scene. The joy of it is creative and the estimation of it stylish.” Furthermore, the accompanying, from a similar plastic artwork, appears to be prominently adequate to show that if Santayana doubted the plastic arts and feel as territories of experience, no other component or method of human undertaking could incite an equivalent gauge of worth: “To feel beauty,” he expressed, “is a superior thing than to see how we come to feel it, to have creative energy and taste, to cherish the best, to be conveyed by the examination of nature to a distinctive confidence in the perfect, this is more, significantly more, than any science can want to be.” And in case this be considered trademark just of the prior works of Santayana (Santayana, 1955), it ought to be seen that a lot later he proposed that the ethical weight

of verse, which he for a long time thought about important to the most astounding beautiful plastic art, is extremely unnecessary, and that there is esteem enough in "negligible beauty and believing and music and cloud frolic" (Carrier, 2018).

Swinging to the particular issues which, show that Santayana questioned the plastic arts, it is maybe most astounding to be educated that one reason plastic art was unsuitable to Santayana is the way that plastic art is "an estimation of the creative ability." Apparently many trust that there is a hopeless clash between the level-headed and the innovative, and reasons that if plastic art is to have a sane capacity, as Santayana demands it must, it cannot likewise be innovative. Santayana, be that as it may, saw no contention between the discerning and the inventive resources, however observed them rather as supplements of one another. In reality, on numerous occasions he brought up the crucial capacity of the creative energy as the wellspring of theories in science and of every single reasonable perfect as communicated in art and religion. Moreover, Santayana often communicated his own inclination for the creative side of life plainly (McCormick, 2017). He composed that "except if human instinct endures an unfathomable change, the boss scholarly and tasteful estimation of our thoughts will dependably originate from the inventive activity of the imagination." Again, he tended to himself legitimately to the thought that the creative energy is awful, and reaffirmed his own conviction that crafted by creative energy are great, they alone are great; and the rest-the entire genuine world-is powder in the mouth (Richards, 2018). In a similar paper he voiced his general conflict with William James by taking note of that James' "pictorial cosmology had the burden of nullifying the human creative energy, with all the tenderness and verse of its creature status." In the main volume of his life account, *Persons and Places*, he checked on his overarching frame of mind toward life in these terms: "As per my energetic heart, presence was profoundly monstrous and off-base. The wonderful remained imaginary... That the genuine was spoiled and just the nonexistent at all intriguing appeared to me axiomatic.... My theory has never showed signs of change." In his most philosophical work he proposed that the creative ability is the workforce which contributes most imperatively to all (Lazzari, et. al, 2011).

Regardless of whether one concurs with this record and gauge of the creative ability and its works, there is literally nothing in Santayana's express explanations concerning its value to substantiate the suggestion that he

doubted the plastic arts since they are creative. To be sure, the esteem, of creative art, however of life itself, as per Santayana is really indivisible from the vistas and qualities which are creative. Obviously, he perceived the conceivable threats of creative ability, and stated, If the creative ability simply estranges us from the real world, without giving us either a model for its revision or a look into its structure, it turns into a shelter of wonderful self-centeredness. Such self-centeredness is fruitless (Santayana, 1955). He cautioned moreover about the threat of confusing the fanciful with what is genuine in an increasingly significant way. Yet, he additionally stressed that one does not stay away from these threats by denying the presence or worth of the creative ability; they are maintained a strategic distance from just by perceiving the creative ability for what it is. No less incorrect than the thought that Santayana couldn't esteem the plastic arts since they are inventive is the proposal that "Santayana's view is veritably a financial specialist's perspective on plastic art." Again I speculate that this end depends on a mistaken elucidation of Santayana's power. Since he was a self-admitted realist in the sense that he was persuaded that whatever is has its network in, and is indistinguishable from, that "profound richness and murkiness" called matter-it may be finished up by one not a nearby understudy of his felt that he could esteem just material products. Positively this appears the main conceivable establishment for the proposal. In any case, the basic component of Santayana's idea in this regard was the Aristotelian saying that everything perfect has a characteristic (material) premise while everything regular (material) has a perfect improvement (Carrier, 2018).



Yet, Santayana was not under any condition a realist in the sense that he looked for and prized material presence and riches regardless of anything else. Nonetheless, he was in no way, shape or form in diverse to monetary security; for he felt that one is allowed to develop the more prominent qualities just when the material establishments of life are relative. Even more essentially, so far as the topic of his perspective on plastic art in connection to financial aspects is concerned. Powers that design is an in a general sense monetary art and more overwhelmed than some other by its materials, its expenses, and its commonsense employments. However its boast perfect works of plastic art have been dependably sanctuaries and royal residences, triumphal doors and fantastic tombs: buildings that a pessimist may articulate shockingly pointless (McCormick, 2017).

Furthermore, however Santayana was ever a cynic, he was excessively human, thoughtful, and humble to be a pessimist. He was not, maybe, as not interested in financial issues just like the stereotyped artist; he perceived the significance and multifaceted nature of both financial matters and man's undertakings in the arts. In any case, he most clearly did in no measure envision or serve the thought that plastic art is, with the exception of maybe by chance, of financial inception, assurance, or intrigue (Richards, 2018). Obviously, he often utilized "economy" in reference to the arts, just as to science, religion, and logic; however he was not alluding to an economy barely imagined or concerned just with material merchandise; the economy of which the arts are parts is somewhat the all out request or association of being, the heavenly economy, of both the material and unimportant a request which would give a legitimate and useful spot for every single human need and interests. To incorporate the plastic arts in human economy, at that point, is essentially a method for demanding that the plastic arts are not the entire of life but rather should exist agreeably as parts of a totality where due thought is offered additionally to science, religion, and the material needs of man (Sprigge, 2012). Joy and human advancement are not achieved or estimated by labour or domain or material belongings, however by the extent of its vitality which is dedicated to free and liberal interests, to the decoration of life and the way of life of the creative ability. For it is in the unconstrained play of his resources that man gets himself and his bliss (Santayana, 1955).

Anyway it is contended that Santayana likewise questioned the plastic arts since they have no ethical duty. It is valid, obviously, that Santayana was

a moralist, and that he looked for good qualities, normal or profound, in every aspect of experience; today is likewise evident that the recommendation that the expressive arts are flippant, or non-moral, is generally acknowledged and safeguarded. Nonetheless, it is not valid that Santayana felt that the expressive arts are without good qualities or responsibilities. In reality, as showed prior in this article, Santayana did not prevent the ethical incentive from claiming aestheticism, in spite of the fact that he proposed that the person of good taste, be reason for the restrictions of his advantage, misses more than he ever finds in the method for good satisfaction and esteem. The truth of the matter is that for Santayana the ethical estimation of the plastic arts is their main case to worth; obviously, the expressive arts contribute pretty much nothing or nothing to characteristic profound quality, to the disclosure and proliferation of codes or measures of direct which are intended to empower man to dodge the most genuine perils of living (Parmington, 2018).



Jeff Koons (1994)

Therefore, for Santayana, any great which is not material has a place with the domain of good qualities, and any great which does not serve some

further end-which does not demonstrate a peril to be evaded or bring an expansion of material advantages is an otherworldly decent. The arts, at that point, are moral products second to none. For sure, Santayana asserted this over and over. In *Reason in Art*, for instance, he stated, "That art is by all appearances and itself a decent cannot be questioned." And his endorsement of the plastic arts appear to be inadequate when he composed that "an ethical quality sorted out about the human heart in a straightforward and true style would include each plastic art and would render the world inescapably lovely. Or on the other hand, the central import of Santayana's theory is that "the joined ability and opportunity, in a word, the innovativeness of art, would, if manifest in every one of the endeavours of men, be the principle of their ethical quality." So it appears that the main point right which may have fittingly made in such manner is that in spite of the fact that art (as he gets it) can't be truly condemned on good grounds, Santayana in any case demanded that where such analysis is wrong, there is no huge art. The vital inquiry there, be that as it may, isn't whether Santayana questioned the plastic arts since they need moral duties (for he was certain of the ethical criticalness and weight of the arts), however whether art is really autonomous of the good, and Santayana's decisions thusly poorly established. Santayana may, obviously, have been mixed up; it might definitely be the situation that ethical decisions are unessential so far as gems are concerned. Be that as it may, it is vital, all things considered, to demonstrate precisely what Santayana's position was. Also, Santayana was persuaded that insofar as the plastic arts add to or bring down the quest for joy they should be judged ethically (Sprigge, 2012). For Joy is the main approval of life; where joy comes up short, presence remains a frantic and deplorable analysis. The setting in which Santayana proposes that ethical decisions of plastic art are through and through suitable and essential is one which guarantees that bliss is the best great, and that joy is accomplished just when every single human intrigue are agreeably related, with the goal that no intrigue or enthusiasm disappoints or scourges another. "The rule that all establishments ought to sub serve bliss," he expressed, "runs further than any religion for art and establishes the framework on which the last may rest securely." Or with an alternate accentuation: "To be beguiled isn't to be spared; however every one of the performers and people of good taste on the planet ought to articulate it to be so (Parmington, 2018).

In any case, such articulations are not just formal and void structures which titillate the senses; they are somewhat acknowledgments and festivities of

human puzzlement and goal, of expectation and despondency; art is the remark by which soul, snared with the requests of the fragile living creature and tormented by the defects of the world, reclaims its own life from vanity and accommodates itself to its impediments and sufferings. For Santayana, if plastic art is not moral, it is neither superb nor meaningful. However, second, the plastic arts are just parts of the totality of life, and whatever they are and do must, in this way, be reliable with the complex of conditions which makes life conceivable and agreeable. Santayana notes in *Reason in Art*, as he did in *The Sense of Beauty*, that often happen upon wonders that need to be relinquished, as we happen upon occasions and commonsense necessities without number that are genuinely deplorable. Also, the plastic arts, and the tasteful experience, are not treated more seriously than different components of life. Each drive, not the stylish state of mind alone, is blameless and flippant in its beginning and valuable in its claim eyes; however every drive or guilty pleasure, including the stylish, is malevolent in its impact, when it renders congruity inconceivable in the general tenor of life, or creates in the spirit division and ruin. Also, it is just by methods for a reasonable good theory that one may figure out which interests, and delights, might be admirably reviled. In the event that man's life were not expose to risks to appetite, presentation, and unnumbered diversions and irreconcilable circumstances which confound and upset the soul or if the soul could accomplish impeccable opportunity, no ethical necessities, no negative instructions, would force themselves on him, and no shades of malice would come to torment the blamelessness and enjoyment of recognition and extravagant regardless of how irregular and reckless. Be that as it may, on the planet all things considered, where the soul is limited and indivisible from the substance, and the tissue defective, The plastic arts are huge instruments in the domain of issue, that appear to serve the soul straightforwardly, apart from utility or truth; yet even they convey a monstrous heap of impedimenta. All the specialized, logical, authentic, social, nearby and worldly side of art has nothing to state to the soul about the Good. Best case scenario, the ground may accordingly be cleared for a free otherworldly life, which will start where those diversions end. This does not mean where they end generally, for they can never end while life in this world proceeds. I mean where they finish ethically and temporarily what is more, yield their profound natural products.

Nevertheless, magnificence, in art or throughout everyday life, Santayana accepted, is indistinguishable from ability, even as the value of what-

ever is done cannot be separated from the way of execution. Moreover, he was against the utilization of any basis in judgment of masterpieces which would bar thought of certain components for other people. An insightful commentator must look impartially to beauty, appropriateness, trouble, innovation, truth, and good importance in the work he judges. Santayana saw no contention between the interest for uncommon capacity, or specialized proficiency, and the rule that in the analysis of plastic art, specialized proficiency, and brilliancy of extravagant or execution, can't benefit to build up an incredible notoriety. They may astonish for a minute, yet they can't pardon an artist from the need of having an essential topic and a normal mankind (Parmington, 2018).

Conclusion

In short, Along these lines, as per Santayana, in spite of the fact that the arts try to be free of good duties, to disregard handy outcomes and to thoroughly enjoy the unadulterated promptness of picture and sound and thought, life is in truth to such an extent that this perfect is both outlandish and unsafe to endeavour; for it disregards the intricate pluralism of human life, what is more, confounds a solitary decent with the all out great. It is not at all important, nonetheless, that art ought to adjust to a previous sane creed. In fact, this, as well, is unsafe. For the states of life, just as the interests of the spirits. are both different and changeable; however it is fundamental, if bliss is esteemed by any means, that one's enthusiasm for and commitment to the arts be squared with whatever conditions in actuality win. To censure art on good grounds is to pay it a high compliment by accepting that it means to be satisfactory, and is routed to a far reaching mind. The main way art could deny such analysis is challenge its unreliable early stages, and concede that it was a pretty much genial in people, and not art at all.

It is proposed, at last, that Santayana doubted the expressive arts since they are pointless in his origination of the phases of modern and liberal art, what is more, since they speak to a detached and untrustworthy motivation that would not coordinate amicably with different driving forces in a fair perfect program for activity in living. Enough has been demonstrated above with respect to Santayana's thoughts of the connection among mechanical and liberal art, and of the spot of plastic art in the human economy, to render apparent the misguided judgments on which these announcements are based.

References

- Carrier, D. (2018). *Aesthetic Theory, Abstract Art, and Lawrence Carroll*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Lazzari, M., Ledo-Suárez, A., López, T., Scaroni, D., & López-Quintela, M. A. (2011). Plastic matters: an analytical procedure to evaluate the degradability of contemporary works of art. *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry*, 399(9), 2939-2948.
- McCormick, J. (2017). *George Santayana: A Biography*. Routledge.
- Parmington, J. (2018). Products of reflection: a practice that discloses the design potential of circumstantial phenomena.
- Richards, S. (2018). “The Moving Image of Eternity”: Idealism, Incompleteness, and the Ise Jingū. *Philosophy East and West*, 68(3), 802-825.
- Santayana, G. (1955). *The sense of beauty: Being the outline of aesthetic theory* (Vol. 238). Courier Corporation.
- Sprigge, T. L. (2012). *Santayana*. Routledge.



**UNIVERSIDAD
DEL ZULIA**

opción

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 35, N° 88, (2019)

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.
Maracaibo - Venezuela

www.luz.edu.ve

www.serbi.luz.edu.ve

produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve