

JÈSSICA JAQUES  
**THE MAIN ISSUES  
ON GUSTATORY AESTHETICS**

This article presents the main issues on gustatory aesthetics, a field which appeared recently in the academic programs. As shown in the first part, gustatory aesthetics is about the non-metaphorical use of taste. The second part is dedicated to issues that define this discipline at the present time: its involvement with gustatory practices; the creation of a radically expanding space for disinterestedness, creativity, freedom and imagination; the artfied strategies for gustatory embodied meanings; the radical demand for narrative; the development of research in a medialab spirit. The article ends with the consideration of this new field as a privileged ground for revolutionizing old academic syllabuses.<sup>1</sup>

### **1. Gustatory Aesthetics: A Discourse on the Non-Metaphorical Use of Taste**

Gustatory aesthetics is the aesthetic discourse dedicated to the non-metaphorical use of the notion of taste. I rightly say “notion” and not “term” because the English language, in order to point to this non-metaphorical use, replaces the term taste with gustatory, changing the noun for an adjective. This adjective differs from gustative, as the latter was originally used for medical purposes.

The term gustatory originates in the Latin term *gustare*, coined in the period of empiricist philosophy towards the end of the seventeenth century. The term gustative was adopted at the beginning of the same century, whereas taste has been traced in English from the end of thirteenth century. Taste is etymologically linked to the French term *toucher* and to the English word *touch*. The adoption of gustatory was probably driven by a desire to stress the physicality of the term, thus explaining its adjectivized

---

<sup>1</sup>This article was made possible thanks to the support of the *Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad* to the research project FFI2012-32614: *Aesthetic Experience and Artistic Research: Cognitive Production in Contemporary Art*. In it, I develop some of the ideas I propose in Jaques 2014.

form. However, this adjective has only become a part of the aesthetic vocabulary and aesthetic arguments very recently. This is the case despite the fact that Voltaire had already pointed out the distinction and correlation between the non-metaphorical and the metaphorical use of taste in 1757, when he drafted the entry for *goût* in Diderot and D'Alembert's *Encyclopédie*:

This sense [some lines later termed 'sensual taste' (*goût sensuel*)], this capacity for discriminating between different foods, has given rise, in all known languages, to the metaphorical word 'taste' [some lines later termed 'intellectual taste' (*goût intellectuel*)] to designate the discernment of beauty and flaws in all the arts. It discriminates as quickly as the tongue and the palate, and like physical taste it anticipates reflection (D'Alembert and Diderot, 2003).

Both kinds of taste were considered capacities of discernment that anticipate reflection; both were bound by "a great resemblance", as Hume stated in *Of the Standard of Taste* (Hume 2001), written in the same year as Voltaire's entry on taste. The recognition of this resemblance enhanced the metaphorical use of "intellectual taste" as well as the awareness of the enormous cognitive potential underlying "sensual taste", implicitly suggesting the coincidence between the etymology of *savoir* (*flavor*; in latin: *sapor -oris*, coming from the substantive of *sapere*) and that of *savoir* (to know; also stemming from *sapere*).

These proposals had to overcome Kant's philosophical disappointments with the non-metaphorical use of taste in his *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (1790), and had to wait for their democratization. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, *gustatory taste* was democratized in restaurants as artistic taste was democratized in museums and salons. It was during that time that it found its own discourse. In 1826, French gastronome Jean-Anthelme Brillat-Savarin published in Paris *Physiologie du Goût, ou méditations de gastronomie transcendante* (*The Physiology of Taste, or Meditations on Transcendental Gastronomy*). With the inclusion of the adjective *transcendante* (wrongly translated as "transcendental") in his title, Brillat-Savarin was pointing at his antagonist; "meditations on transcendental gastronomy" were to give rise to gustatory taste as a reflective faculty in response to Kant's arguments. But Brillat-Savarin's physiological and philosophical efforts did not immediately bear fruit. Gustatory aesthetics had to wait over a century and a half, until Carolyn Korsmeyer's *Making Sense of Taste: Taste, Food and Philosophy* (1999), to achieve philosophical and academic stature. Korsmeyer's work opened an inquiry to establish a vocabulary and proper arguments for gustatory aesthetics in the search of a kind of reason, of a way of worldmaking that, following Michel Onfray, can be termed as the gourmand reason (*la*

*raison gourmande*);<sup>2</sup> I prefer to call it the *gustatory reason*. Gustatory reason should be understood as a kind of understanding of the world that depends on our aesthetic relation to food and gastronomy and poses new challenges to the old term *taste*.

Nowadays gustatory aesthetics is a flourishing academic field established in academia in the ensemble called *Food Studies* (emerging in the 1990s), which hosts food-related studies generally stemming from Anthropology, Cultural Studies, Design, Fine Arts, History, History of Art, Philosophy, Chemistry, Food Science Departments or the courses belonging to Culinary Schools, like the Università degli Studi di Scienze Gastronomiche (in Bra, Piemonte)<sup>3</sup> or the course Science & Cooking in Harvard's School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.<sup>4</sup>

Gustatory aesthetics can be included in Philosophy of Food which, apart from the strictly gustatory aspects, involves ethical concerns related to nourishment and sustenance as well as scarcity and provision; it addresses hunger and eating disorders, vegetarianism, dietary choices and their cultural frameworks, conviviality and community; it is also concerned with food and cooking as a new and powerful institution that includes firms, tourism, technology, science, and art. Usually, the keystone of philosophy of food is to focus on food and gastronomy as symbolic forms<sup>5</sup> in a way similar to how arts and sciences have been considered, following the tradition of Ernst Cassirer, Erwin Panofsky, Fritz Saxl, Aby Warburg, and Nelson Goodman.

In 2013-2014, *gustatory aesthetics* was introduced for the first time in an Undergraduate and Master Degree title within the European Higher Education Area.<sup>6</sup> Professor Gerard Vilar and I imparted the subject in the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, and now it is part of the syllabus of the Department of Philosophy and one of the focuses of our research.

The main issues which gustatory aesthetics supplies us with, are the renovation of terminology and argumentation in traditional aesthetics. The *leitmotiv* which founds and allows this renovation is that, in my view, we are living in *gustatory times*: gustatory practices, especially gastronomic ones, pervade the everyday and more surprisingly, the academies and the art centers, but also the street, the television, ICTs and festivals, communities developing either new profiles (like *food tech tribes*) or those that have

---

<sup>2</sup> See Onfray 1995. The following texts have also designed the statement of gustatory aesthetics: Gigante 2005; Graw et al. 2009; Jaques and Vilar 2012; Kuehn 2005. The main text of gustatory aesthetics is Korsmeyer 1999. I will refer latter to it. See also Korsmeyer 2001.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.unisg.it>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.seas.harvard.edu/cooking>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>5</sup> See for example Douglas 1982. See also Allhoff and Monroe 2007; Curtin and Heldke 1998; Hamilton and Todolí 2009; Kaplan 2012; Telfer 1996.

<sup>6</sup> See <http://www.uab.cat/guiesdocents/2014-15/g100281t2500246a2014-15iCAT.pdf> and <http://eina.cat/en/postgraus/master-oficial-eees-master-universitari-de-recerca-en-art-i-disseny>, accessed April 20, 2015.

been around forever but have developed new communicative possibilities and tools (like the *slow food movement*);<sup>7</sup> gustatory practices even generate new professions, such as food designer.<sup>8</sup>

## 2. Main Issues on Gustatory Aesthetics

### 2.1 The Involvement with Gustatory Practices

Gustatory aesthetics is to food and gastronomy what aesthetics is to the arts, and I could also say that gustatory aesthetics has a deeper involvement with aesthetic practices than traditional aesthetics does. Four practices are in close relationship to gustatory argumentation, and they can be called gustatory practices for the sake of argument. They emerged successively and can be termed food art,<sup>9</sup> edible art, research cooking, and revolutionary cooking. Food art and edible art deal with the artistic status of food and the use of food as an artistic medium, whereas research and revolutionary cooking have to do with gustatory practices that are in close relationship with the arts but keep some degree of autonomy.

Despite having been identified only recently, food art has existed since the beginning of civilization. The term characterizes those artistic practices whose principal material and symbolic referent is food, including its processes of production and rituals of consumption. Food art deals either with the representation of food (as for example in some ancient Egyptian paintings or Dutch still lifes) or with food as a medium; Gordon Matta-Clark, Daniel Spoerri, Allen Ruppertsberg, Antoni Miralda,<sup>10</sup> and Jana Starbak, are the most representative contemporary artists of food art. Many others – from Paul McCarthy to Marina Abramovich, Wim Delvoye, and Carsten Höller – have worked on this topic with certain regularity, and others have done so occasionally, as is the case of Marta Rosler and Hannah Collins. Going beyond these already canonical projects, one can find today fascinating collaborative ones, usually coming from what has been called foodtech art.<sup>11</sup> These kinds of projects are normally activist and anti-disciplinary, and are generally performed by a community of creative people coming from different places: artists trying to go beyond art, biologists trying to go beyond biology, environmentalists, cooks and curators trying to overcome their usual work.

<sup>7</sup><http://www.slowfood.com/>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>8</sup><https://foodforfuture.wordpress.com/tag/>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>9</sup>See Hozhey et al. 2009.

<sup>10</sup> Miralda's project in Barcelona *Foodcultura* can be considered nowadays the main center of the meeting between food and contemporary art, <http://www.foodcultura.org/en/portfolio/>, accessed on April 20, 2015. See also the center *La Cuisine. Centre d'Art et Design* from the French village Nègrépelisse <http://www.la-cuisine.fr/>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>11</sup>See Dolejšová 2014.

Edible art, which emerged in the 1960s, is a specialization within food art. As the term indicates, it is a kind of art that can be eaten and not just contemplated. This is the case, for example, with some of Joseph Beuys', Antoni Miralda's, Lili Fischer's or Rikrit Tiravanija's performances,<sup>12</sup> with Christine Bernhard's installations, Michel Blazy's sculptures, and John Bock's videos. What should more seriously be called edible art is, however, that which has been or is produced in some restaurants or collaborative edible tech art projects where the procedures and appearances of the meals are artfied, which means that they are given the productive, receptive, and institutional or anti-institutional procedures of works of art. One can consider here the peculiar and artfied experience of food which was developed in Gordon Matta-Clark's Food restaurant (NY), or in Antoni Miralda's and Montse Guillen's International (NY), or in Daniel Spoerri's Spoerri (Düsseldorf). Among collaborative anti-institutional projects (as Matta-Clark's was), one can refer for example to the vegan food-hacking project HotKarot & OpenSauce.<sup>13</sup>

Research cooking can be defined as a twenty-first century practice that inherits all the creative impulse and innovation of twentieth-century avant-garde cooking, from nouvelle cuisine to the so-called molecular cooking and techno-emotional cooking. The term research cooking is analogue to the contemporary debates about artistic research and points to the increasing intersection between cooking and arts and between creativity and research.

Research cooking has seven distinctive features:

1. Self-awareness as a symbolic form i.e. as a physical place for thought and knowledge, in the same way as a picture is a physical place for reflection;
2. Emphasis on the receptive moment (community of diners) as a continuation of the creative process;
3. Development of mutual influences between creativity and research;
4. Appropriation of certain ways of artistic, scientific, and technological research, due to the assumption of eventual collapses of creativity in cooking;
5. Consideration of sophisticated technology as a privileged means but not as an end-in-itself;
6. Tendency to artification: increasing awareness of sharing artistic beliefs. Thus, research cooking understands itself as a mode of communication similar to art, including ways of reference such as imitation, expression, quotation, metaphor, and even humour and paradox;
7. Networking among chefs or cooks and with other professionals (scientists, designers, artists, philosophers) in a medialab spirit.

---

<sup>12</sup> See Tiravanija 2010.

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.hotkarot.cz>, accessed April 20, 2015.

When research cooking achieves a paradigm shift, it can also be formulated as revolutionary cooking. In this case, three features should be added:

8. Involvement in the narrative of its own history and creative process, by revisiting and inquiring archives, recipes, and critics in order to point out the essential moments of the paradigm shift;

9. Expansion beyond the restaurant as an institution to reach the public sphere, with books, catalogues, conferences, and, especially, through the internet and social networks, a feature that can be designated as post-institutional expansion;

10. Assertive social engagement.

Some of the pioneer chefs in research cooking and, in some cases, in revolutionary cooking are: Gastón Acurio (*Astrid & Gastón*, Peru), Ferran Adrià (*elBulli & elBulliFoundation*, Catalunya), Andoni Aduriz (*Mugaritz*, Spain), the team of *Biko restaurant* (Mexico), Heston Blumenthal (*The Fat Duck*, England), Massimo Bottura (*Osteria Francescana*, Italy), Grant Achatz (*Alinea*, Chicago), Michel and Sébastien Bras (*Bras*, France), René Redzepi (*Noma*, Denmark), Joan Roca (*El Celler de Can Roca*, Catalunya), and Seiji Yamamoto (*Nihonryori RyuGin*, Japan). In the field of collaborative projects, one can find clear examples of research cooking, for example, in the Center of Genomic Gastronomy.<sup>14</sup>

Food art, edible art, research cooking, and revolutionary cooking are currently topics of deep interest to artistic institutions in an effort to explore new fields of artiness. One of the main events of this inquiry was the participation in 2007 of the restaurant *elBulli* in *Documenta XII*, in Kassel, as Pavilion G. This pavilion was 664 miles away from *elBulli's* location in Roses. The four gustatory practices are also topics of deep interest to “artivistic” curatorial projects, like Amanda McDonald Crowley's *ArtTechFood*.<sup>15</sup>

## 2.2. A Radically Expanding Place for Disinterestedness, Creativity, Freedom and Imagination

Disinterestedness has been since the “First Moment” of Kant's *Critique of the Power of Judgment* the key concept in the qualitative definition of beauty and of the faculty to discern it, that is, metaphorical taste. Gustatory aesthetics refers to it as a key concept. But, how to be disinterested towards an aesthetic object that also serves nourishing functions?<sup>16</sup> Obviously, this is a burning subject in times of precariousness and of economic crisis, opening the way to initiatives such as *Go Halfsies*<sup>17</sup> or to an utmost

<sup>14</sup><http://genomicgastronomy.com/work/dinners/artmeatflesh-3>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>15</sup><http://www.scoop.it/t/arttechfood>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>16</sup>See Sweeney 2012.

<sup>17</sup><http://gohalfsies.com/>, accessed April 20, 2015.

willingness to maintain the quality of what we eat and also of the non-metaphoric taste in a survival economy.<sup>18</sup> At the same time, we should not doubt that this search for pleasure or for certain types of exertion of non-metaphorical sense of taste – either in the *cucina della Nonna* or in everyday food, in avant-garde restaurants, activist performances, music and gastronomy festivals or wherever – is a product of Western opulence and of certain Eastern opulences as well (Japan, China), and it is currently expanding to economically emerging territories (Peru, Mexico, Vietnam, India); most definitely, in territories where culinary creativity can be carried out beyond the imperative of strict survival.

Cuisine is usually the chosen term to point to all gustatory practices that expand in both directions from the everyday to research cooking and revolutionary cooking, with the common peculiarity of being elaborated beyond merely alimentary needs. In this concern, cuisine reveals itself as a radical field in which the aesthetic discourse can generate arguments that defend disinterestedness as the main attitude for a proper exercise of taste (Gigante, 2005), whether metaphorical or non-metaphorical. The same gap between nourishment and cuisine exists, in Kantian terms, between necessity and freedom in regards to disinterestedness. Thus, in Kant's argumentation, freedom is the state of mind of disinterestedness, of creativity beyond vital urgencies, and of imagination. As a matter of fact, the free play between imagination and understanding announced by Kant is, in spite of his own conceptions, more genuine in cuisine than anywhere else, as pointed out by futurists in their manifest *La cucina futurista* (1930, from Filippo Tommaso Marinetti and Luigi Columbo, aka *Fillia*) and as carried out by the same authors in the *Taverna del Santopalato* (Milan, 1930).

In short: dealing essentially with gustatory appreciative faculties –taste, touch, and smell; and all the three together in a synaesthetic confluence which is the ensemble called *flavour*–, cuisine allows to exercise a kind of imagination that emancipates itself from (viewed) images and emphasizes the etymology of *Einbildungskraft* (the German word for imagination), which connotes construction, upbringing, and culture.

### 2.3. Gustatory Embodied Meanings. Some Artified Strategies

Carolyn Korsmeyer's *Making Sense of Taste: Taste, Food and Philosophy* (1999) explores, especially in its third chapter: "The Meaning of Taste and the Taste of Meaning," the philosophical challenge of what it means to build meaning without the hegemony of vision and from what in occidental tradition has been considered as "lower senses."

Certainly, although tongue and palate are speech organs, the philosophical tradition, bound in different degrees by Neo-Platonism, anti-hedonism, and

---

<sup>18</sup><http://flavourcrusader.com/blog/>, accessed April 20, 2015.

intellectualism, has detached them from logos and has redefined the senses they entail: taste, smell, and touch, as “lower (cognitive) senses,” which are opposed to the “higher,” primarily sight and, secondarily, hearing.<sup>19</sup> Divergently, gustatory aesthetics argues for the convergence of taste, smell, and touch in the synaesthetic faculty of discernment that is the gustatory taste, which is a synonym of the capacity of flavour.

This faculty aims to reformulate the old correlations between subjectivity and objectivity as well as between memory and imagination in aesthetic judgments in a refreshing way, in order to go beyond the saying “De gustibus non est disputandum.”

On one hand, gustatory taste refers not only to subjectivity but to the inner sense. Thus, the main organs of gustatory taste: tongue, palate, and olfactory sense, are not on our face but in our insides; as such, they are perceived as part of our inner body. The object of taste has to be violently masticated and gulped, thus becoming an embodied otherness from what it initially was and turning into a component of our inner selves. How ought we to give sense to this embodied otherness, which becomes our very flesh in a bluntly physical way? In other words, how to entail Danto’s challenge in gustatory terms?

Echoing contemporary philosophy and the performative turn in contemporary art,<sup>20</sup> gustatory aesthetics precisely focuses on physicality and centrality of the body in a very radical way. More like an argumentative procedure rather than an ontological one, gustatory aesthetics considers the embodied meaning of gustatory practices usually from their possibility of artification. Considering gustatory practices as artified practices means to consider them as if they were art even though still keeping some degree of autonomy in regards to art.

Some issues in this artified narrative which seem to gradually confirm themselves are the following:

1. Aesthetic practices which have a higher tendency to be ordinarily designated as “universal language” in the common use of the expression (“language” understood here as a non-propositional system of symbolic communication) appear to be those that skilfully entangle rituality and everyday life: music, dance and cooking. Of the three, the latter is the only one which makes all the senses intervene (including thermoception), and most specially the synaesthesia, which, because of its physiological nature, brings forward the old baumgartian pretension of sensible logics. Thus, cooking embodies meaning according to this peculiar “universality”.

2. *Everyday Aesthetics*,<sup>21</sup> and the *Aesthetic of Performative Turn*, as well as the philosophical dignity granted to that which is ephemeral – not only from art in the 60s (it’s been more than half a century!) but also, looking back, to the origin of aesthetic

---

<sup>19</sup> See Brady 2012.

<sup>20</sup> See Fischer–Lichte 2008.

<sup>21</sup> On this topic, see Saito 2007.



practices – allows us to consider gustatory practices as candidates of a contemporary adaptation of the total work of art and at the same time opens the way to its demythologizing: (in a hungerless community) we are all cooks, we are all eaters, and anybody can generate, by means of gustatory practices, an experience of meaning and sense that involves all senses, as required by *Gesamtkunstwerke*.

3. If we are all cooks and eaters, gustatory practices are a good place for aesthetic democratization and novel distributions of the sensible, thus generating what has been called new *social stomachs*.<sup>22</sup> These new social stomachs generate embodied meanings from the emancipation of sensuality (following a Feuerbachian discourse) and of the auratic dimension of certain artistic practices. This has become very common with the aforementioned *Foodtech tribes* as well as with Food networking.

In brief, gustatory embodied meanings have to do with the centrality of the body and the physicality of the object, in terms of touch, smell, sight, hearing, taste, thermoception and synaesthesia, within a community of production and a community of reception. These embodied meanings are found beyond survival and nourishment, and differ especially by means of the institutional or anti-institutional frameworks in which they are developed. Let's take three examples of how to embody meaning in gustatory practices: one from domestic cooking, another from research – revolutionary cooking, and the third from activist cooking.

While preparing Belgian endive soup on certain family celebrations, my parents (who are Flemish) often say that despite being a sophisticated course, it is a soup, and it can be recognized as such at first sight. It turns out that in this context, the symbolic value that is reconstructed in my family every time we sit together and eat that particular soup is, indeed, discernible. It is not the same case, however, with *elBulli's Piña colada, disappearing candy floss* (2004); it does not have an encoded aspect that can indicate the nature of the course, and the generation of the symbolic – which has to do with childhood memories of fairgrounds as well as with the first alcoholic drinks out in bars during adolescence; that is, with a fusion of two moments of “initiation” from an early age and later— in this way is a much more free way of embodying meaning. As a matter of fact, *elBulli's Piña colada* is presented to us as a symbol that challenges the familiar modes of meaning, the ordinary intelligibility of things in the world. Thus, it does what art does; it offers us an alternative way of seeing, forcing us to reflect and revolutionize habits and ways of sharing beliefs.

At the same time, embodied meanings in activist practices also make us reflect and negotiate, sometimes within a less artfied atmosphere. Such is the case, for example, with *Conflict Kitchen*<sup>23</sup> proposals dedicated to gastronomic culture from territories

---

<sup>22</sup> See Dolejšová 2014.

<sup>23</sup> <http://conflictkitchen.org/>, accessed April 20, 2015.

which the USA is in conflict with. If we visit the issue dedicated to Cuba,<sup>24</sup> embodied meanings are to be interpreted toward the end of the Castro era and in the uncertainty of what is yet to come.

#### 2.4. Gustatory Practices' Radical Demand of Narrative

Gustatory practices demand an auto-narrative in order to establish a continuous relationship with the narrative put forward by gustatory aesthetics, which is very different in nature to what is generally established by philosophy of art, on the one hand, and theory and history of art on the other. Let's take artistic avant-gardes as an example. It could be said that the first texts that establish a narrative were manifestos, a literary genre within theory of art. They were followed by a series of critical, historical and theoretical discourses initiated by Greenberg and that have continued until today. Once the avant-gardes had come to an end, philosophy of art started an attempt to establish a conceptual explanation of what had happened from a historical and systematic point of view. A paradigmatic example of this is Rosalind Krauss' *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*, 1985.

In such a way, the relationship between artistic events and their philosophical narrative tends to be, indeed, of Hegelian character: philosophy of art narrates what has already become. This is not the case, however, of the relationship between gustatory aesthetics and the practices it makes reference to. It does not only show a simultaneous relationship, but also one of intimate collaboration. Indeed, gustatory practices have extreme demand of self-knowledge. This is the reason not only to elaborate all kinds of gustatory manifestos, but also to develop a careful, extensive and systematic revision of the history of these practices, of their techniques and of their creative and research processes. What is unusual about this situation is that the demand for self-knowledge, as well as a holistic and encyclopaedic narrative, arises from the very producers of the practices, showing a level of scrutiny whose paragon perhaps should go back to Leon Battista Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* (1450). It is possible that this requirement has to do with the lateness of the avant-garde cuisine, which started out with Nouvelle Cuisine in the beginning of the 70s, when the artistic avant-garde had been "overcome" (in accordance with Hegelian terminology), and the historical, theoretical and philosophical narrative provided the conceptual instruments for its comprehension.

The two most paradigmatic examples of this situation are: *Modernist Cuisine. The Art and Science of Cooking* (2011), led by the "amateur" chef Nathan Myhrvold, and *BulliPèdia*, led (to some extent) by the "ex-chef" Ferran Adrià. I will focus on the latter, as I am currently part of his team.

---

<sup>24</sup> <http://conflictkitchen.org/events/conflict-kitchen-in-cuba>, accessed April 20, 2015.

*BulliPèdia*<sup>25</sup> is an archive-type project that has been hosted by the University of Barcelona,<sup>26</sup> and it has the double profile of a collaborative and a scholarly project, being conceived as a kind of Wikipedia with academic experts for pair review. It involves ten matrix issues. The seven first are devoted to cooking, restaurant management and gastronomy. The eighth is dedicated to the “History of Cooking”, the ninth to “Gustatory Aesthetics, Art and Cooking” and the tenth to the “Creative Process”. Gerard Vilar and I have both been designated to take care of the last two issues. We have been working on them since January 2013, and we have created a team of thirty-four members including undergraduate, Master and PhD students as well as professors from different backgrounds who all passionately work on these issues. As one can imagine, it is much easier to work on “Aesthetics, Art and Cooking” (the main questions that have been here exposed) than on “Creative Process”.

The aim of the issue “Creative Process” is to develop a device for creativity within two spheres: 1. Creativity for cooks, diners, food tribes; 2. Creativity in the general use of the term, especially addressed to the arts, design, technology and sciences. We know that failure is intrinsic to the latter aim, while creativity may not be cancelled in concepts; but the Kantian inquiry about the conditions of possibility in creativity still makes sense, and we work with the hypothesis that most of the creative professionals and academics feel that they have something “which they are willing to share” and which has to do with Wittgenstein’s notion of family resemblances. From this point of view, we can say that *BulliPèdia* has the vocation to find the way to networking, netfeeling and netsharing about creativity, innovation and research.

## 2.5. Gustatory Research in a Medialab Spirit

As established in the previous sections, research in gustatory aesthetics is carried out in very peculiar terms which revolve around recently handled relations between the internal and external, the intimate and communicable, physicality and meaning, the ephemeral and the everyday. It could be said that these peculiar relations are also in need of peculiar ways and methods of research, which are no longer “interdisciplinary” (a term used in the nineties) nor “transdisciplinary” (the prototypical term of the beginning of the twenty-first century), but are rather “antidisciplinary,” a methodology characterized by contemporary medialabs. It should be said that these are becoming neuralgic creative centres of academic institutions, and furthermore, they are turning into extremely crucial nodes for the interaction between knowledge, research, creativity, innovation and their involvement with public sphere. Along these lines, the

<sup>25</sup><http://www.bullipedia.com>, accessed April 20, 2015.

<sup>26</sup>[http://www.ub.edu/campusalimentacio/es/recerca\\_bullipedia.html](http://www.ub.edu/campusalimentacio/es/recerca_bullipedia.html), accessed April 20, 2015.

MIT's medialab, which is involved in the *BulliPedia project*, is presented in its webpage this way:

Actively promoting a unique, antidisiplinary culture, the MIT Media Lab goes beyond known boundaries and disciplines, encouraging the most unconventional mixing and matching of seemingly disparate research areas. [...] The Lab is committed to looking beyond the obvious to ask the questions not yet asked—questions whose answers could radically improve the way people live, learn, express themselves, work, and play.

Anybody could allege that this has always been the spirit of philosophy. And she or he would be right. Philosophy is by nature undisciplined, in the sense that we have here pointed out. As a matter of fact, Jacques Rancière, in an article written in 2006, describes indiscipline as the transgression of the boundaries of a particular discipline to estrange it beyond its own frontiers and especially to stress the very concept of discipline as well as the political and aesthetic constrictions that it implies. Thus, indiscipline means in Rancière's text not only to go beyond disciplines but also to make discourses free enough to become "weapons in a battle" able to "burst war in the scene."<sup>27</sup>

As I said in the beginning of my intervention, we are probably living in gustatory times, which are, in my view, times to fight against the rigid core of academic institutions. And gustatory aesthetics is a way to do it. We are therefore waiting to see to which imminent changes the university will surrender, through the use of ICTs, new communities of knowledge, but also through the results achieved by the research on gustatory aesthetics.

## WORKS CITED

- ALLHOFF, Fritz, and MONROE, Dave, eds. 2007. *Food and Philosophy*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- BRADY, Emily. 2012. "Tastes, Smells and Everyday Aesthetics." In KAPLAN 2012: 69-86.
- BRILLAT-SAVARIN, Jean-Anthelme. 1826, 2009. *The Physiology of Taste, or Meditations on Transcendental Gastronomy*. Translated by M.K. Fischer. New York: Everyman's Library. English translation of *Physiologie du goût, ou méditations de gastronomie transcendante*, first published in 1826.
- CURTIN, Deane W., and HELDKE, Lisa M., eds. 1992. *Cooking, Eating, Thinking: Transformative Philosophies of Food*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- D'ALEMBERT, Jean-Baptiste, and Denis Diderot. 2003. "Taste." In *The Encyclopedia of Diderot & d'Alembert*. Trans. by Nelly S. Hoyt and T. Cassirer, accessed April 20, 2015. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.did2222.0000.168>.

---

<sup>27</sup> See Rancière 2006.

- DOLEJŠOVÁ, Markéta. 2014. "Food-networking on a rise: encounters of foodtech tribes." *Journal of Artistic Research* 5, accessed April 20, 2015. <http://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/57801/58140/0/59>.
- DOUGLAS, Mary. 1982. *In the Active Voice*. London and Boston: Routledge and Keagan Paul.
- FISHER-LICHTE, Erika. 2008. *The transformative Power of Performance. A new Aesthetics*. Trans. by Saskya Iris Jain. New York: Routledge.
- GIGANTE, Denise. 2005. *Taste: A Literary History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- GRAW, Isabelle, Christoph Menke, and Ina Blom. 2009. "Geschmack\Taste." *Texte zur Kunst* 75, monographic issue.
- HAMILTON, Richard, and V. Todolí, eds. 2009. *Food for Thought: Thought Food*. Barcelona and New York: Actar.
- HOZHEY, Magdalena, Renate Bushmann, Beate Ermacora, and Ulrike Grossm, eds. 2009. *Eating the Universe: vom Essen in der Kunst*. Köln: Dumont.
- HUME, David. 2001. *Of the Standard of Taste*. In *The Harvard Classics. English Essays: Sidney to Macaulay*, accessed April 20, 2015. <http://www.bartleby.com/27/15.html>.
- JAQUES, Jèssica. 2014. "Food (aesthetics of)." In Michael Kelly, ed. *Oxford Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, 2nd edition, 63-67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- JAQUES, Jèssica, and Gerad Vilar. 2012. "Feeding Thought: A Philosophy of Cooking and Gastronomy." *Disturbis* 12, accessed April 20, 2015. [http://www.disturbis.esteticauab.org/DisturbisII/Indice\\_12.html](http://www.disturbis.esteticauab.org/DisturbisII/Indice_12.html).
- KANT, Immanuel. 2000. *Critique of the Power of Judgement*. Ed. and trans. by Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KAPLAN, David M., ed. 2012. *The Philosophy of Food*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- KORSMEYER, Carolyn. 1999. *Making Sense of Taste: Taste, Food and Philosophy*. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press.
- 2001. *Savoring Disgust: The Foul and the Fair in Aesthetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- KUEHN, Glenn. 2005. "How Can Food Be Art?" In *The Aesthetics of Everyday Life*, ed. by Andrew Light and Jonathan M. Smith, 194-212. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ONFRAY, Michel. 1995. *La raison gourmande*. Paris: Grasset.
- RANCIERE, Jacques. 2006. "Denken zwischen den Disziplinen. Eine Ästhetik der (Er)kenntnis." *Inaesthetik* 0: 81-102.
- SAITO, Yuriko. 2007. *Everyday Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SWEENEY, Kevin. 2012. "Hunger is the Best Sauce: The Aesthetics of Food." In KAPLAN 2012: 52-68.
- TELFER, Elisabeth. 1996. *Food for Thought: Philosophy and Food*. London and New York: Routledge.
- TIRAVANIJA, Rirkrit. 2010. *Cook Book: Just Smile and Don't Talk*. Bangkok: River Books.