



Marxergasse 16 1030 Vienna

Opening times:

Fr 4 to 8pm...

or by appointment !!!

fox@udobohnenberger.com

fox-vienna.com

Martina Moro

EGGS R US

Oct 29 - Nov 12

Our conception of the mode of theoretical and practical observation seems clear at first glance. „Behold the human“, we say, and we see, facing the person, that which is being observed. Subject and object, active and passive, seem distinctly separated from each other. Everything that lies and unfolds in the in-between space is brushed aside as incidental and meaningless. This is what classical logic insists on, for here, there simply must not be a third, a connecting link. Tertium non datur. And yet one suspects that things are not quite so simple, not so strictly separated from one another, for this would ultimately lead, among other things, to a very strange, paradoxical idea of community and society, namely, as an ensemble of figures that, being entirely with and at themselves, are at most capable of tangential ‘touch’. Now, doesn’t this image fail to correspond to what we experience as a true community and society? It should surely be more than merely a tangential affair. Likewise, the notion that we are capable of being entirely with and within ourselves, to be an in-dividual, seems, if taken seriously, rather peculiar. After all, we have always been something of a mystery to ourselves, a relative hiddenness, and thus, something with which and in which we are not fully and entirely complete. Similar questions could also be raised regarding the Other that we declared as an object: Can this object truly be configured in such a way that, in contrast to us, it knows nothing at all of a being-with-itself or being-present-to-itself? And how are we supposed to know all this? This question arises particularly under classical ontological presuppositions, for the dictum here is that contact with the Other can only ever be constituted tangentially. How, under such presupposition, can insight be gained? This indicates that we are by no means as sovereign as we believe, just as what we ostensibly think we can fundamentally understand, uncover, and unravel—the object—does not merely hang from us, tied to leading strings, in an unsovereign manner. Now, then: where is the division between subject and object? Where is the clear qualitative break? Where is the No-man’s land that no one should be to traverse? With the classical ontological notion of subject and object, it seems that we are succumbing to a kind of narcissism. We have granted ourselves a status of sublimity that is ours in and of itself. We have unlearned how to look beyond ourselves, to see past ourselves as humans. We have unlearned how to see that also the Other is animating the in-between space, just as we do, that we are as much a mystery to ourselves as the Other is to us. We have unlearned how to acknowledge that we are not the only ones asking questions and providing answers, not the only ones operating with meanings and hypotheses, that all that exists is a relative subject and object, inside and outside. Blinded by ourselves and our status, we have unlearned how to think in relations, with regard to a relative connectedness. The connections and entanglements that allow us to come together with Others are precisely not tangential but rather run right through everything that exists – including ourselves. The societal, the social, is by no means a matter humans can resolve solely with or among

themselves. After all, we ourselves are part of the all-encompassing and relative cosmic community – a part of the cosmic egg.

Text by Peter Brandlmayr
English translation by Juri Velt