

What Is and Could Become Olfactory Aesthetics?

Mădălina Diaconu

Twenty years ago, research on the aesthetics of smell was still considered quite exotic. Isolated attempts to enlarge the scope of aesthetics to olfactory phenomena and objects (Brandes and Neumann, 1995; Diaconu; 2005, Brady; 2005; Shiner and Kriskovets, 2007) were inevitably compelled to start by rejecting the denial of the very possibility of an olfactory aesthetics, as this had been argued by authorities in the field of philosophical aesthetics, from Kant (1987) and Hegel (1970) to Harold Osborne (1977). Fortunately, neither the scholars in Smell Studies – whether biologists and psychologists, anthropologists, historians, or promoters of Cultural Studies (Corbin, 1982; Le Guérer, 1988; Rindisbacher, 1992; Classen et al., 1994; Jütte, 2000; Le Guérer, 2005 etc.) – nor aestheticians and practitioners of art and architecture, let alone writers and perfumers, felt inhibited by the philosophers' scepticism regarding the aesthetic dimension of odours and 'followed their nose'. Consequently, both the recently growing body of knowledge in the multidisciplinary cluster of Smell Studies and the diversification of practices related to olfactory art have confirmed that their intuition was right.¹

The rise or, better said, the rediscovery of smell after a long time of modern 'anosmia' in the Western world, including philosophy, was favoured by the awakening of a more general interest in sensibility and corporeality. The rehabilitation of the body and its pleasures in postmodernity began to cast doubt upon the implicit hierarchy of the senses, with vision and hearing on their top, which was rooted in Western metaphysics. Additionally, anthropologists criticised the fiction of a universal subject and made the case for developing global approaches on the sound basis of empirical research.

¹ Meanwhile, contributions to Smell Studies and olfactory aesthetics include Drobnick (2006), Reinartz (2014), Shiner (2015; 2020), Hegel and Wagner (2016), Krause (2016; 2023), Lynn and Riley Parr (2021), Benthack et al. (2021), Herold and Krause (2021) etc. A special mention deserves the experiential account of anosmia in a novel by the aesthetician Marta Tafalla (2023).

Later developments – the emotional turn in sciences, research on cross- and multimodal perception, and the expansion of Atmospheric Studies – must be understood in a more general context that calls into question the implications of ocularcentrism and phallogocentrism for basic philosophical concepts such as matter, thing, agency (commonly associated with the subject’s intentionality) and for privileging persistency over ephemerality, and rational discursivity over sensibility and intuition.

At present, the time has come to shift the focus from self-justificatory and legitimating strategies in Smell Studies and olfactory aesthetics to calling attention to their huge potential, whilst remaining open to possible unforeseen developments. A few years ago, Jim Drobnick remarked in his afterword to the pioneering anthology about smell design edited by Victoria Henshaw et al.: “[...] the trend is obvious that through an accumulation of publications, olfactory studies are moving towards specialization as a discipline” (Drobnick, 2018, p. 273). The achievement of this goal would improve the status and credibility of this new discipline and promise institutional facilities for carrying out research. If the current “disciplinary messiness and permeability” in Smell Studies may appear to some scholars as contradicting the scientific standards, Jim Drobnick continued (2018, p. 273), this may be grounded in specific features of the object of study itself. Anyway, he recommended concentrating, at least in this incipient phase, on innovative research and paying less attention to formal aspects related to disciplinary compartmentalisation. Interdisciplinarity remains both a challenge and an asset for olfactory aesthetics.

Against this background, this issue of *ESPES. The Slovak Journal of Aesthetics* aims to enrich the contributions dedicated to olfactory aesthetics by emphasising its broad scope. A preliminary remark, followed by a general contextualisation of the olfactory aesthetics within the landscape of contemporary aesthetic theory, appears to me as a necessary introduction to the following papers, which focus on specific topics. First, the denomination olfactory aesthetics remains rather formal, indicating only that its object of study is smells.² Further, on closer inspection, it turns out that olfactory aesthetics communicates with several recent subdisciplines of aesthetics, defined as theory of perception and sensibility (in German known as *Asthetik*), everyday aesthetics, environmental aesthetics, social aesthetics, urban aesthetics, feminist aesthetics, aesthetics of race (which corresponds with de- and postcolonial approaches to aesthetics), intercultural aesthetics, religious aesthetics and theological aesthetics, the aesthetics of atmosphere, animal aesthetics and the aesthetics of science, etc. In addition to these, the theory of olfactory aesthetics explores artistic practices that incidentally imply or deliberately use odours, from literary descriptions of olfactory experiences to the presence of smells in architecture and design (including landscape architecture and the art of gardening), in perfumery and in the so-called olfactory art. Some papers collected here exemplarily illustrate the relation of

² The following reflections leave aside the issue of possible differences between olfactory aesthetics and smell design, concentrating on a philosophical aesthetic theory of odours.

olfactory aesthetics to the philosophy of art: Larry Shiner discusses the art status of perfumery, while Brian Goeltzenleuchter and Elena Mancioppi attempt in their conversation to situate the olfactory art within the contemporary artworld. Literary evocations of odours are present as well, grace to Frank Krause's analysis of the 'physico-theological' aesthetics of smell in the work of Barthold Heinrich Brockes, a prominent German poet of the early Enlightenment. Krause is seconded in his 'archaeology' of olfactory aesthetics by Mădălina Diaconu; her paper on the chrism oil deciphers the symbolism of fragrance in Christian sacramental theology, as part of a forthcoming systematic theological aesthetics of smell or Christian 'osmology' (from Greek *osmós*, odour). Finally, Chantal Jaquet's study warns of reducing olfactory aesthetics to positive emotions; her troubling paper draws attention to the persistence of social discrimination and racial hate that are rooted in a negative olfactory imaginary.

The widespread reinterpretation of philosophical aesthetics as a theory of senses and sensibility (e.g. Welsch (1990), Seel (2000), Böhme (2001), Berleant (2010)), often with reference to Alexander Baumgarten's unrealised project of *aesthetica* as "facultatis cognoscitivae inferioris" (Baumgarten, *Metaphysik* § 533, 1983, p. 16), has called on the plan the investigation of *all* senses, including those that Western idealism and rationalism had qualified as 'low' and animalic. As a result, other senses than sight and hearing were traditionally denied *a principio* any possibility of supporting art, their pleasure being considered merely subjective, their objects ephemeral and consumable. In particular, the enlargement of aesthetics to olfaction requires both a philosophical analysis of the subjects' experiential structures and the identification of odorous objects that trigger an aesthetic experience. Moreover, the interweaving of descriptive approaches with the imperative of cultivating sensibility is typical for the reinterpretation of aesthetics as a theory of perception. Directly derived from this is the claim of improving and even institutionalising olfactory aesthetic education at various levels, which at present takes place unreflectively, yet under the interested guidance of economic agents with their sensory marketing. Otherwise put, the *Aisthetik* does not necessarily uncritically revive a European project of the 18th century by putting it into the service of the present sensitive-corporeal consumers, but it can (and in my opinion, should) support the sensible-reasonable citizens' emancipatory efforts, too.

As for the objects of aesthetic olfactory experience, these can be found everywhere: in everyday life, in natural and built environments, in interpersonal encounters, and in the artworld. The central debate in the aesthetics of everyday life about whether an interruption of the everyday by experiencing something extra-ordinary is indispensable to have an aesthetic experience (Leddy, 2012) or whether the subject is expected to disclose the genuine aesthetic aspect of the ordinary in its ordinariness, for example when experiencing the familiar environments as trustworthy and comfortable (Haapala, 2005; Saito, 2017), can be applied to olfactory experiences as well. Both a complex fragrance and the reassuring odour of one's own home, that

tends to remain concealed and reveals itself, for example, after returning home after a long absence, can be assigned aesthetic pleasantness. A similar aesthetic quality characterises negative experiences, which cannot be excluded from everyday aesthetics without deforming and impoverishing life as such: unfamiliar and potentially dangerous environments, as well as publicly tabooed body odours, are felt as unpleasant, inspire fear, mistrust or plainly disgust.

In contrast, the other major debate in everyday aesthetics, which opposes 'weak' to 'strong' approaches (Dowling, 2010), does not appear to work in olfactory aesthetics. To recall, the promoters of the 'weak' everyday aesthetics claim that it suffices to extend aesthetic theories that were initially developed for art to the experience of everyday life, without being necessary to develop specific, genuine concepts and intuitions, as the 'strong' everyday aesthetics considers. However, the theory of olfactory aesthetics can hardly build on the previous philosophy of art. Aesthetics has at best accepted artificial scents for their art-like complexity, yet ignored *common* pleasant odours and their relation to memory or embodiment. In fact, the enjoyment of everyday odours may express the subjects' situatedness, their attachment to places and the commonly ignored role of olfactory experience in the constitution of individual and collective selves (Diaconu, 2021). Unique body odours shape personal, social and cultural identities through bonding and delimitation. The mother-infant bonding is partially based on odours, and environmental smellscape produce feelings of topophilia from an early age. The triple dimension of smells – transitive (I smell the world), intransitive (I am smelly for others) and reflexive (I feel my own smell) – engages the individual in relation to natural and built environments, to members of ingroups and outgroups, and to oneself. The spontaneity of our olfactory attunement (German: *Einstimmung*) or misattunement to people and environments has far-reaching consequences for social behaviour and for feeling in a place at home (hence passively caring for it and actively taking care of it) or feeling 'displaced'. The assignment of offensive odours to sexually (hyper)active women, to the poor segments of the population, to the POCs or to LGBTQ is used to legitimate gender, social and racial discrimination, marginalisation, exclusion and an almost irrational hate, as Chantal Jaquet's paper in this issue brilliantly demonstrates.

On the contrary, natural smells seep deeply into memory and shape identity through emplacement. An interesting controversial case of (uninhabited) environments is wetlands. For a long time, marshes and wetlands have been considered incompatible with aesthetic enjoyment; this judgment remained explainable as long as the spreading of epidemics was put down to foul smells, and people feared drowning in them. Meanwhile, scientific research on the value of wetlands as hotspots of biodiversity has improved their public image and opened the way for integrating them into environmental aesthetics. Even so, the issue of their specific odour is still overlooked. A future olfactory aesthetics may therefore compare various smellscape of natural environments (no matter how problematic the concept of 'nature' has

become): the 'wet' odour of marshes, the 'salty' smell of sea, the 'strong and pure' atmosphere of high mountains, the fragrant composition of a wild meadow or a garden, the relaxing, 'dark green' smellscape of a deep wood, and so on. Moreover, such descriptions can be varied by including temporality and correlating specific environmental smellscape to weather parameters, the time of the day, seasons, and the intrusion of human practices over generations.

Urban smellscape, too, deserve no less attention than the natural ones. The olfactory portrait of a city results from the complex amalgamation of natural factors (geographical position, including climate), the hardly controllable accumulation of social practices and everyday activities (the odour of building materials, cooking, exhaust fumes, street food), urban planning (the placement of industrial facilities, greening), technological factors (desodorisation) and commercial interests (the smell design of shopping centres, airports, Out Of Home Advertising etc.). The deliberate design of urban smellscape, whose pleasantness can be enhanced with fragrant plants and water features, competes with the dwellers' unintentional 'design' (Diaconu, 2012); the bigger a city and the more democratic its politics is, the bigger is also the challenge of controlling its smellscape. Occasionally, the city administration may attempt to regulate odorous everyday practices by forbidding the consumption of 'smelly' food in the public transport system, as the City of Vienna did a few years ago; yet on the whole, given also the under-regulation of olfactory pollution, smells remain a 'subversive' means of anonymous citizens to make *their* city. The unique 'air' of a city is unmistakably perceived by tourists and newcomers when they dive into its new atmosphere.

A further field of olfactory aesthetics, understood as a branch of environmental aesthetics, regards the development of adequate methodologies for researching smellscape; at present, these include descriptions, visualisations, mapping, smell tours, smell extraction and artificial reproduction. The cultivation of sensibility appears once again as indispensable, its implications surpassing aesthetics and achieving both a civic and existential dimension: 'fine noses' may draw attention to atmospheric pollution and sensitise the local authorities to this issue, but olfactory hypersensitivity may also become undesirable in itself in everyday work and life settings.

The distinctive olfactory profile of a city or landscape achieves a new meaning nowadays, when aesthetic subjects must be considered globally. However, a global perspective on aesthetics (whether one calls it global, intercultural, transcultural or differently) cannot be confined to commonalities and the cross-cultural transfer of perceptual qualities, as when the feasibility of an 'international' landscape and garden design is assessed in comparison to international architecture. In addition to the possibilities of acclimatising fragrant plants, a global aesthetics must integrate aesthetic theories about the beauty of smells in various cultural traditions. This includes philosophical associations between smell and art or beauty, as well as interpretations of a wide

range of phenomena that have been hitherto assigned to different disciplines, such as olfactory religious rituals, common or less ordinary habits (for instance, practices, conventions and norms of scenting bodies and indoor spaces), the presence of odours in some *jeux de sociétés* of the elites (e.g. the traditional Japanese *kōdō*) and so on. Research has disclosed the underlying reasons for the fear of smells in Western modernity, whose universality is nowadays being competed in other cultures who claim the plurality of ‘modernities’. Not even the Western world has always been so cautious regarding odours, as the history of Christian liturgy in general and Byzantine commentaries on the use of incense in particular demonstrate. The early Christian Syrian world, for example, has developed an elaborated theology of smell, and the idea of a fragrant epiphany of the sacred in Christian late antiquity was inherited from the Mediterranean cultures (Harvey, 2006). Unlike the complicated history of the liturgical use of incense, which has been already discussed by Roman-Catholic scholars (Pfeifer, 2008), the role of scents in sacramental contexts, particularly in relation to the chrism oil, has been overlooked; Mădălina Diaconu’s paper in this issue is meant to fill this gap.

A global olfactory aesthetics would have both to pursue further investigations of past olfactory practices in the Western premodern world and broaden its horizon to other, more odour-friendly cultures, such as the Indian, the Arab and the indigenous worlds. It is well-known that fragrances accompany rituals of transitions in several cultures and that the cultic functions of smells in such contexts do not compromise, let alone exclude aesthetic enjoyment. In my view, olfactory aesthetics should prefer an expansionist approach that integrates multifarious un/pleasant smelly phenomena and objects rather than a demarcationist one, that seeks purely aesthetic, autotelic fragrant beauty. Even assuming that the aesthetic theory would stick to the criterion of enjoying a smell for its own sake, there remain enough subjects to reflect on; just think of perfumery, whose creation and use can be both passionate and disinterested in the Kantian sense.

In contrast, the venerable tradition of breeding fragrant plants, such as roses, is still far away from being acknowledged as an aesthetic practice. Although roses are probably bred mainly for their colours and forms, the famous pleasantness of their smell is a good enough reason to breed them exclusively for olfactory purposes. The differences in the fragrant quality of plants harvested in different regions are well-known in perfumery. It is high time to overcome the reductionist understanding of the aesthetic use of plants in the art of gardening, ikebana and other flower arrangements, understood as mere formal and chromatic compositions; the experience of a garden as a *Gesamtkunstwerk* is multisensory *par excellence*. From this point of view, breeders may be considered artists who design living materials. A more radical view would even assign smell design to the species themselves. The fact that plants ‘develop’ odours to be pollinated by insects raises the difficult question of acknowledging an aesthetic dimension of teleological processes outside the realm of human intentionality.³

³ A similar question was raised in zoology with respect to the beauty of sexual ornaments (Prum, 2017).

Plant odours are *addressed* to other living beings with the ‘aim’ of being *attractive* to them. *Mutatis mutandis*, can pheromones in the animal world be integrated into the olfactory aesthetics and if so, how? May a species or the evolutionary process itself be regarded as creative or even proto-artistic? Can research in life sciences influence the understanding of olfactory aesthetics in the non-human living world? How do pets react to artificial smells that humans appreciate as pleasant, such as perfumes and other scented products? More generally, how can be built the scaffold of an interspecies aesthetics?

In general, Western modernity associated a fine nose with animals and categories of ‘sub-humans’ who were supposed to be closer to nature (women, ‘primitives’, ‘abnormal’ individuals). Nowadays, artists working with smells question the stereotypical sharp demarcation between humans and other animals and explore the behaviour of species whose sharp sense of olfaction exceeds ours. Olfactory refinement and animality go hand in hand in a positive way. Artistic experiments that promise to enhance the human sense of smell grace to modern technology illustrate both a return of the repressed animality of the human and a leap forward into the age of the posthuman (Diaconu, 2021). Such attempts to bridge the human’s animality with other animal life-worlds represent only one set of issues that are tackled in contemporary olfactory art; in fact, olfactory art provides examples for all the aforementioned connections between the aesthetics of smell and new directions in aesthetics.

Notwithstanding the expansion of the scope of aesthetics during the past few decades, its core remains the philosophy of art. Even so, artists working in the medium of olfaction bring up for discussion fascinating topics that challenge tacit assumptions regarding interpretation, form, the privilege of permanence, the ocularcentric bias of aesthetic theory, and conventional display settings. In this context, it is necessary to distinguish from the outset between perfumery, olfactory art and further arts whose works emanate odours as a side-effect (architecture, gardening, installation) or evoke smells in a non-odorous medium (literature, painting, film, music). In their efforts to legitimate the art of smell, the aestheticians previously concentrated on perfumery. On one side, creative ‘noses’ like Edmond Roudnitska (1977, 1996) and the Groupe du Colysée (Blayn et al. 1988) made the case for acknowledging perfumery as an art by resorting to the legacy of aesthetic thinking, including Kant. On the other side, philosophers rejected objections related to the lack of complexity of fragrances, their volatility, their merely subjective appreciation and rather confused relation to interpretation, the reduction of beauty to adornment, often understood as a means of enhancing erotic attractivity, as well as the perfumer’s dependency on economic agents and on safety and environmental regulations.

At present, the complex landscape of perfumery requires clear conceptual differentiations and fine-tuned analyses, as when Larry Shiner’s paper in this issue suggests arranging perfumes on a continuum that stretches between ‘Artists’ Perfume-like Works’ and ‘Standard Design Perfumes’. In addition to philosophical arguments, recent developments in practising and promoting

perfumery have helped raise the acceptance of perfumery as a specific art. Noteworthy in this respect were groundbreaking exhibitions on perfumery and/as art, the founding of the Institute for Art and Olfaction in Los Angeles, the emergence and diversification of the niche perfumery, specialised blogs and journals (e.g. Nez. *The Olfactory Magazine*), perfume creation workshops, etc. The emancipation of the 'noses' from strictly commercial interests and the integration of perfumery into the system of arts could be accelerated by training them at art academies, allowing them more space for creativity and experimentation, giving them personal public recognition instead of subordinating their authorship to the label of the perfume house, organising competitions with prizes for various categories, hosting exhibitions in art museums and last, but not least by setting up specialised galleries (like the Olfactory Art Keller in New York for olfactory art) in addition to the present 'perfume museums' that display only flacons.

Obviously, the acceptance of odours as art material has benefitted from the flourishing of the so-called olfactory art, whose practitioners usually are classically trained artists. Their olfactory works of art (objects, installations, performances) are exhibited in conventional artistic settings and have among their favourite topics previously tabooed body odours (sweat, sexuality, excretion), unreflected olfactorily coded gender stereotypes, feelings of bonding (to places as well as communities), and the clashing of smell cultures in present megalopolises. The anatomically rooted close association between odours and emotions tempts artists to imagine olfactory installations that unleash the power of fear, evoke nostalgia, and allude to the human's unconscious reactions to subliminal smells (e.g. pheromones). At one end of the perceptual scale, one encounters conceptual art forms and minimalist installations: the visitor faces sealed flacons which double the *noli me tangere* of modern museums with a *noli me olere* and enters white empty or totally dark spaces that are supposed to smell. At the other end, the artists overwhelm the visitor's noses by accumulating fragrant spices or cigarette butts in closed spaces. Olfactory works of art are frequently conceived as a concerted interplay of several senses, as when smelly pieces are combined with comments, classical visual art or videos. Some pieces express the artist's commitment to the values of liberal democracy, by drawing attention to marginalised and discriminated categories and using performances and smell walks to enhance the sense of emplacement and contribute to building communities. On the contrary, others use the power of invisible odours to create spiritual atmospheres and evoke non/super-human entities. Given the multifarious forms of olfactory art, dialogues between their practitioners and theorists, like the conversation between Brian Goeltzenleuchter and Elena Mancioffi hosted in this issue, are extremely promising for contextualising olfactory art in the artworld and society at large and for exploring its theoretical and practical challenges. Let me briefly mention in the following some of these difficulties.

Exhibitions of olfactory art must manage practical problems related to the maintenance of the works (regularly watering fragrant plants, refilling artificial odour containers), the planning of spatial compartmentalisation in

order to avoid an unwanted diffusion of odours, and ensuring proper ventilation. The artists themselves have to consider various factors that influence the production of the odour (sometimes achieved through the accumulation of its natural source); also they are expected to anticipate the interaction of their smelly work with the onsite odour and take measures against the possible alteration of the smell during the exhibition period. It is worth mentioning that the development of olfactory art has already reached a moment in which questions around curatorial practice and art preservation start to be discussed in expert groups.⁴ Moreover, during the past few years, odours have been occasionally used not only in dance and theatre performances but also in historical exhibitions. The proliferation of odourisation practices raises a plethora of issues, some of which are practical, such as the technological control of the indoor circulation of the odour, while others regard the museum visitors' safety (e.g. the tolerable intensity of the odour). A third category of problems has ethical implications, as when the olfactory 'illustration' of wars and other tragedies in museums may unleash too strong emotions or even reactivate traumas. Finally, the *possibility* of adding an olfactory component to an artistic event does not necessarily imply that this *makes* also *sense*, so in each case the question must be raised of whether the multiplication of sensory channels of information is really meaningful or simply responds to the present trend of intermediality in art and beyond it.

The conclusion at the end of this survey can be only one: while it may still be possible to chart the main directions of olfactory aesthetics today, the rapid growth of Smell Studies in general and of olfactory aesthetics in particular in terms of research, publications, public events, new institutions, curricular and networking initiatives, as well as the increasing public interest in aesthetic olfactory practices, suggests that the olfactory art has overcome its stage of infancy and is currently expanding its scope, subjects and forms. The present issue of *ESPEs. The Slovak Journal of Aesthetics* represents only a modest contribution to this broader movement. Let me conclude by thanking the authors for their valuable inspiring insights, the reviewers for their constructive comments and the editorial board of *ESPEs. The Slovak Journal of Aesthetics* for having invited me to edit this issue.

References

- Baumgarten, A. G. (1983) *Texte zur Grundlegung der Ästhetik*. Transl. and ed. by Hans Rudolf Schweizer. Hamburg: Meiner.
- Benthack, Saskia, Linda Günther, Mara-Lisa Kinne, Ingmar Lähnemann, Silke Rosenthal, Eva Vonrüti, Anne Thurmann-Jajes, Janneke de Vries (eds.) (2021) *Smell it! Geruch in der Kunst. The Fragrance of Art*. Köln: Wienand.
- Berleant, Arnold (2010) *Sensibility and Sense. The Aesthetic Transformation of the Human World*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

⁴ The latest example is the session on *Curating and Preserving Olfactory Art and Heritage* that Marjolijn Bol, Olivier David and Érika Wicky organized in June 2024 during the 36th Congress of the International Committee of Art History in Lyon. Many thanks to Frank Krause for this hint.

- Blayn, Jean François (in cooperation with Pierre Bourdon, Jean Claude Delville, Guy Haasser, Jean François Latty, Maurice Maurin, Alberto Morillas, Dominique Preyssas, Maurice Roucel, Henri Sebag, Christian Vuillemin (1988) *Questions de parfumerie*. [Paris:] Corpmann Editions.
- Böhme, Gernot (2001) *Asthetik. Vorlesungen zur Ästhetik als allgemeine Wahrnehmungslehre*. München: Fink.
- Brady, Emily (2005) 'Sniffing and Savoring. The Aesthetics of Smells and Tastes', in Andrew Light, Jonathan M. Smith (eds.) *The aesthetics of everyday life*. New York: Columbia University Press, 177-193.
- Brandes, Uta, Claudia Neumann (Hg.) (1995) *Das Riechen. Von Nasen, Düften und Gestank*. Göttingen: Steidl.
- Classen, Constance, David Howes, Anthony Synnott (1994) *Aroma. The Cultural History of Smell*. London: Routledge.
- Corbin, Alain (1982) *Le Miasme et la Jonquille. L'odorat et l'imaginaire social XVIIIe-XIXe siècle*. Paris: Aubier Montagne.
- Diaconu, Mădălina (2005) *Tasten, Riechen, Schmecken. Eine Ästhetik der anästhesierten Sinne*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Diaconu, Mădălina (2012) 'Es liegt in der Luft. Gerüche der städtischen Atmosphären', in *Sinnesraum Stadt. Eine multisensorische Anthropologie*. Berlin, Vienna: Lit, pp. 177-200.
- Diaconu, Mădălina (2021) 'Being and Making the Olfactory Self: Lessons from Contemporary Artistic Practices', in Nicola di Stefano, Maria Teresa Russo (eds.) *Olfaction. An Interdisciplinary Perspective from Philosophy to Life Sciences*. Berlin: Springer, 55-73.
- Dowling, Christopher (2010) 'The Aesthetics of Daily Life', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 50(3), July 2010, pp. 225-242.
- Drobnick, Jim (2006) *The Smell Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Drobnick, Jim (2018) 'Afterword', in Victoria Henshaw et al. (eds.) *Designing with Smell. Practices, Techniques and Challenges*. New York, London: Routledge, pp. 270-275.
- Haapala, Arto (2005) 'On the Aesthetics of the Everyday. Familiarity, Strangeness, and the Meaning of Place', in Andrew Light, Jonathan M. Smith (eds.) *The aesthetics of everyday life*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 39-55.
- Harvey, Susan Ashbrook (2006) *Scenting Salvation. Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1970) *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik I. Theorie Werkausgabe Bd. 13*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Hegel, Martin and Matthias Wagner K (eds.) (2016) *Für den tieferen Sinn. Duft als Medium in Kunst, Design und Kommunikation*. Wiesbaden: Spielbein.
- Henshaw, Victoria, Kate McLean, Dominic Medway, Chris Perking, Gary Warnaby (eds.) (2018) *Designing with Smell. Practices, Techniques and Challenges*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Herold, Katharina and Frank Krause (2021) *Smell and Social Life. Aspects of English, French and German Literature (1880-1939)*. München: Iudicium Verlag.
- Jütte, Robert (2000) *Geschichte der Sinne*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Kant, Immanuel (1987) *Critique of Judgment*. Transl. by Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Krause, Frank (2016) *Geruchslandschaften mit Kriegsleichen. Deutsche, englische und französische Prosa zum Ersten Weltkrieg*. Göttingen: V & R unipress.
- Krause, Frank (2023) *Geruch und Glaube in der Literatur. Selbst und Natur in deutschsprachigen Texten von Brockes bis Handke*. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press, de Gruyter.
- Le Guérer, Annick (1988) *Les Pouvoirs de l'Odeur*. Paris: François Bourin.
- Le Guérer, Annick (2005) *Le Parfum. Des origines à nos jours*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Leddy, Thomas (2012) *The Extraordinary in the Ordinary. The Aesthetics of Everyday Life*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Lynn, Gwenn-Aël, Debra Riley Parr (2021) *Olfactory Art and the Political in an Age of Resistance*. Routledge.

- Osborne, Harold (1977) 'Odours and Appreciations', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 17(1), Winter 1977, pp. 37–48.
- Pfeifer, Michael (2008) *Der Weihrauch. Geschichte, Bedeutung, Verwendung*. Regensburg: Pustet.
- Prum, Richard O. (2017) *The Evolution of Beauty. How Darwin's Forgotten Theory of Mate Choice Shapes the Animal World – and Us*. New York: Doubleday.
- Reinarz, Jonathan (2014) *Past Scents. Historical Perspectives on Smell*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Rindisbacher, Hans J. (1992) *The Smell of Books. A Cultural-Historical Study of Olfactory Perception in Literature*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Roudnitska, Edmond (1977) *L'esthétique en question*. Préface par Etienne Souriau, avant-propos par Jacques Sauvan. Paris: P.U.F.
- Roudnitska, Edmond (1996) *Die Kunst des Parfums*. Heidelberg: Melcher.
- Saito, Yuriko (2017) *Aesthetics of the Familiar: Everyday Life and World-Making*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seel, Martin (2000) *Ästhetik des Erscheinens*. München, Wien: Hanser.
- Shiner, Larry, Julia Kriskovets (2007) 'The Aesthetics of Smelly Art', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 65(3), Summer 2007, pp. 273–286.
- Shiner, Larry (2015) 'Art Scents: Perfume, Design and Olfactory Art', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 55(3), July 2015, pp. 375–392.
- Shiner, Larry (2020) *Art Scents: Exploring the Aesthetics of Smell and the Olfactory Arts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tafalla, Marta (2023) *Du wirst niemals erfahren, wonach Bagdad riecht*. Transl. by Ursula Wolf. Norderstedt: BoD.
- Welsch, Wolfgang (1990) *Ästhetisches Denken*. Stuttgart: Reclam.

Mădălina Diaconu
 University of Vienna
 Department of Philosophy
 NIG Universitätsstraße 7, 1010 Vienna, Austria
madalina.diaconu@univie.ac.at

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12731041