

In the double issue that lies before you, *Kunstlicht* explores the relationship between visual art and literature. The discussion about the relationship between the two disciplines, which often refers back to Horace's famous credo that poetry is as painting, *ut pictura poesis*, is not new. However, since Horace the arts have undergone tremendous change. Does his statement still stand, or was artist John Ashbery right when, in his 1977 poem 'And *Ut Pictura Poesis* Is Her Name', he started with 'You can't say it that way any more'? In the first article of this issue Marieke Winkler discusses a number of influential aesthetic axioms and shows that ideas about ostensible medium-specific characteristics have not only changed over time, but were perhaps dictated by the ideology of the critic, rather than by the disciplines themselves. Is there an inherent distinction between the two disciplines, or is the distinction imposed on them by the contemplative entities? Aesthetics is an important theme throughout this issue. Rachel Esner, Roel Griffioen, and Marjolein van Tooren analyse how writers have made use of another discipline in order to formulate and present their own poetics: the 'other' art as sparring partner. The idea that the aesthetics of an author becomes apparent in a new artwork is also dealt with by Jane Boddy, who considers an ekphrastic poem by Theodor Körner (1810) as a patent argument against classicism. Hinde Haest and Kent Minturn show that the two disciplines have not met solely in the boxing rink. Haest argues that the Dutch writer Gerard Reve used portrait photography to emphasize certain aspects of his literary work and persona, and Minturn discusses the literary genealogy of art brut, a genealogy overlooked due to the traditional separation of art history and literary history. According to Jos ten Berge, this separation has lead scholars to overlook the fact that in 1959 the visual work of the Situation-

ists and the literary work of the Beat poets underwent a very similar development. The convergence, overlapping, and, in some cases, possible elimination of certain boundaries between the visual and the literary is further explored by Evelyn Austin, Maarten van Gageldonk, and Harmony Wolfe. These articles reveal that the relationship between visual art and literature is as opaque, if not more so, than ever before. While some of the articles allude to possible explanations, such as the rise of new media, and the influence of a new wave of -isms like constructivism, postmodernism, and deconstructivism, the focus is foremost on the interaction between the disciplines: the struggle, the absorption of the one by the other, and finally, or especially, the artistic expressions that follow. Although critics seem to have, every now and then, closed their eyes to the other discipline, an attitude that Diederik Oostdijk in a closing statement argues is no longer justifiable, visual artists and writers have never let the other out of sight, be it out of admiration, rivalry, or a little bit of both. The three artist contributions by Artun Arasli, Eugène Brands and Esther Walter testify of this.

On behalf of the editorial board,
Evelyn Austin and Ragna Manz