PROCEEDINGS
International Conference on Literature
Himpunan Sarjana-Kesusastraan Indonesia (HISKI)
E-ISSN 2988-4357

Beyond multi-, inter-, and transdisciplinary: From aesthetic experience in art to relational epistemology for the new humanities

Kasiyan*
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Email: kasiyan@uny.ac.id

Abstract: *The modern university has long organized knowledge through disciplinary specialization, while multi-, inter-, and transdisciplinary approaches have sought to overcome disciplinary fragmentation. Yet contemporary challenges call for a deeper reconsideration of how knowledge is organized. This article examines aesthetic experience in art as a starting point for rethinking the epistemological foundations of the humanities. Using a reflective-conceptual approach, it engages with literature on knowledge organization, aesthetics, relationality, and decolonial thought. The analysis argues that artistic practice reveals forms of knowing emerging through the interplay of perception, embodiment, materiality, memory, and cultural context. Knowledge, therefore, develops not only within established disciplines or through collaboration among them, but also through relations that shape how the world is experienced and understood. Building on this insight, the article proposes knowledge as relation as a framework for rethinking the architecture of knowledge. Rather than replacing disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches, this framework extends their contributions by positioning relationality as a fundamental epistemological principle. It offers a basis for reimagining the humanities as a space where diverse forms of knowledge encounter one another while retaining their intellectual and cultural distinctiveness.*

Keywords: *aesthetic experience; relational epistemology; knowledge architecture; decolonial epistemology; humanities.*

INTRODUCTION

The modern university has developed through disciplinary differentiation, enabling methodological specialisation and intellectual depth while establishing boundaries that can restrict the understanding of complex realities. As contemporary challenges increasingly involve interconnected ecological, technological, social, and cultural processes, the question is no longer simply how disciplines collaborate, but how knowledge itself might be organised differently.

Multi-, inter-, and transdisciplinary approaches emerged in response to disciplinary fragmentation. Multidisciplinarity brings disciplines together around shared problems, interdisciplinarity encourages interaction and integration, and transdisciplinarity extends inquiry beyond conventional academic boundaries Gibbons et al. (1994); Klein (2021). Although these approaches have expanded knowledge production, they do not necessarily transform an architecture that continues to rely on disciplines as its primary organising units. This raises a fundamental question: can the humanities move beyond disciplinary integration towards an epistemology in which relations become constitutive of knowing?

Aesthetic experience in art offers a productive starting point. Artistic practice generates understanding through interactions among perception, embodiment, materiality, imagination, memory, and cultural experience. Dewey (2008), in *Art as*

*Corresponding author
How to cite (APA 7th): Kasiyan. (2026). Beyond multi-, inter-, and transdisciplinary: From aesthetic experience in art to relational epistemology for the new humanities. *Proceedings 35th KIK, 35*, 50-61.
https://doi.org/10.68634/kik.v35i.121

Experience, understands aesthetic experience as emerging through the interaction between human beings and their environments. Meaning develops through this engagement rather than through the isolated contemplation of an object. Art therefore provides an opportunity to reconsider how knowledge emerges through lived experience.

This perspective challenges the assumption that knowing begins by separating subjects, objects, and analytical categories before reconnecting them. In artistic creation and appreciation, meaning develops through encounters among materials, bodily actions, sensory responses, cultural memories, and social contexts. Barad (2007), concept of "agential realism" further suggests that entities and their boundaries cannot always be understood independently of the relations through which they emerge. Relationality thus participates in the formation of meaning rather than merely connecting established elements.

The implications extend beyond art. Latour (2005), examines networks of human and nonhuman actors, while Braidotti (2013), situates human existence within broader relations involving living beings, materiality, technology, and the environment. These perspectives challenge disciplinary classifications as sufficient frameworks for understanding interconnected realities.

Reconsidering knowledge organisation also requires attention to epistemic authority. Chakrabarty (1992), challenges the universalisation of European historical experience, while Mignolo (2020) and Santos (2018) examine how coloniality shapes hierarchies that privilege certain knowledge traditions and marginalise others. Reconstructing knowledge architecture therefore requires conditions for dialogue among diverse epistemologies without subordinating them to a single dominant framework.

Against this background, this article proposes that aesthetic experience in art can provide a conceptual foundation for a relational epistemology of the humanities. Its central proposition, knowledge is relation, does not reject disciplinary rigour or existing interdisciplinary approaches. Rather, it emphasises that knowing develops through relations among experience, interpretation, material conditions, cultural contexts, and different ways of understanding the world.

Using a reflective-conceptual approach, the article examines three questions: how aesthetic experience illuminates the relational formation of knowledge; why multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches may be insufficient as the ultimate horizon of epistemological transformation; and how relationality might inform the reconstruction of knowledge architecture. By connecting aesthetic thought with theories of relationality and decolonial epistemology, the article seeks to reconceptualise the university as a space where diverse forms of knowledge encounter one another, generate new meanings, and contribute to a more plural and reflective humanities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Disciplinary Knowledge and the Transformation of Knowledge Architecture

The organisation of modern knowledge is closely connected to the historical development of universities and the differentiation of academic disciplines. Disciplinary structures enable methodological specialisation and intellectual depth, but they also

establish boundaries that shape what can be recognised as legitimate knowledge. Foucault (2005), through the concept of *episteme*, demonstrates that knowledge develops within historically specific configurations that determine the conditions under which objects, concepts, and forms of understanding become intelligible. Knowledge organisation is therefore not merely a matter of classification; it also reflects the historical conditions that shape intellectual authority.

The limitations of disciplinary differentiation have encouraged the development of multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches. Klein (2021), highlights the importance of communication, collaboration, and boundary work in overcoming disciplinary divisions. Meanwhile, Gibbons et al. (1994), through the concept of *Mode 2* knowledge production, describe increasingly contextual, heterogeneous, and problem-oriented forms of inquiry. Nowotny et al. (2001), further emphasise the changing relationship between scientific knowledge and society. Although these developments expand opportunities for collaboration, they do not necessarily transform the disciplinary architecture within which knowledge is organised. Bal & Marx-MacDonald (2002) similarly demonstrate that concepts can travel across disciplinary boundaries, acquiring new meanings through encounters with different intellectual contexts. These perspectives raise the question of whether interdisciplinary integration is sufficient or whether knowledge requires a more fundamental reorganisation.

Aesthetic Experience as a Relational Mode of Knowing

Aesthetic theory provides an important perspective for reconsidering this question. In *Art as Experience*, Dewey (2008) understands aesthetic experience as emerging through the interaction between human beings and their environments. Experience is not simply the passive reception of an external object; it develops through the interplay of perception, action, material conditions, and contextual meaning. From this perspective, artistic practice can generate knowledge through processes that exceed the application of established concepts or disciplinary methods.

Aesthetic experience consequently offers a way to examine how knowing emerges through relations rather than through the prior separation of elements. In artistic creation, the interaction between materials, bodily gestures, sensory responses, memory, and cultural contexts contributes to the development of meaning. These elements acquire significance through their interplay, making the artistic process a productive site for examining the relational formation of knowledge. This does not mean that aesthetic experience is inherently superior to scientific inquiry, but that it illuminates dimensions of knowing that cannot always be adequately explained through disciplinary classification alone.

Barad (2007), concept of *agential realism* provides a complementary theoretical perspective by challenging the assumption that entities and their boundaries exist independently before entering into relations. Similarly, Latour (2005; 2012), questions modern divisions between nature and society, subjects and objects, and human and non-human entities. Braidotti (2013), extends this reconsideration through posthuman thought, situating human existence within broader relations involving other living beings, materiality, technology, and the environment. Read alongside Dewey, these perspectives support an understanding of relationality not merely as collaboration

between established fields, but as a condition through which knowledge and meaning emerge.

Relationality, Epistemic Plurality, and the Humanities

Relationality also has ethical and political implications. Haraway (2020), through the concept of *making kin*, emphasises interdependence, responsibility, and shared survival. Damrosch (2003) and Felski (2008) demonstrate how literary works and interpretative practices acquire significance through encounters across cultural, geographical, and intellectual boundaries. These perspectives suggest that the humanities develop not only through disciplinary specialisation but also through relationships that transform how texts, experiences, and cultural differences are understood.

However, relationality cannot be separated from questions of epistemic authority. Chakrabarty (1992), challenges the universalisation of European historical experience, while Mignolo (2020) and Santos (2018) examine how coloniality structures hierarchies of knowledge. Their critiques reveal that relations between knowledge traditions are rarely equal. Some forms of knowledge occupy institutional centres, while others remain marginalised or excluded. Reconstructing knowledge architecture therefore requires more than encouraging dialogue; it also requires reconsidering the conditions under which different traditions gain recognition and participate in knowledge production.

Taken together, these perspectives establish the conceptual foundation for understanding aesthetic experience as a resource for relational epistemology. Disciplinary differentiation produces specialised forms of knowledge, while multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches expand communication across established boundaries. A further possibility emerges when relationality becomes a fundamental principle of knowledge organisation. The proposition *knowledge is relation* extends, rather than simply replaces, the understanding of *knowledge is power*. It recognises that knowledge involves not only explanation and authority but also encounters among experiences, material conditions, cultural traditions, and different ways of understanding the world. This framework provides a basis for rethinking the architecture of knowledge and developing a more plural, dialogical, and relational humanities.

METHOD

This article employs a reflective-conceptual approach to examine how aesthetic experience in art can inform the development of a relational epistemology for the humanities. Rather than investigating a specific empirical phenomenon, the study focuses on critically interpreting theoretical perspectives and developing a conceptual argument concerning the relationship between aesthetic experience, knowledge organization, and relationality. This approach enables a reconsideration of disciplinary, multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary paradigms in relation to the changing epistemological demands of the twenty-first century.

The analysis draws on conceptual and theoretical literature concerning knowledge organization, aesthetic experience, relational epistemology, posthumanism, and decolonial thought. Key sources include Dewey (2008) on art as experience;

Foucault (2005) on the historical conditions of knowledge; Gibbons et al. (1994) and Nowotny et al. (2001) on transformations in knowledge production; and Klein (2021) on interdisciplinary collaboration. The analysis also engages with Barad (2007), Braidotti (2013) and Latour (2005; 2012), to examine relationality, materiality, and the boundaries between human and non-human entities. Critical perspectives from Chakrabarty (1992), Mignolo (2020) and Santos (2018) inform the discussion of epistemic plurality and the historical inequalities shaping knowledge production.

The literature was examined through three interconnected analytical stages. First, the study identified the historical assumptions underlying disciplinary differentiation and the subsequent development of multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches. Second, it examined aesthetic experience as a mode of knowing, focusing on the relationships among perception, embodiment, materiality, and cultural context. Third, insights from these discussions were brought into dialogue with relational and decolonial theories to develop a conceptual synthesis concerning the reconstruction of knowledge architecture.

The analysis proceeded through critical comparison and interpretative synthesis rather than systematic literature-review procedures or empirical testing. Conceptual coherence was assessed by examining the compatibility, differences, and limitations of the theoretical perspectives considered. Particular attention was given to distinguishing relationality as a principle of knowledge formation from collaboration as an organisational strategy. This distinction supports the article's central proposition, *knowledge is relation*, while recognising the continuing contributions of disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches.

The resulting framework is intended as a conceptual contribution rather than an empirically validated model. It provides a basis for reconsidering how aesthetic experience can inform a more relational, plural, and dialogical architecture of knowledge for the contemporary humanities.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Aesthetic Experience as a Mode of Knowing: Art, Materiality, and the Limits of Disciplinary Knowledge

The transformation of knowledge organisation in the twenty-first century requires more than expanding collaboration among academic disciplines. Although multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches have challenged the fragmentation of modern scholarship, their underlying structures remain substantially shaped by disciplinary differentiation. Aesthetic experience in art offers a productive starting point for reconsidering these structures because it reveals dimensions of knowing that emerge through visual perception, embodied engagement, material interaction, and the formation of meaning. The epistemological significance of art, therefore, lies not simply in its capacity to connect different fields of knowledge, but also in its ability to disclose how understanding develops through experiences that cannot be fully reduced to discursive explanation.

Dewey (2008) provides an important foundation for this argument by understanding art as experience arising through the interaction between human beings and their environments. Aesthetic experience is not merely the passive reception of an

object, nor is it simply the application of previously acquired knowledge. It develops through the dynamic relationship between perception, action, material conditions, and the continuity of experience. This perspective suggests that artistic practice can generate understanding through processes in which the artist, the work, and the surrounding world participate in the formation of meaning.

Merleau-Ponty (2012) reflections on painting and perception further illuminate this relationship. Visual experience is not simply the reception of information by a detached observer; it involves an embodied engagement with the visible world. The painter does not merely reproduce an already understood reality but explores how the world becomes visible through colour, line, space, gesture, and material form. Arnheim (2023), through his account of visual thinking, similarly challenges the assumption that cognition operates independently of perception. Visual organisation can itself involve processes of thinking, recognising relationships, and developing understanding. Taken together, these perspectives support the argument that artistic experience constitutes a meaningful mode of knowing rather than merely an illustration of knowledge produced elsewhere.

Consider, for example, the creation of an abstract painting. An artist begins with an intention to explore tension between movement and stillness through the arrangement of colour, line, and spatial composition. During the painting process, the interaction between pigment and surface produces an unexpected texture. A broad brushstroke disrupts the initial balance, while the introduction of a darker colour changes the visual weight of the composition. The artist may respond by altering the direction of a line, reducing an area of colour, or allowing an apparently accidental mark to become central to the work. These decisions are not necessarily derived from a fully formulated proposition that precedes the act of painting. Rather, understanding develops through the artist's continuing engagement with the emerging visual and material relationships.

This example illustrates several interconnected dimensions of artistic knowing. Materiality matters because the properties of pigment, canvas, and tools influence what can be produced. Perception matters because the artist recognises contrasts, rhythms, and imbalances that emerge during the process. Embodiment matters because gestures, movements, and sensory judgements participate in artistic decisions. Interpretation matters because these formal relationships acquire significance through the artist's memories, intentions, and cultural experiences. None of these dimensions operates entirely independently. The meaning of the painting emerges through their interaction, and the artist's understanding may change as the work develops.

The viewer's encounter with the completed painting introduces another dimension. Different viewers may perceive its forms through distinct cultural memories, emotional experiences, and visual conventions. Such interpretations are not necessarily arbitrary, since they remain responsive to the work's formal organisation and material qualities. Nevertheless, meaning cannot be exhausted by identifying the painting's physical properties or translating its visual relationships into a single verbal statement. Language can explain aspects of the experience, but it does not fully substitute for the act of seeing, sensing, and interpreting the work. Aesthetic knowledge thus involves a relationship between perceptual experience and conceptual reflection without being reducible to either one alone.

This argument does not imply that artistic knowledge is inherently superior to scientific inquiry or that aesthetic interpretation is exempt from critical evaluation. Rather, it demonstrates that different modes of knowing may involve different relationships between experience, evidence, and explanation. Scientific analysis may identify the chemical composition of a pigment, while art-historical inquiry may situate its use within a particular visual tradition. Both contribute valuable knowledge, yet neither necessarily captures the entirety of the artist's embodied engagement with the material or the viewer's experience of the painting. The significance of aesthetic experience lies precisely in making these differences visible without requiring them to be collapsed into a single explanatory framework.

This perspective also clarifies the limitations of interdisciplinary integration. Collaboration between art history, chemistry, psychology, and cultural studies may produce a richer understanding of painting, but such collaboration does not automatically explain how artistic meaning emerges through the interaction of material, perception, and practice. The issue is not that disciplinary approaches are inadequate in themselves, but that their integration may leave unexamined the relationships through which the artistic object becomes meaningful in the first place. Barad (2007) concept of *agential realism* provides a complementary theoretical perspective by questioning the assumption that entities and their boundaries are always established independently of their relations. Applied cautiously to the analysis of artistic practice, this perspective directs attention towards the processes through which materials, actions, perceptions, and meanings become mutually consequential.

Aesthetic experience therefore offers more than an additional subject for interdisciplinary research. It provides a conceptual basis for reconsidering knowledge as something that emerges through situated engagement and relationships. The painting becomes intelligible not simply as an isolated object or as the product of several separate disciplines, but through the relations among its material properties, visual organisation, creative process, interpretative possibilities, and cultural context. This understanding establishes the transition from aesthetic experience to relational epistemology: if relationships participate in the formation of artistic meaning, then relationality may also offer a more fundamental principle for reconsidering how knowledge is organised within the humanities.

From Aesthetic Experience to Relational Epistemology

The epistemological significance of aesthetic experience becomes clearer when considered alongside theories that question the independent existence of entities before their relations. Barad (2007) concept of *agential realism* challenges the assumption that boundaries between entities are always predetermined. Instead, distinctions and identities emerge through specific material-discursive relations. Although Barad's argument originates in a different theoretical context, it offers a useful conceptual parallel to aesthetic processes in which meaning develops through encounters among bodies, materials, practices, and contexts.

Latour (2005), actor-network theory similarly draws attention to the associations through which human and non-human actors participate in social processes. Braidotti (2013), through posthuman thought, further challenges the image of the autonomous human subject by situating human existence within broader

ecological, technological, and material relationships. Read in conjunction with Dewey's account of experience, these perspectives suggest that knowledge cannot always be understood as the product of a detached subject observing an independent object. Knowing also involves situated participation in relationships that shape both experience and interpretation.

For the humanities, this argument has particular significance. Literary interpretation, visual analysis, cultural criticism, and artistic research all involve encounters between works, readers, historical circumstances, material forms, and interpretative traditions. Damrosch (2003), demonstrates how literature acquires new significance through circulation, translation, and reception across cultural contexts, while Felski (2008) examines the relationships that connect readers to literary works. Such encounters do not simply transfer meanings unchanged from one context to another. They can generate new interpretations through the interaction between a work and the circumstances in which it is encountered.

The proposition *knowledge is relation* emerges from this understanding. It does not suggest that knowledge consists of relationships alone, nor does it eliminate the need for disciplinary expertise, methodological rigour, or critical evaluation. Instead, it proposes that relations should be understood as constitutive of knowledge formation rather than merely as connections established after knowledge has been produced within separate fields. Knowledge develops through encounters among different experiences, interpretative frameworks, material conditions, and cultural traditions.

This proposition also extends, rather than simply rejects, the historical understanding of *knowledge is power*. Knowledge has enabled explanation, prediction, and intervention, while its institutional organisation has shaped intellectual authority and social relations. Yet knowledge understood exclusively through mastery and control offers an incomplete account of the ways human beings come to understand their worlds. A relational epistemology draws attention to another dimension: the capacity to engage with difference, recognise interdependence, and generate understanding through encounters that may transform the participants themselves.

The distinction matters because relationality should not become another universal formula imposed upon diverse forms of knowledge. Its value lies in opening an epistemological question: what becomes possible when the relationships through which knowledge develops receive as much attention as the disciplines and categories through which knowledge is organised? Aesthetic experience provides one answer by demonstrating that understanding may emerge through processes of engagement that remain open to material resistance, interpretative uncertainty, and changing contexts. This provides the basis for reconsidering knowledge architecture beyond the simple expansion of interdisciplinary collaboration.

Discussion

If aesthetic experience demonstrates that knowledge emerges through relations, the next question concerns the implications for the organisation of academic knowledge. The challenge is not to replace disciplines with an undifferentiated network of ideas, but to reconsider the principles governing their relationships. Knowledge architecture refers to the conceptual and institutional arrangements through which knowledge is produced, legitimised, exchanged, and developed. Its reconstruction therefore requires

attention not only to individual disciplines but also to the relationships through which different forms of understanding interact.

The architectural metaphor highlights an important distinction. Establishing new disciplines, research centres, or collaborative programmes may expand a university's intellectual capacity without transforming its underlying structure. Academic knowledge can become increasingly diverse while remaining organised through relatively separate institutional units. The central question is whether innovation merely adds new spaces to an established structure or transforms the relationships through which those spaces function.

A relational approach does not abolish disciplinary boundaries. Disciplines remain essential for developing specialised concepts, rigorous methods, and intellectual traditions. However, their boundaries should be understood as historically established and open to reconsideration. This perspective extends Klein (2021) discussion of disciplinary boundary work by emphasising the epistemological conditions that enable encounters among different forms of knowledge. Kuhn (2012), account of paradigm shifts offers a complementary insight: changes in knowledge may require reconsidering the assumptions through which problems are defined and evidence interpreted, rather than simply accumulating information within existing frameworks. Although this argument does not equate relational epistemology with a scientific revolution in Kuhn's precise sense, it suggests that transforming knowledge architecture requires more than expanding disciplinary structures.

Aesthetic experience provides a conceptual basis for this transformation. In artistic practice, materials and techniques retain their distinctive properties, yet their significance emerges through their relationships within a work. Colour, texture, composition, bodily gesture, and perception interact to produce meanings that cannot be fully attributed to any single element. Similarly, a relational organisation of humanistic inquiry would preserve disciplinary and epistemological differences while enabling encounters that generate questions and interpretations unavailable to any one perspective independently.

Relationality, however, should not be confused with unrestricted integration. Not every encounter produces understanding, and differences do not always need to be resolved through synthesis. Gadamer's (2013), concept of the fusion of horizons offers a useful perspective: understanding develops through dialogue between historically situated positions, allowing interpretations to be questioned and transformed without requiring participants to abandon their particular standpoints. A relational architecture should therefore facilitate critical exchange without assuming that intellectual differences must disappear.

This reconstruction also has ethical and political implications. Santos (2018) demonstrates how dominant knowledge systems marginalise alternative epistemologies through cognitive injustice, while Mignolo (2020) examines the colonial hierarchies through which certain traditions acquire greater intellectual authority than others. Reorganising knowledge consequently requires more than connecting academic disciplines. It also involves questioning who participates in knowledge production, whose experiences shape research questions, and which forms of knowing are recognised as legitimate.

Aesthetic experience offers an important, though insufficient, starting point for this task. Artistic practices themselves operate within institutional, economic, and cultural conditions that influence which works receive recognition and which traditions remain marginalised. A relational epistemology must therefore examine inequalities within artistic and academic fields alike. Without this critical dimension, relationality risks celebrating connection while overlooking the unequal conditions under which relationships are established.

The implications extend to relationships between universities and public life. Jasanoff's (2004) concept of co-production demonstrates how scientific knowledge and social order develop through mutual interaction, while (Lewis, 2024) discussion of public humanities emphasises engagement between humanistic scholarship and wider social experience. A relational architecture would encourage exchanges among academic research, artistic practice, community experience, technological development, and local knowledge. Such engagement should not reduce community knowledge to material interpreted exclusively by academics; rather, it should recognise communities as contributors to research questions, methods, and interpretations.

The proposition *knowledge is relation* thus has implications for intellectual practice and institutional design. Academic innovation should be assessed not only by the number of interdisciplinary programmes or collaborative projects established, but also by the quality of the relationships they enable. These relationships should sustain methodological rigour, support critical dialogue, acknowledge epistemological differences, and allow historically marginalised perspectives to participate meaningfully in knowledge production.

This argument remains conceptual rather than empirical. It does not establish that relationally organised universities necessarily produce superior outcomes, nor does it provide a complete institutional model. Further research could examine how artistic research, interdisciplinary curricula, and university–community collaborations enable or constrain relational forms of knowing. Such investigations would clarify the practical conditions under which this framework can be implemented and critically evaluated.

Ultimately, moving beyond multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches does not require abandoning their achievements. It means extending their contributions by reconsidering the conditions under which knowledge becomes possible. Aesthetic experience offers a productive point of departure because it reveals how understanding develops through relations among perception, materiality, embodiment, and cultural experience. Art is therefore not merely another field to incorporate into interdisciplinary research, but a source of epistemological reflection. From this perspective, the humanities can be reimagined as an evolving intellectual space in which diverse forms of knowledge encounter, question, and transform one another. The proposition *knowledge is relation* provides a direction for reconstructing knowledge architecture while remaining attentive to difference, epistemic inequality, and the changing conditions of contemporary life.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of knowledge organization demonstrates that disciplinary specialization has enabled intellectual depth while also producing boundaries that can limit the understanding of complex realities. Although multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches have challenged disciplinary fragmentation, they do not necessarily transform the epistemological foundations of knowledge organization. This article has argued that aesthetic experience in art offers a productive starting point for reconsidering these foundations.

Through artistic practice, knowledge emerges from the dynamic relations among perception, embodiment, materiality, imagination, memory, and cultural context. The experience of creating and interpreting a work of art demonstrates that meaning cannot be fully understood by isolating its constituent elements or reducing them to established disciplinary categories. Rather, knowing develops through encounters in which subjects, objects, and contexts participate in the formation of meaning. This insight provides the conceptual basis for the proposition *knowledge is relation*.

The proposition does not seek to replace disciplinary rigour or dismiss existing collaborative approaches. Instead, it extends their possibilities by positioning relationality as a fundamental epistemological principle rather than merely a strategy for connecting established fields. For the humanities, this perspective opens possibilities for reconstructing knowledge architecture through dialogue among diverse intellectual traditions, cultural experiences, and modes of knowing, without subordinating their differences to a single dominant framework.

As a reflective-conceptual inquiry, this article offers a theoretical framework rather than an empirically validated model. Further research may examine how relational epistemology can inform arts education, interdisciplinary curricula, and institutional practices. Ultimately, rethinking knowledge through aesthetic experience invites the humanities to move beyond the integration of disciplines towards a more relational, plural, and dialogical understanding of how knowledge emerges and acquires meaning.

REFERENCES

Arnheim, R. (2023). *Visual thinking*. Univ of California Press.

Bal, M., & Marx-MacDonald, S. (2002). *Travelling concepts in the humanities: A rough guide*. University of Toronto Press.

Barad, K. (2007). Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. In *Duke Up*. Duke University Press.

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. John Wiley & Sons.

Chakrabarty, D. (1992). Provincializing Europe: Postcoloniality and the critique of history. *Cultural Studies*, *6*(3), 337–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502389200490221

Damrosch, D. (2003). *What is world literature?* (Vol. 5). Princeton University Press.

Dewey, J. (2008). Art as experience. In *The richness of art education* (pp. 33–48). Brill.

Felski, R. (2008). *Uses of literature*. John Wiley & Sons.

Foucault, M. (2005). *The order of things*. Routledge.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2013). *Truth and method*. A&C Black.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Scott, P., Schwartzman, S., & Nowotny, H. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Haraway, D. J. (2020). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

Jasanoff, S. (2004). *States of knowledge: The co-production of science and the social order*. Routledge.

Klein, J. T. (2021). *Beyond interdisciplinarity: Boundary work, communication, and collaboration*. Oxford University Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (2012). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions: 50th Anniversary Edition*. University of Chicago Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford Uiversity Press.

Latour, B. (2012). *We have never been modern*. Harvard University Press.

Lewis, P. (2024). *The Public Humanities Turn: The University as an Instrument of Cultural Transformation*. JHU Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). Eye and mind. In *Theatre and Performance Design* (pp. 243–245). Routledge.

Mignolo, W. D. (2020). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.

Nowotny, H., Scott, P., & Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-thinking science: Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. SciELO Argentina.

Santos, B. de S. (2018). The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South. In *The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South. Durham: Duke University*. https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478002000