

**This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Continuum* on 14 July 2019, available online:**

**<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10304312.2019.1641180>**

**If, for academic reasons, you are interested in the final published version (Version of Record) and your institution does not have a subscription to *Continuum*, you can send me an email to [albgarcia@unav.es](mailto:albgarcia@unav.es). Taylor & Francis kindly gives every author who publishes in a subscription journal 50 free eprints to share with colleagues.**



***Hannibal* and the Paradox of Disgust**

Journal:	<i>Continuum</i>
Manuscript ID	CCON-2018-0127.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	<i>Hannibal</i>, disgust, emotions, aesthetics, television studies

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

***Hannibal* and the Paradox of Disgust**

Anonymous

For Peer Review Only

## ***Hannibal* and the Paradox of Disgust**

*Hannibal* (NBC 2013–15) is a bloody and violent television series that also displays an embellished and self-consciously expressive visual style. This article explores the disparity between aesthetic pleasure and repugnance, an issue that scholars working in aesthetic theory have dubbed the ‘paradox of disgust’. It begins by focusing on the specific qualities of disgust among the so-called ‘negative’ emotions in art, and develops this analysis through a close reading of significant scenes in *Hannibal*. Drawing on Strohl’s ‘hedonic ambivalence’, the article argues that *Hannibal* intensifies its aesthetic value precisely by visually boosting the paradox of disgust, maximizing both aversion and pleasure simultaneously. However, the article also shows that *Hannibal* attempts to circumvent the paradox of disgust by prompting an ‘aestheticist turn’, embodied in the experience of protagonist Will Graham.

Key words: *Hannibal*; disgust; emotions; aesthetics; television studies.

### **Introduction**

In one of the earliest scholarly essays published on the NBC television series *Hannibal*, Angela Ndalianis comments on Dr. Hannibal Lecter’s gruesome actions: ‘His killing and cannibalism are great creations that Hannibal perceives as pure acts of art that tell a story about art and the senses, death and life’ (2015, 281). This may seem to be an odd coupling: bloody carnage as the pinnacle of artistic enjoyment. Similar assessments can be found in several recent articles on *Hannibal*: ‘horrific tableau’ (Schwegler-Castañer 2018, 12-13), ‘artistic tableaux of the dead’ (Abbott 2018a, 129), and ‘diabolical beauty’ (Logsdon 2017, 56). By way of *Hannibal* and its scholarly reception, this article explores a wider problem in the philosophy of art: how does natural aversion become a matter of aesthetic delight?

To work through this problem, I will focus on how *Hannibal* thematizes the so-called paradox of disgust. Although there are nuances that differentiate them, I will use ‘disgust’, ‘aversion’, ‘abhorrence’, and ‘detestation’ as broad synonyms. According to Irons, there ‘are all emotions of repugnance. They are feelings in reference to some object which is regarded as repulsive and give rise to actions of withdrawal or avoidance’ (1987, 640). To explore these emotions from the viewpoint of artistic works, I begin here by

1  
2  
3 following Korsmeyer's aesthetic theory and delve into the paradox of negative emotions  
4 — namely, the enjoyment of painful feelings through an aesthetic experience.  
5 Subsequently, I will draw on 'hedonic ambivalence', a concept developed by philosopher  
6 Matthew Strohl, to name the pleasure one can obtain from painful experiences. Placing  
7 Strohl's theory in dialogue with iconic sequences from *Hannibal*, the article shows how  
8 the narrative heightens its aesthetic value by visually amplifying the paradox of disgust. In  
9 the final section, I explore how the concluding episodes to *Hannibal* offer a kind of solution  
10 to the paradox, suggesting that a viewer's own ethical barriers to the enjoyment of violence  
11 can be 'conquered' through a unique capacity for empathy held by protagonist Will  
12 Graham, characterized by Ndalians as 'our doorway' into 'both Hannibal and *Hannibal*'s  
13 masterful style and affective power' (Ndalians 2015, 283).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

### 24 **Negative emotions and the paradox of fiction**

25 How is it possible to enjoy, voluntarily, stories and works of art that engender emotions  
26 such as anguish, grief or disgust? Why do some people deliberately engage with artworks  
27 that create emotions which they may find objectionable in other spheres of life? This study  
28 sorts the different responses to the paradox of negative emotions – encompassing both the  
29 paradox of tragedy and the paradox of disgust – into three categories: the imaginative  
30 solution, the compensatory solution, and the hedonistic solution. In the first instance, the  
31 imaginative response (Walton 1990) suggests that we do not actually feel negative  
32 emotions when faced with these works of art, but rather only imagine feeling them. That  
33 imagination can be pleasant given the safety net between reality and representation.  
34 Second, the compensatory response (Feagin 1983; Carroll 1990) argues that we indeed  
35 perceive negative emotions, but that they are a kind of toll that must be paid on the road to  
36 achieving a full aesthetic experience. These negative emotions are necessary for the  
37 cognitive enjoyment of the overall work of art. However, it is the third category – the  
38 hedonistic response – to which I turn here, for reasons that will become apparent in the  
39 closer treatment of *Hannibal*.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 In a recent contribution to an intellectual tradition that focuses on 'hedonism' at the  
52 centre of aesthetic experience, Carolyn Korsmeyer explores a 'tug of war' that she labels  
53 the 'paradox of aversion'. Instead of putting the stress on 'pleasure', she prefers the more  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 comprehensive notion of ‘the aesthetic’,<sup>1</sup> emphasizing ‘the capacity of disgust to impart an  
4 intuitive, felt grasp of the significance of its object’ (2011, 8). Disgust does not elicit  
5 pleasure *per se*, but a kind of broader aesthetic experience. In this context, Korsmeyer  
6 construes art in a wide-ranging sense, including not only painting, sculpture, and literature,  
7 but also food, television and films. Throughout, she notes that while the emotions provoked  
8 by a given work of art might be uncomfortable, the discomfort makes them valuable:  
9 ‘Disgust is not just the nasty price that must be endured to achieve the point of the work;  
10 the emotion itself delivers the point’ (2012, 760). That is, the ‘hedonistic’ response does  
11 not deny the negative aspects of particular emotional experiences, but instead proposes that  
12 the reflective assessment of those emotions can, in the right circumstances, be desirable.  
13 Disgust may thereby amplify the aesthetic experience, making it more intense by forcing  
14 the viewer to calibrate the contradiction between pleasure and rejection: ‘[I]t is aversion  
15 with a backward glance, lingering over and even savoring its object’ (Korsmeyer 2008,  
16 373).

17  
18 However, it may be that even if artworks can elicit an idea or memory of disgust,  
19 we do not desire artworks to actually be, in themselves, repugnant or repulsing (see Hanich  
20 2010, 94). For example, one may enjoy the visual depiction of rotting flesh in horror  
21 cinema, but have no desire to smell the stench of decay of rotting flesh. This tension  
22 highlights the complexity of the ‘aesthetic’ as both a sensory and a reflective experience.  
23 Given its visceral nature, disgust exemplifies the dense network of cognitive operations,  
24 emotions, gradations, and nuances that come into play when evaluating a work of art. For  
25 **these** reasons, artists sometimes get the balance wrong: if the work is too sickening, the  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

---

46  
47  
48  
49 <sup>1</sup> In his recent *Aesthetic Evaluation and Film*, Andrew Klevan tackles the difference between concepts such  
50 as evaluation, pleasure and value. In a similar fashion to Korsmeyer, Klevan writes, ‘Aesthetics does  
51 not discount or demean moral, political, emotional, cognitive, or conceptual content. [...] But *the*  
52 *engagement will be with the value of its expression through the form of the work*’ (2018, 20,  
53 emphasis in original).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 result is not an intense aesthetic experience but merely repugnance and recoil<sup>2</sup>. In this  
4 context, I argue below that *Hannibal* achieves a proper and aesthetically enhanced balance.  
5 As Schwegler-Castañer puts it in her study on the entangling of aesthetic taste and  
6 conceptual metaphors of consumption in *Hannibal*, the ‘literalization of cannibalism in  
7 association to the aesthetic of the show creates an effect of the appetizing yet repulsive by  
8 its juxtaposition of beauty and terror’ (2018, 15). I will unpack how this juxtaposition of  
9 gorgeousness and dread functions in Bryan Fuller’s television series.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 16 17 ***Hannibal* and the dichotomy between art and the macabre**

18  
19 *Hannibal* was both a reboot and a prequel of the fictional universe novelized by Thomas  
20 Harris and adapted for the big screen by Jonathan Demme and Ridley Scott. **Will Graham**  
21 **is the main character of the show. He works as a criminal profiler, helping the FBI hunt**  
22 **serial killers. Will has an exceptional psychological gift that he displays in the murder case**  
23 **that launches every week’s episode—when visiting the crime scene, he can mentally**  
24 **reenact the killer’s modus operandi.** During its 39 episodes, *Hannibal* basked in a kind of  
25 horrid imagery that is unusual on free-to-air, contemporary television, including scenes  
26 like a giant heart made of human flesh trotting like an elk, a baby inside a ‘pregnant’ pig,  
27 or an eel drowning a disfigured and hideous character. These three examples are among  
28 the most notorious in the series, but they are hardly exceptional. Each episode contains  
29 scenes of violence and beauty woven together, and the dramatized mise-en-scène of each  
30 week’s gruesome murder runs as the series’ dominant aesthetic paradigm. As Stacey  
31 Abbott puts it, ‘These crime scenes blur the lines between science, art and macabre display,  
32 particularly when examined through the eyes of Hannibal Lecter’ (2018b, 559). In-depth  
33 analysis of one example from *Hannibal* can illustrate this dichotomy between art and the  
34 macabre (Abbott), and between beauty and terror (Schwegler-Castañer).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

---

50  
51 <sup>2</sup> There have always been reports of cinema spectators physically suffering from disturbing images by  
52 vomiting, fainting, or becoming dizzy. Sometimes, especially recently, producers themselves boast of  
53 these reports as a morbid marketing tool for films such as *Grave* (Julia Ducournau 2016), *Bite* (Chad  
54 Archibald 2015), *Saw III* (Darren Lynn Bousman 2006), etc. (see Crucchiola 2016).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 One of the most iconic, ghastly murders from season one is the ‘human cello’ found  
4 in ‘Fromage’ (1.8.). The killer — eventually discovered to be Hannibal Lecter himself —  
5 punishes the least talented musician in the Baltimore Orchestra by shoving a cello neck  
6 down his throat and using his vocal cords to play the ‘new’ instrument. This savage crime  
7 neatly illustrates Schwegler-Castañer’s argument that Dr. Lecter’s crimes interweave  
8 aesthetic taste with ‘tangible’ taste in his killings: ‘Hannibal considers that he improves  
9 people by converting them into art by “elevating” them into his artistic creations in the  
10 form of food or into installation artworks with his theatrical exposition of their corpses’  
11 (2018, 7). Bryan Fuller’s ‘theatrical exposition’ of the human cello brings an aura of ornate  
12 symbolism, aesthetic sophistication, and formal beauty to what may otherwise be  
13 experienced as repulsive. This happens in three ways.

14  
15 Firstly, *Hannibal* draws regularly on symbolism. The human cello is the epitome  
16 of the grotesque, which Carroll understands as the ‘feature of combining elements from  
17 different biological or ontological orders in a single composite being’ (2003, 307). The  
18 grotesque often appears throughout the series as the intermingling of human and animal,  
19 such as the skull converted into a beehive in ‘Takiawase’ (2.4.), or the corpse strung up  
20 emulating a dragonfly (‘Secondo’, 3.3.). At other times, *Hannibal* intermixes botanical  
21 themes through the corpses, such as victims buried alive and subsequently used as compost  
22 to cultivate mushrooms (‘Amuse-Bouche’, 2.2.). Secondly, the whole scene acts as a  
23 performance to the cube. There are three levels of discourse superimposed, resonating with  
24 each other: the auditorium as a physical and specific place where the musicians play, the  
25 crime scene as a macabre theatre where the serial killer ostentatiously exhibits his twisted  
26 artistry, and the empathetic performance, through which Will Graham reenacts the process  
27 of the murder—including, in turn, a short ‘cello’ musical act by Will himself. Furthermore,  
28 the multiplication of performances provides the sequence with a high degree of structural  
29 and aesthetic complexity, so that the viewer is never required to focus solely on the grisly  
30 aspects of the murder. Thirdly, visual design is central to the framing of ‘disgusting’  
31 violence in the human cello sequence. As Abbott puts it, *Hannibal* follows an aesthetic  
32 drive already present at *The Silence of the Lambs* (1991), where the dead from the crime  
33 scenes are repeatedly presented as figures of ‘macabre beauty’ (2018b, 558). From its  
34 beginning, the scene shows a visual balance: a long shot shows the whole auditorium—a



1  
2  
3 clean, quiet, and magnificent location. The crime scene is highlighted by a zenithal beam  
4 that projects a perfect circle of light in the centre of the stage. The spotlight becomes more  
5 intense as Will begins his ‘performance’ by re-enacting the slicing and impaling of the  
6 musician.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 [Figure 2 near here. Caption: Graham plays a cello neck in ‘Fromage.’ Credit: NBC]  
13

14  
15 Will discovers the modus operandi of the killer and his final goal: ‘Powder on the wound.  
16 Rosin from the bow. I wanted to play him. I wanted to create a sound. My sound’.  
17 Accordingly, Will ‘plays’ the human cello. The ominous music transforms into a solo, and  
18 the mise-en-scène conveys a crane tilt pan linking the close-up of the cello to a long shot  
19 of the stalls. There lurks the hallucination of Garrett Jacob Hobbs, the serial killer from the  
20 pilot episode, who is alone in the auditorium, clapping under the spotlight. Taken together,  
21 this densely packed aesthetic experience **subsumes and enhances** the primal effect that  
22 repugnance could have upon the spectator, because the disgusting elements are layered  
23 among several other aesthetic devices, **as I will detail henceforth**.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **Hedonic ambivalence, context and absorption in *Hannibal***

34 Through its mise-en-scène and its narrative content, *Hannibal* deliberately maximizes both  
35 disgust and aesthetic enjoyment. To understand how the ‘contradictory’ elements of key  
36 sequences in *Hannibal* might function together, I turn here to Matthew Strohl, who makes  
37 a compelling theoretical argument to account for a contradiction that he terms as ‘hedonic  
38 ambivalence’ (2012, 203). Strohl tackles the complexity of the issue by suggesting a  
39 structural difference between ‘atomic’ and ‘complex’ experiences. The former refers to  
40 discrete, isolated sensations such as smelling a particular scent, while the latter includes a  
41 variety of thoughts and perceptions that accumulate and interrelate, such as the complex  
42 experience of watching a film. ‘A complex experience’, Strohl writes, ‘has the pleasure  
43 structure partly in virtue of one or more of its elements (complex or atomic) having the  
44 pain structure’ (209–10). This argument shared affinities with Kieran’s argument that  
45 ‘what is normally repellent and harsh to look upon may, given a certain context and relation  
46 to other features, become beautiful and pleasing’ (Kieran 1997, 392). In Strohl’s  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 development of this theme, he proposes ‘the possibility that a pain structure can be  
4 *embedded within* a pleasure structure’ (2012, 209, emphasis in original). An artwork offers  
5 a ‘hedonic ambivalence’ when the overall pleasure provoked is due, at least in part, to the  
6 pain/disgust provided by one of its atomic elements:  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12       Pain can be attractive when it synergizes with other elements of a complex  
13       experience to make that experience more pleasant. The attractiveness of a  
14       painful emotion as such is not due to its intrinsic phenomenal character, but  
15       rather to the relation that this character bears to other aspects of the experience  
16       it is an element of. (Strohl 2012, 210)  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 A close reading of the unnamed couple assassinated in the episode of *Hannibal* entitled  
23 ‘Primavera’ (3.2.) illustrates the ways that relational assessment can help to transform  
24 repugnance into beauty.  
25  
26

27       After awakening from his coma, Will Graham has travelled to Italy, where  
28 Hannibal Lecter has escaped from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) with his  
29 psychiatrist and lover, Bedelia du Maurier. Graham meets there inspector Rinaldo Pazzi,  
30 who believes Lecter is related to an old criminal he pursued two decades ago, Il Mostro.  
31 Hannibal’s earlier crimes come to mind because the corpses of a loving couple have been  
32 displayed in a style resembling an allegorical Renaissance painting, ‘Spring’ (1477–1482),  
33 by quattrocento Italian artist Sandro Botticelli. The two unnamed lover are physically used  
34 to replicate the right-hand corner from Botticelli’s tempera on panel – in a sense, the corpses  
35 are both decontextualized and re-contextualized. The display copies Botticelli to an  
36 excruciating detail: the tunics, the physical position, the blue tint for the Zephyrus-like  
37 figure, the yellow tone for Chloris, and the flowers coming out of her mouth. Following  
38 Strohl’s theory, an unsettling encounter with two dead bodies could be understood as an  
39 ‘atomic’ experience that is then subsumed within a ‘complex’ experience. Mise-en-scène  
40 and intertextuality make the implied violence seem both more pleasant and more intense,  
41 such that ‘[one] finds oneself in certain contexts attracted to a feeling that outside such  
42 contexts one is categorically averse to’ (2012, 203).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 [Figure 3 near here. Caption: A murder *à la* Boticcelli in 'Primavera.' Credit: NBC]  
4  
5

6  
7 The brilliance of the *mise-en-scène* allows the viewer to focus on the physical  
8 characteristics of the objects displays, and to suspend or defer feelings of disgust and  
9 repugnance. 'We can be absorbed in either type of experience,' writes Strohl, 'but our  
10 absorption has a positive character in the aesthetic cases. It is in virtue of this positive  
11 character, not in virtue of our absorption, that these experiences count as pleasant' (2012,  
12 207). The notion of fascinated absorption also influences the viewer not only to tolerate,  
13 but also to engage aesthetically, with scenes that feature disgusting acts. A final example  
14 from *Hannibal* episode 'Futamoto' (2.6.) helps to show how such devices work across the  
15 series.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Will Graham is incarcerated, and Hannibal has just survived a murder attempt. The  
23 focus of the episode is the killing of Sheldon Isley, a councilor from Baltimore who had  
24 approved the construction of a parking lot in an area full of songbirds. After declaring to  
25 Alana Bloom that he needs 'to get' his 'appetite back', Hannibal picks up a business card  
26 (Sheldon Isley) from his wheeldex and a recipe (steak and kidney pie) from his box. Brian  
27 Reitzell's musical score commences, deploying metal sounds and a grinding melody. An  
28 extreme close-up from Hannibal's eye dissolves into yellow stamens. The tune unnervingly  
29 intensifies while the montage sequence exhibits a succession of colourful, vivid flowers in  
30 the process of blossoming. One shot rapidly dissolves into the next. A dolly shot moves  
31 the camera away from what seems to be a stunning bouquet. The camera calmly moving  
32 out reveals the ominous location of the bouquet inside an eviscerated body. The flowers  
33 are 'replacing' the internal organs, save for the lungs. The whole body is grafted to a tree,  
34 so that the human body resembles the central trunk. The cadaver's arms merge with the  
35 branches and its feet with the roots. The dolly track ends in a long shot, so that the  
36 surroundings of the 'Tree Man' are visible, and it is revealed that the grotesque sculpture  
37 has been placed in the middle of an empty parking lot, foggy in the background. This recalls  
38 Caspar David Friedrich's landscapes, as if the killing were in the middle of a romantic  
39 vision. The colour palette is pale and subdued, so that the brightness of the flowers contrast  
40 with the rest of the image.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 [Figure 4 near here. Caption: The grotesque ‘Tree Man’ in ‘Futamono.’ Credit: NBC]  
4  
5

6  
7 In this sequence, absorption is not achieved through the empty shock value of the cadaver  
8 image. Instead, it is elicited through the violent and gorgeous expressionism found in the  
9 sequence’s mise-en-scène, which plunges the viewer into a universe of madness, allowing  
10 for what, following Strohl, could be understood as a complexification of the atomic horror  
11 at the centre of the display. A nightmarish pre-opening credits montage that exhibits a  
12 texture of operatic sophistication, sweet dream, and irresistible delicacy.  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 18 **Circumventing the paradox: Will’s aestheticist turn**

19 I have so far explored how *Hannibal*’s ‘hedonic ambivalence’ allows us to make sense of  
20 the narrative’s seemingly contradictory mix of aesthetic splendor and abhorrence.  
21 Nevertheless, *Hannibal* does propose a way to surmount the paradox of disgust, and to  
22 understand this, we need to consider the ethical dimensions of the program. Given Dr.  
23 Lecter’s despicable actions, as well as murders carried out by other screen villains, how do  
24 ethical considerations shape the aesthetic synthesis of disgusting and beautiful images?  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 From a symbolic point of view, Dr. Lecter’s anthropophagy epitomizes a victory of  
31 aesthetics over ethics. Bedelia de Murier puts it bluntly at the beginning of her Italian  
32 journey when she states, ‘You no longer have ethical concerns, Hannibal. Only aesthetical  
33 ones’ (3.1.). When cooking and tasting human organs, Lecter radically refutes any kind of  
34 moral contradiction, because he rejects the first premise of the paradox, that is, that human  
35 innards are somehow disgusting. He dismembers human bodies as part of an artistic  
36 composition and cooks organs with the devotion of a gifted chef. Beyond clinical diagnosis,  
37 the Nietzschean Hannibal Lecter fits the definition of aestheticism, a philosophy of life and  
38 of art. In a book devoted to the issue, Robert Vincent Johnson offers an account of its main  
39 features:  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The work [of art] is not to be valued for anything that could influence our  
51 conduct or even our general attitude to life; it is to be valued *solely for the*  
52 *immediate aesthetic pleasure* it affords (2017, 14, emphasis added)  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 One of the narrative features of *Hannibal* is Lecter's tendency to deploy double meanings  
4 in his speech and to hint at extra-textual irony. During the pilot, after an intense first  
5 encounter at Jack Crawford's office, this dialogue takes place between the two  
6 protagonists:  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 HANNIBAL LECTER: I would apologize for my analytical ambush, but I know I  
12 will soon be apologizing again, and you'll tire of that eventually, so I have to  
13 consider using apologies sparingly.  
14

15  
16 WILL GRAHAM: Just keep it professional.  
17

18 HANNIBAL LECTER: Or we could socialize, like adults. God forbid we become  
19 friendly.  
20

21  
22 WILL GRAHAM: I don't find you that interesting.  
23

24 HANNIBAL LECTER: You will.  
25  
26

27 This early exchange can be understood as an anticipatory meta-commentary on how the  
28 narrative requests the spectator to adapt to *Hannibal*'s 'hedonic ambivalence'. The  
29 narrative invites the audience to find the gruesome scenes more and more enjoyable and  
30 'interesting', and Lecter's call to friendliness grows in parallel with the cultivation of visual  
31 absorption as a key aesthetic device across the series. In the 'complex internal structure'  
32 that every *Hannibal* sequence contains, the 'hedonic ambivalence' also overrides painful  
33 or problematic 'atomic' elements that are embedded within, such as the wicked ethics of  
34 Lecter's horrendous crimes. The story does not end until the protagonist Will Graham can  
35 overcome the paradox of disgust for himself.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Will teams with Hannibal to slay the fearsome Red Dragon. In his last scene with  
44 Hannibal, Will points out that they share a true communion based on aesthetics, resonating  
45 Johnson's aestheticist conviction 'that the enjoyment of beauty can by itself give value and  
46 meaning to life' (2017, 10):  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 HANNIBAL LECTER: This is all I ever wanted for you, Will. For both of us.  
52

53 WILL GRAHAM: It's beautiful!  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 They have their arms around each other's shoulders and together plummet off a cliff. The  
4 very relationship between Will and Hannibal, the thread that weaves through the series'  
5 three seasons, replicates the duality between fascination and repulsion that characterizes  
6 the labyrinth of disgust in art. In this way, the story ends with Lecter's victory, which  
7 amounts to an aesthetic triumph, insofar as Will clears his own ethical concerns by killing  
8 the Red Dragon without experiencing any moral discomfort. In his own 'aestheticist turn',  
9 Will drastically divorces art from life, in the spirit characterized by Johnson: 'art has no  
10 reference to life, therefore no moral implications' (Johnson 2017, 13).

11  
12 During the pilot, Dr. Lecter had already warned Jack Crawford about Will's power:  
13 'What he has is pure empathy. He can assume your point of view, or mine - and maybe  
14 some other points of view that scare him' (1.1.). The fatal farewell of Will and Hannibal  
15 suggests that, at last, Will can maximize his own aesthetic pleasure, notwithstanding the  
16 disgust felt in relation to the sinister artwork – the murder of Red Dragon – he had 'created'  
17 alongside Dr. Lecter. Will's enraptured statement — 'it's beautiful' — shows that morally  
18 murky villains and dainty slasher scenes can be, indeed, highly enjoyable when one puts  
19 aside ethical considerations. Will finally finds magnificence in violence and killing. His  
20 face and clothes are blood-splattered after the savage brawl with the Red Dragon, yet he  
21 lovingly hugs the depraved Dr. Lecter. In this way, *Hannibal* poses questions regarding  
22 limits of empathy and its implications for aesthetic pleasure. In her essay on ethics,  
23 imagination and intercorporeality in *Hannibal*, Stadler suggests that through its 'complex  
24 aesthetic and narrative evocation of disgust and the theme of cannibalistic incorporation,  
25 the television series explicitly invites its audience and its characters to consider themselves  
26 and their own bodily relationships to empathic feelings, sensory perception, and  
27 imagination' (2017, 416). In this context, we can ask: does the audience follow Graham in  
28 this last aestheticist turn? Can the spectator share Will's ecstasy after having killed the Red  
29 Dragon and having found it so beautiful?

### 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 **Conclusion**

51 NBC's visual nightmare *Hannibal* stands out as a crowning moment in the aesthetics of  
52 disgust in contemporary television culture. The characteristics of Gothic horror that Bruhm  
53 describes (1994, xvii) resonate in the 'beautiful barbarity' and 'troublesome power' that  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *Hannibal* depicts. Its craving for style engenders exuberant visual imagery, where fear,  
4 pain, and disgust are adorned with an exquisite beauty that alludes to Botticelli's allegorical  
5 compositions, Friedrich's landscape paintings, or a virtuoso cello performance, to cite  
6 some intertexts analyzed earlier.  
7  
8  
9

10 As Schwegler-Castañer asserts, 'Hannibal embodies binaries and by uniting them,  
11 questions them' (2018, 12). In presenting the disgusting, the atrocious, and the grisly as  
12 beautiful, *Hannibal* and *Hannibal* force the viewer to question the limits of aesthetic  
13 enjoyment, and potentially allow for a more 'complex' experience, in the sense given by  
14 Strohl. The interrelation between beauty and abhorrence developed during gory *Hannibal*  
15 sequences establishes an intense 'hedonic ambivalence', such that disgust makes 'an active  
16 contribution to the pleasant character of the complex experience it is embedded in' (Strohl  
17 2012, 210). For this reason, *Hannibal* offers a fascinating dramatisation of the repugnant  
18 in contemporary television, turning Gothic horror into what might be characterized as  
19 artistic Darwinism: only the greatest aesthetes can survive.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 References

- 30  
31 Abbott, S. 2018a. 'Masters of Mise-en-Scène: The Stylistic Excess of *Hannibal*.' In *Horror*  
32 *Television in the Age of Consumption*. Edited by K. Jackson, and L. Belau, 126–  
33 140. New York: Routledge.  
34  
35  
36 Abbott, S. 2018b. 'Not Just Another Serial Killer Show: *Hannibal*, Complexity, and the  
37 Televisual Palimpsest.' *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 35 (6): 552-567. doi:  
38 10.1080/10509208.2018.1499348  
39  
40  
41 Bruhm, S. 1994. *Gothic Bodies: The Politics of Pain in Romantic Fiction*. Philadelphia:  
42 University of Pennsylvania Press.  
43  
44 Carroll, N. 1990. *The Philosophy of Horror; or, Paradoxes of the Heart*. New York:  
45 Routledge.  
46  
47  
48 Carroll, N. 2003. 'The grotesque today: Preliminary notes toward a taxonomy.' In *Modern*  
49 *Art and the Grotesque*. Edited by F. S. Connelly, 291–311. Cambridge: Cambridge  
50 University Press.  
51  
52  
53 Crucchiola, J. 2016. 'Raw and 15 Other Horror Movies That Physically Sickened  
54 Audiences.' *Vulture*. September 15. Accessed 12 January 2018.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 [http://www.vulture.com/2016/09/raw-antichrist-history-of-movies-that-sickened-](http://www.vulture.com/2016/09/raw-antichrist-history-of-movies-that-sickened-audiences.html)  
4 [audiences.html](http://www.vulture.com/2016/09/raw-antichrist-history-of-movies-that-sickened-audiences.html)  
5

6 Feagin, S. L. 1983. 'The pleasures of tragedy.' *American Philosophical Quarterly* 20 (1):  
7 95-104.  
8

9  
10 Hanich, J. 2010. *Cinematic Emotion in Horror Films and Thrillers: The Aesthetic Paradox*  
11 *of Pleasurable Fear*. New York: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203854587  
12

13 Irons, D. 1987. 'The Primary Emotions.' *The Philosophical Review* 6 (6): 626–45.  
14

15 Johnson, R. V. (1969) 2017. *Aestheticism*. London: Routledge. doi:  
16 10.4324/9781315314723  
17

18 Kieran, M. 1997. 'Aesthetic Value: Beauty, Ugliness and Incoherence.' *Philosophy* 72  
19 (281): 383–99.  
20

21  
22 Klevan, A. 2018. *Aesthetic Evaluation and Film*. Manchester: Manchester UP. doi:  
23 10.7765/9781526132567.00006  
24

25 Korsmeyer, C. 2008. 'Fear and Disgust: The Sublime and the Sublate.' *Revue*  
26 *Internationale de philosophie* 246: 367–79.  
27

28  
29 Korsmeyer, C. 2011. *Savoring Disgust. The Foul and the Fair in Aesthetics*. New York:  
30 Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199756940.001.0001  
31

32 Korsmeyer, C. 2012. 'Disgust and Aesthetics.' *Philosophy Compass* 7 (11): 753-761. doi:  
33 10.1111/j.1747-9991.2012.00522.x  
34

35  
36 Logsdon, R. 2017. 'Merging with the Darkness: An Examination of the Aesthetics of  
37 Collusion in NBC's *Hannibal*.' *The Journal of American Culture* 40 (1): 50-65. doi:  
38 10.1111/jacc.12678  
39

40  
41 Ndalianis, A. 2015. '*Hannibal*: A disturbing feast for the senses.' *Journal of Visual Culture*  
42 14 (3): 279-84. doi: 10.1177/1470412915607928  
43

44  
45 Schwegler-Castañer, A. 2018. 'The Art of Tasting Corpses: the Conceptual Metaphor of  
46 Consumption in *Hannibal*.' *Continuum* 32 (5): 611-28.  
47 doi:10.1080/10304312.2018.1499874  
48

49  
50 Stadler, J. 2017. 'The Empath and the Psychopath: Ethics, Imagination, and  
51 Intercorporeality in Bryan Fuller's *Hannibal*.' *Film-Philosophy* 21 (3): 410-27. doi:  
52 10.3366/film.2017.0058  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Strohl, M. 2012. 'Horror and Hedonic Ambivalence.' *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art*  
4 *Criticism* 70 (2): 203–12. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6245.2012.01512.x  
5

6 Walton, K. L. 1990. *Mimesis as Make-Believe: On the Foundations of the Representational*  
7 *Arts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Graham plays a cello neck in 'Fromage.' Credit: NBC

451x254mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



A murder *à la* Botticelli in 'Primavera.' Credit: NBC

335x188mm (72 x 72 DPI)



The grotesque 'Tree Man' in 'Futamono.' Credit: NBC

317x176mm (96 x 96 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60