Marina Yu
18 March 2026

Difficulty: On Value, Pleasure, and Aesthetic Engagement

I. Introduction

Watching a disturbing psychological thriller, reading modernist novel, sitting through Shostakovich's tedious Leningrad symphony. What do all of these things have in common? Well, one could respond with *"I didn't enjoy it, but I'm glad I experienced it",* in each case.

Consider the claim that aesthetic value is pleasurable experience. Combined with the phenomenological observations above, we get a defining logical claim. If value equates to pleasure, then the statement *"I didn't enjoy it, but I'm glad I experienced it"* collapses into "I got no value from it but I'm glad I experienced it"—which either means you *did* get value (contradicting "didn't enjoy")[1] or you sought an experience you knew would be valueless (which is irrational). Neither makes sense, but people say it sincerely and we understand what they mean, so perhaps aesthetic value is not simply pleasurable experience.

The source of this puzzle is, what I believe, a pervasive conflation of aesthetic value and pleasurable experience, operating in hedonist theory, in critical discourse ("is it enjoyable?"), and in the consumption habits of the everyday consumer. In this paper, I argue that difficulty in art is not an obstacle to value or a tax on pleasure. It is sufficient—but not necessary—to make certain forms of aesthetic engagement and their value possible.

II. The Conflation

In aesthetic hedonism, the value of art is derived from its production of pleasurable experience in the appropriately situated audience. This seems intuitive and has real explanatory power—we experience art to be moved, delighted, or absorbed; there is nothing wrong with that[2].

The conflation of value and pleasure is often seen in critical discourse. For example, in film (and other) reviews, "did it grip you?" is routinely treated as equivalent to "is it good?" Consumer behavior reinforces this: recommendation algorithms, star ratings, and watch-time metrics all operationalize value as pleasurable experience. Even sophisticated audiences are not immune. Nguyen, in "Autonomy and Aesthetic Engagement" (*Mind*, 2019), argues that aesthetic engagement can be compromised when external values such as rankings, ratings, and social approval substitute for genuine first-person response. The result is a feedback loop of gratification masquerading as engagement: you consume what confirms your existing preferences, and call it good.

---

[1] The argument does not presuppose the distinction it sets out to establish. The incoherence is internal to hedonism: if aesthetic value just is pleasurable experience, then "I didn't enjoy it" and "it had no aesthetic value for me" are equivalent by definition, and "I'm glad I experienced it" becomes unintelligible. The distinction between value and pleasure is not a premise here—it is what the incoherence points toward.

[2] The critique of hedonism in this paper is conceptual, not normative.

What the conflation muddles is that value and pleasure can come apart—and not just in obvious cases outside of art. The *"glad I experienced it"* locution has a two-tier structure. There is a first-order experience, the pleasure or discomfort during engagement, and also a second-order assessment of its value. These can diverge. Difficult art is precisely the domain in which they most often do, and it is that divergence that this paper aims to explain.

III. What is Difficulty?

Before turning to the argument, it is necessary to define our terms. Difficulty in art can be preliminarily defined as the degree to which a work resists immediate comprehension, absorption, or emotional resolution. This resistance can be cognitive—a dense argument, heavy allusion, formal complexity. It can be emotional—something confrontational, morally unsettling, or demanding sustained attention. Or it can be formal—unconventional structure, opacity of meaning. For now, these are treated as instances of a single phenomenon: what unifies them is that each functions as a barrier by presenting a perceived challenge to the consumer. The distinctions between them will become important later in the paper.

It is equally important to distinguish difficulty from mere obscurity or failure. Not all resistance is productive difficulty. Some art is just impenetrable without reward, some could say even carelessly opaque.[3] What makes difficulty philosophically interesting, however, is a specific, oriented conception of it. Productive difficulty resits in a way that invites continued engagement, holding out the promise—not guarantee—of resolution or depth. The criterion here is a complex one, involving the work, the audience, and authorial intent in ways this paper does not attempt to fully resolve.[4] What matters for the argument is the distinction itself: this paper does not argue that difficult art is valuable, but that difficulty can be constitutive of value rather than just incidental to it.[5]

Consider high-altitude mountaineering, where you wake up before midnight, strap on heavy gear, and trudge thousands of feet upward while hypoxia slowly dulls your mind. Now, remove the difficulty. Take a helicopter to the top, and you have not made the climb easier; you have eliminated it entirely. The difficulty of a climb is not an unfortunate feature that is required to be overcome in order to reach the summit—it *is* what the climb is

This is not unique to physical and emotional pursuits. Nguyen, in "Games and the Art of Agency" (*Philosophical Review 128*, 2019), argues that artificial obstacles in games are not bugs but

---

[3] The distinction between productive difficulty and mere obscurity maps loosely onto Kant's distinction between the sublime and the merely overwhelming. Whether Kant's aesthetic framework is ultimately compatible with the argument here is a question worth pursuing but outside this paper's scope.

[4] Whether the locus of meaning in art resides in authorial intent, the work itself, or the audience's response is one of the central disputes in the philosophy of art, spanning intentionalism, formalism, and reader-response theory. This paper brackets that debate. The claim that productive difficulty involves all three factors is meant as a gesture toward its complexity, not a resolution.

[5] The risk of circularity here was significantly considered. If productive difficulty is defined as difficulty that generates value, and value is explained by productive difficulty, the account proves nothing. The way out is to anchor the definition in a structural feature of the work that is independent of its outcomes—oriented resistance, meaning the work's resistance has direction. This is admittedly a thin criterion, but it is enough to break the biconditional without requiring a full theory of artistic success or failure.

features, and that they generate the structured engagement from which meaning and achievement emerge[6]. Does something analogous hold for art? I believe so, but the mechanism is different.

IV. The Standard Views and Their Limits

First, consider the instrumentalist view: difficulty is valuable when it produces better pleasure. In other words, difficult art is valuable not despite its difficulty but because overcoming difficulty produces a deeper or richer pleasure than simple gratification. This preserves hedonism while accommodating difficult art, and it is a parsimonious view. It requires no new theory of value; it simply extends the hedonist account by allowing that some pleasures are harder won than others.

However, instrumentalism has real limits. It cannot account for cases where the difficulty is never fully resolved, even after sustained engagement, yet we still judge it valuable. Consider films like David Lynch's *Mulholland Drive* or Christopher Nolan's *Inception*. They end completely unresolved yet are still widely considered masterpieces not despite, but because of that lack of resolution. Instrumentalism has no clean explanation for this since it treats difficulty as always in service of pleasure. More critically, even where instrumentalism succeeds, it still subordinates value to pleasure, just with a longer causal chain. The conflation still remains.

Nguyen's account of autonomy and aesthetic engagement offers more. What matters, for Nguyen, is not just you experience pleasure, but that the engagement is wholly your *own*—undistorted by external rankings, social pressures, or pre-digested interpretations. The implicit premise connecting difficulty to autonomy is that when a work resists immediate absorption, passive reaction becomes impossible. You cannot simply receive difficult work. You must actively wrestle with it, which means the engagement that results is necessarily self-directed. This shifts the focus from pleasure to the quality of engagement, which is a much more productive debate. But Nguyen's view still has limitations. His account correctly identifies that the quality of engagement matters, but stops short of asking what makes that engagement possible at all. This is the gap the following account attempts to fill.

V. The Positive Account

My core claim is that difficulty does not just produce engagement as a side effect. It structures the environment in which engagement can be possible. Correspondingly, meaning in art is not a fixed property of the work, retrievable by any minimally attentive audience. It is something that is relationally constituted, emerging only through engaging with the art. When a work offers no resistance, the audience is reduced to a passive recipient of meaning: a terminal point in a one-way transmission. Consider an Instagram Reel or TikTok. Such works are designed for total transparency. Everything there is to see has to be shown. Everything there is to understand has been pre-digested by the creator. A sophisticated painting or dense literary work operates differently—it withholds, it

[6] Nguyen's account is specifically concerned with games as a distinct art form, and his claims about difficulty and agency are tailored to that context. The extension to art more broadly is not one that Nguyen explicitly makes, and it is not uncontroversial. One might argue that the voluntary, rule-bound structure of games is precisely what makes difficulty value-generating there, and that art lacks this structure. This will be addressed in Section V of this paper.

resists, it leaves gaps the audience must actively work to fill. This is not to say that easy art produces no meaning at all, but that it produces meaning of a thinner kind, what we might call *transmitted,* since it is entirely author-determined and non-relational. However, the specific kind of meaning that this account is concerned with is a different and thicker kind: *constituted* meaning, which emerges only through transformation and achievement. Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground,* whose narrator is so relentlessly unreliable that the reader must recalibrate their interpretation, holding contradictory signals in tension simultaneously. This active "holding-together" is more than just means to meaning—it *is* meaning, in the relevant sense.

The claim here is stronger. Aesthetic properties supervene on the formal and structural properties of the work itself.[7] This means that two versions of the same work—one with and another without difficulty—are not the same work, that is, they are aesthetically distinct. Aesthetic distinctness warrants different responses since the interpretive frameworks they demand and the kinds of meaning they make available are different. Consider German Lied—the art song repertoire of Schubert, Schumann, Wolf, and others. To perform these songs in English translation would be both a travesty and unorthodox. The composers set the text to music with utmost intention; the formal difficulty of the music lies in the compression of the German and the way meaning is distributed across vowel songs that the music was composed to inhabit. The translated version is not the same work made easier. It is a different and thinner object.[8]

What, then, is the value generated here, if not just pleasure? I believe that it is a mélange of achievement and epistemic expansion. That is, the work has demanded something of the consumer and in meeting that demand, the consumer has become, in some minute way, different. This is why people say *"I'm glad I experienced it"*—it meaningfully changed the shape of their engagement with the world and not just because they suffered and survived.[9] This is precisely also why some art that is deeply unpleasant can still be profoundly valuable.

It is now worth returning to the distinction between different types of difficulty, which operate through related but distinct mechanisms. Cognitive difficulty, as in *Notes from Underground*, structures engagement by demanding interpretive labor: the audience must actively construct coherence from resistance. Emotional and moral difficulty, on the other hand, operate differently. They demand the consumer hold something in view that they would rather look away from. This is exactly the phenomenon Tamar Szabó Gendler identifies in "The Puzzle of Imaginative Resistance" (*Journal of Philosophy,* 2000). Gendler observes that we are surprisingly resistant to imagining morally

---

[7] The supervenience claim is introduced here in a limited form. The thesis that aesthetic properties supervene on formal and structural properties is widely accepted in analytic aesthetics, but its precise formulation is contested. See Frank Sibley, "Aesthetic Concepts," *Philosophical Review* 68 (1959): 421–450, for the canonical treatment of the relationship between aesthetic and non-aesthetic properties.

[8] This claim has implications for theories of translation and adaptation more broadly. If difficulty is constitutive of aesthetic content rather than incidental to it, then any adaptation that reduces difficulty is not a neutral transposition but a transformation of the work itself. This bears on ongoing debates in music performance practice, literary translation theory, and film adaptation.

[9] The notion of epistemic and perceptual expansion through aesthetic encounter has antecedents in Dewey's *Art as Experience* (1934), where aesthetic experience is characterized by its capacity to reorganize perception. The account here is indebted to that tradition while differing in its emphasis on difficulty as the structural condition for such reorganization, rather than absorption or continuity of experience.

deviant propositions in fictional contexts. Consider the protagonist in Toni Morisson's *Beloved*, Sethe, killing her baby with a chainsaw. We balk, we pull back, we refuse to follow the fiction where it leads.

However, moral difficulty in art is what makes resistance so important. Another example is Vladimir Nabokov's *Lolita*. The novel's prose is deliberately seductive with Humbert Humbert's voice being charming, lyrical, and self-justifying. This forces the reader to actively resist being aesthetically complicit in this perspective while at the same time engaging with the work on its own terms. The audience is required to do more than just work out what the work means. They also need to consider what it means for them to be engaging with the work at all.[10]

This is where the moral and cognitive forms of difficulty diverge, and where this paper connects to the central concerns of the course. If moral difficulty demands a second-order assessment, then consuming the difficult work of a morally bad person is more than an aesthetic choice. It is itself a form of structured moral engagement, one that the difficulty makes unavoidable.[11] The question "can I enjoy this?" is a fundamental mischaracterization of what is at stake. We should reframe this to a more honest question: what is this work demanding of me, and am I capable of meeting that demand with integrity?

VI. Objections and Replies

The most obvious objection is that someone could simply say their goal in consuming art is pleasure. They are not conflating value and pleasure—they just identify as a hedonist, and this paper's critique does not touch them. This objection has real force and deserves a careful response. The argument offered here does not require that everyone converge on the same goals. As a matter of fact, it shows that even the hedonist should care about difficulty. The key is to recognize that the pleasures art produces are not simple hedonic states—such as the warmth of a bath or sweetness of sugar—they are *intentional* pleasures, whose content cannot be disaggregated from the object or activity that produces them. You cannot extract the pleasure of understanding a difficult math proof from the activity of working through it, because the pleasure just *is* the experience of that activity. The same holds in art. A blanket aversion to difficulty therefore, is fruitless, even on purely hedonistic grounds.[12] This is not a critique of hedonism as a theory of value per se; it is an observation that a hedonistic argument risks misunderstanding its own conditions of satisfaction.

Another objection is that if difficulty generates value through structured engagement and structured engagement is what makes meaning constituted rather than transmitted, then any activity that hits a threshold of difficulty should produce the same kind of value. Assembling flat-pack furniture, navigating a bureaucracy, or filing taxes is difficult, but we do not hold these to have

---

[10] Gendler's original puzzle is somewhat narrower—she is primarily concerned with why we resist imagining morally deviant propositions as *true* within fictional worlds, rather than with the broader experience of moral difficulty in art. The extension of her account here goes beyond what she explicitly claims, though the underlying mechanism, the friction between imaginative engagement and moral judgment, is the same.

[11] Whether that engagement is ultimately redemptive, corrupting, or simply clarifying is a question this paper does not resolve.

[12] This reframes hedonism rather than rejecting it. The claim is not that pleasure is an unworthy goal but that the hedonist has an impoverished model of how aesthetic pleasure is generated. A more sophisticated hedonism would recognize that intentional pleasures cannot be disaggregated from the structured encounters that produce them.

aesthetic value. The difference lies in the intentional structure of the difficulty itself. Flat-pack furniture is difficult as a defect—IKEA would eliminate the difficulty if it could, and a version of the assembly with no difficulty would be strictly better. In contrast, art's difficulty is crafted and intentional, presenting itself as more than just a barrier. One might object that some art is just accidentally difficult. On the intentionality criterion, accidentally difficult art would be classified the same as flat-pack furniture, and the difficulty would be a defect. But, does it even matter whether the difficulty was intended if it is there and oriented?

VII. Implications

The argument of this paper has been primarily diagnostic: difficulty in art is not an obstacle to value but a sufficient condition for a specific kind of valuable engagement, and the conflation of aesthetic value with pleasurable experience has obscured this. But this paper gives way to implications that go beyond the diagnostic—implications about the nature of aesthetic engagement itself, about how we evaluate difficult art, and about what honest engagement demands of us as audiences and consumers.

The first implication concerns what might be called aesthetic alienation. Bernard Williams, in his essay "A Critique of Utilitarianism" (*Utilitarianism: For and Against,* 1973), argues that utilitarianism's demand for impartial calculation requires the moral agent to alienate themselves from their own commitments and projects, and that this alienation is not a minor cost but a destruction of what makes a life meaningful. The parallel to aesthetic engagement is instructive. If the value of difficult art is process-dependent—that is, if it is constituted by the activity of structured engagement rather than by its output—then passive or distracted engagement is not just a diminished version of full engagement. It is a categorically different relationship to the work.

Marcia Muelder Eaton's account in "Integrating the Aesthetic and the Moral" (*Philosophical Studies 67,* 1992) furthers this point. Eaton's central claim is that the question of whether moral considerations override aesthetic ones rests on a false premise—that aesthetic and moral values are separable in the first place. On her view, aesthetic and moral features are present in a single, unified act of perception and judgment. Therefore, aesthetic responsiveness (the capacity to be genuinely open to what the work is doing) and moral responsiveness (the capacity to be affected by and answer to its moral dimensions) are not two distinct faculties deployed sequentially. Therefore, aesthetic alienation can be characterized as a failure more than just an impoverished way of engaging with art. It is important to note that this claim does not generate a duty to engage with difficult art. It only suggests that the quality of engagement is not incidental to the value received, in the same way that Williams' alienated moral agent has not just performed worse but has failed to engage with the relevant domain at all.[13]

The second implication concerns an asymmetry between difficult and easy art that this paper subtly entails. It is tempting to treat difficulty as a scalar property. Works are more or less difficult,

[13] Aesthetic engagement is not identical to moral agency, and the stakes are different. What the parallel illuminates is the structural point: in both cases, alienation names a failure not of outcome but of relationship, a severance from the process through which value is generated rather than merely a reduction in the quantity of value received.

and more difficulty means more resistance to be overcome, vice versa. But the implication is something stronger: difficult and easy art are not just different in degree but in kind, because they generate value through entirely different mechanisms. Easy art *offers* meaning; difficult art *requires* the audience, in part, to constitute it. This is an ontological claim and not a value judgment. It is not a prescriptive claim that difficult art is better than easy art, nor that seeking easy art reflects on the audience in some way. To treat it as such would be a category error, conflating a descriptive claim about the structure of aesthetic objects with a normative claim about their relative worth. What the asymmetry does entail is that evaluating difficult and easy art by the same standard—asking of both simply "was it enjoyable?"—is itself a category error in the other direction.[14]

The third implication is the most unsettling, and is offered here as an implication rather than a fully fleshed out conclusion. If meaning in difficult art is partly constituted by the audience's engagement, then two audiences who engage differently with the same difficult work have not, in a philosophically precise sense, encountered the same aesthetic object. This leads us to question whether aesthetic disagreement can be resolved in the first place. When two people disagree about the value of a difficult work, it is conceivable that they are not disagreeing about the same thing. Their respective critical judgments, however sincerely held, are not straightforwardly about the work the other person experienced.[15] Taken together, these implications suggest that the stakes of the value-pleasure conflation are higher than they first appeared.

VIII. Conclusion

This returns us, finally, to where we began. "*I didn't enjoy it, but I'm glad I experienced it"* is not incoherent, nor is it a polite way of saying the experience was unpleasant but educational. It is a phenomenological report of a two-tier structure that the conflation of value and pleasure renders invisible. Art, climbing, games, and certain forms of scholarship are not simply practices that happen to involve difficulty. Perhaps, they constitute a distinct ontological category—practices whose defining feature is that value is inseparable from structured engagement. If that is right, then the question this paper began with is not really about difficulty at all. It is about what kind of thing art is, and what kind of activity engaging with it involves. Those are questions this paper does not settle. What it does is make them harder to avoid.[16]

---

[14] This implication has affinities with Gadamer's account of the hermeneutic circle in *Truth and Method* (1960), where understanding a text is not a matter of recovering a fixed meaning but of a fusion of horizons between text and interpreter. It is important to note that the argument presented in this paper is more modest than Gadamer's.

[15] [1] The most pressing of these implications is the relativism worry: if meaning is partly constituted by the audience's engagement, does this collapse into the view that all interpretations are equally valid? The account resists this conclusion. The work's demands, set by the practice to which it belongs, constrain what counts as legitimate engagement, but a full defense of that resistance would require a more sustained treatment of aesthetic ontology than this paper undertakes. The question is left open deliberately.

[16] If art does belong to such a category, this has implications that extend well beyond aesthetics. It would suggest that the dominant frameworks through which we evaluate and distribute art (recommendation algorithms, star ratings, critical consensus) are not merely imperfect proxies for aesthetic value but are structurally misaligned with it, because they operationalize value as a product rather than a process. The institutional consequences of that misalignment could be serious.

References

Dewey, John. *Art as Experience*. New York: Minton, Balch & Company, 1934.

Eaton, Marcia Muelder. "Integrating the Aesthetic and the Moral." *Philosophical Studies* 67, no. 2 (1992): 219–240.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. New York: Crossroad, 1989. Originally published 1960.

Gendler, Tamar Szabó. "The Puzzle of Imaginative Resistance." *The Journal of Philosophy* 97, no. 2 (2000): 55–81.

Nguyen, C. Thi. "Autonomy and Aesthetic Engagement." *Mind* 129, no. 516 (2020): 1127–1156.

Nguyen, C. Thi. "Games and the Art of Agency." *Philosophical Review* 128, no. 4 (2019): 423–462.

Williams, Bernard. "A Critique of Utilitarianism." In *Utilitarianism: For and Against*, by J.J.C. Smart and Bernard Williams, 77–150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.