

ECONOMICS*Sociology*

Vasyl Chernets, Arts and Aesthetics: Nature and the Specific Relationship and Interaction, *Economics & Sociology*, Vol. 3, No 2, 2010, pp. 114-120.

Vasyl Chernets

*Rector of the National Academy of
the Culture and Arts Leaders,
Kyiv, Ukraine*

**ARTS AND AESTHETICS: NATURE
AND THE SPECIFIC RELATIONSHIP
AND INTERACTION**

Received: May, 2010

1st Revision: September, 2010

Accepted: October, 2010

ABSTRACT. The issues raised in the article can – for the theoretical needs – be transformed in the history of art development in general and its specific spheres in particular. In a framework of a particular philosophical and aesthetic saturation of the specific historical period, art attempted to reflect this atmosphere of search, helping to deepen the outlook and to define life sense problems.

JEL Classification: Z11, P2

Keywords: art and aesthetics development

Introduction

As international practice shows, at the turn of the centuries aesthetics and art history take on a new weight and meaning by some unexpected reasons, namely: depression of humanity in the sense of scientific and technological progress, and its "triumphant march across the planet Earth." Man-made disasters, some confusion of science caused by unidentified secrets of atomic energy, slowing down of space exploration, etc. changed the paradigm of values and direction of futures forecasts. If at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries, the appearance of the car, airplane, and numerous discoveries in the field of physical knowledge, and later formulations of the theory of relativity, mastery and awareness of the idea of speed gave rise to futurism, cubism, and with this the idea of introducing the art of analytical research method, the end of XX century revives the importance of human knowledge, which is the key to the humanization of man, awareness of its responsibility to the human civilization and its future.

Art and aesthetics as a science

In this regard, among the problems of the contemporary humanities issues the relation of aesthetics and art criticism became particularly important. This is due to several factors. Among them, first of all, we note a common interest in aesthetics as a science, capable to harmonize the personality, to develop and improve the culture of human feelings, to raise the taste consistency. Interest in art history is linked with the fate of modern art – the art of the last years of XX century. It is not a secret that at the end of the century the general picture of art-forms focus have changed so that it can be hardly compared not only with the beginning of the century, but even with the processes in 80's – early 90's. Let's turn to the facts. Thus, if in the beginning of XX century "childhood" of the cinema was assessed as a compulsory further prosperity, and the 80-ies have confirmed these predictions, since the early 90's, the most

optimistic researchers not only have determined that the cinema is in crisis, but they even do not undertake to predict its nearest future. Literature loses its value as a spiritual teacher, mentor, and conscience of the people. This process of decay that was typical for the literature with the educational function now was determined and observed with some trepidation by researchers and the same process of the change in paradigm of the students interests from literature to television and computer had been noted by the teachers. The latter leads to stereotyped thinking, depriving the child of contact with an outstanding world of a particular writer. The list of the facts can be extended, and it becomes clear that the massive fascination with pop culture is not the way to understand the music. The process goes in the opposite direction: the “pop” distortion of the taste would not allow us to understand the spiritual power of classical music. Consequently, an interest for the art history issues is not only a theoretical interest, but also a practical search for the ways of regulation of the art-forms, developing the respect for the creativity and the artist’s personality; it is also an education of the conscious attitude to art as the memory of mankind.

There is no doubt in the fact of the proximity of aesthetics and art history, which at one time are rather independent and this enabled them to pass over the centuries with their own history, persist and open for modern researchers the potential of joint influence on people. Having a certain historical tradition of studying the specificity of interaction of aesthetics and art history, the theoretical basis of the conceptualization of this issue is connected, of course, with the XX century. It has to be recognized that within the Marxist methodology much fruitful has been done to determine the aesthetic nature of art. At the same time, there was unequal development of aesthetics and art criticism. Aesthetics within the unified methodology acquired, nevertheless, significantly higher opportunities for its development, having a right in one or another form to access the history of world culture, art history, and, simultaneously, is based on the live artistic practice of Soviet times.

In fact, art criticism had the only foundation – the works in Socialist Realism genre, but the necessity of developing the theory with a common art-shaped structure of factual material would not let the space for research. The combination of aesthetics and art criticism, had not only strengthened the position of the latter, but also allowed to distinguish a crucial problems, induced to a generalized perception of the arts, putting forward such promising ideas as a synthesis of the arts and co-authorship of the different art-forms.

Scientific practice have been formed in such way that the interest to a wide range of art issues, its aesthetics and aesthetics as a methodology of art criticism – within the tradition of Soviet times – was inherent by Russian, Georgian, Ukrainian theorists, and this made it possible to combine theory with specific traditions of national art, that, in turn, significantly personalized its position and enriched the general picture. If at least briefly, make some stress on the history of Soviet art, national identity approaches to the interpretation of certain events, historical facts, identify the psychological characteristics of the characters of heroes – it will be undeniable. This fact was convincingly confirmed, for example, by the development of historical themes in Soviet cinema 70-80ies. Films by T. Abuladze “Prayer”, A.Tarkovskyy “Andrei Rublev”, G. Koch “Yaroslav the Wise”, Y. Iliencko “Princess Olga” were peculiar cinematic sensations, each of which – under the general concept of “Soviet Cinema”, showed the distinctive fictional world. The national identity of the literary works by Stelmach, N. Dumbadze, P.Zagrebelniy, E. Mezhelaytisa, C. Amirejibi, V. Rasputin, Y. Bondarev and many-many of others have created an outstanding artistic space. To some extent, the very identity of art searches provided theorists with the “food for thoughts”.

Let us note some of the works that have played an important role in identifying the theoretical foundations of aesthetic and art criticism approach in the 70-90’s [1].

Despite the independence of the reflection about the nature of art that was presented in the works of these authors, it can be defined a common approach. The most typical was the

position grounded in the 80 years by famous Russian aesthetics M. N. Afasizhev. He tried to transform the existing views and the specific approaches through the specific systemic principles, relying on the existing system-forming principles. In this approach, the principle is the understanding of the “system” of its structural elements.

Analyzing the various definitions of the term “system” that are most common in the literature [2], it can be argued that the system is a set of interacting entities (the most common definition). The second definition emphasizes the importance of the system as a unity with the environment. Researchers necessarily structure the system determining the subordination of elements that in their turn, act as a systems of lower level.

M. Afasizhev, drawing on these formal structures, at the same time, reveals the limitations of these approaches which ignore the “one important characteristic of any system – its development as a result of the operation in a given environment and interaction with other systems as the highest and lowest order [3, 5]”. This is more approximate to the problems of art, the understanding of the system allowed M. Afasizhev to determine its own art system, which “in light of the postulates of the systemic art approach, in its genre and form diversity, is a complex system of interrelated subsystems that are in a dialectical interact with each other – on the one hand, and with different social systems – on the other [3, 6]”.

This interaction, M. Afasizhev proposes to analyze in the three sections: **1) vertical, 2) horizontal, 3) temporal.**

Vertical section, according to a scientist, discovers a complex system, “leading and independent unit of which is the work of art”, in turn, the product is already a system for “subsystems of – images, story, songs, style features”. The latter can be differentiated by more specific features: “the material, ideological significance, linguistic, fine expressive features, the evolution of the image, etc. [3, 6]”.

Horizontal section notes the specific forms of system of art – literature, paintings, music, architecture, film, etc. By the relying on the type of system, one can identify its subset: literature, for example, consists of genera (prose, poetry, drama). In turn, the genus is divided into classes (novel, story, tale), and classes – by genre (historical romance, adventure, psychological, sentimental). If dissect every genus within each art form in such a way, it will compose, as you might imagine, quite complex and multidimensional structure.

At the same time, according to M. Afasizhev, on the horizontal section “art of a country or nation, in its form or genre ambiguities, interacts with the art of another country or nation.

Thus, it can be seen a broad picture of the interaction of art, its national art forms, and as a consequence – the possibility of considering art as a unified system of a certain period [3]”.

Temporal section, according to the theorist, suggests that the whole system is not functioning in the “vacuum”, and “is a subsystem of the society of a certain age”, depends on various social systems and structures, the nature and level of social production and interacts with other forms of social consciousness – science, politics, ethics, religion, etc. [3]”.

We believe that the approach proposed by M. Afasizhev has a summing, unifying character, whereby almost all the specific features of art find its level. At the same time, in such condensed form it becomes clear that the art is a complex phenomenon. If, however, we will agree with M. Afasizhev that all systems and subsystems of society “are in constant dynamic motion”, it is understandable how difficult “the life of the art” is. As it should be considered, firstly, in reference to the society, and secondly, as a process of artistic creation, which takes place in time, and the perception of the creativity products by the society or the public [3]”.

We have already noted the theoretical works, which examines the specific principles of the aesthetic and art criticism approach to art. At the same time, the conceptual approaches

that have created quite a voluminous research plane should be noted. Let us note the analysis of such areas as the study of theoretically cognitive nature of art: A. Andreev, M. Kiyaschenko, V. Mazepa, L. Stolovich. Over the several decades a functional approach to art was quit intensively developed: S. Alexandrov, V. Vanslov, M. Kagan, A. Lanovenko, V. Tolstykh. A significant contribution was made by those authors who studied the level of active art influence on the formation of personality: A. Azarhin, A. Canarskiy, A. Shevchenko, R. Shulga. The list of the analysis areas can be continued and expanded, however, we do not claim for inclusiveness, but it should be noted that the deliberate work of many theorists who were mentioned led to an impulse for aesthetics that, above all, the Ukrainian experiences in 90ies. Right now we can name a number of studies of Ukrainian aestheticians, who opened up new horizons in this problem.

Another positive sign of the modern Ukrainian experience is, in our opinion, in the organic unity of the theoretical approach with the use of its achievements in practice of both – to teach these sciences and to enrich the forms and methods of aesthetic and artistic education of children and youth, to improve methodological support of practical types of work. The work that was done in Ukraine by V.Lazov, N.Myropolska, A.Rudnytska gives us a reason to talk about the theoretical and practical integrity of mastering of the aesthetics and art interrelationship problem.

As for the theoretical achievements, the concept of the Ukrainian esthetician D.Y.Kucheriuk deserves special support. He considers aesthetics as **a metatheory of art**, he quite argumentatively “leads” us to the adoption of the term “**metatheory**” and to the identifying specific opportunities of aesthetics as a metatheory of art. He rightly notes that the scientific and theoretical approach is not the only way to development and evaluation of art. Beside the scientific and theoretical there is a level of the ordinary consciousness: “Peculiar democratism of the nationwide availability of the arts, and with that openness to subjective assessments, manifestation of the degree of their own understanding, or even the use of in accordance with the understanding, makes art vulnerable to the arbitrary representations, in this way introducing the element of beyond-aesthetics passions, and often tragic situations too [4, 108]”.

The complexity of the phenomenon of art itself, different methodological approaches to the clarifying of its nature and specificity of perception creates a contradiction precisely because it is several sciences that are studying art. D.Y.Kucheriuk classifies them as:

1. Science and analysis methods, which are agreed upon the need for research in the field of artistic culture (history and theory of art, poetics, art criticism, aesthetics).
2. Science, formed by the collision of different methodologies (psychology, semiotics, sociology, folklore, history).
3. Sciences of natural and technological or biological orientation (information theory, holography, bionics, physiological experiments, cosmology, medicine).

Given the quantity of sciences that study the art, there is a real possibility of “blurring” of the art among the various aspects. Therefore the need to identify some cornerstone concepts and methodology basis emerges. This sort of peculiar load can perform an aesthetic, which, by the apposite remark of D.Y.Kucheryuka, “first internally, and eventually, in his terminology definition has evolved to the level of system-creating philosophical discipline that can accumulate in itself a variety of methods and approaches in the analysis of any manifestations that characterize the specificity of art [4, 111]”. Based on this approach D.Y.Kucheryuk forms the notion of “metatheory”. Aesthetics is one of the sciences of art, it is anyway connected with them, because apart from aesthetic analysis performs the integrative function of the accumulation of synthetic knowledge about art. Its philosophical and methodological ability to be a kind of a metatheory of the art evolved gradually. The process is not completed yet [4, 110]”.

We believe the proposed approach is not only fundamentally new, but extremely promising in the reconstruction of the real relations of aesthetics and art. At the same time the consideration of aesthetics as a metatheory of art, on the one hand, will classify types of art, will enrich their conceptual and categorical apparatus and will help to deepen the sensual nature of the artwork. With regard to aesthetics, the proposed approach will primarily reveal the true value of art in the aesthetics' object.

Another productive area of relationship problems development of aesthetics and art history is associated with the name of M.M. Brovko. At least two of his works – “Art activity in the cultural and historical process” (1995) and “Art as an aesthetic phenomenon” (1999) – completed within five years – clearly reflect a kind of theoretical search tensions in this area. There is no doubt that as the biggest achievement of M.M. Brovko can be considered its consistent attention to a particular aesthetic and art category of “activity”, a comprehensive analysis of which he is engaged. Clearly, that any notion cannot be artificially invented, “processed” through its other related and similar in content and declare a new category. Modern theory knows such attempts and at the same time, the same theory proves their stillbirth. Regarding works of M.M. Brovko, the scientist, analyzing previous experience of aesthetic analysis of art, accurately singled out “activity” as a concept with considerable theoretical potential and demonstrated its capabilities in different ways: deepening of the understanding of artistic activity specificity, its functionality, clarification of the creation identity and art works perception etc. This detailed processing of the “activity” makes author's findings convincing: “...determinants of art activity that primarily reflect internal sense, interior mechanisms for its efficiency is, first, aesthetic ways of interaction between subject and object and, secondly, art object, which gets relevant features during the process of social and practical art development [5, 99]”.

M.M. Brovko pays extraordinary attention to the art object in determining the nature of art activity. It could be surprising, but the concept of “art object” still remains a vulnerable spot in the theory of art. Relevant literature varies usually between the position of Leo Tolstoy, who in his article “What is art?” emphasized the art object *as a means of feelings transferring*, and views of Maxim Gorky, to whom art – is a *study of human*. In this debatable and still not completely theoretically accurate problem of the art object, determining the specificity of the art activity manifestation in the context of his object can effectively influence on creating a convincing theoretical concept of art object itself. As to the views of M.M. Brovko, the scientist believes that “art object on the one hand is an essential condition of the art specifications, and on the other – takes the art out of its own borders, into the sphere of social and cultural life [12]”. The author's last comment seems to us fundamentally important, as important is the empowerment of art is in the social space. Thus, in our opinion, the limitations of the art analysis are overcome only through statements of its characteristic social functions.

The development of the category of “activity” allows M.M. Brovko to use traditional art analysis components in a bit new to use way, and namely – an aesthetic ideal and artistic image – substantial and specific determinants of activity. He writes: “The action of these determinants of arts activity can be deployed in other, external to-the-art itself structures. And though the both aesthetic ideal and artistic image are an integral component of the aesthetic nature of art, at the same time, these two factors make it possible in full force and in accordance with its essential features to realize the active influence of all the arts filed on the processes occurring in social and cultural environment [5, 99]”.

Valuable meaning has, to our deep conviction, M.M. Brovko's appeal to a number of concepts that are related to activity and that, although are used in the modern theory, but have no clear theoretical and scientific boundaries. It is referred to concepts such as: “creation”, “change”, “transformation”, “personification”, “artistic reality”, “artistic transformation” and

others. All these concepts are transformed exactly into identifying of the artistic thinking specificity, into disclosing of the creation identity, functioning and influence – aesthetic, moral and psychological, social and political, artistic work – on the audience.

It should be noted that the increased interest in conceptual and categorical system is inherent not only for positions of M.M. Brovko, based on which it is appropriate to approach to the analysis of artistic activity. This trend is quite common today and can be clearly seen in the works of many Ukrainian researchers of last decade. In addition to the concepts of “metatheory” and “activity” that we paid some attention, an important place also occupy the concepts of “intersubjectivity”, “corporeality”, “plasticity”. As far as it can be judged, these concepts gain a conceptual meaning and can greatly enhance both aesthetics and art.

Conclusion

The issues raised in the article can – for the theoretical needs – be transformed in the history of art development in general and its specific spheres in particular. In a framework of a particular philosophical and aesthetic saturation of the specific historical period, art attempted to reflect this atmosphere of search, helping to deepen the outlook and to define life sense problems. This philosophical and aesthetic conceptuality, its grip of the common to all mankind characteristics defined transcultural work of Dante, Leonardo da Vinci, Shakespeare, Goethe, Beethoven, Rodin and others.

The positive influence of aesthetics is felt even when complex, filled with philosophy themes are developed in works of certain arts. Hardly the pieces would be formed as they are of, for example, Tarkovskyy (“Stalker”, “Solaris”) if the futurological, existential or psychoanalytic ideas orientation have not been subject of substantial interest among intellectuals in 1960 and 70 years. Searching of Tarkovskyy cannot be separated from the new moral and psychological landmarks associated with the works of Z. Freud, A. Camus, Jean-P. Sartre. Of course, the movies of the artist then inspired intellectuals to identify themselves in the higher level. We intentionally emphasize the relation of the creation of the movie director with intellectuals of the time, because his work has never had, so to speak, out-of-the-intellectual influence. It also demonstrates the importance of aesthetic orientation, the importance of aesthetic education. After all, beyond a certain level of aesthetic education it is hardly possible to perceive, understand and experience such works. The given example from the work of Andriy Tarkovskyy is not accidental, because this movie director not only was a symbol of aesthetic and philosophical orientation of art, but he worshipped aestheticism in those models, which he acquired in late XX century, namely: the deliberate involvement in movie language symbols, metaphors, the principle of associative thinking and others. The creativity of Andriy Tarkovskyy pattern brings new challenges to the art in general, and to such an important part of it as criticism, in particular. However, the overall system of arts education should consider forming of the audience ability to perceive and analyze such works, “penetrate” into their artistic fabric. Without this men-of-art work it is unlikely that the artwork of Vynnychenko, Bulgakov, Marques, Dali, Dürrenmatt, Visconti, Cavani, and many more whose work makes the heritage of the art of philosophical orientation, could ever become the mankind heritage.

These aesthetic platforms stimulated many artistic directions in the art of XX century, and – accordingly – art developments, their quantitative and qualitative enrichment. For instance, we are obliged to intuitive aesthetics for the emergence of such outstanding literary phenomenon as a “new novel”, and aesthetics of phenomenology not only formulated the idea of the “artization” of the world, but also in 70-years demonstrated a significant influence of mass spectacles on the psychology of the viewer.

In the problem of “aesthetics – art”, we have significant achievements in the detection of the art aesthetic potential, but further theoretical search, which could correspond to the development dynamics of both aesthetics and art, is also necessary.

References

1. See.: Afasyzhev M.A. Arts as a subject of comprehensive research. – M., 1983; Ereemeev A.F. Borders of Arts. – M., 1987; Ermash G.L. Arts as thinking. – M., 1982; Ivanov V.P. Human activities – cognition – arts. – K., 1977; Kakabadze Z.A. The phenomenon of the Arts. Tbilisi, 1980; Malakhov V.A. Arts and human interrelation with the world. – K., 1988 and others.
2. See.: Studies on the general theory of system. – M., 1969.
3. Afasyzhev M.N. Arts as a subject of comprehensive study / M.N. Afasyzhev. – M., 1983.
4. Kucheriuk D.Y. Aesthetics as a metatheory of Arts / D.Y. Kucheryuk // Aesthetics. – K., 1997.
5. Brovko M.M. Art as an Aesthetic Phenomenon / M.M. Brovko. – K., 1999.