

PHILOSOPHICAL-AESTHETIC FOUNDATIONS OF TRANSITION AESTHETICS

Suslova T.I.

*Tomsk State University of Control Systems and Radioelectronics (TUSUR),
Tomsk, Russia*

This article gives consideration to philosophic-aesthetical conception of the aesthetical transformation, represented in the aspect of historic- civilized approach. There is a definition for “aesthetic of transformation”, the mechanism of transition Old Russian mythologemes into modern cultural field. The innovation interpretation and the introduction of the definition “transformation” into aesthetic field allow to continue further study of modern creative work with the aid of actualization aesthetic foundation of culture. The article can become the reason for thought about further ways of modern aesthetic development.

For culturologues philosophers and everyone who is interested in modern state of world wide and native culture and art.

Methodological and theoretical foundations of researches in transition aesthetics are the principles of cultural-typological and comparative historical analyses. Primarily the author is based on the methodology which commencement was started by Aristotle in his work “About coming into existence and annihilation” [1]. Analyzing the very idea of coming into existence he applies to the principle of cyclicity: “Thus, there is absolute necessity in movement in a circle and in coming into existence in a circle. If coming into existence is going on in a circle, then every [link] inevitably coming into existence and coming into existence takes place, and if it is necessary, than coming into existence is going on in a circle”[2]. In the work Aristotle grounds the idea of coming into existence - annihilation which later on has been spread to the laws of the cyclic development of history, the idea of transition as such: “Simple transition into non matter is a simple annihilation, but transition into simple matter is simple coming into existence [3]”. And after that he goes on: “But just as they speak about simple annihilation if [something] transfers into imperceptible and non-matter, like this they speak about coming into existence from non-matter if it coming into existence from imperceptible” [4].

While developing the philosophical-aesthetic grounds of “transition aesthetic” conception the author was guided by the cycle theory for culture developed by P.Sorokin, who affirms that “the theory of

the ancient adherents of the cyclic theory, such as Confucius, Platon, Phukidid, Aristotle, Ciceronian, Seneka, Machiavelly, Vico was more scientific and grasped the reality much better than less speculative theories of “tendentious lawmakers”[5].

P. Sorokin marks out in the history the perceptual culture, the ideational culture and the third one, “which is the transitional one between the perceptual culture and the culture of the ideational type”. He named it idealistic, integrated, id est the culture which came up to the certain synthesis of the former two cultures. “Here we can observe eclectics both in Sorokin’s works and in the XXc. culture, and this fact defines the idea of aesthetic in it” – says N.A.Khrenov [6]. Thus, guided by Sorokin’s fundamental conception of the ideational and perceptual cultures interchange along the whole world culture development, the interpretation of the “transition aesthetics” conception in home art practice of the XXc. has been shown in this work.

The cycle interchange is associated with regress, that is with coming back to the origins. “As for the XXth c. it seems we mean about coming back not only to the sources of the cycle, but to the sources of civilization in general, i.e. to the archaic character which is so active in the art at the turn of the XIX-XXc.”[7].

Actualization of the old Russian culture values, especially amateur and folk arts most evidently and distinctively shows itself in the art of the Russian modernism in the

XIX-early XXc. In the XIX a keen interest in the folk cults and heresies was shown. Those times have been described as an age of romanticism, and it is characterized by the interest in secrets and life of common people. Based on the works of contemporary authors who investigate the problem in the needed vein, the author has concentrated her attention upon the artistic practice of modernism as the transition aesthetics, the synthesis of elite and traditions in the art.

The Russian religions – philosophical Renaissance, which functions were to revise “the old” consciousness, to form a new value system, to cause a certain turn in spiritual life must be admitted as an important sociocultural tendency in the early XXc.

Modernism with regard to the art, undoubtedly, correlates with the age of the collapse of the classical tradition. Renunciation of the rationalism, subjective self-absorption, pessimism and nihilism creates an affinity between the modernism art and anthropological philosophy. Standing aloof from the social and moral problems is typical for modernism. But for the classical art besides aesthetic the moral content is very important. Thus, the art of modernism breaks off with the nearest traditions of the Enlightenment and the Newtimes aesthetics.

The most characteristic features for them were: revision of the creativity grounds, destruction, fragmenting (at the initial stage) and combining, work with a sign, futuristic reflection of “negation”. The Russian modernism on the one hand was nourished on the roots of the folk art, on the other hand the desire to involve masses in the creative work went with elitism, with the intention to make an artificial world of beauty. The transition in aesthetics was formed on the innovations, through negating the fundamental principle of reflection. But, as the history of culture shows, any attempt of novation brings about many ancient cultural layers. The Ukrainian culture expert Miron Petrovskiy gives as examples of the shattering innovation poetry of V. Mayakovskiy, who actualized the medieval-Christian models, more fundamental

“willbeing” of Velimir Khlebnikov, relating to the area of the original mythology, and the “precultural space” of A. Kruchenikh in his experiments in the space of alogism and transcendent poetry.

In the Russian modernism the game principles, the stylization of ... which are the fundamentals in the postmodernism can be clearly seen. In the intellectualism of modernism the revival of traditions, classes in their new forms and subjective senses took place rather than the renunciation of them.

The Russian art nouveau “as nothing else” was painted in the national colors of the home country. At the beginning of the century icon painting was taken as a painting similar to the primitive art, as a completely museum piece, an “aesthetic underthinking and underfeeling”, and this fact, according to P. Florenskiy, prevented them from taking it as an object of worship.

From the beginning of the century much attention has been paid to so-called “the third culture”. N.A. Khrenov describes the Russian culture as a culture of obliviousness, bereavement, renunciation of traditions. – V. Pigulevskiy. Now the modern art of Russia is ready for accepting innovations as it has been before, the fact is reflected in the modern aesthetic theory on a rather wide scale. Investigating the cultural events in a vital, real, spatio-temporal continuum of the history enables to see the harmonization of traditions and innovations. The situation of the time shows the actualization of so-called “Big tradition” and “Complete tradition”, the complete tradition means that the ideal and symbolic systems are closed. The specific existence form for a tradition is art, science, religion etc.

With respect to the culture and the society a tradition is a system generating notion, it is a demiurge of a culture. So, in this sense the digression from the classic aesthetic traditions in the modern art doesn't mean to be out of touch with reality, but it shows the gap in the aesthetic theory supported by the Western classical aesthetics which emerged in the West. That's why it is impossible to reflect

adequately the realities of the aesthetic practice in the modern Russia, supported, however paradoxically it sounds, by the Russian Slavic heathen tradition.

The art practice of the postmodernism – the deconstructivism – as an utmost deflection from the tradition, shows that the postmodernism has a different “truth”, it is opposite to the former spiritual tradition and the former culture. It reflects metaphysics and conventional for that time conceptions of a human and his place in the world. The absence – of an author, a subject, a human – is a specific indication, the feature of the actual “postmodern” philosophizing. It opposes, abolishes the philosophical anthropology. Setting up the informational reality leads to the changes in the mental area, to the deconstruction of the whole of metaphysics, anthropology, and it means the rejection of the distinction between the subject and the object. A human in this situation doesn't meet the modern traditions and, according to V.Kutyrev, he himself becomes a tradition.

The theories of “the vital world” by the late E.Gusserl and L.Witgenshtein have a bent for the subject – reality unity. The postmetaphysical manner of philosophizing orientates itself to the transition from the paradigm of the objective reality to the paradigm of formation, it means that the world loses its substantiality and transforms into the moral state.

Sinergetics has a claim on the role of the science forming the methodology. The scientific conception of the world is getting to become “an energy”.

The ideology of a proceeding prevails. Putting in a claim for being a weltanschauung sinergetics undermines the foundations of the subject-object identity, transforming it from real into possible, from reality into the virtual reality. It means that per se a human loses his identity, turns into singularity, an individual unit. It is impersonal, but is not missed in “the abyss” of the objective reality. The singularity is the same thing that once had been a man, a subject, an individual, a personality, an existence.

Non-traditionality is declared to be a general feature of the postmodern situation in culture. The declaration is unequivocal, as it has never been typical for the Russian creative mentality. But the whole of XXc. art was turned to reconsideration of the grounds which were set up in the European culture by the classical antiquity and Renaissance. At that time many authors started to exploit the idea of “a breakthrough”, a total change of the paradigms. Thus, the art partially inclined to the field of a pure experiment, technical and design searching, that brought about the shocking art and the kitsch. But even during the periods of jumps and transitions the old values, having been created the centuries – old experience of humanity were only driven back to the background, but they have never left the eternal verities of culture.

The outstanding artists in the beginning of the century though broke traditions knew them and appreciated them. K. Malevich in his late works came back to the traditions at another turn of art and created a number of portraits with shining faces in the manner of Renaissance. All of them had been creating the novelty and fell in with “the largest” cultural context.

Nowadays there is a direct evidence of generalizing the aesthetic art history and cultural problems and their acquiring theoretical-methodological and world-view sense.

Aesthetics is defined in terms of essential “playing” characteristics of the art, but the artistic creativity is getting to become a theory. In their desire to explain the universal nature of a human they bring themselves up to the levels of explanation “to the ground”. The investigations of the art creativity “to-the-ground” as the condition for knowledge and art existence bring to the investigation of deconstructivism phenomenon.

With formalists and futurists the art and life are on tense terms with each other, as an artist is an active source of creativity. According to R.Barth, an author is “guest of his text”, one of many “visitors” of the text. Consequently, the theory and the creative ac-

tivity in the traditional sense are secondary and dependent on writing, the practice of which seems to be primary.

Interpreted in such a way “the writing” opposes any philosophical-aesthetic doctrine tending “to stop” the process of “the texts” creation with this or that monistic explanation. Theory doesn’t aware what “writing” must be. Any theory arises after “writing”. Thus, philosophizing cannot forego the art practice and cannot put guidelines for it.

That is the “writing” practice that is the aesthetic philosophizing, but the art acquires the functions of reality interpreting not through the heroes’ thoughts and talks but through “the writing” dynamics.

The ideas of a character or a story are absolutely old and useless from the “writing” theory point of view, but the author’s power is in breaking the stereotyped patterns, which had had been built before “writing”, and the power of aesthetics is in the mission to understand and interpret “the writing” rejecting the sphacelated stereotypes.

The idea of deconstruction being concerned, its negative sense is brought to the forefront, the skepticism. Speaking about nowadays culture we cannot explain the flowering of skepticism only with returning to the tradition, though the adherents of deconstruction keep saying about nonremovability of skepticism in the philosophical speculations, referring to the traditions ascending from the antique times.

On the whole in the deconstructivism we can clearly see the searching for other theoretical-methodological guidelines and other prospects for the scientifically interpreted humanism, it gives away longing for “the generality”, yearning for having back the established and traditional.

Summing up the written above we should admit that on the ground of the postmodernism philosophy the innovative art has been growing up as an empiric mental prac-

tice, being built on the basic principles of the innovative art-consciousness of the present: game, irony, ugliness. The innovations in the field of aesthetics are described with such notions as: deconstructivism, absurdity, cruelty, artifact, eclecticism, text, hypertext, flesh, daily routine, gesture and others. The same notions are simultaneously seen as the aesthetic forms of the transition period in the art and aesthetics of the present time.

From the standpoint of the classical aesthetics adherents the postmodernism art negates the values of the traditional culture and the image-symbolic nature of the art. But we contend that the innovative practice of the postmodernism doesn’t disclaim, but extends and intensifies the semantic area of the modern aesthetic consciousness.

That’s why we have come to the conclusion that the modern aesthetic theory should keep the systems of the main traditional values of culture not as some museum relicts but as the living and real forms of the modern art practice and culture.

References

1. Aristotle. About coming into existence and annihilation/Works in 4 vol. – Moscow.: Mysl.-1981.-v. 2.-p. 379-441;
2. Aristotle. About coming into existence and annihilation/Works in 4 vol. – Moscow.: Mysl.-1981.-v. 2.-p. 440;
3. Aristotle. About coming into existence and annihilation/Works in 4 vol. – Moscow.: Mysl.-1981.-v. 2.-p. 392;
4. Aristotle. About coming into existence and annihilation/Works in 4 vol. – Moscow.: Mysl.-1981.-v. 2.-p. 393;
5. Sorokin, P. Man. Civilization. Society. – Moscow: “Mysl”, 1992.-p.341;
6. Khrenov, N.A. XXc. art against a background of the iterative fluctuations within the long periods of historical items/In the book: Cyclic rhythms in history, culture and art. – Moscow: “Nauka”, 2004. – p.54;
7. Khrenov, N.A. XXc. art against a background of the iterative fluctuations within the long periods of historical items/In the book: Cyclic rhythms in history, culture and art. – Moscow: “Nauka”, 2004. – p.70.