

Evelina Tilta

Art Academy of Latvia, Riga

Functions of Sublime and Beautiful in the Context of Contemporary Art Market

The question about the correlation between aesthetics and society and the generation of artworks within this correlation is not only important for the institutional or academical framework, but also for art as *causa sui*. The main problem with difficulties of understanding contemporary artworks, especially in the context of East and West Europe, is based on social and cultural differences of perceiving, representing and understanding such basic aesthetic principles for arts as *sublimity* and *beauty*. For instance, there is obvious correlation between social trends on ideologies - feminism, post-colonialism, global warming issues, etc. - that directly affect the art world (including art market, academic and institutional force, influence on patronage and financials, arises the questions about multiculturalism, globalisation, and so on) changes the understanding of the artwork, and, thus, sets aesthetic trends on *beauty* and *sublime*.

Within my research "The functions of terms *beauty* and *sublime* in the contemporary art market" five important causalities are opened and currently are analysed: (1) the correlation between *free beauty* and *dynamic sublime* which connects with the free spirit of artist to never-ending intention to create; (2) The *dependent beauty* and *moral sublime* correlation, especially, in the context of political and social art; (3) The correlation between *formal beauty* and *mathematical sublime* which is clearly seen if we compare musical artworks with visuals, as well as the attends of theoretical and practical combination of both of them; (4) the connection between *ugly beauty* and *terrifying or tragic sublime* - this connection is the most appropriate for reflections of contemporary artworks and the way the artwork is represented; and (5) the connection with *easy beauty* and *natural sublime* that is connected to overall social and cultural aspects, that is the way how society conducts the understanding and criteria for both terms.

Currently, I am working on the 4th connection - the functional correlation between *ugly beauty* and *terrifying or tragic sublime*. In the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* Kant often hints at the distinction between ugliness and beauty in various forms, for instance, mentioning that ugliness shall be defined as the contrary of beauty. Additionally, Kant defines some essential features of judgment on beauty by contrasting them with two other types of judgments of taste. That is, some judgements are based on the sensory aspects of the object and particularly on the feeling of the agreeable: "one says of the agreeable not merely that it *pleases* but that it *gratifies*. It is not mere approval that I give it, rather inclination is thereby aroused." So the question about understandings of ugliness and, moreover, understanding of the concept of ugly-beautiful, begins in Kant's aesthetics.

Since Immanuel Kant is having the idea of pure beauty, the impure ugliness is possible in the contrary of adherent beauty (which by the contrast to free beauty: "does presuppose such a concept of what the object ought to be... as adhering to a concept/conditioned beauty, it is ascribed to objects that stand under the concept of a particular end.") In relation to the differences in specifying of the judgments, the idea about impure ugliness may be called conceptual ugliness, due to the Kant's distinction of the passions: "simply due to passion, one can portray something which one has seen as being ugly. Thus, the idea of correlation between ugly beautiful and terrifying sublime may be connected to the idea of God and the Devil, which is as much a construct for Freud as the Aryan ideal. Additionally, such distinction can be analysed within East and West understanding of *ugly beautiful* and *terrifying sublime*.

Within the forum I'd like discuss already found ideas of beauty and sublime within context of fear and ugliness, particularly paying attention to the difference between terrifying both terms and contemporary art market.