

UOT 7.01

Tahir BAYRAMOV
PhD (Art Study), Assistant Professor
Institute of Architecture and Art of ANAS
(Azerbaijan)
b.tahir@mail.ru

A NEW LOOK AT TRADITIONS AND INNOVATION IN ART

Abstract. The author agrees with the accepted opinion that the main function of the art tradition is the realization of continuity in translation of the art experience. But I principally disagree with “dialectics of traditions and innovation” (Hegel – Marxist).

The history of art refutes this dialectics. Certainly, in art always appears something new. But this new one can be the result of intentionally innovation. So is not the intentionally novelty in the middle ages art. On the other hand, the innovation can be the rejection of traditions as it was in avant-garde of XX century.

Key words: traditions, innovation, art, contemporaneity, dialectics.

Introduction. Even the most superficial consideration of the problem of artistic tradition makes it possible to see the variety of its aspects. Perhaps problems of terminology are the most complicated ones. The notion tradition itself is interpreted by various authors differently. Simplifying A.A.Kamensky’s wording it is possible to determine the artistic tradition as a process of sharing and developing of artistic experience [4, p.206]. No wonder that having various opinions for determining the notion “artistic tradition”, the problem of interrelations between tradition, canon and style is not clear. One more subject is necessary to be worked out thoroughly: artistic tradition and transmission of traditional culture.

The other not a less complicated question: traditions and innovation in art. A lot of publications of soviet art critics were dedicated to this theme in the 60-es. In 1965 there was published V.M.Zimenko’s “Tradition, innovation,

contemporaneity” [3]. Later, in the 80-es soviet theorists of art took notice of the problem of traditions and innovation. Here we can name V.V.Vanslov’s article where the author pays attention to the main function of artistic tradition – realization of relations between previous and following phenomena in historical development of the art [1, p.52].

The interpretation of the main material. General for works of soviet authors dedicated to this theme is the fact that marxist theorists of art solved the problem of traditions and innovation from the point of view of dialectical materialism. In their conclusions marxists advance not form private to general but from general to private, not from the analysis of concrete artistic phenomena to generalizations of theoretical character, but from tough dogmatic principles of marxist – leninist philosophy and aesthetics to concrete material of art. Hence is tendentious character of the choice of concrete examples which must illustrate some theoretical postulates: “masterpieces” of socialist realism, classic art and “progressive” modern art of the West (Renato Guttuso, Henri Fuzheron). The art of West-European Middle Ages and oriental art, as a rule, were not in the field of vision of marxist-theorists. Separate artistic phenomena can not always be brought to conformity with abstract theoretical constructions. The less scientific abstractions are connected with the reality, the more the range of phenomena not being in the field of vision of the scientist- theorist is expanded.

Among these abstractions there can be regarded such a conviction that afore-thought innovation in art has a universal character, any significant phenomenon in the world of art to one or another degree contains the element of deliberate innovation. To affirm the reverse is to doubt in the truth of the law of struggle and unity of opposites. Form the point of view of marxism the art is the struggle, the struggle of the new with the old, the struggle of progressive tendencies in the creative reactionary routine of dogmata of canons, traditional ways and means of expressiveness of themes and ideas out of date. The art theorist has at his disposal the artist-innovator and artistic tradition at various sides of barricade. To his opinion it must symbolize the struggle of opposites. If there exist traditions, the innovation must be contrasted with it. Dialectics demands it. From the point of view of marxism it is impossible to imagine the development of the world artistic process. But materialistic dialectics speaks not only about the struggle but also about the unity of opposites. Therefore genuine innovator has to preserve and develop “all the best” that there is in the tradition, unite in a single whole that is

borrowed from classic heritage and absolutely new ones. In this connection V.M.Zimenko writes: “marxism-leninism in the problem of mastering cultural heritage adhere to absolutely certain principle: mastering heritage is an electoral process, from the heritage we take only viable, only progressive, only able to enrich the newly created great culture of communism” [3, p.III]. Here the law of the struggle and unity of opposites crosses with the law of negation. Artists – innovators create something unprecedented, “open a new page in the history of art”, coming to it through the negation of traditional aesthetic and artistic values, stylistic ways of obsolete descriptive language. But all useful, “progressive” in artistic heritage the innovators try to preserve and pass to descendants. Soon innovations introduced into the practice by the past generation of artists become a part of tradition.

The following generation of innovators repeats the procedure of selection: “dirty linen is washed in public”, there remains all the necessary, useful. And so infinitely. According to marxist aesthetics and theory of art, thus is realized a living connection of times, succession in art.

Which counter-arguments can modern researcher of art propose? Objective scientific criticism of marxist dogmata in humanitarian branch of sciences can't be based only on discourses about the political situation undergoing changes. There is no need to cite classics of marxism-leninism everywhere, but up to present it is not clear: is it possible following the advice of these classics, “laughing” once for all “to say good-bye to our past”.

Let's try to cast a glance at the problem of traditions and innovation in the light of the theory of artistic creation. The art is developing and each new work differs from previous ones. The innovation in art is inevitable. Even the same artist can't paint two absolutely the same portrait or still life: the one which is painted later i.e. comparatively new work will to some extent differ from the earliest one. But the new in art can appear against the artist's will and in this case it will be the result of the inner immanent logics of the art's development. Here the question about traditions and innovation close up with the question about the premeditated and the unpremeditated in art. To all appearance, the innovation is always connected with premeditation as it supposes the presence of the subjects of creative activity consciously orientated towards the reaching of a certain purpose, namely creating of something new which “there has never been”.

Long ago there was firmly established the notion “Muslim Renaissance” in the aesthetics of art and art science. In this connection there appears a

question: is it possible that the idea of innovation can appear owing to Islam and Muslim culture?

The innovation in art begins with critical look at tradition, with ascertainment of a distance between the tradition and the artist. Leonardo da Vinci's creative work can be an example of treatment to tradition. The great artist writes about his predecessors: "The artist's picture will be of little perfection if he takes pictures of others as an inspirer; we see it in artists after Romans who all the time imitated each other and pushed this art into the decay. After them Giotto, Florentine came... After him the art fall into decay again and so from century to century it inclined to decay [5, v.2, p. 116].

It is interesting that Leonardo da Vinci thinks in medieval Christian traditions in accordance with which "any development was considered as "decrease" of the truth, as removal from initial cause, as descending...". Fundamental nature of medieval Christian culture – comprehension of the process of historical development as the change for the worse, as "defection of the work from Creator" - it brought this culture to self-denial.

If to speak about the flourishing of Muslim miniature in the 15-16th centuries, this period was marked by the appearance of new tendencies in the development of the art. But these tendencies have never been the denial of tradition, the oblivion of medieval art. I.Danilova writes about European Renaissance: "creative impulse of time consists in the joy of the breach, breaking, in the declaration of possibility of such a breach..." [2, p.9]. This joy of destruction isn't absolutely visible in oriental art of that time. In Dust Muhammad's "Treatise about calligraphers and artists there is "A chapter about former artists and masters close to them" [5, v.2]. The author of the treatise points out the divine nature of fine arts: "creator of things sent Adam a casket with several thousands of sections and with a piece of silk in each of them, on the silk – a portrait of one of prophets". Then Mani" having a claim on the title prophet" was engaged in the art of representation. "The other ancient was Shapur who with his miraculous brush painted Khosrow's portrait..." Then there was master Shamsaddin who painted illustrations in "Shahname"..."

Further Dust Muhammad narrates the history of formations of Herat school. He calls Mlrek- nakkash "irreplaceable" and "inimitable" in miniature art, Kamaladdin Behzad "the best of contemporaries" and "remarkable of the century". And there is nothing about periods of decadence, about decadent schools or tendencies. Dust Muhammad does not try to depreciate the

importance of creative work of medieval artists or make an object of critics the mastership of ancient ones. In the hierarchy of artistic values Behzad's and legendary Mani's masterpieces are put on the same high level by the author. Dust Muhammad doesn't accentuate and mark epochs of "decay" because he doesn't simply see them.

So in European art of Renaissance we have to do with a partial denial of tradition, in the art of Muslim East of that time – the absence of denial of any stages of development of tradition.

Philosophy and aesthetics, theory and history of art refute the position of marxism in the question about traditions and innovation in art which comes to tough sketch: tradition can't develop without innovation but authentic innovation is not possible without support upon tradition ("support upon tradition" doesn't mean "a blind imitation", it is" a selection of all valuable, useful"). It has always been so, in the art of all times and peoples. Hence it doesn't follow the other, wrong conclusion that there is nothing new in the art, that "all the new is a well forgotten old". Sultan Muhammad opened a new page in the history of Azerbaijan-Persian art. The authors of the book "Azerbaijan art" K.Karimov, R.Efendiyev, N.Rzayev and N.Habibov note that "great mastery of this artist lies in the fact that depicting traditional subjects he didn't keep to the beaten track, he enriched them with new plots, found new means of expressiveness" [6, p. 121-122]. To the first sight it seems that here we have to do with innovation in miniature art. But considering the question more attentively it turns out that Sultan Muhammad's creative work doesn't bear any relation to premeditated innovation. We determined the innovation as a purposeful action where the creation of the new in art is the aim towards which the artist quite consciously and deliberately orientates his creative activity; a partial negation of artistic tradition and creative search are means for attaining this object. We come across examples of critical treatment of the tradition only in European art of Renaissance, New and the Newest times, in soviet art.

Really beauty, harmony are those values which are expressed in the creative work of medieval oriental miniaturists. They are those aims towards which masters of Tabriz school deliberately and purposefully moved forward. But the innovation (innovation of the form and innovation of the content – both of them) didn't enter into the system of values of medieval oriental culture. Therefore it is dialectics of traditions and innovation in Azerbaijan art up to the middle of the 19th century. In the Middle Ages the criteria of innovation

was not the criteria of aesthetic appreciation of the work of art. If to speak about Islam, about Muslim culture, owing to the idea of timelessness and original comprehension of causality, the brink between the old and the new in the culture and art wasn't felt enough clear and distinct. The innovation realized through deliberate denial from demands of artistic tradition couldn't develop in traditional Azerbaijan art. Examples of innovation in Azerbaijan art should be looked for in modern artistic process. "Artist! Bum yourself in this dark room without draughts, pour with solvent and bum! At this site of fire there will be bom a new culture!", - the authors of the I manifesto of the group "Tasdig" are calling. It is absolutely European look at the development of the art: the new in artistic culture must appear on the mins of the old. Such a comprehension of the development of the art has found its reflection in artistic practice in Amirbay Narimanbayov's, Teymur Taghiyev's (Daimi) and Samir Gafarov's creative work. Young artists, students of Az.SIA named after M.A.Aliyev in 1989 taught by M.Abdullayev abandoned traditional technique of painting and appealed to assemblages, objects and installations popular in the 80-es. Here takes place a critical regard for tradition - denial of traditions of Azerbaijan soviet school of painting and continuation of traditions of European modernism. There is an innovation here too: for the first time Azerbaijan artists appealed to the art of the object developing innovatorily this new kind of art. However at the beginning of the 1990-es Amirbay Narimanbayov's and Teymur Daimi's creative activity there was outlined the process of gradual return to traditional materials and techniques. Changes in the world outlook also paralleling took place. Artists realized the necessity of recreation of oriental world outlook and oriental aesthetic sense.

Conclusion. So we come to the conclusion that if the innovation was possible in the Middle Ages, it was of unpremeditated character. Premeditated innovation appeared in the art in the epoch of Renaissance and held out up to the epoch of postmodernism when philosophers and artists abandoned the cult of innovation in art.

Certainly the new always took place in artistic culture. But till the period of Renaissance it was either of unpremeditated character, or was connected with the renewal of the religious cult, the appearance of new religions... These phenomena were also explained by "revelations" but not the desire to change "the old-fashioned". It is absolutely evident that the criteria of artistic innovation was not the criteria of artistic appreciation of works in the Middle Ages and in ancient times.

REFERENCES:

1. Ванслов В.В. О традициях и новаторстве в искусстве. // Проблема наследия в теории искусства. – М., 1984.
2. Данилова Л.Ю. От средних веков до Ренессанса. – М., 1975.
3. Зименко В.М. Традиции. Инновации. Современность. – М., 1965.
4. Каменский А.А. О значении художественной традиции. // Советское искусствознание. 82. – М., 1983.
5. Мастера искусства об искусстве. Т. I -М., 1965; Т. II -М., 1966.
6. Kərimov R.C., Əfəndiyev R.S., Rzayev N.İ., Həbibov N.D. Azərbaycan incəsənəti. – Bakı, 1992.

Tahir Bayramov (Azərbaycan)

İNCƏSƏNƏTDƏ ƏNƏNƏ VƏ NOVATORLUĞA YENİ BAXIŞ

Müəllif bədii ənənənin əsas funksiyasının bədii təcrübənin ötürülməsində davamlılığı haqqında ümumi qəbul olunmuş fikir ilə razıdır. Ancaq “ənənə və yenilik dialektikası” (hegelian-marksist) ilə tamamilə razı deyil. İncəsənət tarixi bu dialektikanı təkzib edir. Əlbəttə incəsəntdə həmişə yeniliklər yaranır. Ancaq bu yenilik əvvəlcədən düşünülmüş novatorluğun nəticəsi olmaya bilər. Orta əsr incəsənətində gözlənilməyən yenilik də belədir. Digər tərəfdən XX əsr avanqard incəsənətdə olduğu kimi, novatorluq ənənəni inkar da edə bilər.

Açar sözlər: ənənələr, novasiyalar, incəsənət, müasirlik, dialektika.

Таир Байрамов (Азербайджан)

НОВЫЙ ВЗГЛЯД НА ТРАДИЦИИ И НОВАТОРСТВО В ИСКУССТВЕ

Автор согласен с общепринятой точкой зрения о том, что основная функция художественной традиции – осуществление преемственности в трансляции художественного опыта. Но принципиально не согласен с т.н. «дialeктикой традиций и новаторства» (гегелевско – марксистской). История искусства опровергает эту диалектику. Конечно в искусстве всегда возникает что-то новое. Но это новое может не быть результатом преднамеренного новаторства. Такова непреднамеренная новизна в средневековом искусстве. С другой стороны, новаторство может быть отрицанием традиций, как в авангарде XX века.

Ключевые слова: традиции, новаторство, искусство, современность, диалектика.