

**THE TYPES OF FREEDOM IN THE  
APPERCEPTION OF PICTORIAL ART  
REGARDING AESTHETICS**

**PH. YILDIRIM ONUR ERDIREN**

Self-Improvement: 258

1st Edition: May - 2023

ISBN: 978-625-8088-73-1

Publisher Certificate No: 19708

The Types Of Freedom In The Apperception Of Pictorial Art Regarding Aesthetics

Yıldırım Onur Erdiren Ph. D.

Cover and Book Design: Artikel Akademi

PRINTING: Net Kırtasiye Tanıtım ve Matbaa San. Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Gümüşsuyu, İnönü Caddesi & Beytül Malcı Sokak 23/A,

34427 Beyoğlu/İstanbul

Certification No.: 47334

© Karadeniz Kitap - 2023

This book cannot be reproduced, copied or published partly or, as a whole without the authorization of the publisher.

KARADENİZ KİTAP LTD. ŞTİ. - ARTİKEL AKADEMİ  
Koşuyolu Mah. Mehmet Akfan Sok. No:67/3 Kadıköy-İstanbul  
Tel: 0 216 428 06 54 // 0530 076 94 90

mail: [info@artikelakademi.com](mailto:info@artikelakademi.com)

[www.artikelakademi.com](http://www.artikelakademi.com)

**THE TYPES OF FREEDOM IN THE  
APPERCEPTION OF PICTORIAL ART  
REGARDING AESTHETICS**

**PH. YILDIRIM ONUR ERDIREN**



# CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	7
INTRODUCTION.....	11
CHAPTER 1	
CONCEPTUAL AND RELATED DIMENSIONS	
OF AESTHETIC THINKING.....	15
1.1 Aesthetic Problems in the Historical Process.....	16
1.2 Steps of Aesthetic Analysis.....	40
1.2.1 Aesthetic Subject-Object Relationship.....	42
1.2.2 Aesthetic Value-Judgment Relationship.....	47
1.3 Aesthetic Analysis of Painting Art.....	65
CHAPTER 2	
FORMS OF FREEDOM IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.....	73
2.1 Being Human and Freedom.....	84
2.2 Social and Political Freedom.....	91
2.3 Freedom in Art.....	93
2.4 Aesthetic Reception as a Form of Freedom.....	98
CHAPTER 3	
THE RELATIONSHIP ART AND FREEDOM.....	103
3.1 Artist and Freedom Relationship.....	121
3.2 Art Critic and Freedom Relationship.....	125
3.3 Art Lover and Freedom Relationship.....	129
3.4 The Instructor and Freedom Relationship.....	130
3.5 The Relationship between the Statesman and Freedom.....	132
3.6 The Relationship between Art, Institutionalization and Freedom.....	134
CONCLUSION.....	149
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	144



## ABSTRACT

The aim of this study, which examines the forms of freedom in the reception of the art of painting in the context of aesthetics, is to explain the relationship of freedom in art in the context of aesthetics and to exemplify the problematics within which this discussion is evaluated in the art of painting.

The conceptual philosophical discussion dimension, which has emerged since the formation of aesthetic thought, is located at the end of the thesis. The aesthetic subject-object relationship and the aesthetic value-judgment relationship, which are considered as the steps of aesthetic analysis, are explained with a holistic approach in this section. Thus, in this section, two different types of analysis have been tried to be dealt with in relational dimensions from the beginning of the artist's creative activity to the evaluation of the artwork.

The forms of freedom are explained in the context of human, society, politics and art in a philosophical perspective. The titles of being human and freedom, social freedom, political freedom and freedom in art were interpreted and compared in terms of different understandings in the history of philosophy. Again in this section, through the example of the reception of painting as a form of freedom, which epistemological, ontological and ethical dimensions of reception correspond to aesthetically and how the art of painting is received are examined.

The relationship between the art of painting and freedom is examined within the framework of contemporary debates and the actors of art. In terms of positioning them as the subjects of art, the extent of the freedom relations mentioned in the figures of the artist, art critic, art lover, educator and statesman has been explained. Finally, the relationship between art, institutionalization and freedom was opened to discussion. Therefore, in this study, to reveal the philosophical dimension of the relationship between the founding and executive elements of art; On the other hand, it aims to contribute to today's understanding of freedom, especially in the art of painting.

To my family for their unwavering support throughout my education life, I would like to thank my professors who supported me during my doctoral process and did not spare their help during my studies.



I would like to thank my family for their unwavering support throughout my education life, my professors who supported me during my doctoral process and helped me during my studies.



## INTRODUCTION

The Greek word for aesthetics “*aesthesis*” throw away “*aisthanesthai*” comes from the word. “*Aesthesis* The word” means sensation, sensible perception as well as “*aisthanesthai* The word” means to be perceived by the senses. In some thinkers *aesthetic* It can be seen that the word” is used in both senses. For example, Kant uses the word aesthetic both in the sense of emotionality and in the sense of today’s aesthetic science (Tunali, 2012: 13). Alexander G. Baumgarten is the founder of considering aesthetics as a scientific research field. According to him, a special term was needed to express the logic of sensation itself, and eventually the Greek word meaning “pertaining to the senses.” *aesthesis* he called it aesthetics (Baumgarten, 23: 1954). According to Baumgarten, the goal of logical understanding is real, and the goal of aesthetic (sensory) understanding is beautiful. Aesthetics is the science of beauty. Beautiful is perfection grasped by the senses, and truth is perfection grasped by reason. If it is good, it is the perfection reached with the moral will (Tolstoy, 2015: 21). Baumgarten, published between 1750 and 1758. *Aesthetica* For the first time, he grounds such a science, determines its subject and draws the boundaries of this science. published in 1735. *Philosophical meditations on some things relating to the poem*” (*Some Philosophical Reflections on Poetry*) mentions the possibility of such a science in his doctoral thesis. for the first time *aesthetic* the word as the name of such a science *aesthetic* used in the book.

In the first part of the work, the aesthetic phenomenon or aesthetic entity occurs as an ontic unity of four elements. These are aesthetic subject analysis, aesthetic object analysis, aesthetic value analysis and aesthetic judgment analysis, which are the steps of aesthetic analysis. This ontic unity constitutes the subject of philosophical aesthetics. Thanks to these analyzes, perceiving all kinds of works of art with knowledge, existence, value and judgment will help us to perceive that work. Therefore, “reception” reveals itself as a form of comprehension in the integrity of knowledge-being-value and judgment.

The subject is understood as an item of knowledge. As a conscious being, man grasps the objects outside himself, as well as his own existence, and ultimately his own consciousness with introspection. In the event of knowing, this perceiving, grasping consciousness entity, the “I” is called the subject, and the perceived and grasped entity is called the “object”. The subject related to knowledge is called “knowledge subject”, as in the example above. In this context, on the one hand, there is the aesthetic entity, “for example, a piece of nature, a work of art, in short, aesthetic entity, aesthetic object; On the other hand, there is a subject who has an aesthetic interest in this aesthetic entity, perceives it aesthetically, enjoys it or feels aesthetic pleasure. The subject, who has such an interest with an aesthetic object, ceases to be a simple subject of knowledge, but becomes an aesthetic subject” (Tunali, 2012: 23).

Aesthetic existence, of course, does not only depend on the existence of the subject. In the aesthetic phenomenon, there is another entity that the subject turns to and establishes an interest in, opposite to the subject entity participating in this phenomenon. This entity is an aesthetic object. An aesthetic object means an entity with which the aesthetic subject has an aesthetic interest. The main problem and question of the aesthetic object is “What is a work of art?” (Tunali, 2012: 47).

Another important analysis is the analysis of aesthetic value. Every art object has an art value. According to Tunali, as an aesthetic subject, we not only engage with an aesthetic object, we also attribute a value to this object, we call it “beautiful”, “sublime”, tragic or “funny”. All these are the predicates that we attribute to the objects, and they express an aesthetic value (Tunali, 2012: 131).

The subject, who has an aesthetic interest with the aesthetic object, makes an aesthetic judgment about the aesthetic object. We can express our thoughts by making judgments. It is possible to make judgments in a work of art. Making a judgment about a work of art is based on freedom of thought.

The aesthetic analysis of painting is to examine pictures or paintings in various mediations. Undoubtedly, the art of painting can be interpreted in many different ways such as material, technique, periodical and aesthetic and information (*episteme*) can be examined in terms of Other important elements are the period of the painting, what kind of information it gives to the person, color, tone (*degrade*), light and shadow, form, direction, line, balance (place, space, etc.) We can examine the assemblage technique created with materials, the collage tech-

nique, which consists of various parts and combines those parts, as well as the effect of art movements on value attribution, judgment, reception, the cultural level of individuals and the problem of freedom. The first part of the study deals with explaining the philosophical basis on the way to such an examination and the discussion on the axes of object-subject, value-judgment.

In the second part of the study, human and social freedom in the forms of freedom in the history of philosophy are examined. Art, as a human-specific cultural activity and in terms of its origin, is as old and as old as humanity, and has manifested itself in different ways throughout the ages. Based on this, art in general has been the subject of various theories in the context of the art object embodied in art production, the subject receiving the art, and the artist-subject. The nature of the art object and how artistic production is a cultural activity, the philosophical foundations of the creation process and aesthetic evaluation, the epistemological and ontological theories on which the idea of art is based, and the relationship of art creation with freedom are discussed in terms of philosophy of art with its political and ethical dimensions. In this framework, in a philosophical inquiry to be made under the general title of “freedom in art”, it can be considered in three main types as “freedom in terms of action”, “freedom in design” and “freedom in artistic judgments”. Human freedom has been widely discussed in the history of philosophy and different views have been put forward. Freedom of will, personal freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of action and freedom of judgment are the forms of freedom mentioned in this context.

In this study, aesthetic reception (*comprehension*) an art object *clutch*, *evaluation* and *to understand* described as a whole. The reception process of the art object, the technique used in the artwork, the material and the attitude of the artist, the education level of the individual or individuals against the object, the education they receive to interpret, understand and evaluate the artwork, the processes of pleasing/pleasure and the interpersonal cultural variability of all these variables. can be expressed by being subject to it.

In the third chapter, the relations between painting art-freedom and freedom according to the subjects (actors) of art are explained. In this section, firstly, what the art of painting is and how the dimension of freedom differs is explained. Painting is one of the branches of art that philosophers talk about the most in philosophy of art and aesthetics. For example, according to Plato, the art of painting *mimesis* According to Aristotle, most of the arts of painting, epos, tragedy,

comedy, dithrambos poetry, flute and kithara are generally imitation (Aristotle, 2012: 11). The question of what painting and painting art is and whether it is an element of imitation, as a question of meaning, is in question not only in the relationship between painting and painter, but also in the relationship of anyone who takes an aesthetic attitude towards painting. Therefore, the question should be put forward and examined in all its generality (Soykan, 2015: 252). The relationship between painting and freedom manifests itself in the main forms of freedom. These; freedom of thought, freedom of creation, freedom of choice, freedom of the creator and freedom of expression in painting. These forms of freedom reveal how we reflect ourselves in our works.

Subjects of art are important in terms of freedom. In particular, the perspectives of the artist, art critic, art lover, educator and statesman to freedom were investigated. As mentioned in the section on the relationship between painting and freedom, comprehension, that is, reception, comprehension and evaluation of a work is important in these respects. The artist also buys, comprehends and evaluates a work. The artist's reception of a work first begins with the choice of subject and material. After receiving the subject, he decides on the material and determines in which technique he will work on that work. While grasping the work, he/she examines the object or theme he/she will paint and grasps it in detail. For example, if it is a portrait that he will paint, that human face should be examined in detail. After this decision phase, he starts to paint after evaluating the subject he will paint. These stages help the artist to receive the picture. It allows the artist to see better. Therefore, the artist is initially free to receive, comprehend and evaluate. However, since the evaluation of the artist's originality is made by others, the general aesthetic evaluation trend of the art type, which is in demand by the society, does not show that the individual freedom of the artist is realized at the same rate in public. So much so that the artist is torn between what he wants to reveal freely and what he puts into the field of public appreciation.

# CHAPTER 1

## THE CONCEPTUAL AND RELATED DIMENSION OF AESTHETIC THINKING

*Aesthetica* In the first lines of, Baumgarten defines aesthetics as: “*Aesthetica (theoria liberallium atrium, gnoseologia inferior, ars pulcre cogitandi, ars analogue rationis = theory of free arts, theory of inferior knowledge, reflection on the beautiful, and a mind-like faculty) est scientia cognitionis sensitivae*(Aesthetics is the science of sensory knowledge)” (Act. Tunalı, 2012: 14). For the first time in such a description, a definition of science, which is called aesthetics, Tunalı said, “This definition is a multi-sided definition. All these different elements that want to determine aesthetics can bring back a basic determining motive; this basic determining motive is cognition sensitiv, sensory knowledge” (Tunalı, 2012: 14).

Since aesthetics is defined as the science of an unambiguous knowledge, sensitive knowledge, clarity and distinctness are not the measure of aesthetic knowledge; Clarity and distinctness are the measure of intellectual knowledge. Sensitive, that is, the characteristic of aesthetic knowledge is not to be clear and distinct, on the contrary, it is not to be clear and distinct, but to be blurry (Tunalı, 2012: 14). According to Baumgarten, it is necessary to have a science that will investigate sensitive conceptions. Such a science would be aesthetic. According to Baumgarten, aesthetics is a kind of logic, that is, he defines it as the younger sister of logic. In contrast to logic’s investigation into the higher domain, aesthetics probes the lower domain: *Aesthetics is the science of sensitive knowledge*”. This definition easily leads us to the other basic determinant of aesthetics, the concept of gnoseologia inferior (Tunalı, 2012: 14). This definition *lower gnoseology* defines the concept.

Aesthetics, just “*Being a science that studies the value of beauty, a philos-*

ophy of beauty, would have limited the field of research of the science we call aesthetics very narrowly from the very beginning. Because even if aesthetics is understood only as a philosophy of value, a science of value in its narrow sense, other values such as the value of beauty, such as the value of beauty, for example, sublime, tragic, funny, elegant, interesting, pleasant, harmony, childish and even ugly, also fall within the boundaries of this science. All these values have an aesthetic meaning as well as aesthetics as well as beauty. (Tunalı, 2012: 15). These values are also used as concepts attributed to art objects in aesthetics. In addition, an aesthetic judgment can be made with these concepts. For example, when it is said “This painting is beautiful”, it is a judgment made by attributing an aesthetic value.

According to Eagleton, aesthetics was born as a discourse about the body. In the original formulation given by Baumgarten, the term does not refer to art in the first place, but to Greek *aesthesis* as the word indicates, it sends it to the whole human perception and sensation field, as opposed to the very refined conceptual thought field (Eagleton, 2011: 32).

Aesthetics cannot be justified as a science of beauty. But there is a certain affinity between beauty and man. Man likes beauty and takes pleasure in it. The purpose of beauty is to give pleasure to people (Tunalı, 2012: 16). Art objects can also give pleasure to people. The enjoyment of works of art may differ from person to person. For example, a landscape painting may give pleasure to a person, while a death-themed painting may not be enjoyable.

## 1.1 Aesthetic Problems in the Historical Process

Although aesthetics has a history of only two centuries as an independent science, we have been able to follow the first thinkers dealing with aesthetic problems since the Antiquity (Arat, 2006: 39). Plato, *mimesis* He was the first philosopher to introduce his theory of aesthetics. Plato *State* (in his tenth and final book) his art is generally an imitation (*mimesis*) is seen. According to Plato, everything in the world is the work of God. The artist is a master of imitation, reflecting only the existing. As long as he can imitate nature well, he is an artist. Since everything was created by God, the artist's inclination is out of question. The task of art is to reflect the world we perceive with our senses, in its most

perfect form, to what exists in nature, in order to reach the knowledge of God, the creator of all things. Thus, the knowledge of God can be accessed from the existent. In short, art is *amimesis*, one *imitation* truck. According to Plato, the object of imitation is the world of objects, appearances that surround us directly from all sides. With one word *kosmos aisthetos*' is (the sensible world). But according to Plato, real being *idea*'s world. Accordingly, the phenomena that are the objects of art are actually a set of copies that have no reality (Tunali, 2011: 81). the only real *idea* are; If it is what art imitates, this is *idea* They are a simile, a copy. Since the object to which art is directed, namely the mimetic object, is actually nothing but a copy, the work of art is not a copy of a reality or an essence, but a copy of a copy (Tunali, 2011: 81).

Plato *mimesis* view makes people think of people who are dealing with the art of painting. "Is painting an imitation activity?" This is a question that painters question. "Are we imitating the raw materials of the design or the principles, the elements of the design?" By thinking with questions such as, art objects are imitated, as Plato said. Another problematic is "do we copy works of art?", "what themes do we copy?", "what elements do we use and copy?", "is it right to copy?" Questions like these are the other major questions that the imitation element should be questioned. In short, imitation, which is frequently used in painting, is used especially in "portrait" works, and it is more correct for artists to paint these themes with their own original works.

Plato, *mimesis* uses the concept in various dialogues. But as described in various dialogues *mimesis* The term is used in a different sense. For example, as a technical idiom, as an ethical concept, *dox*) is used as an imitation of (Tunali, 2011: 76). Plato, *mimesis* first introduced the concept as a technical idiom. *Kratylos* uses it in the dialogue.

His *mimesis* is used in the sense of complete imitation. Like painting and music, names are also meanings of imitation *mimesis*, is again used as a purely technical idiom; and it is considered as a positive concept. Just as the picture of something is an imitation of that thing, in the same way, the name of a thing is an imitation of the essence of that thing (Tunali, 2011: 76-77).

To achieve similarity, painters sometimes use only garnet; sometimes, for example, when they prepare a meat color or another color of this kind, they mix many colors... It means that the name is nothing but the imitation of the object with sound. A person imitates the object and says its name (Plato, 2015: 82-84).

This technique is conceived as a positive concept, almost as a basic category of culture. positive understanding *State* It continues for a while in the third book of. But, *State* in the third book of *mimesis* While using, Plato does this in relation to education (Tunalı, 2011: 77). Plato poses the problem thus:

When the poet tells us where and how the words spoken by others are said, his work is only a narrative. But while the poet utters these words, isn't it himself, but rather to take the place of someone else, to adapt his words to someone else's personality as best he can? Well, what would a person do if he tried to match his voice and behavior to someone else? Wouldn't he have imitated the person he wanted to emulate? This means that both Homer and all poets resort to imitation in their narratives (Plato, 2011: 83-84).

Plato, *mimesis* He wants to show that it is a narrative tool. *Mimeisthai* imitation is a kind of narration; not an indirect expression, but a direct expression style. When the narrator assumes the personality of the person he is going to tell and acts on his behalf, a narrative is no longer a random one, it becomes *ami-meisthai* becomes (Tunalı, 2011: 78).

Plato uses *mimesis*, a description and a form of expression, wrongly tragedy and comedy (Tunalı, 2011: 78). Thus, we understand that there are two types of literary form. What is the genre that uses *Mimesis* and *Mimeistha*, what art is it that uses narration?

Starting from the *mimesis*, Plato describes the new forms encountered when it comes to narration as follows:

But if the poet never conceals himself, imitation does not interfere with what he tells. Again, I couldn't understand how, let me explain it for me to try: If Homer had spoken of himself as Homer, not as if he had become Chryses, after saying that Chryses brought salvation for his daughter, imitation would not interfere, this would be narration... So, there are two ways of expressing the poem: One as I said, the path of imitation in tragedy and comedy; the other is the poet's own narration of what happened. This variety is found in dithyrambos, I think. It happens that both types come together, as in epics and other poems (Plato, 2011: 84-85).

As it can be understood from here, three types of poetry are encountered: *mi-meisthayes* the other one *tragedy* and *comedy*, the other *Diegesis* based on *dithyrambos*; third, *mimesis* and *diegesis* Mixed forms of: *epos*, etc. (Tunalı, 2011:

78). Thus, *State* The view of art described in the tenth book of *Feast* Art activity, which is understood more as a poetic activity in *State* in a completely *mimetic* (imitative) is understood as an activity (Tunali, 2011: 80). In Plato's own words,

If you want, take a mirror and hold it all around. All of a sudden, you left the sun, the stars, the earth, yourself, all the furniture in the house, plants, all living things - Yes, I would have created visible beings, but they have no reality- well, you just stepped on my thought; because we can put painters among the masters who create such beings, right? (Plato, 2011: 337).

In the mirror we hold to the outside world, objects, we create the objects and the object world; However, the world in this mirror is not a real object and a real world, on the contrary, they are just an image, a simile and a copy of the objects (Tunali, 2011: 80).

Plato *State* Tragedy, poetry, painting, etc. in his work. examines the arts and the work of artists dealing with them. According to Plato, such works are mostly based on "simile", that is, imitation. For this reason, if it is not known what the likened thing really is, the order of the people who see and listen to them is disrupted. Plato begins by saying that we are looking for an idea, a pattern that includes different objects that we call the same name all at once. According to Plato, there are many tables and ottomans in the world. But these ottomans and tables fall into many tables and ottomans of the idea of a single table and cedar. The worker who makes one of these invents an idea, what he does, *idea* Some of them make tables, some are ottomans, some are other things (Plato, 2011: 336).

Plato also says that what the painter does has no reality, that what is done is appearance. For example, according to Plato, the carpenter cannot make the idea, the original, the essence of the cedar. It can only do one type. Since the master cannot make the cedar, he will have made a similar example, not the real one. Therefore, anyone who says that what the carpenter or another master does is truly real is deceived (Plato, 2011: 337). According to Plato, in this case there are three cedars. According to him, the real cedar, which only God can make, is the cedar made by the carpenter. The third is the cedar made by the artist. In this case, only three types of cedar masters can be mentioned: God, carpenter and painter, the cedar made by God is the origin and essence of the cedar. The real creator of the cedar is God. Dülger is in a sense a cedar maker. However, according to him, the painter is not the maker of the cedar, but only an imitator, that is, an imitator. In a way, the painter made the shadow of the shadow (Plato,

2011: 338). As it can be understood from here, Plato says that there are three arts that depend on everything. These are the arts of using, making and analogy (Plato, 2011: 344). According to him, the person who deals with analogy does not deal with reality, but only deals with appearances and knows them. In the art of simile, the simile imitates everything he does. But he doesn't know if this is good or bad. Every metaphorical art is direct and far from the truth. According to him, it is the non-measurable part of our mind that cannot reveal the analogy. This side falls with our side that opposes wisdom, and does not follow anything solid and real (Plato, 2011: 346).

Looking at all this; The example that the artist imitates is not the truth itself, it is a fact or an image. All the artist can do is to imitate as close to the truth as possible. Because what it imitates cannot always go beyond an image. For example, the painter imitates both natural and artificial objects, which are themselves nothing more than imitations of ideas. So the painter does not imitate ideas, but imitates them. Therefore, since art is an imitation, it is not knowledge. According to Plato, this is not a serious business. It is only a harmony directed towards pleasure.

As it can be understood from here, Plato, *mimesis* He imitates art objects while using his theory. Artists often use this theory in their works. For example, the portrait of "Monaliza" is painted using the element of imitation. We freely reflect the theory of imitation to our works by reflecting both the stylization of the works and the realism.

Aristotle, *Metaphysics* He mentions three basic activities in human beings in his work. These are knowing, acting and creating (Aristotle, 2014: 293). Again, three basic knowledge corresponds to these three basic activities: knowing, "theoretical"; action, "practice"; creation, "poiesis" constitutes the subject of "poetike". Theoreticism, which studies knowing, reaches its peak in "First Philosophy", "Prote philosophia", because the aim of theoreticism is truth, to reach the knowledge of diseases; If this information is in the highest content of the first philosophy, that is *Metaphysics* (Aristotle, 2014: 293). Atistotle examined this at length in his First Philosophy. But Aristotle *poiesis* left the creative activity unexamined and *poetry* he did not write. But a *Poetics* he wrote; but this is a very incomplete book on the art of literature (Tunali, 2016: 307).

Aristotle, *imitation* brings the artist forward by changing the concept. According to Aristotle, the artist presents a creation and a revelation to people with

his own intelligence and creative ability. The aim of art is to reflect the possible, not the existing in nature. Unlike Plato, he gives the artist a personality. The task of the artist is to reveal the unknown, the knowable, starting from the existing. That is, it is to create a wise person, not knowledgeable (Special, 2104: 292).

According to Aristotle, imitation

... it is in the nature of Man, starting from childhood; Man differs from “other” animals by his great tendency to imitate and acquires his first knowledge through imitation; He takes great pleasure in imitation. A clear proof of this is that we like very much the exact imitation of things that we can hardly watch in reality, such as the most terrifying images of monsters or cadavers. This is because learning is a very pleasant thing: not just for philosophers, but for all human beings, although they may not have much in common. We like to look at pictures, because we can learn from looking at them, we can reason, and from this picture, for example, we can infer that it depicts such and such a person. Even if we have not seen that man before, the work will please us, not as an imitation this time, but with the mastery of its construction, its colors or any other feature (Aristotle, 2014: 13).

Aristotle’s starting point, unlike Plato, is not a transcendent metaphysical idea of beauty, but rather individual works of art. According to him, the work of art is an ontic whole. The determination of the work of art as an ontic whole, the search for the categories that determine this ontic whole, is no longer a metaphysics, but rather an ontology, an ontology of art. According to him, the basic determination of aesthetics is that it is an ontology, an ontology of art (Tunalı, 2012: 8). According to Aristotle, because the idea of beauty exists, works of art do not win with objects that we find beautiful, on the contrary, we talk about the concept of beauty because works of art exist, and we can talk about the beauty of objects because they are beautiful objects (Aristotle, 2012: 8).

Aristotle, *Poetics* In his work, he dealt not with a general poetics, but rather with the problems of literature and language. According to Aristotle, *epos*, *tragedy*, *comedy*, *dithrambos* his poem with *flute* and *guitar* a large part of their art is generally imitation (Aristotle, 1902: 7). But these types of art differ from each other in three respects: in the means used to imitate, in the objects imitated, in the style of imitation. (Aristotle, 2012: 11).

Some arts imitate by means of colors and figures, some arts imitate by means of sound, according to this, in all the aforementioned arts in general, imitation

is carried out either through rhythm, words or harmony. But these three are used separately or together. For example, flute and kithara, as well as the flute arts, use only harmony and rhythm; because dancers imitate character traits, passions and movements through rhythmic body movements (Aristotle, 2012: 14). Each of the arts also reflects this difference by being different from the other in that it imitates different actions. We can see these differences in every art. For example, one of the differences between tragedy and comedy is this: According to Aristotle, comedy wants to imitate characters who are worse than average, and tragedy wants to imitate characters who are better than average.

Tragedy, according to Aristotle, is an imitation of an action that is morally predominant, has a beginning and an end, and has a certain length. The artist has a beautified language. It uses special tools for each part it includes; represented by those taking action. Therefore, according to Aristotle, tragedy is not just a story-telling. Tragedy's duty is to purge people of passions with the pity and fear it evokes. Aristotle, 2012: 22). According to Aristotle, since the action imitated in tragedy is represented by people in action who must have a certain characteristic in terms of character and thought, character and thought appear as two factors of tragic action. People can reach their goals (happiness) by complying with these two factors in their actions or not. In this case, the imitation of an action creates the story. Aristotle, *"When we say story, the plot of events, when we say character, what we attribute a feature in terms of people who act, when we say thought, what those who talk to him prove something or testify to a general truth"* says he understands Aristotle, 2012: 23).

According to Aristotle, tragedy has six elements; story, characters, language, thoughts, decoration and music. Language and music constitute the means of imitation of tragedy, decoration forms the style of imitation, stories, characters and ideas constitute the objects of imitation. Every tragedy is based on decoration, characters, a story, language, music and unity of thought (Tunalı, 2012: 23). The most important of these elements is the interconnection of events. For tragedy is not the imitation of persons, but rather the imitation of their actions, of a life spent in happiness and disaster. In terms of character, we are either this or that; In terms of action, we are either happy or not. Tragedy poets do not aim to imitate the characters when they reveal the people who act. On the contrary, they also reveal characters together through actions. In this case, the action and the story constitute the end of the tragedy. The final goal, happiness, is the most important

of all goals. While there can be a tragedy that is not based on characters, there cannot be a tragedy without a story (Aristotle, 2012: 23-24).

In general, tragedy should imitate actions that evoke fear and pity. This forms the essence and basis of the art called “tragedy”. Accordingly, the tragedian poet will do as follows; neither should he show virtuous persons as fallen from bliss to disaster, for such a state arouses not fear and pity, but only anger; nor should it portray wicked persons as triumphant, for such a thing would never be tragic. Moreover, someone who is very bad should not be portrayed as falling from bliss to disaster. Therefore, according to Aristotle, Euripides can be said to be superior to all other poets in tragic effect (Aristotle, 2012: 36-37). Now, fear and pity are either evoked through the stage decoration, or they arise spontaneously from the plot of events. The plot of the story should be such that it should be able to arouse fear and pity just by listening to the events in the story and without seeing it being played on the stage. Tragedy cannot be asked to give pleasure of any kind. The pleasure expected from him is the pleasure of the essence of the tragedy (Aristotle, 2012: 39).

According to Aristotle, every tragedy consists of a knot and a solution. Events found in some works, apart from most works, form the knot; all remaining events constitute the solution. The knot is the plot that extends to the part at the beginning of the work that sets the limit for the return of luck towards happiness or disaster. The solution is the part from this baht return to the end of the work (Aristotle, 2012: 51). According to Aristotle, there are four types of tragedy; These are complex tragedy, ethical tragedy involving a painful act, ethical tragedy based on character description, and simple tragedy (Aristotle, 2012: 52).

*Epos* or is it *tragedy* Aristotle answers the question whether it is a superior art. A less vulgar imitation presupposes a more enlightened reader. Such an imitation is superior to a crude imitation. Tragedy is an art that fits the style in which older players evaluate younger players (Aristotle, 2012: 83). Whereas epic art presupposes a more enlightened reader who does not need to see the events in front of his eyes, tragic art is directed to a lesser audience. Accordingly, if the tragic art is a cruder art, then it is clear that tragedy in terms of value *epos* It is located below (Aristotle, 2012: 84). But tragedy has everything that epic poetry has. Because he can use the same measure. Tragedy achieves some effects both with its text and with the performance of the work on the stage. Tragedy achieves its goal as imitative description within a narrower framework of events. Because

compressed gives a more pleasant effect than one that is spread over a long period of time. According to Aristotle, by reaching the goal of tragedy better, *epos* gives an advantage over (Aristotle, 2012: 85).

While Artistotele imitated nature, artists used nature imitation. Imitation is frequently used especially in landscape painting, which is a type of painting. For example, we often see this in painters who work on landscape painting. You can imitate nature by looking at nature, or you can imitate nature by looking at a painting. Artists have free creativity in these actions. According to Aristotle, tragedy is an imitation of an action and is free in terms of thought and actions.

Plotinos's view of art generally has the character of Plato. But, despite this, he differs from Plato on some fundamental points. Acting on the principles of Plato, Plotinos consistently reaches the goal that Plato could not reach, without falling into the inconsistency of Plato (Tunalı, 2011: 124). According to Plotinos, art is a *mimesis*. According to that *mimesis* It has a unique meaning. of Plotinos *mimesis* for example, Plato's *State* in the sense that he understands and develops in his book *mimesis* is not. Her *Feast* expressed in the dialogue *poiesis* concept (Tunalı, 2011: 125). *Poiesis* word in Greek *poiein* It is the name of an activity described with the verb and is used in the sense of making, producing and creating. Just like Aristotle's activity called *poiesis oraxis* associating it with being oriented towards realizing a specific purpose. According to that, *poiesis* the word equivalent of art, which is an activity related to *techniques* you.

Art and aesthetic understanding, which was more faith-based in the Middle Ages, did not care much for the beauty of the external world and the human body perceived by the senses. In the Renaissance period, with the influence of the idea of Humanism, which emphasized the value of human beings, art, starting from the existing, reflects the beauty of nature and human beings, and the image of a supernatural perfection that cannot be perceived by the senses. Renaissance art idealizes man. The knowledge about the visible world with the mind leads to the knowledge of a world that cannot be perceived by the senses. Thus, the artist becomes both the creator of innovation and the imitator of nature. Now, the buyer starts to judge the paintings according to the mastery of reflecting nature and life on earth (Private, 2014: 293). In the Renaissance period, figurative elements are in the foreground in art. Especially the art of figurative sculpture and painting is highly developed. The figurative elements in sculpture and painting are copies of each other. *Imitation* The element is also quite visible in this period.

The Middle Ages inherited many of its aesthetic problems from classical Antiquity; however, he placed these issues within the typical Christian understanding of man, the world, and divinity, adding a new meaning to them (Eco, 2015: 21). In the Middle Ages, there was only a grasp of intelligible beauty, moral harmony, and metaphysical splendor. He says that the concept of beauty in ancient and medieval times was more comprehensive than it is today and states that it includes moral value and utility (Eco, 1988: 183).

When scholastic philosophy spoke of beauty, it meant one of the attributes of God. There was no relation between the metaphysics of beauty (for example, in Plotinus) and the theory of art. “Modern” man places an excessive value on art, as they have lost the sense of intelligible beauty possessed by the Neo-Platonists and the Middle Ages. Here, there is a kind of beauty that aesthetics knows nothing about (as cited in Curtius (Eco, 2015: 22).

By extending the aesthetic interest to the field of beauty that cannot be perceived by the senses, the Middle Ages developed various views on sensible beauty, the beauty of things in nature and art by analogy, by establishing explicit or implicit parallels (Eco, 2015: 22-23). XII. In the 19th century, unnecessary and excessive flamboyant art elements were used in church decorations. Objects such as stained glass, sculpture, painting, gold and silver in churches were used a lot.

The description of beauty by Duns Scotus in the Middle Ages is very interesting; While it looks similar to the definitions we’ve reviewed so far, it’s actually quite different from them:

Beauty is not an absolute (independent) quality present in the beautiful body; It originates from the unity of things that unite in it, such as size, shape and color, and the unity of these features both with the object and with all the relations among themselves (as cited in De Bruyne. Eco, 2015: 168).

Art theory constitutes the most obscure chapter of medieval aesthetic history; indeed, the medievalist view of the *ars*, aside from the numerous and typical fluctuations that must be dealt with in a detailed analysis, has its roots in the classical and intellectualist doctrine of making it peculiar to man, and sees art almost in line with this doctrine (Eco, 2015: 175). Medieval art theory is particularly interesting in that it is a philosophy about the formation of human technique and the relations between technical formation and natural formation (Eco, 2015: 177). Although he makes a connection between medieval aesthetics and art, he still has

an insufficient awareness of “art in particular”. In other words, the Middle Ages did not have a theory of fine arts, a view of art as we understand it today (Eco, 2015: 181-182).

Humanist Neoplatonism is a strong Neoplatonism compared to medieval Neoplatonism; It is a thought that has not been corrected with the need to save the rationality and non-contradiction of the divine principle (Eco, 2015: 234). By reconnecting with the original Neo-Platonism stretching from Plotinus to Proklos, a metaphysics and an ontology now come into existence, in which there is an incomprehensible and incomprehensible One at the apex of the chain of beings; Since it is not prone to any determination, it includes all determinations, so it is an extremely productive field of contradictions (Eco, 2015: 234).

What makes the Renaissance artist different from previous periods is that he can reflect an idealized beauty that is beyond the reality based on observation and technique, which is above the senses but can be grasped with intuition. In this situation, which requires a new skill, the aim of the artist is to provide us with clues about the secrets of the universe with the mystical and imaginary environment he creates beyond physical reality. Thus, by overcoming nature, art tries to reach the ideal beauty behind the invisible. After that, artists go beyond reality with their extraordinary creativity and create their own expressive language and aesthetic understanding (Private, 2014: 294). Writers such as Dante, Petrarca and Baccaccio became the pioneers of humanism representing the Renaissance period. Humanism was a trend that formerly focused on the literature of antiquity, mostly focused on the study of the Greek and Latin languages, cultures, and arts. humanism in the Renaissance; It became the name of an approach that defines all of the studies investigating the human being, the essence of man and his place in this world, and focuses on these values. Humanism, in a broader sense, can also be understood as a definition that reveals the new understanding of life and way of thinking of the modern man, who wants to create a philosophy and culture about human and life, independent of religion (Private, 2014: 130).

Although Locke was the thinker who most despised poetry among the 17th century philosophers, it may seem ironic in the history of aesthetics that he inspired, to a certain extent, an entirely new aesthetic movement. Locke’s new method consisted in taking a particular psychic event, rather than a general truth of reason, as the starting point for any scientific inquiry. To explain for a Lockean meant to reveal the historical origin of any process in a sense-impression (Arat,

1979: 76).

The 18th century, known as the Age of Enlightenment, is a period of fundamental changes in the cultural structure of the Western world, in the life of the individual and in social life, depending on scientific thought. Concepts prioritizing religion in the Middle Ages revealed art in Renaissance thought, while the concept of reason in the 17th and 18th centuries left its place to science. In this period, it is revealed from the form concerns realized depending on nature. Now, works of art begin to gain value with their aesthetic qualities rather than functionality.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, his temperament and interests are different from many philosophers. Rousseau, too, was torn between the old art system and the new fine art system. Even his contemporaries were accused of being in a paradox, if not a contradiction, of continuing to write operas, plays and novels while rejecting fine arts as a manifestation of moral corruption (Shiner, 2013: 218-219). Rousseau's award-winning *First Discourse* was a resounding no to the question about the moral merits of the Arts and Sciences. One of the things that makes his essay so interesting for us is this: in this essay, which Rousseau wrote in the very year that Alembert advertised these concepts in the preface to the *Encyclopedia*, he was unequivocally critical of both the new beaux arts category and the opposition of pleasure and utility. (Shiner, 2013: 219). Rousseau's critique was built on the common opposition between the depressed Athenians and the urban-minded Spartans: "While the sins brought by Fine Arts were brought into Athens", the Spartans "pushed Art and Artists out" (Shiner, 2013: 219-220).

Rousseau now *First Discourse* It received a lot of criticism. This situation forced him to think more deeply about the role of fine arts in corrupting society (Shiner, 2013: 220). Rousseau's idea of taste was as ambiguous as his approach to the fine arts category. From time to time, as in emphasizing the unity of emotion and reason in taste, opinions towards refined taste, which later became aesthetic, were voiced (Shiner, 2013: 221). Contrary to the refined or neutral taste embraced by mainstream aesthetic theory, Rousseau defined taste as an ordinary form of pleasure, which he called "moderate sensuality" or "lustlessness" (Shiner, 2013: 222). In order to fully appreciate Rousseau's resistance to the emerging ideals of fine art and aesthetics, we need to consider together this idea of taste as moderate sensuality and his views on craft and festival. According to Rousseau, we could still find traces of the original unity of art and everyday life in Native

American craft practices and even in some Swiss villages (Shiner, 2013: 223). The most competent interpreter of Rousseau's thoughts on art calls the festival he describes a "normative" myth. But this is not entirely a fantasy for him. The simple arts performed at a festival attended by everyone corresponds to Rousseau's notion of taste as moderate sensuality. It is no surprise that the efforts of the mainstream aesthetic and fine art world to reunite Art and Life are always in vain (Shiner, 2013: 224).

According to Rousseau, the progress of the sciences has not been in the best interest of the people at all. Progress in the sciences has made people more and more enslaved; has led to increased inequalities and injustices. From now on, it is necessary to return to natural environments in order to raise and educate people. Rousseau also deals with his determinations in this context in terms of their relevance to education, political life and political organization (Çotuksöken, 2012: 160).

The aesthetics of the 18th century did not follow the path of either French Classicism or Hume. However, the continuous effect of both currents of thought on this aesthetic can be seen both in its approach to problems and in its development (Arat, 1979: 75). In empiricism, since the basic elements of this movement were included in the first expression of the aesthetic problem, it became more difficult to avoid its influence. However, in this century, the problem of aesthetics could generally be approached from a psychological point of view (Arat, 1979: 75).

Hume's concept of objective beauty has been completely abolished. He has set pure subjectivity against the objectivity of beauty. He also removed the imagination instead of reason and removed the imagination. The sense of beauty has succeeded in making the judge. At least he accepted the sense of beauty in his judgment. This brought a relative suitability of judgment in the field of form (Schiller, 1965: X). Although Kant affirmed the subjective nature of beauty, he defended the general value and necessity of aesthetic judgment against Hume: Kant won this judgment by making aesthetic judgment similar to moral judgment (Schiller, 1965: X). According to Hume, the measure of beauty is disorder, or utilitarianism.

When Hume claimed that all the critics after Aristotle said too little with words because they could not develop their tastes and senses as a condition with the truth of philosophy, he expressed the new association doctrine put forward by

Locke with a laudatory phrase such as the truth of philosophy (Arat, 1979: 76).

Shaftesbury wants to find in his aesthetic the law that governs the structure of the personal inner-world. According to him, philosophy, which is conceived as a mere wisdom doctrine, is incomplete within a beauty doctrine. True truth cannot exist without beauty, and beauty cannot exist without truth (Arat, 1979: 101).

Beautiful, which has been considered together with the concepts of good, nice and right since ancient times, first appeared as a purely aesthetic value in Kant's system of thought, as a separate research field in the 18th century. Kant wants to base the judgment of taste as a general judgment by producing thoughts on the importance and validity of aesthetic judgments. He argues that nature has a decisive role in the emergence of art as a result of the creative activity of man, which is the product of nature. According to Kant, the sense of pleasure obtained from art is not dependent on sensations, but is determined as a result of a judgment obtained by thinking and gains universal validity. For Kant, "sublime" as an aesthetic value is related to "beautiful", which is also an aesthetic value. This interest can naturally be determined by identifying the similarities and differences between the sublime and the beautiful. Kant speaks of two kinds of "sublime": the mathematical sublime and the dynamic sublime. Mathematics manifests itself as a sublime, incomprehensible greatness. The dynamic sublime is a force that exceeds all measures (Tunalı, 2012: 228). The absolute is called the great, the sublime. But being great and being sublime are completely separate concepts. In the same way, to say that something is clearly great is quite different from saying that it is absolutely great. The last one is the big one beyond all comparison (Kant, 2016: 74). Power is a faculty that excels over great obstacles. If he himself overcomes a power over the resistance of the good, it is called a power. Nature is dynamically sublime when it is seen as a force that has no effect on us in aesthetic judgment (Kant, 2016: 83).

Because while the emotion of the sublime, as its character, carries out a movement connected with the judgment of the object of the mind, in the case of the Beautiful, taste presupposes and continues in the calm contemplation of the mind. But this movement must be judged subjectively and objectively; it thus relates through the faculty of imagination either to the faculty of knowledge or to the faculty of will; but in both relations the purposiveness of the given idea must be judged solely in terms of this faculty; accordingly, in the first case it is ascribed to the object as a mathematical, in the second, a dynamic adjustment

of the imagination; thus, the object is designed as sublime in the two ways mentioned (Kant, 2016: 73-74).

The philosophy of beauty, which started with Plato in antiquity, reaches its zenith in Hegel, the most impressive thinker of 19th century aesthetics. According to Hegel, aesthetics is the science of emotion (Hegel, 1988: 1). Hegel states that the beautiful is only about the art created by human beings, and the beauty that aesthetics will deal with is the beauty of art, which is the productive activity of human effort and imagination. The artist does not copy all the features of nature as they are, but expands their meaning by grasping their essence and deep character. It also does not deny the beauty that exists in nature, because beauty first occurs in nature. Although the artist takes nature as a model, he transcends it and idealizes it by making the eternal and unchanging reality visible. Hegel proclaims the freedom of art and the artist with his thoughts. According to Hegel, aesthetics has the vast empire of the beautiful as its subject, and to use the expression that best fits this science, it would be appropriate to say philosophy of art, or more precisely, philosophy of fine arts (Hegel, 1982: 66).

According to Schiller, when he started his aesthetic studies in 1791, aesthetics was a hot topic. Canteen. *Judgment Criticism* his work was not very depressing. Although his thoughts were clearly given in the work, the opposites hardly seemed to be eliminated because of their weight; then there was talk of a French, an English and a German aesthetic. Although the distinction between them was very diverse, he only outlined the main lines: the “French aesthetic” was rational. One side of the “English aesthetics” was experimentalist and the other side was idealistic. As for the “German aesthetic”, they called it: critical-idealist (Schiller, 1965: VIII-IX). Discussions centered on two issues. The first of these is the unity of the truth, the beautiful and the good. Second, what is the task of art? What should the sample be? are questions. In the unity of truth, beauty and good, many philosophers expressed their views on beauty and commented on the measure of beauty. Among the positive forces driving Schiller’s aesthetic views is his great respect for Antiquity, most notably Ancient Greek mythology, philosophy, and art. Schiller, a philosopher who adopted Kant’s thoughts, *Scattered Views* beauty in her article; wants to distinguish it from the concepts of pleasant, good, and sublime:

Pleasant is not worthy of art; is not the goal of good art; because the aim of art is pleasure. And the good, whether practical or theoretical, cannot be a means

of sense. Pleasant, pleases only the senses; good only the mind pleases; If it is beautiful, it is a vehicle for sensory enjoyment, and in this respect it differs from the good. But the mind also pleases you because of its form; In this way, it is also separated from the pleasant. So: good is pleasing only in its rational form. The beautiful is pleasing in its mind-like form. Your pleasure has no form, it is only matter. It is well thought, well watched, pleasant is heard with the senses (Private, 2014: 168).

By saying this, Schiller shares common views with Kant with his evaluations that distinguish the beautiful from the good and the pleasant. With this definition, be autiful can be understood as a synthesis of these concepts.

Schelling is one of the important post-Kantian thinkers of German philosophy. Schelling and Hegel interpreted Kant's philosophy in a metaphysical understanding of aesthetics and beauty called "German idealism". To understand Schelling's teachings on aesthetics, it is necessary to examine.

Every aesthetic creation begins in itself an infinite separation of the two factors separated in every free creation. Now, however, since these two factors in the product have to be put forward together, what is infinite is thus put forward as finite. But putting the infinite as the finite is beauty. The basic character of every work of art, which grasps both by prioritizing them, is beauty, and there is no work of art without beauty (Private, 2014: 175).

Schelling considers aesthetics the highest and highest level of all philosophy. The knowledge reached at the end of the process that reveals beauty is the philosophy of art. The knowledge that philosophy wants to obtain is the ideas that are the real truth. Since it is possible to reach the ideas, which are the essence of existence, with art, the culmination of the philosophy of art should be beauty (Private, 2014: 176).

In the aesthetics of the 19th century, it is presented more strongly than in Kant. From the side of the work of art given to the senses, through aesthetic life, we grasp another world, the metaphysical. If this is so, the metaphysical must be 'heard', that is, known in a primitive way. Schopenhauer constantly repeats that the life of art contains a knowledge. The aim of all arts is the declaration of the conceived Idea; watching the objectification games of the will; what we taste in art (Geiger, 2015: 46). Psychological aesthetics for the first time; he wants to put aside the intellectual and geist-related residues in aesthetic life. For Schopenhauer, aesthetic life is the effect of the object on the emotions; must have

a completely passive taste. The intellectual has no place in it. For the first time, this aesthetic provides a theoretical basis for the amateur, who turns into himself and concentrates (Geiger, 2015: 46).

Schopenhauer tries to “provide a practical, not a theoretical, way of salvation. He showed aesthetics as the first and most important candidate for this practical path. Aesthetic experience makes it possible for a person to take a considerable distance in order to get out of the wheel of will and futility. Schopenhauer, who says that the aesthetic experience coming from art as a source of salvation gives people the opportunity to overcome the limits of time and get rid of individuality, says that art does this very paradoxically by giving us information” (Cevizci, 2014: 928). Attaching a high value to art, Schopenhauer does not neglect to say that “it also gives us pleasure. The pleasure of art is of two kinds. The first of these is objective pleasure, which has a cognitive value. The pleasure in question has a cognitive value that enables us to come into contact with Platonic ideas and to conceive of ‘the world as will’ rather than as an idea or representation. The second is subjective pleasure, which gives us a state of emotion that saves us from the hustle and bustle of human existence and futile efforts” (Cevizci, 2014: 929).

Nietzsche particularly emphasizes tragedy as an art. But this tragedy is also a way of life, the highest way of living. There is no distinction between art and life. By naming this duality at the core of tragedy, Nietzsche indicates his attitude towards art, especially the tragic. Dionysus and Apollo are not concepts, but two entities that have mixed and influenced ancient Greek life; one can see them, touch them. The fact that Nietzsche sees tragedy in such a framework shows that he approaches art with a direct understanding, not with logical inferences (Kuçuradi, 2013: 22). Apollo and Dionysus, the Greeks who expressed the latent doctrine of their worldview with their gods and at the same time kept it secret, are two gods as a double source for their art. In the field of art, these names symbolize the stylistic differences that usually travel side by side in competition and seem to fuse only once, when the Helen “will” is at its peak, in the name of the work of art called “Attica Tragedy” (Nietzsche, 2011: 57). Apollo is the god of sun and light. He is the “visible” with everything, he is completely the god of sun and light, his feature comes from his beauty and therefore he reigns in the dream world of the beautiful (Nietzsche, 2011: 57-58). Dionysian art is about play with enthusiasm and ecstasy. The two forces that bring the naive nature person to

the level of ecstasy are prioritized, the spring impulse, the “Start!” of all nature. command and narcotic drink. Their effects *Dionysos* finds its expression in the figure (Nietzsche, 2011: 58).

Modernism in art and later the Frankfurt School for theory and post-structuralism helped to establish a solid foundation. Because the positive aesthetic tradition, which found the system too strong to oppose, has lost its power (Eagleton, 2012: 461). Modernism is important in painting as works of art. Unlike the postmodern, modern art is reflected in the works. Artists reflecting modernism reflected realism extremely freely. To give an example from the art of painting, the artist/painter who reflects this theory is İbrahim Çallı. Çallı's works reflect modernism.

According to Lyotard, modern art presents “the fact of being that is not presented”. From this point of view, Lyotard talks about the art objects of modern art that are not really, not produced and consumed by reflection. It is seen as an important feature for modern art that the art object points to a new type of art that has not been discovered in an original form.

Postmodernism tends to question traditional conceptions of truth, and skepticism towards these absolute, technological claims of truth has indeed had radical effects. However, postmodernism, as is customary, exhibits a chronic tendency to characterize ideas about reality that are directed to a knowledge that has a transcendent neutrality in order to experience the pleasure of feeling superior to its enemies (Eagleton, 2012: 473). With the development of postmodernism, there have been developments in the art of painting. It has especially improved in terms of freedom of thought. As we can see in the works produced, the classical forms are out of the way. As freedom of thought developed, creativity increased. Abstract art made in the works is one of the effects of postmodernism.

Heidegger is one of the thinkers who established a very close bond between beauty and truth. According to Heidegger, beauty is a kind of illumination of being; this is nothing but truth. Truth is the liberation of existence from secrecy. Truth is the truth of being. Beauty does not come alongside truth. If truth enters into the work of art, then it appears as beauty (Tunalı, 2012: 137). According to Heidegger, the work of art and the origin of the artist are art. We understand its existence in the actual work. The reality of the work is determined by the fact that the truth is at work in the work and the realization of the truth (Heidegger, 2007: 55). Art reveals the truth. Art, as a constitutive protection, extracts the ex-

isting truth in the work. To give birth to something means to be thrown from the origin of being towards the being, that is, it means origin (Heidegger, 2007: 73). The origin of the work of art, that is, the origins of the creators and preservers, that is, the origin of a people's historical presence, is art. This is so because art is an origin in its own being, that is, it is historical in a wonderful way like truth (Heidegger, 2007: 73-74). Heidegger's aesthetic criticism stems from his assessment that modern art has lost its ties to life. Heidegger compares modern art with the older conceptualization of aesthetic art. In this older conceptualization, art is seen as something that guides us how we can live (Bolt, 2015: 126). Heidegger claims that the conceptualization of art has been replaced by a conceptualization related to sensory perception and new experience. According to Heidegger, art as an experience no longer has a connection with how we live life, so it has become unable to guide us on how to live. Aesthetic art conceptualization brings to the end of art precisely for this reason. When experience is the source and standard of not only the appreciation and enjoyment of art, but also artistic creativity, the element in which art dies is experience (Bolt, 2015: 126).

For Heidegger, great art is not "high" art as opposed to the "low" art that art historians and theorists write about and critics praise. Heidegger describes "great art" on the basis of his definition of the essence of art. Great art is art that makes a difference in people's daily lives and provides an ethical ground for understanding our existence in the world (Bolt, 2015: 126-127). Great art is great because it is important to world history and fulfills an important task: "It reveals what beings as a whole are". In other words, according to Heidegger, great art plays a decisive role because it reveals the "truth of beings as a whole, that is, the conditional, the absolute", and thus guides us how to live in a particular historical context because of its "opening the truth" quality. Thus, what makes art great is not a question of the quality of the work of art, but that it is an absolute necessity. As an absolute need, art depends on the ethics of life (Bolt, 2015: 127).

At the beginning of the 20th century, a new argument was made about the establishment of aesthetics. It was Croce who made this argument. According to Croce, the science we call aesthetics was founded by an Italian philosopher before Baumgarten. This philosopher is Vico (Tunali, 2012: 16). Vico examines the essence of poetry and art. *New Science* According to Croce, twenty-five years before Baumgarten with his 1725 published work, he should be considered to have established aesthetics. However, this argument of Croce did not receive

a certain resonance and attention, and Baumgarten, as the founder of aesthetic science and also the father of the name, preserved its reality (Tunali, 2012: 16-17). According to Croce, the subject of aesthetics is intuition, a universal field of existence. Intuition is the simplest way of knowing, which precedes conceptual knowledge, forms its basis, and gives us the individual.

These are intuitions: *This river, this lake, this stream, this rain, this glass of water*" (Tunali, 2012: 17). Intuition gives us the individual, but therefore does not mean the same thing as perception. There is such a science that examines all these intuitions, and this science is aesthetics.

Sartre's dividing language into two as prose and poetic language and being negative towards poetry is a feature seen in all his aesthetics. Sartre also distinguishes between the beautiful and the good. Sartre is negative towards the beautiful; beautiful is bad, beautiful is not good. This understanding of beauty is different from the traditional understanding of beauty. In Plato, the beautiful is the good. What is not good is not beautiful. In fact, these concepts are expressed with the same word in ancient Greek. As a matter of fact, the idea of beauty, like all other ideas, unites in the absolute good. This absolute or ideal understanding of beauty continued its effectiveness in the history of philosophy until Hegel (Turgut, 1993: 71). in Sartre "*Beauty or beauty is the abstraction of the being, the determination of the truth. Beautiful is moving away from being and thinking about nothingness. Therefore it is bad. The imaginary, the poetic, is beautiful. Beauty has no social or moral value. But there is good. Good is about right and wrong. Therefore, literature is good, poetry is beautiful.*" (Turgut, 1993: 71).

The relationship between the object of being and the work of art has been one of the main problems of the philosophy of art since Plato and Aristotle. Although Marxist aesthetics considers the existence in nature as an aesthetic object, the aesthetic reality it deals with is different from the natural reality. Aesthetic reality exists with people. What exists in nature is a social reality specific to art and humans. The basis of the Marxist philosophy of art is a problem of knowledge. The information here is related to the existence of the artwork and aesthetic reality. In Marxist aesthetics, the appearance of nature in a work of art means that what is created by the artist is shared with society.

While emphasizing the necessity of the existence of a subject in order to comprehend the aesthetic object, that is, the art event, Marx undoubtedly makes a different contribution to today's aesthetic understanding. An aesthetic object

cannot exist as an entity in its own right, but only with a subject grasping it. The Marxist understanding, which gives importance to the individual with a humanist approach, judges art in terms of social values and decides and tells about human, nature and social events in terms of its relation to human. In this context, art has a social duty and art must fulfill this duty.

Marx can reveal Adorno's reasoning, explaining the meaning of his describing modernist works of art as monads. As Marx begins the grain of capitalism, "capitalist society presents itself as an enormous accumulation of commodities", then states that the commodity is "a mysterious thing full of metaphysical subtleties and theological details" (Boucher, 2013: 99). Adorno thinks that today there is a risk that the proletariat will dissolve into consumerism. He does not abandon Marx's style of analysis. He attributes to art a revolutionary role at the heart of capitalism's contradictions. According to Adorno, although autonomous art is commodified, it is not created as a useful object unlike the standard commercial products of the culture industry (Boucher, 2013: 100). In the 20th century, art is no longer a means but an end. The reason for the existence of art cannot be attributed to anything other than itself. In order to be able to talk about a work of art as a purpose, first of all, it must come into existence as an aesthetic object.

Adorno, one of the Frankfurt School thinkers dominated by the Marxist understanding, *mimesis* evaluates his theory from a new perspective. According to him, art cannot be expected to reflect social reality; because social reality is corrupt, distorted and wrong, such a reality cannot be the subject of art. If art has a function of being an example to society, the value of being an example should be sought in art, not society. Art is a balanced formation that is thought and fictionalized based on the form existing in nature. Beyond these, the most important thing for Adorno is that the work of art is autonomous and original.

In the modern world where technology and production come to the fore, the individual loses his originality and transforms into objects that are almost similar to each other. Marcuse, one of the thinkers of the Frankfurt School, thinks that capitalism and consumer society do not allow the development of culture and personality, but also limit creativity and the freedom of the individual, and he, like Adorno, thinks that art is the only way of salvation.

In the first half of the 20th century, Lukacs, a thinker of Marxist origin, both tries to evaluate art and aesthetics as a whole, which Marxist theorists do not

mention much, and succeeds in overcoming it with new fictions in his own world of thought by assimilating the views of all thinkers starting from Aristotle and Plato. Aesthetics, in its essence, is not reality itself, but its reflection. Thus, the lived reality gains a unique meaning by being reproduced at the aesthetic level. Reflecting reality faithfully has no aesthetic value. The work of art is born both from everyday life and from the extreme contradiction of everyday life. This contradiction is present in every act of creation. Art, which emerged as an aesthetic value, is now an objectification (Private, 2014: 298).

Considering that while developing the theory of aesthetics, Lukacs constantly seeks the origins of this behavior in the integrity of human actions while determining the position of aesthetic behavior, the reason for the great importance is self-explanatory (Lukacs, 1978: 10). Lukacs is at a very young age when he deals with aesthetic problems arising from the creative actions of human beings and the works of art that are the product of this action. Lukacs has not yet truly assimilated even Marxist doctrine. Starting from very early times, Lukacs thought very intensely on the work of art and saw art as an important tool to overcome the contradictions and disruptions in society (Lukacs, 1978: 10). Lukacs's aesthetic differs radically from classical aesthetics, which envisages a stand-alone study of aesthetic categories, detached from context. Aesthetics is a concept that Lukacs has always strongly opposed; Against this concept, Lukacs puts the working style of the critic based on philosophy (Lukacs, 1978: 12-13).

For Adorno, all art *Utopian* it contains a moment: "Even in the purest work of art, it could have been otherwise" is hidden. Objects that have been literally built, including literary ones, that is, works of art, point to a practice that they themselves avoid (Eagleton, 2012: 437). According to Adorno, art is an idealized field of existence rather than an embodied contradiction. Everything that has been made works resolutely against itself, and it does so in all sorts of ways. It strives for pure autonomy, but it is a nothingness that disappears into the air without a disjunctive moment (Eagleton, 2012: 440). The main concern of Adorno's aesthetics is purely historical rather than reducing art to a bland conceptuality that can be better handled with logical propositions, rather than establishing a final form in works of art that is highly self-reflexive about the historical position of the principle of hope, it is alert to the shifting relationship between individual and society. . Autonomous art "feeds on the idea of humanity": (Boucher,

2013: 92). Adorno is well aware of the hermetic nature of modernist works of art. He positions them as autonomous fragments drifting in a sea of universal equivalence, and while describing their paradoxical structures, he appeals to the definition of social monads of modernist arts (Boucher, 2013: 98). According to Adorno, self-forming, the very fact that the work of art sets its own rules from itself, is nothing but a local state of social totality, since works of art are produced within the social division of labor by a certain kind of practice (Boucher, 2013: 99). Adorno, works of art “are plenipotentiary ambassadors of what can no longer be distorted by exchange, profit, and the false needs of a humiliated humanity.” In an almost completely reified society, autonomous art is the last refuge of the creative praxis that points beyond alienated labor. While autonomous art is a form of creative praxis that is the antithesis of social reification, it also lacks the power to change crippled practices by falling into the social division of labor of alienated labor (Boucher, 2013: 100-101). This is why radical works of art must remain true to the contradiction that created them, simultaneously preserving and negating the art’s promise of human happiness. Adorno thinks that the only way to do this is aesthetic dissonance (Boucher, 2013: 101).

Autonomous art by its very existence is a protest against reification and rationalization. Autonomous art is the antithesis of instrumental reason and commodity reification, and even the social division of labor that creates these problems. Combining a labor process with human creativity creates the potential for resistance to routinization and domination. His combination of mental and manual labor contrasts the crippling separation of these forms of activity in the social division of labor. Art is the antithesis of society because it represents the possibility of creative praxis that presupposes utopian reconciliation by its inherent nature (Boucher, 2013: 101). Adorno, who agrees with Kant’s idea that defines art as “deliberate uselessness”, makes the determination that “if a social function is to be attributed to works of art, it is their dysfunction” (Boucher, 2013: 101). In conditions where intellectual culture is incorporated into the division of labor and industrialized, reacting and homogenizing as a result, the independence and originality of the artwork is a rebel. Art, the source of the strength of resistance, lies in combining social dysfunction and aesthetic autonomy (Boucher, 2013: 101).

The position of the Frankfurt School in aesthetics becomes evident in the process of discussion between Adorno and Lukacs. While Adorno, one of these

two thinkers, both of whom are of Marxist origin, defends modern aesthetics, Lukacs stands closer to reflection aesthetics (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 61). According to Adorno, “Lukacs misunderstood in many respects the problems of form, the founder and creator of the work of art. For Adorno, his defense of the Lukacs theory of reflection and his insistence on assuming that realism is something that can be achieved by imitating experimental reality led him to think that the images of modernism are distorted forms of reality or unconsciously disguised appearances of objective reality” (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 61). According to Adorno, the production of the work of art is comprehended to the extent that the subject assimilates and internalizes the objective world; but it depends on the aesthetic form being able to do it in accordance with its own laws (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 61). Lukacs considered the use of terms such as “image” and “essence” in aesthetics to be indicative of idealism. But the application of these terms to the field of art is entirely different from their application in philosophy. The most important inadequacy of Lukacs’ approach to these problems is his inability to see the difference between the two (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 62). The tension between Adorno and Lukacs can be considered both as a debate between modern aesthetics and aesthetics of reflection, and as a discussion on how Marxist aesthetics should be. While Adorno tried to open Marxist aesthetics to modernism, Lukacs tried to base it on the realist aesthetic, which was the pinnacle of reflection aesthetics at that time. Lukacs’s greatest contribution to aesthetic theory was the development of a theory of mediations that would enable us to understand and comprehend the political and ideological content, which until then was only a formal aesthetic phenomenon (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 64).

Aesthetic views theoretically help to better comprehend and perceive art objects. The aesthetic views of philosophers have led to new ideas that have shed light on our day. Aesthetic views theoretically help to better comprehend and perceive art objects. to art objects; sublime, beautiful, pleasant, harmony (*harmony* we understand that judgments such as) and ugly are an expression of evaluation and therefore reception as a result of aesthetic views. When we attribute these concepts to art objects, a more conscious interpretation can be made. If the people who comment on the work first receive the work and then make an evaluation, the judgment attributed to that work will be more accurate. Thus, it can be seen more clearly and clearly what kind of quality the work has.

## 1.2 Steps of Aesthetic Analysis

The aesthetic phenomenon or aesthetic being occurs as an ontic unity of four elements. These are aesthetic subject analysis, aesthetic object analysis, aesthetic value analysis and aesthetic judgment analysis, which are the steps of aesthetic analysis. We find four basic structural elements in the ontic integrity of the aesthetic phenomenon.

Wilhelm Worringer, *“Modern aesthetics, which has taken an absolute step from aesthetic objectivism to aesthetic subjectivism, proceeds from the behavior of the subject who no longer looks at the aesthetic object but from the aesthetic object in his works”* while interpreting aesthetics, he directly expressed psychological aesthetics (Tunali, 2012: 19). One of the most important criticisms against psychology and psychological aesthetics from past to present is the criticism expressed by Wittgenstein. His criticism is mostly in terms of aesthetic judgment. He was interested in the question of aesthetic judgment. According to that, *“People always say that one day psychology will explain all our aesthetic judgments, and when they say psychology, they mean experimental psychology”* (Tunali, 2012: 19).

Philosophical aesthetics is not just a psychology of aesthetic feelings, a philosophy of art, a philosophy of beauty, or a logic of aesthetic judgments. A most common misunderstanding in aesthetics comes from wanting to reduce philosophical aesthetics, which examines aesthetic existence in its entirety, to a single ontic element within this unity of existence. The concept of philosophical aesthetics is above all in its content. The individual aesthetic disciplines that make each of the four ontic elements their subject are included in the subject of philosophical aesthetics. In this respect, there is no contrast between aesthetics and philosophy of art and other disciplines; nor does it make sense to avoid using the concept of aesthetics for aesthetic reality. Because philosophical aesthetics surrounds and embraces the whole meaning of being. The task of philosophical aesthetics is to investigate this aesthetic entity in terms of ontic elements (Tunali, 2012: 21-22).

Aesthetic reality can only come to light if these structural elements are handled with a philosophical attitude in their entirety. So many questions arise that

we need to explore. These are “what is an aesthetic subject?”, “what is an aesthetic object?”, “what is aesthetic value?”, and “what is aesthetic judgment?” are questions. As mentioned at the beginning of the subject, these questions enable us to perceive and perceive the art object or the art of painting.

If we explain it through a painting, the aesthetic subject is the information that the painting provides and gives us. This information; The message that painting gives us is what it tells us, what emotions it makes us feel. The structure of the frame of the painting, whether it fits the picture, and whether that frame is suitable in terms of color is the information it gives us. In addition, whether there is an element of imitation, what colors it consists of, who made the painting, in which technique it was made, and in what period it was painted are the aesthetic information it gives us. Therefore, it is very difficult to receive a painting or a work without this information.

Aesthetic existence does not rely solely on the existence of the subject. In the aesthetic phenomenon, there is another entity on which the subject depends and is related to the subject entity participating in this phenomenon (Tunalı, 2012: 20). If the subject, the aesthetic phenomenon is a necessary being, the aesthetic object is also necessary for the aesthetic phenomenon. An object can be a natural entity, as well as a work of art in a narrower sense, to give an example; poetry, painting, ceramics, etc. it could be. It is imperative to comprehend the aesthetic object, just as it is necessary to examine the subject in comprehending the aesthetic being. In the historical development process, the aesthetic object researches started before the subject researches. Thus, objectivist aesthetics wants to determine the aesthetic object, the mode of being and the categories of existence in the narrow sense of the meaning of the work of art and art, by leaving the separation between the work of art and the natural object (Tunalı, 2012: 20). Although an aesthetic starting from the aesthetic subject is a subjectivist and psychologistic aesthetic, an aesthetic starting from the aesthetic object eventually becomes an objectivist aesthetic. In other words, objectivist aesthetics can be called a philosophy of art, that is, an ontology of art (Tunalı, 2012: 21).

The aesthetic object is to examine the works from a phenomenological and ontological point of view. Aesthetic object also means attributing that work or painting as “existing”. Some artists are of the opinion that it is not enough to examine the works as information, and they should be explained as assets. For example, it is sufficient for a table to exist only with its frame. In addition, the

work of art tells us about existence and gives information about existence. For this reason, every work of art reveals a knowledge of existence and reality, and at the same time, the understanding of being and reality of that art is reflected in this knowledge. In the basis of every artwork, there is an object of knowledge, a knowledge of the being that the artist perceives, comprehends and determines as reality (Tunalı: 2003: 31).

Every work of art has a value. In the art of painting, every painting has a value and we attribute a value to these works. These values are the concepts we attribute such as sublime, beautiful, pleasant, funny, harmonious and ugly. Thanks to these values we attribute, aesthetic judgments are imposed on the art of painting, that is, on paintings. For example, when we say “The frame of this painting did not look nice”, we attribute a value and make an aesthetic judgment. Thus, aesthetic analyzes become a tool for us to perceive art objects or painting.

### **1.2.1 Aesthetic Subject-Object Relationship**

In the event of knowing, the being of consciousness that perceives and grasps, the “I” is called the “subject”, and the perceived and grasped being is called the “object”. The subject related to knowledge is called “knowledge subject”, as in the example above. In this context, on the one hand, there is a piece of nature or a work of art, in short, an aesthetic object; On the other hand, there is a subject who has an aesthetic interest in this aesthetic object, perceives it aesthetically, enjoys it or feels aesthetic pleasure. The subject, who has such an interest with an aesthetic object, ceases to be a simple subject of knowledge, but becomes an aesthetic subject (Tunalı, 2012: 23). Aesthetic subject means “I”, the consciousness being that perceives an aesthetic object, grasps it, enjoys it aesthetically, and feels aesthetic pleasure from it. Such an aesthetic subject, while grasping and enjoying an aesthetic object, takes an aesthetic attitude towards this aesthetic object (Tunalı: 2012: 23). We see that the aesthetic subject, like the general subject, consists of some psychic processes. The concept of aesthetic subjectivity shows a feature such as this extraordinarily complex unity of psychic processes and subjective copies of (reality) (Tunalı, 2003: 67).

The subject of knowledge and the subject of aesthetics have the same qualities. These qualities are, on the one hand, that they are purely psychic phenomena, and on the other hand, that these phenomena are a reflection of reality. However, there is a difference between them starting from this point. This separation

is especially evident in the case of “reflection of reality” (Tunalı, 2003: 67). Although the reality corresponding to the aesthetic subject is the reality corresponding to the knowledge subject, the reflection of this reality in consciousness in the aesthetic subject is different. While this reflection is in the form of reality in the subject of knowledge, it becomes an art form, an aesthetic form in the aesthetic subject (Tunalı, 2003: 68). Perceiving and comprehending a piece of nature that we call beautiful or a work of art that we find beautiful is only possible by taking a certain attitude towards this entity that we call aesthetic object. This can be described as “taking a certain attitude” (Tunalı, 2012: 23).

Let’s take the first look first. This way of looking, “when and by whom was the mansion built?” comes up with the question. Or “what is his style, what is his artistic value?” with questions. Looking at the mansion in terms of these questions shows a point of view or attitude that wants to learn about it in terms of history and art history. Such an attitude is an attitude of seeking knowledge, an attitude of knowledge. Such an attitude has a certain purpose, to obtain information, accurate information about objects. Therefore, such an attitude is called an intellectual-informational attitude or an intellectual attitude. As for the other point of view, the one that asks about the monetary value of the mansion, this point of view can be called a practical-economic attitude. In this way of looking, the minister has a goal of practical or economic benefit. As for the third attitude: This way of looking is directed towards the building, the mansion without asking any questions, just to watch it, watching it to enjoy it and take pleasure from it. Neither the historicity of the building, nor its artistic value, nor its economic value, etc. questions like these do not interest him at all; nothing else interests him except to watch the mansion to watch. These definitions and taking an attitude are called taking an aesthetic attitude (Tunalı, 2012: 24).

Every work of art tells us about existence and gives information about existence. For this reason, every work of art reveals a knowledge of existence and reality, and at the same time, the understanding of being and reality of that art is reflected in this knowledge. In the basis of every artwork, there is an object of knowledge, a knowledge of the being that the artist sees, comprehends and determines as reality (Tunalı, 2003: 31). In every information event, there is a perceptual, intellectual, emotional and intuitive, etc. relationship between a knowing subject and a known object. If there is an interest in art, there is also an interest between an artist’s subject and an object world that he grasps, for example, with

words, lines, colors, and sounds (Tunali, 2003: 32). All knowledge is based on a subject and object interest. On the one hand, there is the human being, who is a conscious being, on the other hand, the perception, thinking, designing, imagining, etc. of this conscious being, the subject we call “human”. objects, thoughts, etc., which he associates with acts of knowing, such as existence, object world (Tunali, 2003: 39). We see the same subject and object interest in the field of aesthetics. Here, however, the subject is not a conscious human being, as in the context of knowledge, but a being with special abilities that we call “artist”. The object to which he is directed can be anything. The artist turns to objects with his creative imagination, grasps them and expresses them (Tunali, 2003: 39-40).

For example;

A painter paints a landscape, a sculptor sculpts a human being, a poet or musician expresses his feelings, a novelist expresses the events that take place in a society. The painter’s means of expressing the object he deals with is color and paint, the sculptor’s wood, marble and metal, the poet and novelist’s words. But no matter what means of expression the artist uses, he always turns to a certain object, relates to it and comprehends it. He describes it with some lines and paints or sounds or words according to himself, interprets it according to himself, and thus knows it. In this way, telling and expressing means grasping the object and knowing it. There will be a big difference between the three paintings that will be created by three painters who made the same landscape. Therefore, knowledge of art is a subjective knowledge (Tunali, 2003: 40).

Here, not only the senses but also the imagination establishes the relationship between the artist’s subject and the object to which he or she is directed. The artist not only sees an object to which he is directed, but also changes, enriches and expresses it with his imagination. Therefore, knowledge of art ceases to be an ordinary knowledge (Tunali, 2003: 40). Aesthetic knowledge is a subjective interest that occurs between an artist subject and a piece of nature that occurs between a piece of nature, which achieves concreteness in the artwork. A work of art is an entity created by the artist’s subjective experiences, sensations and feelings in the face of reality, and this entity shows the subjective equivalent of reality (Tunali, 2003: 48). Knowledge of art is knowledge of reality, but not knowledge that is a rough copy of reality. Marxist aesthetics admits that this is so, contradicting its assumption. What saves art from being a simple reflection of reality is its sensory-emotional and imaginative quality (Tunali, 2003: 53).

One reason art knowledge is subjective is that the relationship between subject and object is not merely factual or conceptual, but emotional and imaginative. The artist does not only turn to the object or phenomenon he wants to focus on factually, but replaces it with his imagination. Thus, knowledge of art is not a type of knowledge, it is a free aesthetic knowledge (Turgut, 1993: 181). There are no elements in the knowledge of art that cannot be proved objectively. The knowledge of art, the knowledge of the preliminary structure, that is, the knowledge at the technical level, how the language is used and the mastery in the use of language can be determined by experts (Turgut, 1993: 182). The main problem in the knowledge of art is the knowledge of the background. This structure is a structure that varies from person to person who asks for interpretation. It is in the structure where the artist's feelings and thoughts are hidden and he reveals his imagination (Turgut, 1993: 182). According to Turgut, what makes art knowledge really important is its artistic or aesthetic propositions. The problem is in these propositions (Turgut, 1993: 182).

The aesthetic subject has aesthetic senses, aesthetic sensations and the ability to receive aesthetic pleasure. According to Marxist aesthetics, the aesthetic phenomenon occurs with these faculties possessed by the aesthetic subject. Aesthetic phenomenon and aesthetic object do not occur on their own, but with the subjective activity of the aesthetic subject and gain an aesthetic existence (Tunalı, 2003: 70). Thus, there is no art without knowledge, no knowledge without art. It is very difficult to have art due to the lack of knowledge. The more knowledge we have, the more we can advance in art. Consequently, there can be no art without knowledge, no knowledge without art. It is extremely important to know art from a conceptual and practical point of view.

Aesthetic existence, of course, does not only depend on the existence of the subject. In the aesthetic phenomenon, there is another entity that the subject turns towards and establishes an interest in, opposite the subject entity participating in this phenomenon. *"This entity is an aesthetic object. An aesthetic object means an entity with which the aesthetic subject has an aesthetic interest. The main problem and question of the aesthetic object is "What is a work of art? This question should be approached from the point of view of contemporary or modern philosophy.* (Tunalı, 2012: 47). While aesthetic object analysis examines the object analysis of phenomenological-ontological aesthetics, the aesthetic object understanding of Marxist aesthetics consists of object understanding in infor-

mation aesthetics, structuralist aesthetics and object analysis, and aesthetics of reception and aesthetic object understanding. Phenomenological analysis, the activity we call “art” for a psychological understanding, can only be understood by analyzing the emotions of the subject watching the artwork. The most basic emotion that the subject feels before the work of art is aesthetic pleasure (Tunalı, 2012: 47-48). The psychology of aesthetic pleasure should be a main road leading to the analysis of art and artwork. Theodor Lipps has been the most important representative of this view. According to Lipps, aesthetic pleasure is “self-pleasure in an object outside oneself.” Therefore, it is not an aesthetic object, that is, a work of art, on the contrary, what matters is our activity, our emotions and our pleasure (Tunalı, 2012: 48).

An aesthetic object, whether it is a poem, a musical composition, a sculpture or a structure, is an object with certain qualities and characteristics. Those that have certain characteristics and qualities are gathered under a certain idiom, a certain concept, and this is called “aesthetic object” or “work of art” (Tunalı, 2011: 54). In the aesthetic object, the work of art is an existent. As such an entity, it is the concrete thing from which to proceed in the field of aesthetics. These are the ones that will be analyzed in terms of various works of art (Tunalı, 2011: 61). In Hartmann’s definition of aesthetic object, an aesthetic object, whether it is a poem, a musical composition, a sculpture or a structure, is an object with certain qualities and characteristics. Existences with these certain characteristics and qualities are gathered under a certain idiom, a certain concept, and this is called “aesthetic object” or “work of art” (Tunalı, 2012: 52).

As a stimulant, painting gives movement to our aesthetic feelings and aesthetic concerns. If a painting can create aesthetic concern in its buyer, it is an aesthetic object. In other words, only an aesthetic object can create aesthetic anxiety (Erinç, 2016: 54). The quality of a painting as an aesthetic object is its reason for existence. The more aesthetic concern it can create in its buyer, the more it proves its existence (Erinç, 2016: 54).

Every work of art is an aesthetic object. Interest in every work of art begins with ‘liking’. But not every work of art creates aesthetic concern and does not necessarily create it. The fact that it reinforces our ready feelings is enough for it to be considered a work of art. But when we try to make an evaluation among works of art, it is this aesthetic concern that will guide us (Erinç, 2016: 54).

Discussions and opinions between the aesthetic object and the subject have

led to different interpretations. Kuçuradi *Looking at Art with Philosophy* in his “*If art is seen as an activity that produces works that provide a special kind of knowledge, Aesthetics today loses its reason for existence as a branch of philosophy, and some of its problems cease to be meaningful.*” says (Kuçuradi, 2013: 91). As for Tunali, *Modern Painting in the Light of Philosophy* in his work, “*Beauty is not about being, but about appearance.*” says (Tunali, 2013: 90). According to Tunali, just as the subject in the problem of knowledge turns to an object outside himself and wants to grasp it, in the case of art there is a situation of comprehension between the artist and the object to which he or she is directed, as in the case of knowledge.

Thus, in order to perceive and comprehend an art object, an aesthetic subject is needed rather than an aesthetic object. Because an art object can only be understood about what kind of information it gives us.

### **1.2.2 Aesthetic Value-Judgment Relationship**

Another important analysis is related to aesthetic value. Every art object has an art value. According to Tunali, as an aesthetic subject, we not only engage with an aesthetic object, we also attribute a value to this object, we call it “beautiful”, “sublime”, “tragic” or “funny”. All these are the predicates that we attribute to the objects, and they express an aesthetic value (Tunali, 2012: 131).

Aesthetic existence is not only determined by the subject and aesthetic object elements; an entity that creates it is aesthetic value or beauty. Every aesthetic event wants to reveal a certain aesthetic value. This value is the beautiful value or idea. The beautiful also necessarily participates in the aesthetic phenomenon. The subject, who takes an aesthetic attitude towards an aesthetic object, expresses this attitude as an aesthetic value: “This poem is beautiful”, “this painting is not beautiful”. Beauty can be thought of as a value, an idea, an *eidos* (essence), or it can also be defined as the quality of an aesthetic object such as proportion, symmetry and order. The same can be said for ugliness. Such a research that deals with beauty would be a theory or philosophy of beauty, but it would also be an absolutist view as a view that reduces aesthetic existence to beauty only (Tunali, 2012: 21).

According to Baumgarten, the goal of logical understanding is real, and the goal of aesthetic (sensory) understanding is beautiful. Beautiful is perfection

grasped by the senses. Truth is perfection grasped by reason. The good is the perfection reached with the moral will (Tolstoy, 2015: 21). According to Baumgarten, beauty is determined by the harmony and order in the relations of the parts with each other and with the whole. The aim of the beautiful is to please and arouse desire (Tolstoy, 2015: 21). Regarding the emergence of the beautiful, Baumgarten sees nature as the place where the beauty is realized at the highest level; In that respect, according to Baumgarten, the greatest task of art is to imitate nature (Tolstoy, 2015: 21).

Aesthetic existence alone does not determine the subject and aesthetic object elements; an entity that creates it is aesthetic value or beauty. Every aesthetic event wants to reveal a certain aesthetic value. This value is the beautiful value or idea. The beautiful also necessarily participates in the aesthetic phenomenon. The subject, who takes an aesthetic attitude towards the aesthetic object, expresses this attitude as an aesthetic value: “This poem is beautiful”, This painting is not beautiful” (Tunalı, 2012: 21). We can attribute the value of beautiful or meanings such as “not beautiful” to art objects. Beautiful, a value, an idea, a *eidos* It can be thought of as (essence) or it can also be determined as the quality of the aesthetic object such as proportion, symmetry, order. The same can be said for ugliness. There will also be an absolutist view as a view that deals with beauty and reduces aesthetic existence to beauty only. We can also attribute the concept of ugliness, which is a value, to art objects.

The subject of pre-Platonic philosophy was first nature and then man. The interest of the sophists in art did not go beyond in terms of human relations and utility. For the first time, Plato approached the question of art and beauty with a philosophical and metaphysical approach and asked, “What is beautiful?” he asked the question. Plato, throughout his life, “What is beautiful?” interpreted the question. Plato first defines beauty as a concept in his youth period. In the maturity period, however, it determines the beautiful idea as substance. In particular, this determination *Feast* We’ll see you in the dialog. *Feast* a new concept, Eros, is put forward to grasp beauty. Love is the means of attaining beauty and reaching creativity in it. The desire to be creative in beauty is the same as the desire for immortality. It is love that makes people immortal (Plato, 2015: 88-89). According to Plato, the first beauty to which Eros turns is the beautiful body. “Listen to me now: one who wants to reach secrets must seek beautiful bodies at a younger age.” (Plato, 2015: 93). However, a beautiful body is one of those

things that are beautiful individually. Beauty of bodies is not enough for one who wants to attain perfection and true beauty.

The next thing he will do is to see the beauty of the soul above the beauty of the body. A precious soul, even if its shimmer in the body is dim, should be enough to ignite its love; he should give himself to it and seek and find the most beautiful thoughts to say for the rise of the youth. Thus, he will inevitably see beauty in the ways of living and behaving, he will realize that the beauty in all of them is always the same beauty, and thus he will learn not to get too caught up in the beauty of the body. Behavior will pass from the ways of life to the sciences and see the beauty in them (Plato, 2015: 93-94).

He will seek the true beauty, the beauty in substance, from which the beauty of the body and soul have a share. It is seen that the way to the universal and essential beauty first starts from beautiful bodies, from there it rises to lead a beautiful life, to the beauty of soul and virtue. By passing a beautiful knowledge, he finally reaches beauty on his own (Arat, 1979: 20). Pure beauty, the goal of Eros, is the goal of life. He who attains pure beauty attains immortality and happiness. This moment of attainment is a sublime moment when one “overflows before the vast sea of beauty unfolds before you.” (Plato, 2015: 94). “Isn’t there a moment when one encounters pure beauty, only for that moment human life is worth living.” (Plato, 2015: 95). What Plato is trying to define is a metaphysical beauty outside of space and time.

It is always there, birthless, immortal, inexhaustible, inexhaustible beauty. In a way, it is ugly, beautiful somewhere, ugly somewhere, beautiful today, ugly tomorrow, beautiful according to that, ugly according to that, beautiful in the eyes of some, not ugly in the eyes of others. A beauty that will not show itself with a face, feet, or anything attached to the body, neither a word, nor a knowledge, that will not exist in a living thing or a certain being, neither in the living thing, on the earth, in the sky, nowhere, it exists from itself, it exists from itself. He is always an example with himself. All beauties take their share from him. It does not increase, decrease or change with their flashing (Plato, 2015: 94).

Beauty is now a divine beauty, and it turns into a real form of existence that no longer fits any definition and no logic can determine. Beautiful is not just an aesthetic value, but a basic value, a substance related to all beings (Arat, 1979: 21). The idea of determining beauty as mathematics is a very old idea in Greek philosophy. We first encounter such an understanding in the pre-Platonic Hera-

clitus:

By reconciling opposing strivings; According to Heraclitus, who said, “The most beautiful union is the one that separates from each other,” there is a joining and harmony of the beautiful elements. It is obvious that art creates this (harmony arising from opposites) by imitating nature. The picture mixes the color elements white and black, yellow and red in the table, thus creating the correspondence with the example; music combines high and low, long and short tones in different voices, thus creating harmony with the sample; music combines high and low, long and short tones in different voices, thus creating a unified harmony; the art of writing also mixes the voiced and silent sounds and creates the whole art from there (Tunalı, 2011: 56).

As can be understood from these words, the harmony of the universe also creates the harmony in art. The word “harmony” is used synonymously with the word beauty (Tunalı, 2011: 56). As another example, we see the idea of harmony in Empedokles;

Just as painters paint votive plaques in color, smart people who understand art well combine them in harmony, and they make shapes similar to all things by taking more or less than that (Tunalı, 2011: 56).

It is stated here that the artist’s job is to provide a harmony (beauty) with the color elements (Tunalı, 2011: 57).

It is the Pythagoreans who are important and grounded the pre-Platonic views. However, the idea of harmony has been treated as mathematics. The doctrine of Pythagoras comprehends the cosmos as a harmonic whole (Tunalı, 2012: 208). The basis of this universe harmony is the number of arithmetic. The thing that dominates the universe and ensures the harmony of the universe is the number, the ratio between the numbers. Knowing the universe means knowing the number and number relations on which it is based (Tunalı, 2011: 57).

According to Tunalı, a certain relationship was thought between beauty and number and symmetry in the early periods. But since these thoughts are not thought systematically, a systematic thought structure cannot be formed from these thoughts. However, these thoughts serve as a support and basis for the ideas that will be put forward and developed in this direction later on (Tunalı, 2011: 58). Plato is one of those who attempt to determine the beauty mathematically. Plato, who reached such a view in his old age, exhibits a quite different

situation. This situation firstly manifests itself as the doctrine of ideas gradually losing its ontological side. Later, this ontological side starts to take its place with a logic-mathematical side and eventually it does. Accordingly, the whole Platonic system and the understanding of beauty change as well. Plato *Feast* He tries to understand the beauty more deeply and questions the relationship between beauty and eros (love) (Tunali, 2012: 209). A philosophy of art in harmony with the philosophy of beauty was expected from Plato, who puts beauty at the center of all existence, and absolutizes the good and the beautiful by making them equal; in this harmony, he should have glorified art as well as beauty (Tunali, 2011: 95).

According to Aristotle, beauty is a proportionality, a concept that can be determined mathematically. *Metaphysics* Aristotle states this in his work:

But since the good and the beautiful are different things, for the good always appears in action, the beautiful is also found in things that are not in action, - those who claim that the mathematical sciences can say nothing about the beautiful and the good are deceived. Undoubtedly, the mathematical sciences speak of the beautiful and the good and reveal them. However, if they do this without mentioning their names, but show their functions and proportions, it does not mean that they do not mention them. Basic forms of beauty, order is limitation; that is, things that are proven by most mathematical disciplines (Aristotle, 2014: 539).

What we understand from these words is that it is a beautiful, mathematical phenomenon, but it can also be determined as mathematics (Aristotle, 2014: 539). This is nothing but a new expression of Plato's understanding of beauty in his old age (Tunali, 2011: 64). To determine the beauty mathematically, Aristotle's *Poetics* We also see it in Aristotle says:

Moreover, the beautiful, whether it is a living being or an object made up of certain parts, not only shows the proper order of the parts it contains, but also has a non-random size; for beauty is based on order and greatness. How a very small thing can therefore be beautiful, for our understanding is scattered at the margins of the imperceptibly small; nor a very big thing, it can be beautiful, because it cannot be grasped at once and its unity and greatness are lost in the minister... (Aristotle, 2014: 1459 b 70-71).

Nice here, the math shows up in a determination. However, these definitions are not guiding definitions that direct Aristotle towards a certain goal. Therefore, Aristotle does not think of establishing an aesthetic, a metaphysics on them

(Tunali, 2011: 65). According to Tunali, these definitions about beauty, as pointed out earlier, were put forward independently, for example, they do not belong to a certain system, and in fact they were not considered within such a system (Tunali, 2011: 65).

He says that something too big, something beyond grasping power, will not be beautiful. The Greek spirit and intelligence consider the aesthetic as something that should be comprehensible and call it beautiful (Tunali, 2012: 214). Tunali asks if something beyond our grasping power can't be an aesthetic thing, and of course it can be, but something beyond our grasping power can no longer be beautiful. He was given the supreme name many centuries after Aristotle (Tunali, 2011: 65).

The sublime is also an aesthetic category; but this category was not known in Greek antiquity. More precisely, for the Greek soul it was a closed world. That's why Aristotle rejected the grandeur that exceeds our grasp as un-beautiful, un-aesthetic. It would be necessary to wait until Kant to learn the aesthetic value of the sublime (Tunali, 2011: 65).

Locke, on the other hand, not only tended to base his beauty experience on a sense, but also wanted to identify beauty itself with sensation because of this effect. What Locke taught about the second qualities of the objects was also transferred to the third-level features of the objects (Arat, 1979: 87).

The most famous thinkers of the age said that beauty, with at least a part, is a predicate of sensation itself. Hume has been accused of dealing the final blow to this wrong way of thinking, which turns tangible problems of objective order, even truth itself, into "a function of the sensory part of our nature" (Arat, 1979: 88). Hume equates beauty with pleasure and pleasure with the main source of our active being. He says, "Pleasure and pain are not only necessary companions of beauty and deformity, but also constitute their essential essence" (Arat, 1979: 81). Hume describes beauty as an innate feeling or passion that "makes one enjoy a well-proportioned sculpture". He is conscious of the close connection between symmetry and proportion and reason. However, he adds that our preference for well-proportioned figures does not prove the kind of inference that we use our intellect while making this selection (Arat, 1979: 81). Hume has two clear statements that ascribe beauty to the person: "No doubt, rather than sweet and bitter, beauty and ugliness are qualities that are not in the object, but entirely related to the inner or outer senses."

If I were not afraid of appearing too philosophical, I would remind my reader of the famous teaching, which asserts that tastes and colors and all other sensible qualities, which are supposed to be fully proved in contemporary times, are found in bodies, but only in the senses, and that the situation is identical for beauty and ugliness (Arat, 1979: 88).

Hume warns us against inferring that placing beauty in the mind diminishes its value or detracts from its visible reality (Arat, 1979: 88). Hume's problem begins to become more difficult when he acknowledges that certain qualities in objects are "innately predisposed to produce special emotions", even though the qualities are located in the mind (Arat, 1979: 88).

Burke, on the other hand, reduces the entire aesthetic process to passion in explaining beauty, and makes beauty openly what opens the social instinct of humanity. "Beauty asks no help from our reasoning. Even the will is indifferent. Just as applications of ice or fire produce ideas of cold or heat in us, so the appearance of beauty effectively induces a certain level of love." (Arat, 1979: 89). Burke showed that there are two basic instincts in man, one of which compels man to preserve his own existence and the other to live in society. According to him, the feeling of the sublime is based on the first of these, and the sense of the beautiful is based on the second. Beautiful, unites; sublime separates. In terms of being original, there is no other aesthetic experience that gives people as much confidence and courage as their sublime impression (Arat, 1979: 113).

Kant, who connected all aesthetic problems and the problem of beauty to the judgment of taste in modern aesthetics, and examined it logically such as quantity, quality, interest, modality, generally took a subjectivist-psychological attitude. Kantian aesthetics, judgment of taste *first* Although it showed a metaphysical quality and tendency by going beyond the psychological limits by addressing problems such as its generality and generality, it still remained at an anti-metaphysical level (Tunali, 2012: 147). Besides the beautiful, we find another important aesthetic value, which is the sublime or sublime value. Kant on the side of the beautiful *In the Critique of Judicial Power* considering it as a basic aesthetic category, it grounds it in such a way that it has to explain it in line with Kant or by taking a critical attitude against Kant's understanding (Tunali, 2012: 227).

Kant's aesthetics rises on the following foundations: According to Kant, man comprehends nature outside himself and himself within nature. He seeks truth

in nature outside himself; seeks the good in himself; one of them is the work of pure reason, the other is the work of practical reason (free will). Apart from these two comprehension (perceiving) tools, according to Kant, there is also the ability to judge and decide, which is the ability that creates a decision without judgment and produces pleasure without desire. This ability forms the basis of aesthetic sense. For Kant, the beautiful is what is generally enjoyed, subjectively, without judgment and without any practical utility; In an objective sense, it is the perceptibly purposeful formation of things without knowing anything about their purpose (Tolstoy, 2015: 25-26).

While separating the beautiful from the pleasant, the good, the direct and the useful, Kant says that the beautiful lacks the concept and the notion of purpose, and says: *A beauty of nature is a beautiful thing, and a beauty of art is a beautiful imagination about something*” (Tunalı, 2012: 179).

For Kant, the thing is based on the concept of the object. If we want to show this on an example, when we say “a man”, it obtains its existence in relation to a concept that we think of as a man (Tunalı, 2012: 179). According to Kant; “Nature is beautiful if it also appears as art” (Tunalı, 2012: 180). With this determination, according to Kant, the beauty of nature can be considered beautiful only if it looks like the beauty of art and if it seems to have the qualities of artistic beauty (Tunalı, 2012: 180). The understanding and views of beauty developed after Kant are also important. Especially the views of Schiller, Schelling and Hegel are remarkable. According to Schiller, the aim of art is beauty, just as it is for Kant; the source of beauty is pleasure, which has the purpose of practical utility. Art can also be called “play”, but not in the sense of a worthless pursuit, but in the sense of revealing the beauty of life, which has no purpose other than beauty (Tolstoy, 2015: 26). Schiller, *A Series of Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man* In his work, he dealt specifically with the theory of beauty. For him, beauty is wholeness. This is achieved not only by the union of the two powers, but by the development of all the powers, all faculties and impulses in man. Then there is only harmony (Schiller, 1965: XX). Schiller wants to separate the beautiful from the concepts close to the beautiful. He finds these near concepts pleasant, good, and sublime. While separating these concepts from the beautiful: “Pleasant is not worthy of art, it is not the goal of good art, because the goal of art is pleasure. The beautiful is a vehicle for sensory enjoyment, and in this respect it differs from the good. But, because of its shape, the mind also likes it, and in this

way it is also separated from the pleasant. The beautiful is pleasing in its mind-like form. Beautiful becomes a synthesis of pleasant and good with the senses (Tunali, 2011: 148).

According to Fichte, the emergence of beauty consciousness is as follows:

The world, or rather nature, has two sides; on the one hand it is the product of our limitations; on the other hand, it is the product of our free, ideal activity. In the first sense the world is limited, in the second it is free. Again, in the first sense, every body is limited, crooked, cramped, and we see ugliness; in the second there is inner integrity, life, revival, renewal, and we see beauty. Thus, the ugliness or beauty of everything, according to Fichte, depends on the viewer's point of view. In that respect, beauty is not found in the world, but in the beautiful soul. Art, too, is nothing but the emergence of this beautiful spirit, and the aim of art is not only the mind, not only the heart, but also the whole human being. Therefore, the cursor of the beautiful is not in anything external, but in the presence of the beautiful soul in the artist (Tolstoy, 2015: 27).

According to Schelling, art is the work or result of the worldview in which the subject becomes his object or the object becomes its subject. The beautiful is the imagination of eternity in the finite. And the essential characteristic of the work of art is unconscious infinity. Art is the union of the subjective and the objective, nature and reason, unconscious and consciousness. For this reason, art is the highest tool of knowledge, knowing and understanding (Tolstoy, 2015: 27-28). The source of Schelling's aesthetic, and indirectly its understanding of beauty, is to be found in this transcendental philosophy. According to him, harmony is an expression that excludes harmony. It is an expression of "immobility and greatness". This expression is beauty. Beauty shows a harmony where the opposition disappears (Tunali, 2012: 149).

In Hegel, on the other hand, beauty rises again to the level of an idea. The idea is both true and beautiful. The idea of beauty shows itself in works of art (Ergün, 5). For Hegel, beauty and truth are in a sense identical. The beautiful has to be truth, especially in itself. But when we look more closely at truth and beauty, we see that they are also different (Hegel, 1982: 106-107). This freedom and infinity, which the concept of the beautiful and its objectivity and their reflection in subjective inner thought carry within themselves, and the domain of the beautiful have been pulled out of the relativity of finite relations and elevated to the absolute kingship of the idea and its truth (Hegel, 1982: 114). According to

Hegel, there is a difference between beauty and truth; Truth, if the idea is thought in itself and in its general principle, is the idea itself, and thought is what it is. For if it appears to consciousness not in the external and emotional form that exists for reason, but universally, that is, directly with external reality, and if the idea remains united and identified with its external appearance, then the idea is not only truth but also beautiful. The beautiful defines itself as the appearance of the idea in the sensory field (Hegel, 1982: 102-103).

Thinkers such as Kant, Hegel, Croce and Lukacs distinguished the beauty of nature from the beauty of art. Kant said, "Nature is beautiful when seen as a work of art." he said. Nature is beautiful if it also appears as art. According to Kant, the beauty of nature can be considered beautiful only if it looks like the beauty of art, and if it seems to have the qualities of artistic beauty. According to Croce, the beauty in art objects is actually the beauty that occurs in the soul of the artist. Artificial beauty, the beauty of the work of art is part of the physical beauty. Making it nice is a much more common and effective help tool. Even though the beauty of art is carried by a material structure, it needs to be transformed into a spiritual activity or expression. Croce, like Hegel, prioritized the beauty of art above the beauty of nature.

In Hegel, the beauty of art is superior to the beauty of nature. B. Croce also deals with the subject from an aesthetic point of view. In general, natural beauty is something non-aesthetic; but if we see its pleasing and pleasing aspects as an aesthetic object, that piece of nature is beautiful. In other words, the source of beauty is not the world of nature and matter, but the inner world of man. Because when people look at the environment, they do not look at them with the eyes of an animal; his psychological state, age, profession, hopes, dreams, etc. It affects the gaze, to affect whether it sees beautiful or ugly. Hegel, like Kant, emphasizes the separation between the beauty of nature and the beauty of art and wants to ground this separation much more deeply. However, Hegel's attitude towards these two types of beauty should be evaluated in two different ways (Tunali, 2012: 180). According to Hegel; "The beauty of art is a beauty born from the spirit, spirit and spirit products are superior to nature and its appearances" (Tunali, 2012: 180). Therefore, the beauty that aesthetics will deal with will only be the beauty of art. The superiority of this artistic beauty over the beauty of nature, which is the subject of Aesthetics, is not a relative evaluation, on the contrary, since the spirit alone is truth and encompasses everything within itself,

beauty will also join the spirit on the basis of truth and be created by the spirit (Tunali, 2012: 180). In this sense, Hegel said, “The beauty of nature is a reflex of the beauty of the spirit.” says. According to Hegel, then, beauty must be limited to the beauty of art. Because what is important in terms of aesthetics is the beauty of art, not the beauty of nature (Tunali, 2012: 180). According to Hegel, the biggest proof of this is that until now the beauty of nature has not been achieved, so Hegel says:

Until now, it has never occurred to anyone to reveal the beauty of natural things and to establish a science that will make a systematic account of this beauty. For example, a science, a materia medica, which deals with nature in terms of utility and helps against diseases, was written, a description of minerals, chemical products, plants and animals useful for healing was made. However, the riches of nature were not collected and evaluated in terms of beauty. He understands that we are in a lot of uncertainty in the face of the beauty of nature, since we do not have a scale, and therefore, examining the beauties of nature does not arouse much interest (Tunali, 2012: 180).

In this attitude, Hegel is against the beauty of nature, it has no value or importance in the face of the beauty of art born from the spirit (Tunali, 2012: 180). For Hegel, beauty is the idea:

The idea is true (truth) if the idea is considered in itself as an idea and in terms of the general principle. If the general idea is considered in this sensuous and external being, not its sensuous and external existence. However, the idea must also be realized externally, it must acquire a being as natural and spiritual objectivity... Now, by being in direct unity with its external appearance, the idea is not only true but also beautiful (Tunali, 2012). : 152).

Starting from this, Hegel arrives at a universal concept of beauty that is valid for idealist beauty theories in general.

God appears as beauty in nature and art. It is a dual aspect: in object and subject, in nature and spirit. Beauty is thought felt and seen through matter. True beauty is only the soul and things related to the soul; Therefore, the beauty of nature is nothing but the reflection of the soul, the beauty of the soul: Beauty has only one content, and that is the spiritual content. The spiritual, however, must emerge sensibly. The sensory manifestation of my soul is merely sight. And this view is the only reality of beauty. As for art, it is both the realization of this view of thought and the means of reaching consciousness with religion and philoso-

phy and conveying to people the highest goals and the highest truth of the soul (Tolstoy, 2015: 28-29).

For Hegel, the real and the beautiful are one and the same thing; the only difference between them is that the truth exists by itself, so it can think, therefore it is thought itself. At the same time, beauty is the emergence of thought (Tolstoy, 2015: 29).

Since Kant, there are two kinds of beauty: free beauty and purely connected beauty. First, it assumes no concept of what the object should be and the completeness of the object according to it (Kant, 2016: 59). The first kind is called the beauty of this or that thing; secondly, it is attributed to objects that stand under the concept of a particular purpose, depending on a concept (conditional beauty) (Kant, 2016: 59). B. Croce, while addressing the concept of beauty, feels the need to dwell on beauties that are free and not free.

According to Schopenhauer;

The will becomes objectified at different levels; Although the higher the objectification level of the will is, the more beautiful it is, each step has its own beauty. To plunge into the course of one of these steps, through which the will emerges, by denying its personality, gives us the consciousness of beauty. According to Schopenhauer, everyone has the ability to perceive this thought from different levels, and in this way, people are liberated from their personalities for a while. The genius of the artist has this ability from the highest step, therefore it shows the highest beauty (Tolstoy, 2015: 31).

For Schopenhauer, in the beautiful we always grasp the basic and essential forms of animate and inanimate nature, hence Plato's ideas, and in this understanding, as its condition, there is a corresponding subject of knowing, independent of will, in other words, a pure mind without goals and plans. Schopenhauer, 2013: 26).

The tragic, which we encounter at the level of aesthetic value, has been handled as a unique value since Antiquity, since Aristotle. We can even say that it is a value that has been considered and discussed the most (Tunali, 2014: 234).

Heidegger is one of the thinkers who finds a very tight connection between beauty and truth. According to him, beauty is a kind of illumination, enlightenment of being; this is nothing but truth (Tunali, 2012: 137). According to Heidegger, beauty can only be seen when placed in an art object that has captured the truth.

It is the liberation of the existing from secrecy. Truth is the truth of being. Beauty does not come alongside truth. If truth enters the work of art, then it appears as beauty. Beauty is the appearance of truth as its presence in the work of art (Tunalı, 2012: 137).

In this sense, beauty is one of the types of existence of truth. “Beauty is one of the kinds of existence of righteousness.” In other words, Heidegger maintains the understanding of truth-beauty identity, which has been since Plato, on a metaphysical basis (Tunalı, 2012: 137).

There are debates about whether “funny”, another value concept, is an aesthetic value. Like classical views, N. Hartmann responds positively. However, what needs to be done here is to ground the comic in terms of the structure of layers. Comic takes an important place in his system as an aesthetic value. But its importance depends on the understanding of the comic in all its dimensions. The comic, when conceived as such, is really an aesthetic value with its metaphysical-aesthetic qualities. But if the comic is understood as a mere laughing situation, then it can easily lose its aesthetic value (Tunalı, 2014: 245).

According to Tolstoy, it is seen that we are faced with two definitions of the beautiful: The first one is an objective, a fantastic, ground-breaking definition that takes the beautiful and connects it to supreme perfection, God, and mixes it with it; the other, on the contrary, is an extremely simple, clear, understandable, subjective definition (Tolstoy, 2015: 40). Beautiful is defined subjectively as something that gives us a certain kind of pleasure, and objectively, as absolute perfection that exists outside of us (Tolstoy, 2015: 41). According to Tolstoy, there is no objective definition of the beautiful, where the existing real metaphysical and experimental definitions are based is the subjective definition that what can be accepted as art is what brings out the beautiful; beautiful is what pleases (Tolstoy, 2015: 41-42).

Aesthetic value is beauty. We can interpret works of art as “beautiful” or “not beautiful”. Every work of art is a value. Every work, whether it is an object, a decision, or an institution, is itself an appraisal of human reality; it is the valuation of reality or the appraisal of it and then its valuation (Kuçuradı, 2013: 52). Evaluation of individual art objects and concepts such as beautiful and ugly are attributed to them according to their “aesthetic value judgments” which are their reality. Today, works of art are approached with an aesthetic thought, judgments such as beautiful, pleasant, elegant and harmonious, as well as ugly and freaky,

are made and meanings are predicated. In the analysis of aesthetic judgment, Kant's grounding of aesthetic judgment is extremely important. The subject who has an aesthetic interest with the aesthetic object has become the object with which the subject has an aesthetic interest, and finally the aesthetic judgment of the subject about the aesthetic object.

The aesthetic phenomenon can be thought of as a subject-object relationship. The subject-object relationship becomes objective as a judgment. Because the interest established with the aesthetic object is always revealed in the form of aesthetic judgments. Aesthetic judgments must also be included in the aesthetic existence as a constructive element. However, aesthetic existence can never be reduced to only aesthetic judgments (Tunalı, 2012: 21). Such a reduction would be an absolutist view. Aesthetics is understood only as a logic of aesthetic judgments and a branch of logic. Aesthetic judgment is something pleasant but impartial, individual but universal, spontaneous but necessary, conceptless but intellectual, something that has no moral doctrine but reveals our moral nature (Shinner, 2013: 203).

It was Aristotle, the thinker who focused on judgments and established formal, classical logic, which is a logic of judgments in this sense. According to Aristotle, judgments are statements about things that exist or not, right or wrong. Aristotle's forms of judgment are the same as linguistic forms of expression. According to Aristotle, there are forms of prejudice; (Tunalı, 2012: 247). These are examined in terms of quantity, quality, relation and modality.

It is possible to make judgments in a work of art. Making a judgment about that work is based on freedom of thought. We can express our thoughts by making judgments.

Kant states that the grammatical form of aesthetic judgments is actually deceptive and hypocritical. In sentences like "I am beautiful", "You are great", adjectives appear as predicates, but this is actually an illusion (Eagleton, 2012: 134). According to Eagleton, judgments of taste appear as descriptions of the world, but these judgments are actually disguised emotional expressions. However, a strict approach will also be taken to decipher and read the pseudo-proposition "x is beautiful" as "I like x". Because these judgments are independent of interest and unrelated to the contingent tendencies and desires of man (Eagleton, 2012: 134). In the operation of aesthetic judgment, nature or even the existence of the referent is irrelevant, just as ideology is not fundamentally a question of

the correctness of certain propositions (Eagleton, 2012: 138).

Kant's analysis of aesthetic judgment *Critique of Judicial Power* considers in his work. Kant first speaks of the judgment of taste. The underlying definition of taste is that it is the ability to judge beauty. But the analysis of the judgment of taste must reveal what is necessary in order to call an object beautiful. I have sought, guided by the logical functions of judgment, the moments which this judgment faculty considers in its reflection. The reason why I consider the quality moment first is that the aesthetic judgment on the beautiful first takes it into account (Kant, 2016: 39).

In order to distinguish whether something is beautiful or not, we relate design not to the object for knowledge through understanding, but to the subject through the imagination and to its sense of pleasure and pleasure. The judgment of taste is therefore not a judgment of knowledge, and therefore not logical, but aesthetic, with which we understand that whose ground of determination cannot be other than subjective. But the whole relation of representations, even that of sensations, may be objective; but the relation with the feeling of pleasure and displeasure cannot be objective; with this, nothing is stated in the object, but in it, the subject feels himself as he is influenced by design (Kant, 2016: 39).

According to Kant, pleasant is distinguished from good. But despite all this distinction between pleasant and good, both always agree to be bound by an interest in their object; therefore, what is pleasant and pleasant as a means towards any pleasantness is not indirectly good, but also absolutely and in all respects good, that is, moral good carries the highest interest with itself (Kant, 2016: 43). These are the elements that Kant wanted to exclude at the beginning of his discussion of aesthetic judgment. Appreciation for the pleasurable awakens in the subject the desire to satisfy his personal or sensual interests. This appreciation sheds light on the bodily, sensory and animalistic aspects of our nature (Berger, 2009: 66).

The first element of the judgment of taste in terms of quality is that it is aesthetic. The judgment of taste is neither a judgment of knowledge nor a judgment of morality. On the contrary, it is only aesthetic. The fact that the judgment of taste is aesthetic means that it is completely subjective (Tunali, 2012: 250). The like, which determines the judgment of taste, is far from all interests. Pleasure is interest, which depends on the imagination of the existence of an object. Such enjoyment is related to the appetite. When we say whether something is beautiful

or not, the existence of that thing does not concern us (Tunali, 2012: 250). The enjoyment of pleasant depends on interests. A judgment I make about an object as “I like it” expresses an interest in the existence of that object. It creates a desire for the existence of that object by means of the sense of interest. Therefore, it is not just an aesthetic judgment given about the object, on the contrary, this judgment is based on the relationship between the existence of that object and my mental state (Tunali, 2012: 250). The enjoyment of good depends on interests. The good is pleasing through reason and pure concept. We say “good” because they are a tool to reach a certain goal and they are liked as such a tool (Tunali, 2012: 250). In response to this separation between pleasant and good, they converge on this point: they are always related to the object. Pleasant, beautiful and good, accordingly, shows the three different relations of the imaginations with the feelings of pleasure and pain.

*“Like is the ability to judge an object, or an object-image, by means of a like or a dislike, away from all interest. The object of such enjoyment is called beautiful. (Kant, 2016: 252). “For Kant, taste is the ability to judge an object or a type of representation by a like or dislike without any interest. The object of such enjoyment is called beautiful. (Kant, 2016: 45).*

The beautiful is that which is conceived, without concepts, as an object of universal enjoyment... This explanation of the beautiful can be deduced from its previous description as an object of purely disinterested enjoyment. Because what everyone is aware of is that liking the beautiful is completely self-interested in oneself, - one cannot judge this fact otherwise because it should cover a ground for all people to like it (Kant, 2016: 45).

The judgment of taste, conscious of its isolation from all interests, must demand truth for all, and it must do so regardless of universality based on objects; subjective universality demand must be bound (Kant, 2016: 45-46).

In terms of logical quantity, all judgments of taste are singular judgments. Because I have to present the object directly to my feelings of pleasure and displeasure - and yet not through concepts - those judgments cannot carry the quantity of objectively valid judgments; On the other hand, if the singular design of the object of the judgment of taste is transformed into a concept by comparison according to the conditions that determine this judgment, a logically universal judgment can emerge from it (Kant, 2016: 48).

As a result, what is beautiful is universally pleasing without a concept (Kant,

2016: 51).

In the third door of the judgments of taste, according to the relation of the ends that are examined in them, if we want to explain what a goal is according to the transcendental determinations, the goal is the object of a concept, but to the extent that the concept is seen as the cause of the object; and the causality of a concept in terms of its object is teleology. According to a form of teleology, we can at least observe it without grounding it on a purpose, and consider it in objects, albeit only through reflection (Kant, 2016: 52). Kant, here, examines the judgment of taste in terms of finality. Kant determines what he understands from finality as follows: “The causality of a concept against its object is its finality” (Tunalı, 2012: 255). This finality is based on the concept and is therefore an objective finality. Ethical propositions, for example, show such an objective finality; their aim, that is, the action we call “good”, is to obey the moral law. The moral law expresses the concept and imagination of such a goal (Tunalı, 2012: 255).

At the third gate, the main problem is to be considered in terms of purposefulness. judgment of taste *a priori* grounding it on the ground, it purifies beauty from theories of charm, perfection and perfection.

Every end, if seen as the ground of enjoyment, always carries in itself an interest as the ground of determination of judgment on the object of pleasure. Therefore, no subjective purpose can lie on the basis of the judgment of taste. But the idea of an objective end, and hence a concept of the good, cannot determine the judgment of taste either; for it is an aesthetic judgment, not a judgment of knowledge, and therefore it is concerned with the relations of the cognitions among themselves, in so far as they are determined by one reason or another the quality of the object, or its inner or outer possibility, not by a concept, but only by an idea (Kant, 1998). 2016: 52).

In the determination of an object as a beautiful object, this relation is bound up with a feeling of pleasure, which is also declared valid for everyone through the judgment of taste; accordingly, a pleasantness accompanying the design can only cover the determination ground of the judgment as much as the design of the object’s completeness and the concept of the good (Kant, 2016: 52-53). The connection between a feeling of pleasure or unpleasantness as an effect and any design as its cause *a priori* it is absolutely impossible to create; for it will be a relation of particular causality, but always *in the aftermath* and it can be known

through the experience itself (Kant, 2016: 53).

The judgment of taste is an aesthetic judgment, based on subjective grounds, and the ground of determination is not a concept, and therefore not a concept of a particular end. Through beauty as formal subjective teleology, a perfection of the object is by no means thought of as a supposedly formal, yet still objective, teleology; They are separate according to the logical form, and the first is a complex, the second is a clear concept of completeness (Kant, 2016: 58). Therefore, judgments do not give information about the object. Beauty is the form of the finality of an object (Kant, 2016: 64). Beauty acquires a new determination. Beauty is the form of an object being suitable for the purpose in terms of being perceived in the object, without a vision of a goal (Tunali, 2012: 256).

According to the modality of liking the object, in the fourth door of the judgment of taste, the pleasure of the object is considered as a necessity. The beautiful is known as the object of obligatory enjoyment without any concept (Kant, 2016: 67). Kant determined the judgment of taste as a necessary judgment. By necessity, it is understood that the opposite of which cannot be considered in general. In logic judgments, necessity is a basic concept on which it is based (Tunali, 2012: 256).

I say about something I call pleasant that it really gives me pleasure. But when I say beautiful, I think that what I call beautiful has something to do with aesthetic pleasure. However, this is not mandatory; In theoretical objective necessity, it can be known as a priori that everyone will feel this pleasure in the object that I find beautiful; this necessity is not a practical necessity either; In practical necessity, this pleasure, which is based on the concepts of pure will, which serves as the rule for the freely acting human being, is the necessary result of an objective law. This obligation can only be called an example as a necessity considered in an aesthetic judgment, that is, it is the obligation for everyone to accept a judgment that is seen as an example of an inexpressible general rule (Tunali, 2012: 256-257).

In this statement of Kant, we encounter two determinations. The first is that the necessity of aesthetic judgment is different from the necessity of theoretical and practical judgments, and the second is that it is an exemplary necessity (Tunali, 2012: 257).

For each design, I would say, it is at least possible that it is bound (in knowledge) with a pleasure. For a design that I call pleasant, I can say that it actually

creates pleasure in me. But as for the beautiful, it is thought to have a necessary relation with liking. Now, this necessity is of a particular kind: it is not a theoretical objective necessity, in which case everyone would feel this liking for the object I call beautiful *a priori* can be known; Nor is it a practical necessity, in which case, by the notions of a pure reason-will-serving as a rule to freely behaving beings, this enjoyment is a necessary consequence of an objective law, and implies nothing more than that one must act absolutely in a certain way (Kant, 2016: 64).

When considered in an aesthetic judgment, necessity can only be called exemplary, it is an obligation of everyone's approval in a judgment that is seen as an example of a universal rule that we cannot declare (Kant, 2016: 65). Since the aesthetic judgment is not an objective judgment of knowledge, this necessity is not derived from certain concepts and is therefore not apodictic. It is even more impossible to deduce from the universality of experience. Because a concept of the necessity of these judgments cannot be grounded on empirical judgments, except that experience alone does not provide sufficient evidence for this (Kant, 2016: 65). As a result, the beautiful can be known as an object of obligatory enjoyment without any concept (Kant, 2016: 67).

When we look at these judgments and concepts of Kant, there are concepts that we can think, interpret and apply freely. We especially use the judgment of taste in the art of painting. Making a judgment on a work, that is, liking it or not, is related to one's free thought.

### **1.3 Aesthetic Analysis of Painting Art**

The aesthetic analysis of the art of painting is to examine the aesthetic phenomenon/existence peculiar to the art of painting in terms of various elements. These; the feeling the painting makes us feel, the material from which the painting is created or the raw material, the technique used by the artist (mixed technique, oil painting, charcoal, pastel, print, etc.), the period of the painting, what kind of information it gives to the person, color, tone (gradient), light and shadow, form, direction, line, the balance (place, space, etc.) The assemblage technique, the collage technique, which is a composition consisting of various parts and combining those parts as well as paint, is elements such as attributing value, making judgments, the effect of art movements on reception, the cultural level of individuals and the problem of freedom.

The painter, art lover or consumer examines the art of painting with various elements. While painting, the painter examines his work with concepts such as its material, technique, light and shadow, and tries to create his work in the closest way to the form and content in his mind, thanks to aesthetic analysis. The painter uses the freedom of expression, creation and thought while examining his work aesthetically. The art lover or the consumer also examines the works together with the above-mentioned concepts while analyzing them aesthetically. The emotion he feels while analyzing the painting from an aesthetic point of view is at the forefront. Artist and art lover both evaluate works in various aesthetic categories. These categories are various categories such as pleasure, ugly, taste, harmony, beautiful. They can evaluate whether they enjoy the works or not. The artist and art lover can also comment on whether the painting has an artistic value and whether it contributes to them.

The art of painting gives us a lot of information in terms of material, technique, period and aesthetics. It gives us the information of what material the painting is made of, what type of paint is used, what period it belongs to, and how it is interpreted and criticized aesthetically. Therefore, just looking at the art of painting is not enough. It is necessary to examine it in every aspect, to receive it and to gain knowledge. Thus, the object before us as a picture becomes the subject of epistemology and ontology as an object in terms of being a source of information, while it becomes an ethical problem from an evaluation stage.

The basic element that provides the transitions between this different context and layer, which is mentioned in the handling of the aesthetic phenomenon of the art of painting, is the power of abstraction in painting. Abstraction is an important concept that needs to be examined in the aesthetic analysis of painting. What needs to be examined here is whether the painting reflects the reality or whether the reality is abstracted and stylized. Some paintings are presented by imitating the natural objects found in nature in the best way, depending on the imitative theory; Some pictures claim to reflect the reality that is the subject of our perception, while some pictures are presented to objects in nature by exceeding the representations of perception, reality and truth. This comes from the power of abstraction in paintings. Abstraction, which is frequently used today, is in the foreground in the pictures reflecting the reality. The artist is free in terms of which technique to use in terms of these two painting techniques. Here we can say that the choice that constitutes the source of the painting is decisive before

the aesthetic act (i.e. the artist's creation process). At the very beginning of his aesthetic activity, a painter determines whether he wants the object he will reveal to resemble a natural object in its perfect form, or whether he wants to create an object as an abstraction completely outside this frame. This determination made by the artist while presenting the painting also determines how the viewer, who perceives and evaluates the object, should understand that object. For example, the viewer-art lover who looks at a painting created with the still life technique considers the success of copying here as a criterion for aesthetic reception, while the viewer who looks at a cubist painting determines the competence of the power of abstraction as a criterion for his aesthetic reception. Thus, we can say that the art object revealed in the art of painting is determined in terms of the source of the aesthetic relationship established by the artist.

Duchamp, *Naked Stripped Image* in his book; "museums and galleries say they are overflowing with imitations of various works and works." (Duchamp, 2017: 86). Today, we often see examples of this. For example, Osman Hamdi Bey's "Turtle Trainer" is one of the most well-known and most imitated works in painting. We often see this work imitating it as an oil painting and digital print on the walls of the spaces and in various galleries. This work is a figurative work and has been imitated exactly by the artists. Thus, a copy of the copy, which is also an opinion of Plato, has emerged. By imitating this work, it also gives us the knowledge of how to be imitated.

To give another example of imitation from the art of painting, the painting "Mona Lisa" painted by Leonardo da Vinci is one of the best examples of imitation theory. We see this work as imitation in various places. We can even see this work on various objects (reproduction products). In this work, it is an episteme that it is presented to us in terms of form and how it is presented. As a result of these examples, it is important not to imitate but to be original in the art of painting. Because it is possible to get information from every original work.

The theory of imitation was noted in Antiquity. This theory gives importance to us as an idea in our study of the art of painting. The most important theory in antiquity *mimesis* It is known as (imitation). Plato, *State* In his work, he says that there are three arts that depend on everything. These are the art of using, the art of making and the art of analogy (Plato, 2011: 344). The materials used in the art of painting and what this material is, in which technique the work was made, that is, whether it was made with oil paint or printing technique, in the art of analo-

gy, whether it was exactly likened, whether it was drawn by looking at a figure standing in front of us or whether it was stylized by abstraction are the subjects that need to be examined. . Plato stated his view as “a copy of a copy”. With this change, Plato states that it is an ontological copy, on the other hand *mimesis* He also states that it is epistemologically valuable within the framework of his view. In Plato, while imitation is an incomplete copy of nature, on the other hand, it is an educational element that can be repeated and thus contains a didactic element. Then, in the analysis of the aesthetic existence of the art of painting, a competent still life claims to teach the painter and those who receive the painting what nature is. Therefore, a competent imitation is not good itself. He didn't get enough of it. However, it can be considered close to beautiful.

In the history of philosophy, “beauty” has been discussed from different angles. As with Plato, Aristotle *Metaphysics* He defined beauty as mathematics in his work. We see Plato at the beginning of the philosophers who determined the beauty as mathematics. According to Plato, beauty is nothing but proportionality (Tunali, 2011a: 63). Aristotle, on the other hand, says that the highest forms of beauty are “order, symmetry and certainty” (Aristotle, 2014: 539). Therefore, while analyzing the art of painting aesthetically, it is necessary to examine the proportion and symmetry harmony of objects in painting, as various philosophers have determined beauty as mathematics. It is also necessary to examine whether the objects in the painting are in harmony in terms of placement on the canvas, and whether the objects are placed proportionally in terms of direction and space. It is the artist's choice to place objects on the canvas in proportion or symmetry; This choice is his freedom.

Aristotle, on the other hand, *Poetics* He stated in his work named painting, epos, tragedy, comedy, dithrambos poetry, and a large part of the flute and guitarra (Aristotle, 2014: 11). Aristotle again *Poetics* in his work named “Some arts imitate through colors” (Aristotle, 2014: 11). The element of color, which gives life and direction to painting, is important in painting. The element of imitation continues in the colors used by the artists. It is an aesthetic information that the artist gives us which colors he uses in the painting or whether he imitates them with the same colors from another work. Aristotle *Metaphysics* He talks about the matter-form relationship in his work. He even explains it through the Bronze sphere. Bronze sphere is composed of matter and form, as well as a holistic form related to the species consisting of genus and distinction (Aristotle, 2014: 335).

It can also be examined in terms of examining a painting in the relationship between matter and form. The color and structure of the frame of that painting, the form of the painting or the shape of the frame is the information it gives us. Aristotle *Metaphysics* He mentions four reasons in his work. Of these, the material cause and the formal cause play an important role in the art of painting (Aristotle, 2014: 86). It can be examined in terms of examining a table in terms of matter and form relationship. The color and structure of the frame of that painting, the form of the painting or the shape of the frame is the information it gives us.

The Middle Ages is an important period in which important developments were experienced in terms of art in painting, sculpture and architecture and were examined conceptually. Especially figurative elements are included in the art of painting and other types of art. Sculpture and architecture developed during this period. The figures used in the sculptures and the figurative elements painted on the walls are the most influential elements of the period. We continue to see the effects of ratio aesthetics, color and light appreciation, and perspective, which are important in medieval painting and aesthetic analysis. In this period, the terms of symmetry and ratio included in the texts of Vitruvius, who emphasized the ratio theory. He developed Vitruvius' figurative ratio theory. A period when the medieval color taste also emerged was important. In this period, the paintings preferred primary colors, distinct colors, were away from intermediate tones, and even adopted an understanding that the unity of colors created its own shine (Eco, 2015: 82).

Although the aesthetic analysis made by Vitruvius in the Middle Ages was guiding for the artist, the forms of freedom in the art of painting began to be discussed and its total change was in the Renaissance period. As will be conveyed in the next sub-title, the post-Renaissance painting freedom relationship reveals itself periodically; on the other hand, it emerges within the framework of art movements dating back to the New Age. At this point, what needs to be discussed is how to discuss the judgment of taste in the aesthetic analysis of the art of painting.

Kant, *Judgment Criticism* He made various judgments in his work. These; judgment of taste, judgment of beauty and judgment of the supreme. The art of painting is also a type of art that has limitations. As long as the artist is original in the art of painting, it is unlimited. Hegel stated that what a person creates, another person can create and imitate (Hegel, 2012: 26). As philosophers have men-

tioned, the element of imitation in painting can be interpreted as informational.

In terms of being a product of visual art, a perception element that the artist cannot give up in the art of painting is the perspective to which he is attached. In perspective, objects appear large or small as they approach or move away from the angle of the eye (Duchamp, 2017: 133). As an artist, the painter expresses the dimension he wants to reflect with his own freedom of creation.

Michel Foucault's interpretation of Velasquez's painting "The Bridesmaids" is a determination that should be taken into account in terms of explaining reception in painting. The painting has more than one figurative element. These painting and figurative elements can be examined as design elements such as color, form, direction, perspective, tone, and line. Especially in this painting, the painter's gaze, his face slightly turned and his head tilted towards his shoulder drew attention. Looking at the far right in the painting, the painting takes its light from a window painted in a fleeting perspective; We see nothing but the sill. As in this painting, perspective, which is an important element of art, has an important place in the art of painting. We see perspective in every painting (Foucault, 2013: 1).

A different method is used in the art of painting in the assemblage technique, which is seen as the three-dimensional version of the collage, which emerged after 1950 and was created with various materials with the technique of sticking on the painting. The materials used usually consist of waste materials or various objects. The assemblage technique is a way of telling and expressing the picture from different angles. Examining the assemblage technique in an aesthetic way has different dimensions. For example, what the shoe attached to a painting tells, what the artist reflects, what the art lover feels are important in terms of emotion and thought. Assemblage and collage are free to produce and create innovative ideas as material. While applying the collage and assemblage technique, the artist and art lover has the freedom to think freely and to choose between different possibilities.

Another aesthetic analysis of painting art is the aesthetic object. Aesthetic object analysis examines works of art ontologically. While some artists defended the art of painting as an aesthetic subject, some artists only determined it as an entity and these were opposing views. Kuçuradi, *Looking at Art with Philosophy* In his book titled "What is the structure of the work of art (as being)?" he asks (Kuçuradi, 2013: 92). This question can be addressed from several aspects. In

the art of painting, the frame of a painting, that is, the color of that frame, its structure, what material it is made of, is proof of its existence, or the existence of the material or color of the paint used in that work is considered sufficient to prove it as a painting.

Another step of the aesthetic analysis of the art of painting is value. Value is known as the “beauty” element. As İsmail Tunalı stated, aesthetic existence is not only determined by aesthetic subject and aesthetic object elements; an entity that creates it is aesthetic value and beauty (Tunalı, 2011: 17). In the art of painting, we can ascribe the beautiful value to the paintings. For example, when we say “This painting is beautiful” or “This painting is not beautiful”, we attribute a value to it. To give another example, when we say “This painting is worth seeing”, we attribute value to this situation. Because, in which dimension this table is valuable or not can be examined and interpreted. While examining the painting in the art of painting, the concepts of proportion-proportion and symmetry are related to its beauty elements. In other words, the elements in the painting can be interpreted as an element of beauty in proportion, which is a principle of design. Besides, what is beautiful may be ugly for some.

Another element of the aesthetic analysis of painting is judgment. In painting, we can make judgments about works. These judgments are concepts loaded on works such as beauty, pleasant, harmony, sublime and ugly. Philosophers have made various judgments in the history of philosophy. For example, Kant, *Judgment Criticism* He made various judgments in his work. These; judgment of taste, judgment of beauty and judgment of the supreme. Kant says, “We call the absolute and the unlimited supreme” (Kant, 2016: 74). The art of painting is also a type of art that has limitations. As long as the artist is original in the art of painting, it is unlimited. Its unlimitedness stems from the materials it uses, its technique and its free action.

As we mentioned in value, when we say “This painting is beautiful”, we can make judgments as well as attributing a value to it. Here, we can refer to that work as a judgment of “liking”. However, when we say “This painting is not beautiful”, we can attribute the “ugly” judgment to that work. As a result, the art of painting can be grasped and received with free thought with the elements of aesthetic analysis.

According to Hartmann, the work of art called painting essentially consists of two areas. These fields can be named as; the real fore-structure is the foreground

and the irreal background, the background.

It is necessary to examine the art movements while making an aesthetic analysis of the art of painting. These movements provide different ways of seeing the art of painting. Because each stream has different characteristics. It is important to know which current the picture belongs to. The influence of the currents from those times until now has opened the way for freedom in the art of painting. Paintings lead artists in terms of freedom of thought and freedom of creation. For example, it is a concept that is taken as an example in terms of geometric forms and colors today, which has the effects of Cubism.

The form of freedom in the art of painting is not only at the point of creating the form, but also offers a wide range of freedom to determine how the artist approaches the forms, how they perceive them and even how they should be perceived. For example, in another important movement, Impressionism, the artist traces how to achieve an impressionism from form, and at this point, he frees himself from being dependent on forms. This freedom experienced by the artist also expands the freedom of the art lover/viewer.

At the same time, while examining the art of painting, which is a problem of freedom, all the items we have mentioned have inspired artists and art lovers to think and create freely. The emotion, material, technique, period, knowledge, color, tone, light and shadow, form, direction, line, balance, perspective, proportion-proportion, visual continuity, emphasis, integrity, abstraction, identity, imitation, value, All these elements, such as judgment, are concepts that we can get an idea before or while making a painting, and that we can freely reflect on the work while creating it. Thus, it is a choice of freedom according to the painter and the art lover.

The artist creates a space for himself here. In the aesthetic analysis of painting art, the freedom of the painter and the artist is preferred. For example, in Cubism, which is an important art movement, the artist is still free while creating his work. Cubism has its own rules and style, but the artist is free to create his work within these rules. How to use geometric form, stain or color element is his own choice. Here, the artist creates a space, a world for himself. In the aesthetic analysis of painting art, the freedom of the painter and the artist is preferred.

## CHAPTER 2

### FORMS OF FREEDOM IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Art, as a human-specific cultural activity and in terms of its origin, is as old and as old as humanity, and is an activity that has manifested itself in different ways throughout the ages. Based on this, art in general has been the subject of various theories in the context of the art object embodied in art production, the subject receiving the art, and the value judgments about art. The nature of the art object and how artistic production is a cultural activity, the philosophical foundations of the creation process and aesthetic evaluation, the epistemological and ontological theories on which the idea of art is based, and the relationship of art creation and artistic reception with freedom are discussed in terms of philosophy of art with its political and ethical dimensions. In this context, freedom in a philosophical inquiry to be made under the general title of “freedom in art” can be considered in three main types as freedom in terms of action, freedom in design and freedom in artistic judgments. When “freedom in art” is mentioned, it is important to consider the act of creation in terms of actions taken voluntarily or unintentionally. It is very difficult to be truly free through actions done out of ignorance. The act of creating in art is a form of action that is delicately designed, reflects the artist, is preferred in terms of its subjectivity, is performed voluntarily and deliberately, that is, with a conscious expression. Therefore, the purely artistic act-freedom relationship can be discussed even in terms of the existence of the artist who produced the work. When we consider it by limiting it to this point, we can say that freedom in art resembles the relationship Aristotle established between action and freedom. Aristotle’s *Nikomakhos’a Etik* as he states in his book, actions, *voluntary actions* and *involuntary actions* are basically divided into two. Willful actions are divided into those that are the product of

choice and those that are not the product of choice. Involuntary actions, on the other hand, are divided into those that are done by force and those that are done due to ignorance (Aristotle, 2011: 44). So here, the artist appears as the agent of freedom in terms of subject action.

It is very important to be free in the realized art objects that are the subject of our perception or the designs behind them. In terms of the raw materials of the design; principles of tone, form, direction, color, line and design; In the works created by using these concepts in terms of ratio-proportion, balance, visual continuity, integrity and emphasis, infinity shows parallelism and a tight correlation with freedom of thought and freedom of creation. At the same time, “harmony”, “pleasure”, “pleasure”, “beauty”, etc., which are the main concepts of aesthetics. In the context of concepts, freedom of thought emerges as factors affecting the evaluation effectiveness.

Art is a particular form of expression that emerges at the end of the artist or artists' creative process. Art is also a means of communication and a way of expressing thought in society. As the works of art are shared, they become a social element. As free as the artist is when performing his works, he is also free when exhibiting. From this point of view, freedom in art first comes first. *it is a personal right* it can be said (Bingöl, 2011: 104-108). In addition to personal metaphysical freedom, freedom in thought, freedom in actions, and moral freedom in artistic creativity are also extremely important. Thus, we can say that artistic freedom can be considered in terms of its references to the public, as well as having an aspect that concerns the individual. Regarding the relationship between art and freedom, there are two articles in the 1982 Constitution, which is still in force in our country, where the concept of freedom in art is indirectly mentioned. These are regulated by Article 27 regulated in the section of the rights and duties of the person (“everyone has the right to freely learn and teach science and art, to explain, disseminate and research in these fields”.), is Article 64 regulated in the section of social, economic rights and duties. According to Article 64 “*The state protects art activities and the artist. It takes necessary measures for the protection, evaluation and support of works of art and the artist, and for the spread of the love of art*” (Bingöl, 2011: 109). Article 64 is a right that provides institutional guarantees. With this article, art and artist are placed under the special protection of the state. Thus, we understand once again that in terms of securing freedom in art with the rules of law in terms of social order, it has positive con-

sequences for the artist's ability to transfer his free thoughts to his works. If an artist is under state protection, he can produce more original works.

In the history of thought since Kant, we see that the arts are distinguished as free and unfree arts (Tunali, 2012: 189). Free arts are understood as fine arts, and when non-free arts are mentioned, arts based on manual dexterity such as carpentry and jewelery are understood. Painting, which is a branch of fine arts, is also a free art form. The artist is free in terms of aesthetic thought, style and style in painting.

Practical reason assures us that freedom is real; theoretical reason can never tell us what freedom is. Explaining how theoretical reason can be practical is beyond the power of human reason, as Kant sadly mentions. However, all is not lost. Because, after all, there is a way in which nature and practical reason can be harmonized, because there is a type of course that participates equally in both the principle of the empirical explanation of Nature and the principle of moral judgment (Eagleton, 2012: 122). *Judgment Criticism* In the aesthetic and theological modes of judgment, the empirical world appears with its freedom, purposefulness, meaningful integrity, and self-regulating autonomy, in accord with the purposes of practical reason (Eagleton, 2012: 122).

Beauty is neither just emotional nor just mental in Schiller. Beauty is a harmony of the emotional and the mental. Beauty is also freedom in appearance. According to Schiller, man, aesthetic man, is only a free man in harmony. Aesthetic man is the only being who plays, hence the being who is free. Schiller's phrase "the view of beauty is freedom in it". In beauty, the impulse of matter and the impulse of form, which want to dominate man on their own, unite in harmony, the compelling power of both disappears in the freedom of the impulse of play. Such a person is now an aesthetic construction. Aesthetic man is a man who plays and he is the only being who plays and he is a free being. According to Schiller, if a child playing games does not realize how time passes, a person dealing with art does not understand how time passes.\_

Marx's thoughts on the freedom-necessity relationship are important. "Necessity is blind unless it is grasped. Freedom is the realization of necessity." This meant the acceptance of the objective legality and necessity in nature, the dialectical transformation of freedom (Lenin, 2014: 27). According to Marx, it was the bourgeoisie's preference for peace with the slave-owning order when the war for freedom was the only option (Lenin, 2014: 68).

According to Adorno, the division of society stems from the opposition of the bourgeois subject to his own production in the Marxist sense and expresses an antagonism. As long as this disagreement continues, it means wrong in the society (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 56). As long as this conflict continues, so will wrongdoing and division in society. Man also feels the need to eliminate this division. A society in which divisions and falsity are eliminated becomes a society that is integrated and has attained the truth (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 56). Therefore, art is a place of refuge in the midst of mistakes and divisions, the land of integrity and truth. The liberation of the bourgeois society can also be achieved by taking this art country as an example (Dellaloğlu, 2014: 56). For Adorno, the idea of freedom is tied to individuality. The concept of freedom, that is, the freedom of the individual, has a meaning in the process that we understand as his/her own responsibility, autonomy, self-acting and making decisions for himself (Adorno, 2006: 84). Therefore, there is a relationship between the content of the art object and the freedom of the individual.

For Bauman, freedom was born as a privilege and has remained so ever since. It divides and separates. It separates the best from the rest. It is difference that makes freedom attractive; its presence or absence reveals and grounds the contrast between high and low, good and bad, desired and contradictory (Bauman, 2016: 17). Freedom represents the coexistence of two strictly separated social situations; The terms “reaching freedom” and “being free” mean rising from a low social status (Bauman, 2016: 17).

According to Kuçuradi, freedom is a dialectical definition. Kuçuradi expresses this definition as follows; “*To be free is to know that you are not free, to admit it and to accept it*” (Kuçuradi, 2009: 27). As can be seen from all experiences of life, it is unquestionable that we are bound by more than one limit to our life, whatever the circumstances. The importance of freedom and the definition of unfreedom at every moment comes from the fact that it includes theories about more than one freedom, such as free will, which is the ability of the will to choose and realize itself, as a special case (Kuçuradi, 2009: 27-28).

According to Kuçuradi, much has been talked about freedom in philosophy. The first thing we can learn from freedom is the need to make conceptual distinctions. When we look at what is characterized by freedom, namely whose freedom and what freedom is mentioned, we can divide freedom into three types. Although these are related to each other, there are three types of freedom that

should not be confused: a) freedom of man as a species, b) freedom of individuals or ethical freedom, and c) social freedom (Kuçuradi, 2014: 1-2). According to Kuçuradi, freedom is actually an “idea”. The problem of freedom has troubled every philosopher in the history of thought. According to him, so much has been said about and unrelated to each other that a person who wants to deal with the problem of freedom has to look at what is going on by taking all these thoughts into account, learn something from it, and thus catch a clue that will enable him to take some steps (Kuçuradi, 2010: 31). ). In the history of philosophy, various philosophers have put forward their views of freedom and it has been discussed about what kind of freedom forms these freedoms are.

Plato’s *State* he does not directly refer to the problem of freedom, but Plato makes very important determinations about freedom through a myth. Plato, *State* He touches on this subject in his tenth book.

As Adugit points out, *State* According to the myth in the tenth book of , Er, a soldier, dies in battle. However, he does not share the same fate with the other dead. His corpse, which was found undecomposed after ten days on the battlefield, is taken to his home for burial. On the twelfth day, it comes back to life as it is laid on the firewood to be burned. Divine Providence has said so. He is tasked with conveying what is happening in the other world to people. As for himself, he describes to people what he saw in the other world during the ten-day period. Plato conveys the myth in detail in the work in question. Er lives his afterlife experiences with all their openness. Death is experienced for the first and last time. This experience of the impossible gives him access to the knowledge of the impossible. The places he was taken to, the people he met, the torments people suffered, the rewards enjoyed... All of these have nothing to record in terms of freedom, but what Er tells about freedom contains data that precedes many philosophers (Adugit, 2013: 64).

According to what Er narrated, after the souls were taken to the necessary places in the other world and subjected to the necessary procedures, they were brought before Lakheisis, Atropus and Klotho from the Morias, the daughters of necessity, who were called the goddesses of fate. One of God’s spokesmen lines up the souls and takes the drawing numbers and life samples on Lachesis’ arrays and informs the souls that they will enter a mortal period again. *State* The command of Lakheisis is as follows:

A fairy of fate will not choose you, you will choose your own fairy of fate.

Everyone will choose the life that Destiny will bind them to, in their turn. As for goodness, it has no owner; The more a person gives to the good, the more he will have a share of the good. Everyone is responsible for the life they choose; God does not interfere with this (Plato, 2011: 364).

The concepts of responsibility, choice and obligation are important here. Freedom analysis is made in the context of these concepts. As can be understood from here, freedom is about choices and choices about life as a whole. According to Plato, freedom is the choice of one's own structure; It can be defined as deciding for himself what kind of person he will be. What kind of a person he will be is in one's own hands, in his own possibilities. Each individual is the creator of his own personality and the master of his own life (Adugit, 2013: 65).

For Aristotle, freedom, in its broadest form, is man's ability to choose. Making a choice is knowingly and willingly making a choice or taking action, not by force or ignorance (Aristotle, 2011: 48). According to Aristotle, man has the opportunity to act willingly, not by force or ignorance. He has the opportunity to do it under his own control in his actions. He has the ability to think about how rational his actions are. Based on these views, freedom is the choice of a person through his mind. In other words, freedom is the state of being able to do what a person does and does according to his own power and possibility.

Freedom in the Middle Ages was clearly related to the struggle for power. The most emblematic and famous document of this struggle, the "Magna Carta Libertatum", the Great Edict of Freedom, King John's unreliable dynastic authorizations, the resources of the Crusades and the high costs of the king's barons that strained their patience to the breaking point, the knights' need for action for military service and the civilian It is the joint product of the growing threat of war (Bauman, 2016: 49). Freedom is therefore a privilege from the king, acquired by a narrow wealthy and powerful class; In a short time, the name "free man" began to be used to mean a person of noble descent. Free persons are the part of the people over which the king can have only limited authority (Bauman, 2016: 50).

Discourses about freedom at the basis of Spinoza's philosophy are at two levels. The first is about whether free will is possible in an order of determination where everything is in a causal chain. The second is about how people can freely take their moral and social decisions in such an order. Apart from these points, the life story of the philosopher can also be a guide in understanding Spinoza's

libertarian philosophy (Timuçin, 2016: 26). According to Spinoza, moral freedom requires the individual's personal effort towards himself. While his morals may be linked to a morality of duty to some extent, Spinoza is more concerned with how one is a free agent than with moral responsibility. How man becomes a morally free individual is related to the philosopher's concept of knowledge (Timuçin, 2016: 69). Spinoza states that with moral freedom, man reveals his inner power rather than his voluntary actions. Thus, at the highest level of knowledge, a person reaches intuitive knowledge and reaches the knowledge of nature with intuition. The person feels free at this level of knowledge (Timuçin, 2016: 76).

Freedom is really a virtue, that is, a competence. No conclusion showing the incompetent person can be tied to freedom. Thus, man cannot be characterized as free because he does not exist or cannot use his reason, he can only be characterized as free to the extent that man has the power to exist and act according to the laws of nature. We can talk about how free a person is, the more he prefers, and thus God, who is absolutely free, exists, knows, and acts. There is no doubt that God acts with the same necessity that he exists: Since he exists according to the necessity of his own nature, he acts according to his own nature, that is, with absolute freedom (Timuçin, 2016: 82).

For Hume: "There is freedom if we understand by freedom only the power to act or not to act according to the determinations of the will; but if we understand from freedom to act without determining the will, to act without reason, or to act randomly without wanting something, then it can be said that "freedom" does not exist (Kuçuradi, 2014: 3). Again, not many learned anything from Hume's attention other than one or two philosophers. Hume referred to freedom of the press; He debated whether freedom of the press is beneficial or not.

According to Kant, freedom is an idea, an idea produced by the human mind. An idea about an opportunity that a person has can determine his will, inclinations and interests, as well as a law that is the product of pure reason, which he calls the "moral law". According to Kant, freedom is wanting it while acting; wanting to act like this. Freedom is a feature of our wishes, not our actions (Kuçuradi, 2014: 4).

Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason* In his work titled, he touched on the problem of freedom more fundamentally and tried to justify freedom on the basis of new principles. Kant had to resort to the theory of duality while reaching a certain

solution on the basis of a new basis for the problem of freedom. The emergence of this theory, along with other human problems, was caused by the problem of freedom. Kant demonstrates the existence of both freedom and causality by obtaining the opportunity to separate the fields of freedom and causality without being stuck with one of the determinism-indeterminism options (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 98). Kant, by showing that these fields are different from each other, depending on separate and even opposite determinations, reached a new solution in the problem of freedom compared to the philosophy before him. Therefore, it shows that at least one side of a person is independent (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 98).

The concept of freedom, insofar as it proves reality by a necessary law of practical reason, now constitutes the keystone of the whole structure in the system of pure reason - even theoretical reason; All other concepts, which, as mere ideas, remained unsupported in the theoretical mind, are now attached to the concept of freedom, find support with and through it, acquire objective reality, that is, their possibility is proved by the fact that freedom is real; because this idea reveals itself through the moral law (Kant, 2014: 3-4).

For Kant, freedom is also, in all the ideas of theoretical reason, its possibility, though we cannot grasp it directly. *first* It is the only idea we know as; because freedom is the condition of moral law (Kant, 2014: 4). The ideas of God and immortality, on the other hand, are not the conditions of the moral law, but only the conditions of the necessary object of a will determined by this law, that is, the conditions of the purely practical use of our pure reason; Therefore, we cannot say that we know and directly grasp the possibility of these ideas, let alone the reality. But still, these ideas are that the morally determined will *first* are the conditions of its application to the given object (Kant, 2014: 4). According to Kant, the possibility of these ideas, although not theoretically known or directly grasped, can and should be accepted from this Practical point of view. For this, it is practically sufficient that they have no internal impossibilities. Here we find the basis for an assumption that remains purely subjective compared to theoretical reason, but also has objective validity for a pure but practical mind like theoretical reason; Thus, through the concept of freedom, the objective reality of the ideas of God and immortality and the right to accept these concepts and even the subjective necessity of accepting them are created (Kant, 2014: 5). According to Kant, the concept of freedom is the obstacle that all empiricists face; On the other hand, for critical moralists who see that they must follow a rational

path by necessity, it is the key to the highest practical principles (Kant, 2014: 8).

The theoretical use of reason dealt only with the objects of cognition, and a critique of this use of reason concerned only pure cognition. This ability aroused a suspicion that was later confirmed, that is, he lost himself among objects that could not be reached easily by crossing their borders or between concepts that contradicted each other (Kant, 2014: 16). The situation is different in the practical behavior of the mind. In this usage, the mind deals with the determination causes of the will, which is a faculty that creates the objects corresponding to the ideas or determines itself to create these objects. For, here, reason may be sufficient to determine will, and when it comes to will alone, reason always has objective reality, so this is the first question to ask: Can pure reason by itself be sufficient to determine will? Or can there be a reason for asking for reason only empirically-conditionally? (Kant, 2014: 16). A concept of causality emerges, which is justified by the critique of pure reason, but cannot be demonstrated empirically, namely, freedom. If grounds can be found to prove that this freedom is indeed a property of human will, not only will it turn out that pure reason can be practical; at the same time, it will be revealed that only pure reason is unconditionally practical, not the mind limited by experiment (Kant, 2014: 17). According to Kant, since the mere form of the law can only be represented by the mind, and therefore it is not an object of the senses and therefore does not take place among the appearances, the formal design of the law as the cause that determines will is different from all the reasons that determine the events in nature in accordance with the law of causality; because in their case, the determining causes must themselves be appearances (Kant, 2014: 33). If no determining cause other than the general legislative form can serve as a law for the will, such a will must be considered completely independent of the natural law on which appearances depend, i.e., the law of causality, and the latter from the other. The name of such independence is literally “transcendental freedom”. Therefore, if only the legislative form of the maxim can serve as a law for a will, that will is a free will (Kant, 2014: 33).

Freedom and unconditional practical law lead to each other reciprocally. “Are they really different from each other; or is an unconditional law merely the self-consciousness of pure practical reason; is this pure practical reason exactly the same as the positive concept of freedom?” Kant does not ask. The question Kant asks is, “Where does our knowledge of the unconditionally practical begin?

Is it freedom or practical law?" (Kant, 2014: 33). According to Kant, this knowledge cannot start from freedom; Because we can neither become conscious of freedom directly, because its first concept is negative, nor can we remove it from experiment, because experiment only gives the law of appearances, and therefore the mechanism of nature, which is the exact opposite of freedom (Kant, 2014: 33-34). According to Kant, the first thing that shows itself to us is the moral law of which we are directly conscious; And since reason presents it as a determining reason that cannot be overcome by any sensory condition, even completely independent of conditions, the moral law leads us directly to the concept of freedom (Kant, 2014: 34).

The autonomy of the will is the sole principle of all moral laws and the duties in accordance with these laws. On the other hand, personal preference is not the basis of any obligation, moreover, it is against the principle of such an obligation and the morality of will (Kant, 2014: 38). The only principle of morality consists in the fact that the law is independent of any content, and yet personal preference is determined only by a general legislative form in which it can take a maximum. This independence, on the other hand, is freedom in a negative sense, whereas this self-legislation of purely practical reason is freedom in a positive sense (Kant, 2014: 38). For Kant, the moral law expresses nothing but the autonomy of pure practical reason, that is, the autonomy of freedom. This freedom itself is the formal condition of all maxims, and maxims can only agree with the highest practical law when they are subject to this condition (Kant, 2014: 38). Kant does not deny that since the will of man is determined directly by the moral law thanks to freedom, a feeling of contentment can arise when the reason for this determination is acted on frequently (Kant, 2014: 45).

For the first time in the history of philosophy, Kant asked, "Is man free or not?" tries to show why the question of freedom cannot receive an informative answer, and finds a way out to change the question about freedom (Kuçuradi, 2014: 3). According to Kant, will is a kind of causality of rational living beings, and freedom is a quality of this causation, since it can act without being dependent on alien causes that determine living beings: Likewise, necessity in nature is a form of causality of living beings whose behavior is irrational and whose behavior is determined by foreign causes. is the attribute. But this expression of freedom has a negative character; so this explanation is not fruitful for understanding what freedom is; only from this can emerge a positive concept of

freedom, and that is an equally fruitful concept. Since freedom is a causality of will and the concept of causality includes the concept of law, something else, that is, a result, must occur thanks to something we call “cause” (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 62). A year and a half later, Sartre will consider the concept of freedom, which appears in Kant as a type of purpose that people can achieve, as a feature of the human being’s structure, as it was before Kant, and even -in his famous words-” He will say that he is condemned to be free” (Kuçuradi, 2014: 4). It seems to contradict Kant’s own belief that moral freedom defines our human dignity. Kant said that there is a connection, albeit indirectly, between aesthetics and morality. Since both aesthetic and moral judgment are independent of external rules, beauty is a symbol of morality (Shinner, 2013: 202).

For Hegel, freedom is consciousness and necessity is unconsciousness. There is a leap from necessity to freedom. The purpose of freedom is to want nothing but itself. Hegel says that necessity is blind only if it is not understood; According to him, “necessity becomes freedom not because it disappears, but only because its hitherto intimate identity with freedom finally manifests itself”. (Hegel, 1982: 43-44). According to Hegel, freedom is “only wanting one’s own essence”. That is, freedom is nothing but consciousness affirming itself as itself. In other words, freedom is that consciousness only wants what its essence is (Hegel, 1982: 43). When Hegel speaks of freedom, it is understood as what the subjective supremely grasps in itself and conceals for itself. Freedom is Spirit’s highest form of existence and a kind of determination of it (Hegel, 1982: 95). Freedom in thought takes only pure thought as its reality, which lacks the fullness of life and is therefore only the concept of freedom, not living freedom itself; Because for this freedom, essence is first of all thinking in general, form in general, which has come out of the independence of things and returned to itself (Hegel, 2015: 87). Hegel speaks of right and law for freedom. According to Hegel, it is the possibility of concretization that freedom offers him directly. It determines this situation as a right (Hegel, 1942: 38).

Schiller expresses the moment when the mind can properly perceive its own freedom as the moment when it fully believes in its existence and sensitivity; and the state of mind arising from such peace and freedom of the mind as a moment when a real work of art breaks away from the person’s self (Altar, 2013: 16-17).

Kant, who associates the concept of freedom with a transcendental causality outside of the mechanical cause-effect chain of the external world, was the first

thinker to think about freedom in a real sense, according to Schelling. According to Schelling; *“The true and living concept of freedom is its competence for good and evil.”* (Schelling, 2017: 16).

According to Schopenhauer, to be free, to be able to get out of causal connections, to say “no” to will and to life and the world as it is; not being free means not being able to break away from causal connections and using knowledge as a tool for wills (Kuçuradi, 2013: 87).

For Nietzsche, freedom is the separation of a person from the herd, that is, seeing that the value judgments in reality lack the basis of existence, and it is a first step. The real issue starts after this freedom (Kuçuradi, 2013: 94).

Freedom, which is the basic principle of existentialism, is handled unusually, as in all of Sartre’s works. Freedom is not non-interference, non-attachment. It’s not breaking with boundaries, and it’s not even irresponsible. But we must be free in our dealings with the outside world. We have endless options before us. We should be able to choose any of them as we wish. For example, Roquentin is unemployed and his family can do it. He can go anywhere, try every possibility. Their behavior is determined by rules such as religion and morality (Turgut, 1993: 73).

Freedom is an important concept that has various qualities and forms. Human freedom, the freedom of individuals, that is, ethical freedom and social freedom, is an important condition for our free thinking, action and creativity. In terms of being human, freedom is the state of having these qualities, because man must have free qualities such as thought, action, will, creativity.

## **2.1. Being Human and Freedom**

Although freedom has entered many moral teachings as a ready-made concept, it cannot be said that its true meaning and its defining feature in terms of human beings have been sufficiently clarified. It is not thought that the number of those who accept that freedom is the only purpose of man or the only feature that distinguishes man from animals (Hacıkadıroğlu, 2002: 16). Freedom of thought, which is a form of freedom, is the freedom to express one’s thoughts. There is no distinction between the person who is prevented from saying what he thinks when he wants, and the person who is prevented from getting what he wants when he wants, by being tied up. Thus, the pursuit of freedom, which is

synonymous with the effort of man to continue his existence, is valid for all types of human action (Hacıkadıroğlu, 2002: 16). Man has the freedom of thought because he has the ability to know. In other words, it is a situation that arises from the knowledge that knows how to think, takes or makes decisions. It also means that he can choose the most suitable situation for himself.

The concepts of knowledge and freedom are interdependent. In this case, a question arises as to which of the knowledge and freedom is in the foreground for human beings. In other words, does a person know because he seeks freedom, or does he find the opportunity to be free because he has the ability to know? questions are the issues that need to be discussed (Hacıkadıroğlu, 2002: 18).

Man is a being with freedom of thought and creative freedom. It is these forms of freedom that make man human. Especially in the art of painting, which is also the subject of the study, the important thing is that people reflect their creativity freely in their work by adding their free thought.

When the self-evaluation of human beings in terms of the possibilities of being human is summarized through aesthetic vision and examination, the products we encounter can be called “art” in general terms. We can say that art corresponds to the history of humanity and is a cultural summary of man’s view of nature and himself. Thus, man can be defined as a being who makes art (*homo esteticus*). Since man is a being who makes art, he has the authority to produce art freely. He can think freely in every branch of art and put forward new views. The relationship between man and art is undoubtedly too diverse and rich to fit into theories and approaches. It is the source of this richness that needs to be examined from a philosophical point of view and the way it is expressed. One should be able to freely use art theories and philosophical theories and be able to think theoretically in the field of art.

Considering that freedom means choosing between different kinds of captivity, one can only call man as freedom-seeking, not as free. The concept of freedom on its own can be compared with a term of absolute freedom, such that a person does not have to endure any captivity in order to reach a certain goal (Hacıkadıroğlu, 2002: 17).

According to Bauman, “it takes at least two for one to be free.” *der*. Freedom refers to a social relationship, an asymmetry in social conditions; essentially, it shows social separation, that is, it assumes social division (Bauman, 2016: 18). People can be liberated only when they have some kind of attachment that they

want to get rid of. If being free is used to mean having permission to go anywhere, it also means that there are people who are tied to their homes and have renounced their right to move freely (Bauman, 2016: 18).

Human freedom has been widely discussed in the history of philosophy and different views have been put forward. Freedom of will, personal freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of action and freedom of judgment are important forms of freedom.

What makes man human is that he determines his own actions, has a practical mind and autonomy, only in this way does man rise above animate and inanimate nature and gain the ability to give an account of his actions. For this reason, it must be an independent, undetermined area of existence (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 57). The high values that give people the honor of being human are that they have the opportunity to do the opposite of these values. Freedom and responsibility are essential at this point.

While examining freedom, one of the fundamental problems of human existence, Kant had to stick to the determinism-indeterminism alternative or one of their varieties. This was a consistent course of action; because it is difficult to see the possibility of reaching another conclusion as long as human is understood as a part of nature in its entirety (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 57). Kant not only gave an important place to human problems in his philosophy, but also took some of these problems to a certain solution form by processing them. Freedom problem is one of them (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 94). The problems that Kant researched such as freedom, religion, knowledge, morality, and law are anthropological problems in today's sense. Today's anthropology has started to deal with all these human problems as fundamental problems, not only enriching them, but also bringing a new view (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 95). Problems such as freedom, religion, morality, and law are important problems for philosophical anthropology that lie at the heart of human existence. Among these concepts, the problem of freedom predominates in Kant's philosophy (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 96).

Kant saw that freedom is the most important of human's "conditions of existence". The place he gives to the problem of freedom in his philosophy shows this; because it is impossible to talk about human rights and morals without explaining and grounding this problem. The same thing happens in the field of morality. If man acted like a machine, that is, if his actions were dictated to him by nature, as in animals, how can one speak of morality, how can one know his

guilt, how can one be held accountable for his conscience and his actions, or rather how can one speak of conscience in humans? can it be? The disappearance of phenomena like these means the disappearance of humanity (Mengüşoğlu, 2014: 96).

According to Schelling, the freedom of man, spirituality as personality, is above the causality of nature and its laws. This superiority stems from the freedom to choose two basic principles, namely two wills against each other (Schelling, 2017: 21). According to him, free choice should depend on the nature of the concept of freedom, what is chosen should be chosen only for itself. This choice is not based on an equality or balance between the things to be chosen, as can be seen in the example of the donkey that died of hunger because it could not choose between two haystacks at the same distance (Schelling, 2017: 22). He tells it to become an unconditional choice state that he makes with his own mental activity, completely independent of the effects (Schelling, 2017: 22). Freedom is a necessary condition of being human, as it reveals one's own free nature. If a person wants to be like a human, he has to grasp his own essence and own it (Schelling, 2017: 22). The essence of human existence is the freedom to choose and decide one's own existence, who one is. Man is responsible for himself, that is, he cannot escape his own freedom. Although the essence of man determines the free choice of good and evil, this essence is not immutable after it is determined (Schelling, 2017: 23). Philosophical studies and research on the basis of human freedom may point in part to the true concept of freedom; because the phenomenon of freedom has left a direct trace in every individual as a feeling, but although it is not necessary to put it into words more than the familiar clarity and depth of the meaning of freedom, freedom is actually not on the surface (Schelling, 2017: 31).

Freedom is incompatible with any system, any philosophical effort that tries to achieve this harmony or unity will end with the denial of freedom. will bring. If the concept of system is thought to be against freedom in general and in itself, it is strange to claim that a system that reconciles with freedom can only be found in a divine mind (Schelling, 2017: 32).

Schopenhauer divided human freedom into two in the problem of freedom. The first of these are "the freedom of man as an idea" and "the freedom of one man". As an idea, man is free in two senses and this freedom is intertwined with necessity: his freedom in the first sense is a negative freedom with the terminol-

ogy in the history of philosophy and is in the same situation as the freedom of other stages of existence; Freedom in the second sense is the freedom encountered only in human beings and at the same time it is freedom that is positive but only a “freedom of possibilities”, that is, freedom that does not appear in the world of appearances (Kuçuradi, 2013: 62). Schopenhauer draws the existence of man’s “freedom of possibilities” as a logical conclusion and bases it on a parallelism: he places freedom in one’s essential being. This freedom is found in one’s own nature, in being as it is. This kind of freedom does not appear at all; this freedom is a freedom of possibilities, that is, a freedom that does not appear; If appearance is left to a standstill in order to arrive at something outside of all time, which should be considered as the inner structure of man itself, then there is freedom; what is visible is what the person does one by one that is not otherwise (Kuçuradi, 2013: 64-65). In the freedom of a single person, the freedom that is inherent in the human being but never seen in the world emerges as an event contrary to this world in a single situation: this is free people (Kuçuradi, 2013: 67). In Schopenhauer, freedom in a positive sense is the freedom of one person, neither an inderterminism as in the freedom of the basic will, nor the self-legislation of the will as in Kant.

Freedom is when a person suddenly sees, as if by lightning, directly the structure of man, the unity of all things, clearly and definitively, and when he sees this, he erases himself; wanting freedom is leaving the reins in the hands of knowledge. This is the enlightenment of will; this is freedom realized (Kuçuradi, 2013: 69).

Nietzsche’s understanding of human is important in the history of philosophy. In particular, the concept of free man has led to different views. In the history of philosophical thought, man becomes the main discussion problem and starting point of a thinker with Nietzsche; all other problems are tried to be comprehended and evaluated in terms of their direct relevance to life, according to human beings and living people (Kuçuradi, 2009: 1). At the end of the last century and at the beginning of our century, a free person is a non-religious, democratic or socialist taste, scientist, positivist, narrow-minded, shallow, not at all independent, who calls himself “free thinkers” and represents today’s “modern man”. A person who is a “bulldozer” is not a defender or advocate of “modern thoughts” (Kuçuradi, 2009: 53). A free man is an immoral man. A free person is a person who is detached from the period in which he grew up and lived, who seeks his

own way, who wants to see everything related to people and everything with his own eyes (Kuçuradi, 2009: 53).

According to Rousseau, to renounce freedom means to renounce human rights and even duties as a human being. A person who renounces everything has no opportunity to compensate for any harm. Taking all kinds of freedom from the will of man means removing all kinds of moral thoughts from his behavior (Rousseau, 2017: 9).

There are varieties of freedom that should not be confused with each other. When we take the freedom of man-human as a species-as a problem, freedom is seen as a structural feature of man (Kuçuradi, 2010: 31-32). When the freedom of man is taken as a problem, freedom is a possibility of man, one of the main structural features that distinguishes man from other living things (Kuçuradi, 2010: 51). This possibility, which is unique to human beings, is an opportunity that appears in various activities of human beings, especially in interpersonal relations. This means that man can be determined by some products of his own kind, in addition to the biopsies that determine other living things; it can also be determined by values and valuable principles. This possibility realized by people constitutes one of the characteristics of man that distinguishes him from other beings. Therefore, first of all, freedom is a value of people (Kuçuradi, 2010: 52). According to Kuçuradi, freedom becomes a personality trait when people realize freedom: freedom is a person value or an ethical value in interpersonal relations (Kuçuradi, 2014: 52). A free person is one who acts every day, as much as he can, based on accurate assessments and taking into account the value of human beings and the knowledge of values. Ethical freedom is the characteristic of a person who can evaluate correctly while living and do what is necessary based on this (Kuçuradi, 2014: 52). It is primarily other free people who enable free people to grow. But one factor that helps to keep people free, though not the only one, is the principles that apply to the regulation of social relations in a country. These principles may or may not be the principles that ensure the protection of human value in people (Kuçuradi, 2010: 52-53). The state of social freedom is related to the freedom of those who are engaged in all kinds of administrative affairs in that country. One thing that can be learned from the adventure of freedom is this inseparable connection between social freedom and ethical freedom. It is that only free people can ensure the continuous realization of social freedom (Kuçuradi, 2010: 53). Freedom emerges as a human value, a person value and a

society value. Such freedoms are important for people in art and freedom in art. The freedom of the person is discussed in terms of acting freely in line with his own rights.

Schiller, *A Series of Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man* He talks about freedom in his work. Freedom begins only after man is complete, after both his main impulses have developed. As long as man is not complete, as long as one of the two impulses remains outside, freedom is lacking in him. In order to complete this deficiency, everything that will make a person full must be given back to him (Schiller, 1965: 98).

Rousseau, *Social Contract* “People are born free, but everywhere they are in chains,” he says. Some people consider themselves masters of others, but he is just as much a slave as others. Rousseau questioned how the master-slave distinction emerged and what legitimizes it (Rousseau, 2017: 4).

Grotius says: “When a man can renounce his freedom and become a master’s slave, why can’t a whole nation transfer its freedom and subordinate itself to a king.”

According to Rousseau, to renounce freedom means to renounce human rights and even duties as a human being. A person who renounces everything has no opportunity to compensate for any harm. Such a renunciation is incompatible with human nature. Taking all kinds of freedom from the will of man means removing all kinds of moral thoughts from his behavior (Rousseau, 2017: 9).

Sartre says that a person is either completely free or not at all. In his famous saying, “man is doomed to freedom”, which seems paradoxical at first glance, but is extremely meaningful when we think about it in his own terms. Because freedom is not a feature of man, it is him, in other words, it is his ontic dimension. It is the situation in which the “being-for-itself” mode, which is nothing but the conceptual expression of human reality, finds itself necessarily while running after “value” (Tansel, 2006: 184). According to Sartre: while one is acting, that is, doing something to change what is; his actions are determined by a purpose he has set (a non-existent, a nothing); that is, to act in order to realize something that one wishes, designs, but does not yet exist, expresses his freedom (Kuçuradi, 2014: 4). Thus, according to Kuçuradi, freedom, the indeterminacy of human existence – becomes the condition of action. The desire of a person – mine, yours, his – for something that does not exist (“nothing”, the non-existent) as a goal to realize this and being determined to act by this non-existent expresses his

freedom (Kuçuradi, 2014: 5).

“What is freedom?” in the Camus philosophy. answers the question on the basis of “personal freedom”. Regarding the freedom of man as a species, if expressed in Wittgenstein’s language, the logic followed by Camus, who prefers to remain silent, makes the person his own master. Camus, who avoids being stuck in a general essentialism by choosing to remain silent about metaphysical freedom, persistently avoids following Sartre’s point of view, which is seen as an important parameter of a narrower view of freedom, by putting the person in the center (Adugit, 2013: 86). Therefore, it does not understand one’s freedom to realize one’s own essence. He confidently argues that freedom cannot be considered not only in the context of the structure or essence of the human species, but also in the context of “the essence of the person” or structure. It cuts off the traditional bond of freedom, so to speak, with the person or the human nature. Considering freedom in the context of the person means that the person is not under the yoke of another master in terms of thoughts, decisions and actions. This may be the understanding of the prisoner or the understanding of a contemporary person in the state (Adugit, 2013: 86).

## **2.2. Social and Political Freedom**

According to Kuçuradi, social freedom is an idea and an idea of necessity. It is necessary to organize social relations in such a way as to protect the value of human beings; It is the idea that social relations should be arranged in such a way that people can be determined by values (Kuçurradi, 2014: 53).

Social freedom emerges in the relation of the regulation of social relations in a country with values. This arrangement requires a constant, always renewed effort in changing historical conditions; it never ends. We can learn this from the adventure of freedom in the field of action. The existence of freedom in this country means that valuable principles constantly determine the regulation of social relations; the purpose of the regulations made every day, knowingly and knowingly, means to protect the value of the human being (Kuçuradi, 2010: 54). When we say social freedom, we can say firstly the freedom of the individual, the freedom of the person in terms of social relations, and the freedom of the political union: a state. Social freedom consists of freedoms that we can divide into several types. These; social freedom, moral freedom and legal freedom. According to Kuçuradi, these types of freedom appear as a problem of individual

freedom (Kuçuradi, 2010: 32). Social freedom is an idea and an idea of necessity. It is necessary to organize social relations in such a way as to protect the value of human beings; It is the thought that social relations should be arranged in such a way that people can be determined by values (Kuçuradi, 2014: 53).

Moral freedom is often effective in a person's actions and evaluations that contradict the value judgments of the group he is in: if we understand that the person's life is not reacted to; it can be said that this freedom has increased considerably in the last twenty-twenty-five years in Turkey (Kuçuradi, 2010: 32). "Moral freedom is the whole of the behaviors that are allowed easily or hard within the limits drawn to individuals by the value judgments valid in a group. Legal freedom, on the other hand, is related to a part of the basic human rights, which are the rights that can only be protected. Another meaning is related to the rights recognized and whose borders can be drawn differently from country to country" (Kuçuradi, 2010: 54).

We see freedom in one's social relations as a problem of legal freedom, a problem of different freedoms. These freedoms are the freedoms that correspond to the rights called human rights. In other words, these rights and freedoms are called different aspects of the same thing (Kuçuradi, 2010: 33). These rights are not the rights granted to individuals, but those that are protected or unprotected according to the way social relations are organized. It is the state that is responsible for protecting them. Protecting these rights in the social relations of the individual is one of the main duties of the state (Kuçuradi, 2010: 33).

If we look at the problem of social freedom from another angle, putting the political union, that is, the state, in the center, not the individual, the problem of freedom; the problem of freedom in the relations of a state with other states, that is, of political independence; Also, it appears as a problem of public freedoms, that is, the problem of the opportunities that a state provides to its people with its internal regulation, that is, with the internal order of ensuring individual freedoms, with the public order including the political order (Kuçuradi, 2010: 35).

Freedom is a theory that has an individual as well as a social and social as well as a political context. Freedom has always been one of the distinguishing concepts of Spinoza's thought. Here, the most distinctive concept of democracy, which he sees as the best method, is freedom (Timuçin, 2016: 16). In political life, individuals seek more favorable living conditions for themselves. Thus, the concept of freedom gains meaning.

According to Rousseau, man's natural freedom is an unlimited right to what he wills and can obtain. What he gains is social freedom and ownership of his possessions. In order not to be mistaken in this equalization, the natural freedom that is limited by the power of the individual is limited to the freedom of society, which is limited by the vote of the people; It is necessary to distinguish possession, which is the result of brute force or the right of first residence, from ownership based on real authority (Rousseau, 2017: 18). We can also say the spiritual freedom that makes man his own master. Because obeying the power of pure desires is slavery, and obeying the laws we set for ourselves is freedom (Rousseau, 2017: 19). According to him, if we inquire what the general good is, which should be the aim of every legislative system, we find that it comes down to two obvious things, freedom and equality: it comes to freedom, because every private allegiance means just as much power subtracted from the body of the state; it reaches equality, so there is no freedom without equality (Rousseau, 2017: 48).

Talking about the freedom of society, Rousseau said that when it comes to equality, it is not that the degrees of power and wealth are the same for everyone, that this power should not be subjected to any tyranny, and that this power should be used as long as the position and laws require, and in terms of wealth, no nation is rich enough to buy someone else, nor have it to sell itself. It should be understood that it should not be poor (Rousseau, 2017: 49).

Forms of freedom such as creation, thought, will, social, expression, and will affect both the freedom of man and society. Freedom in art, which will be explained in the next section, especially affects the freedom to create art, to think and to express. Thus, these forms affect both people and society's perspective on art.

### **2.3. Freedom in Art**

Art, "What is Art?" It starts with the question. This question is both historically at the beginning of philosophy and always in the form of philosophical objectification, and the object must be in a way that can remove this question (Soykan, 2015: 15). "What is Art?" Different answers are given to the question. Art is often called "an aesthetic perception" or "seeing, understanding and grasping what I am looking at". In fact, art is really the reception of art objects.

The word "art" has been used in different contexts throughout the ages. Dis-

cussions about whether art is an action, a way of knowing, a science or a teachable technique are especially related to the emergence of the understanding of “modern arts”. Collingwood has stated that we need to look at its historicity in order to eliminate this debate about the word “art”. According to Collingwood, Latin “*ars*” as in Greek “*tekhnē*” means carpentry, blacksmithing or surgery (Özkan, 2012: 13). “Medieval Latin “*ars*”, as in early modern English “*art* Like”, he borrowed both words and senses and expressed some special forms of learning from the book such as logic or grammar, astrology and magic (Özkan, 2012: 14). English translation of art *art*’truck. “*Pay attention*” means to combine, to make by making up, Italian “*until*”, in French “*art*”. It comes from the root of “offering” in Arabic and it means beauty and admirable power (Çakır, 2015: 25).

The word art is generally used for the arts that we call plastic (painting, sculpture, ceramics) or visual. The word “art” actually encompasses all kinds of art. Although the materials used by all these arts are different, they have common aspects (Ersoy, 2016: 9). Because we create art as a result of what comes out with the use of these different materials. The great awakening and liberation of art took place approximately towards the end of the 5th century BC, and artists thus became fully conscious of their power and skill (Gombrich, 2013: 99). It continues today as a freedom issue.

According to Aristotle, art can be an object, something created or made that can be other than what it is. According to him, art is becoming, performing art; The principle is about looking at how one of the things that is possible or not in the creator, not in the created, occurs (Aristotle, 2011: 117-118). As Agathon says, “art loves luck, and luck loves art” art is a habit of creation that goes with right mind; the lack of art, on the other hand, is a habit of creation that goes with the mind that is not true and is related to what can be other than what it is (Aristotle, 2011: 118). According to him, art is *virtue* have. The person who deliberately makes mistakes in art can be preferred more (Aristotle, 2011: 119). Freedom in art depends on actions. The more we are free in our actions, the more we are free to create works.

Since for Aristotle there is also a creature that creates man, the act of creation of man is important in revealing works of art. Creating a work of art is a necessity as a form of self-expression and free expression of one’s own work.

According to Tolstoy, art arose out of the need to express it with forms determined by color, line, sound or words (Ersoy, 2002: 9-10). In Aristotle, some

arts are imitated through sound, and some arts are imitated through color. These elements are effective in using our creativity while creating a work. These elements are important in imitation. By using these elements in art, we can create a free art work.

According to Hegel, not only philosophy, but also religion, law, science and art are natural and necessary products of a certain period and time. All these human skills areas of various disciplines such as religion, philosophy, science and art are tightly interconnected. With the human soul's free observation of its own essence, art arises from its grasp of its essence with symbols, and every art object is related to an existing thing and an object (Ersoy, 2016: 10). According to Hegel, there are three basic types of art. First, art is the symbolic form. Within this symbolic form, the idea still seeks its true artistic expression, that is, it is still unrestricted and abstract in itself. Therefore, it is not yet ready in itself for a fully appropriate and harmonious external appearance (Hegel, 1982: 114). As the second type of art *It's coming* does not isolate and stabilize itself from the ambiguity of general ideas; In addition, the idea is an infinitely free objectivity in itself and perceives this situation as spirit in its activity (Hegel, 1982: 115). According to him, the spirit is determined in and by itself as a free subject; In this self-determination, in self-determination, the spirit also has its proper external form in which it can unite with its immanent reality. The free subject, which appears in the classical art style, is independent of external and internal features and all possibilities and is basically universal (Hegel, 1982: 115-116). In the third and final stage of art, when the idea of the beautiful, which has its true existence only in itself as spirit and grasps itself as a free and pure spirit for itself, no longer takes place in the external element as a perfect realization (Hegel, 1982: 116).

In trying to explain art, we judge it from two perspectives. The first of these is the objective view, and the second is the subjective view. The objective view is a unity that consists of the relationship between the artist's personal sensations, thoughts and decisions and the environment. Subjective view, on the other hand, is an opinion that values individuality and personality (Ersoy, 2016: 16). Kant, one of the thinkers who support this view, states that the main elements of human perception power are. These are the perception of spiritual value and the perception of individual value. With the creativity of the imagination, the art object is the product of individuality. According to Schelling, man is under two kinds of pressure: the truth and the good. By destroying one of these pressures

with the help of the other, art becomes free from other pressures. The artist, who defends the subjective situation, specializes in his critiques towards nature and society more and more in his own subjectivity. This makes the personality more comprehensive and rich. Expressing a subjective and objective opinion about art objects by artists or art lovers may be related to freedom of thought.

Kant is like the distinction between art and nature in general, from the act or not, and the product or result of the former as the work of the latter as the effect (Kant, 2016: 116). According to Kant, there is only production through freedom, production through diligence that bases reason on its actions *art* should try. So even though we want to show the products of bees as a work of art, this is still so by way of analogy; As soon as we realize that their work is not based on rational reflection, it may seem that it is a product of their nature and as art we attribute it only to their creations (Kant, 2016: 116). The value that art carries for freedom stems from the fact that it presents non-identical versus identical thought. According to Adorno, the activity that allows thinking of what is not identical to freedom in the modern world is modern art. Thus, as Kant stated in his aesthetic, thought acts with the power of judgment, not with the power of decisive judgment. Contrary to the decisive judgment power in the art object, since the power of thought does not have a ready universal, it has an exploratory quality rather than finding the universal ready (Kant, 2007: 15).

Art, as a human skill, is also separated from science. Just as practical faculty is separate from theoretical faculty, and practice from theory. For this reason, it is not called art if we do not know what to do, and if so, we can only do it as soon as we know enough about the desired effect (Kant, 2016: 116).

Art is also separated from craft. While the first is called “free”, we can also call the second “paid art”. First, it is seen as something that can only come out as a fit, an occupation that is pleasing to oneself, and as something attractive only through its influence and therefore something that can be imposed by force (Kant, 2016: 117). Freedom in art is as important as freedom in art. Freedom to create is important in both.

It would not be out of place to remind that in all free arts, however, something forced or, as it is said, a mechanism is necessary, and that without it, the spirit, which should be free in art and which is the only inspiration of the work, will be deprived of a body and completely evaporate and disappear. Modern educators are of the opinion that the best way to produce a free art is to remove it from all

compulsions and transform it from labor into pure play (Kant, 2016: 117).

After revealing the meaning and function of art, when it comes to the field of law, concepts such as freedom, right and justice emerge. Although it is possible to cross borders and go beyond certain patterns in terms of art, the law does not allow to exceed certain limits (Bingöl, 2011: 100). The beauty associated with the concept of art while evaluating the freedom of art is the relations of form connections between our senses.

Freedom of art began to be felt for the first time with the 1789 French Revolution, which led to the disintegration of traditions in art. Adnan Turani stated that the freedom gained in the name of art progressed in relation to the French Revolution (Bingöl, 2011: 96). It creates the meaning of art for people, freedom, creativity and the effort to freely reveal the will of people.

Modern art has had to struggle with traditional naturalist and academic understandings of art in order to attain its own essence and freedom. Initially, the impressionist artists paved the way for freedom, especially in color and form, instead of following a certain theme in their works (Artut, 2013: 46). This tradition continues today. Most artists express themselves in color and shape by working abstractly from their themes. This situation is expressed as freedom of expression and freedom of creation.

Hegel *Aesthetic* in his work, “*With what need does man produce works of art?*” he asks. On the one hand, it is possible to absorb the product of art as a simple game of coincidence, situations and conditions, and to think whether it reveals itself freely in this game; Thus, it can be thought that there are other, better, tools and forms that can complement what art itself offers and attract people with something higher and more important than the satisfaction it can give (Hegel, 1982: 74). He finds the absolute and general need of art in the phenomenon of human, who is a thinking and conscious being; In other words, art finds its origin in man, who makes an existence for himself, whatever his mode of being (Hegel, 1982: 75). Because of his freedom, man takes action to liberate his strict and quite alien structure and feature from the external world and to integrate with the things he finds in the external form of his own reality (Hegel, 1982: 76).

Thus, the need for art means that it is a rational need that pushes man to reach the consciousness of the inner and outer world, and this pushes him to make an object that he can recognise from these two worlds. On the other hand, it satisfies the need of spiritual freedom by realizing the existence for itself, which exists in

an internal way, also externally. Art extracts the necessary origin of man, which lies in his rational free basis, by finding it himself; Whatever exists as action and knowledge, art takes them all from the basis of man (Hegel, 1982: 77). After the forms that affect freedom in art, there are also forms of freedom in aesthetic reception.

#### **2.4. Aesthetic Reception as a Form of Freedom**

The paintings we see in museums, exhibitions, art centers or art fairs or objects integrated with the art of painting are called “art objects”.

In this context, aesthetics *reception* an art object *clutch*, *evaluation* and *is to understand*. Because we cannot evaluate an art object without first grasping it and then we cannot understand it. We can perceive an art object from various angles. In order for a painting and/or painting to be an art object, a painting work on paper, not on canvas, is also an art object. A hollow picture frame on display is accepted as an art object (See: <http://www.internethaber.com/bedri-baykamdand-bos-cerceve-aciklamasi-518664h.htm>). For example, painter Bedri Baykam’s work titled “The Empty Frame”, which became a hot topic after businessman Murat Ülker’s purchase, was exhibited at Contemporary Istanbul and sold at a high price (See: <http://www.internethaber.com/bedri-baykamdand-bos-frame-description-518664h.htm> ). There have been many news and discussions about the painter Bedri Baykam’s work called “The Empty Frame”. The most important question that emerged from the discussions and comments was “Is this a work of art?” it happened. Painter Bedri Baykam said to those who said, “I can do this,” that there is no empty content for this work, but that there is an important quality behind the frame, “But you couldn’t.” He stated how his work was actually valuable and explained with examples from the art world. Here we understand that for a painting to be an object, it does not have to be made only by paints or brush strokes. An open-ended painting that is open to interpretation in terms of meaning can also be an art object.

The difference between the art object and the knowledge object is obvious; this difference arises in the relation of objects to people rather than forming a wide or narrow space, and it is based on their carrying any meaning. The object of art is either directly or indirectly related to the human being. The object of art is primarily related to human relations, structures, their place in the world of existence, and the problems they are in in every age. Even when the art ob-

ject is related to a piece of nature, it has a relationship with the human being (Mengüsoğlu, 2013: 261-262).

The reception process of the art object, the technique used in the art work, the material and the attitude of the artist, the education level of the individual or individuals against the object, the education they receive to interpret, understand and evaluate the art work, the processes of pleasing/pleasure and the interpersonal cultural variability of all these variables. can be expressed by being subject to it.

Reception of the painter and art lover is important in aesthetic reception. A painter and an art lover purchases an art object as material, technique and design elements. Thus, he first grasps the work, evaluates it, and then understands it. In order for an art lover to comment on a work, he or she must receive that work. His comments are his thoughts on the material of the work, its technique, the period in which it was made and how it made him feel. Art lovers can benefit from the freedom of thought while purchasing the work. Because he can freely share how he feels about the work and his feelings. Before starting a work, the painter also does research and analysis on that subject. For example, before making a painting with the theme of “Galata Tower”, they go to the place and buy that place. First grasps, evaluates and understands the Galata Tower. Then, he freely reflects the object or theme he receives on his work, down to its material, structure and every fine detail, with its own unique expression. The painter is free to purchase the works he will do.

In a work of art, the artist has to be intimate with the tools and equipment he uses. This intimacy is very important for achieving aesthetic taste, whatever the material. While some materials are long or short-lived, some may be matte or glossy, some may even be transparent, some with or without scent (Eroğlu, 2013: 101). The artist prefers the paint material not because it is ready, easy and useful, but because its qualities are more suitable for expressing his thoughts. Material selection is not a patchwork of thought and form, but a fundamental task. Materials used by artists for painting, such as pencils, brushes, spatulas, colored chalk or engraving pencils, are tools that help to reveal their personal expressiveness with their unique aspects. We can freely use and reflect our own style by these materials. For example, the choice of brush that a painter uses while painting on canvas is very important. First of all, the painter should be free to choose brushes while making the picture he will reflect on the canvas. The freer the painter, the more successful and original brushstrokes are reflected on the canvas.

For the artist, the “technical” phenomenon has a great place in seeing art. This phenomenon has a good relationship with the material. For example; Printed paintings are a proof of artistic and technical efficiency in both the technique used by the artist while creating his work, providing the view of the artist and shaping it (Eroğlu, 2017: 102). When buying an art object, it is extremely important to look at it “technically”. Technically oil paint, acrylic paint, watercolor etc. is used. The most common techniques we come across in the exhibitions are oil painting, mixed media and original print works. Which paint type and technique the artist will use in his works depends on his own free will.

Here, it is necessary to first grasp an art object in terms of material and technique, evaluate it in order to interpret it, and understand it by spending a long time. At the end of these stages, it is necessary to interpret this process freely. A consumer cannot see the art of painting without knowing and learning some pictorial rules. First, the viewer must have a vision and strive to be a consumer art intellectual. The consumer needs to understand concepts such as line, light and dark, color, shadow, space, order and unity. Especially when we go to an exhibition, seeing and grasping the light and shadow of that work is one of the most important elements.

According to Mengüşoğlu, both the artist and the scientist comprehend their object through acts. The concrete that is grasped in the field of art is individuality. However, what science grasps is the general and typical as opposed to the individual. Concepts in science and philosophy should be created and used appropriately (Mengüşoğlu, 2013: 263). Every artist needs to grasp his object with his own special material and his own acts. An important point in the field of art is whether the object is grasped with its depth; because only a work that comprehends its object in depth, that is, its essence of existence, has the importance of being a work of art (Mengüşoğlu, 2013: 263).

The extent of popular and academic criticism is of great importance when purchasing a work of art. Academic criticism is more important in reception and comprehension. Because a person who does academic criticism well can interpret a work conceptually and scientifically correctly because he has received an art education. When a person goes to an art center and looks at that work, if he is a person who has an art education, that person can bring an academic interpretation to the work. Thus, he can receive that work academically. However, if a person is giving popular criticism to the work, that person has not studied art.

Thus, when that person looks at the work, he may have difficulty in receiving and comprehending it.

A person with an art education can correctly perceive the work, technique, type of painting, period, light-shadow. However, a person who has not received an art education will receive these concepts in a wrong way. Because, while buying, it will only add its own point of view and will bring comments. On the other hand, a person with an art education will be able to interpret the work freely and accurately. When grasped correctly, it will make the individual feel more free. Some people think and believe that the tendency towards beauty, which is believed to be inherent in human beings, is sufficient for understanding and comprehending art. Art education ensures that the tastes of both the buyer and the artist gradually develop and reach the right decisions (Private, 2014: 49).

The intellectual, sensory and cultural structure of the individual is important in the reception of a work. This is true for various designs and works. Especially the cultural situation of the individual is effective in the viewpoint of the works. Understanding the art object as an art product, interpreting and evaluating it as a work of art is closely related to the intellectual and socio-economic level of the individual (Artut, 2013: 21).

Perception is an important element when purchasing a work of art. How we perceive an art object is important. Because interpreting a work depends on how we perceive it. Some objects are perceived individually, while some objects collectively create a perception. This situation depends on the free will of the art lover. Some art lovers make a comment by examining the works one by one, some art lovers comment on the works of art they perceive collectively in the exhibition.

A work of art *receive* for this, it is necessary to go deep, starting from the image. With the help of the artist's imagination, the contrasts between a reconciled inner structure and the outer world reconcile and create aesthetic beauty. Art emerges from these contrasts (Ersoy, 2016: 18). Imagination, which is an important element of art, will help us in perception in terms of free thinking and creation.

Mengusoglu *Introduction to Philosophy* In his book, "Is the understanding or comprehension of a work of art its pleasing?" he asks. He says "no" in response. "Like or dislike is not a criterion in understanding an art object. Enjoyment is based on a sense of worth on the lower rung. But the sense of worth at the lower

level is not a sufficient condition for acquiring art. Art enters consciousness only by grasping what is meant by it; this requires a sense of value on a high step” (Mengüşoğlu, 2013: 273).

When buying a painting, it is necessary to interpret the type of painting. Types of painting are portrait, figurative painting, still life (inanimate nature), landscape (landscape), abstract painting, interior. Knowing these types of painting will help us understand the artwork we are looking at. For example, when we see an abstract painting when we attend an exhibition, it is necessary to perceive that the painting consists of geometric forms, spots, shapes and colors. This will give a privilege to the art lover. When buying a painting, it is necessary to perceive what that work teaches or adds to us and what message it gives. For example; In abstract painting, people can bring different interpretations from that painting. When we look at that work, people can interpret what that abstract painting tells us with the effect of colors or the theme created by the shapes.

When we buy an art object, it is important to have information about the artist who made that work. Every painter has his own style. When we get to know the painter, we can more easily understand who the work is. Now, when we look at that work, we can understand which painter it belongs to.

From this point of view, as mentioned in the first part, it is important what we understand from the art object as “aesthetic subject”. In other words, it is how we receive and interpret the aesthetic object as information. Because each individual’s perception of the art object is different. It is necessary to have the ability to think freely while purchasing art objects. The more universal we think, the more original interpretations we will have and the more different ideas we will have.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE RELATIONSHIP ART AND FREEDOM

In the event of knowing, the being of consciousness that perceives and comprehends is called the “I”, and the being perceived and grasped is called the “object”. The subject related to knowledge is called “knowledge subject” (Tunalı, 2012: 23). Aesthetic subject means “I”, the consciousness entity that perceives an aesthetic object, grasps it, enjoys it aesthetically, and feels aesthetic pleasure from it. An aesthetic object, whether it is a poem, a musical composition, a sculpture or a structure, is an object with certain qualities and characteristics. Existing ones with certain characteristics and qualities are gathered under a certain idiom, a certain concept, and this is called an aesthetic object or work of art (Tunalı, 2011: 54).

As a stimulant, painting gives movement to our aesthetic feelings and aesthetic concerns. If a painting can create aesthetic anxiety in its buyer, it is an aesthetic object (Erinç, 2016: 54).

*Aesthetic reception* an art object *clutch*, *evaluation* and *is to understand* we defined. We can define aesthetic reception in painting art with these concepts. Because we cannot evaluate an art object without first grasping it and then we cannot understand it. We can perceive an art object from various angles. In order for a painting and/or painting to be an art object, a painting work on paper, not on canvas, is also an art object. Therefore, it is necessary to understand what art is.

There are similarities and differences between art and craft. If we need to talk about them; The artist is far from material expectations. The craftsman has financial expectations. The art object is like no other. Craftsmanship, on the other hand, has many similarities. Craftsmen repeat the same product many times, while the craftsman tries to create an original work each time. An artist is born

with talent. The crafter gains this skill later. It can be as the material of art and craft. A sculptor and a mason deal with similar materials. The purpose of art is to create a sense of beauty, which is called aesthetics, to respond to the needs of the craft and to be useful. The art and craftsman's creation or how he wants to perform his art depends on his own free will and is his own choice. Kant, who was the first to express the separation of aesthetics from "craft" in philosophical terms for the first time, thought that he showed the autonomous one on which art would depend, by revealing the riddle in the principle of judgment. Kant did this by pointing out the possibility of an ability from which the phenomenon he is subject to can be derived from, based on the principle that no direct deduction can be made for the sense of pleasure and unpleasantness from concepts (Bal, 2011: 73).

The decline in craftsmanship with the decline of the industrial revolution, the birth of a new middle class devoid of tradition, the emergence of a lot of crude and cheap products under the word art, led to a decline in the appreciation of the society (Gormbrich, 1997: 502).

Art is one of the many expressions of the unique genius, which drives mankind to repeat the creative act of the Creator in everything he does, and perhaps the most specific, and human beings thus tend to transcend themselves for centuries (Bazin, 2015: 15). The beginning of art dates back to ancient times. Especially the Paleolithic period (chipped stone period) and Neolithic period (stone age) are important for the history of art and painting.

Painting is one of the branches of art that philosophers talk about the most in philosophy of art and aesthetics. For example, according to Plato, the art of painting *mimesis* According to Aristotle, most of the arts of painting, epos, tragedy, comedy, dithrambos poetry, flute and kithara are generally imitation (Aristotle, 2012: 11). The question of what painting and painting art is and whether it is an element of imitation, as a question of meaning, is in question not only in the relationship between painting and painter, but also in the relationship of anyone who takes an aesthetic attitude towards painting. Therefore, the question should be put forward and examined in all its generality (Soykan, 2015: 252).

The relationship between painting and freedom manifests itself in the main forms of freedom. These; freedom of thought, freedom of creation, freedom of choice, freedom of the creator and freedom of expression in painting. These forms of freedom reveal how we reflect ourselves in our works.

In the art of painting, the styles and styles of the painters started as a tradition and continued, and this tradition opened a way for freedom to the new ages. For example, Picasso reflected his own style by using and abstracting human figures, and other painters were influenced by this style and continued this tradition freely by using this style. Today, we see the effects of this style in the exhibitions, the effects of the cubist movement and the abstract effects. Cubism is a form of expression of freedom in painting. Cubism brought art the freedom to relinquish the ancient task of projecting reality to a certain degree of directness, to find new ways of expression or new combinations of language to reflect the world from new angles. It has become a subject of analysis especially in the form of portraits and still lifes (Konak, 2016: 299).

It is important to understand and interpret the art of painting. We can interpret the art of painting technically in terms of genre, emotion, movement, period and philosophical. While interpreting the art of painting, we can openly criticize and express our ideas in terms of freedom of thought. Freedom of thought will also take the art of painting to an advanced level. The more we can freely convey our thoughts and perspectives, the more awareness we can create, because universality is important in art.

Another form of freedom in painting is the freedom to create. What is essential in its relationship with other freedoms is the necessity of taking into account the activity of creating the work that determines its norm area and the area that the created work affects (Bingöl, 2011: 118). As mentioned in the previous section, freedom in art depends on actions. The more free and free we are in actions, the more free works we create. The same is true in the art of painting. The act of creation is important in revealing the work of art.

The freedom of the creator, his own freedom with which the creator and the object in front of him relate, and the third is the necessity for others to have the same freedom under the same conditions. Therefore, a work formed in an aesthetic environment is a freedom calling to another freedom, awakening and conscious of freedom in aesthetic taste, in the face of an object. In a work of art, the subjective and psychological state belongs to the artist, and the social situation belongs to the outside world. An artist is also a person who recognizes his own freedom and applies to the freedom of another (Ersoy, 2016: 64).

The act of creating in painting is also related to the designs we exhibit. The more free we are in our works, the more creative works will emerge. For exam-

ple, nudes are one of the main styles of painting. But nowadays it is very difficult for us to create and display nude paintings. In this case, it is a situation that is an obstacle to our freedom to create. Here, there is a case of freedom regarding the issue of gender. However, there are many artists who are devoted to this art style and work on the human figure pattern, which is the basis of the painting. The main names of these artists are İbrahim Çallı and Bedri Rahmi Eyüboğlu.

“Freedom of choice” in painting is important as a form of freedom. When an art lover or consumer goes to an exhibition or auction, they should be able to freely buy the work they want. They are people who constantly follow the consumer art market, collect art works, and try to buy the most special works. The consumer also has the specificity to socialize in the art market and in various arts organizations. The culture consumer is dependent on a feature that likes to proclaim itself and follows the fashion (Lunn, 1995: 159). Adorno highly criticizes this situation, which we call the culture industry. Because there is no opportunity to talk about freedom.

Another free form in painting is freedom of expression. Artists and art lovers should express themselves freely in their art. It is important to be able to express the thought that he reflects in terms of color, form and subject. These concepts enable us to express ourselves in art, especially in painting. Today, artists cannot express themselves adequately due to the prohibitions in art. The more clearly he expresses what is meant to be conveyed, then the artist will be free.

According to Collingwood, the artist’s job is to express emotions; The only emotions he can express are his own emotions. If he attaches the slightest importance to the judgments of his followers, it is because he thinks that the emotions he is trying to express are shared by his followers (Collingwood, 107: 1938). Therefore, it is an important element for the artist to express the work with his emotions.

Art is a tool that seduces the senses and activates the emotions of a whole view of life with acquired experiences (Bingöl, 2011: 99). From the past to the present, even to the 19th century, painting is a medium in general; It either reflects ‘what is’, as Plato said, or ‘what could be’, as Aristotle said. In the Renaissance period, painting reflects the ‘ideal’; that is, the art of painting has to imitate an ‘idea’ that exists before the art phenomenon, which is outside the ‘trivet’ that creates the field of art, and has to reflect that ‘idea’, as in the mirror example. As Plato argued, he says that the art of painting is an imitation (imitation), that

is, an imitation of ideas (Plato, 2011: 344). This is the reason for the painting's existence, and its function is to convey that idea to people in a way that coincides with both content and form (Erinç, 2016: 43-44).

Concepts in painting are an important element to understand painting. Especially *mimesis* concepts such as (imitation), art, creation, design, abstract, and figure. Of these, figurative painting is extremely important. Figurative painting has been the most discussed subject throughout the human figure art history, from the most primitive periods to today's art. The process in which the human figure is best and detailed has reached its zenith with the concept of humanism of the Renaissance (Üner, 2013: 152). Interpreting and examining the art of painting from a conceptual point of view is especially important for freedom of expression.

Later, Indian art and Chinese art, which are the civilizations of the Far East, played an important role. Especially Chinese art is important in the field of painting. Of these, to grasp the aesthetic value of Chinese painting, which, together with its bronze works, best reveals my Chinese perception and thinking; It is one of the products of the best periods in museums and galleries. Although we can't see much of the murals that adorn the palaces of the inns today, we can get an idea from some examples that are copies of them and found in the tombs (Brain, 2015: 533).

In ancient Greece, artists examined the proportions of the human figure and determined the ideal dimensions that should be in an ideal person. Apollo is known as the god of art because it is an essential quality of form and beauty. Monumental male figures are depicted as Apollo in sculptures in Antiquity. The first thing that comes to mind in Greek sculpture art is Polykleitos of Argos. At that time, the artist paid attention to harmony and proportion. These measures, which have preserved their validity by coming up with the discussions until the 20th century, are now fully accepted today (Üner, 2013: 156). These measures have been used a lot by artists and have become a style. Painters freely reflected these measures in their works.

Michelangelo, different and important portrait artists, Rembrandt, Adriaen Van de Velde, Albrecht Dürer are artists who work on figurative painting. In human figure paintings, only the head is depicted as a bodyless portrait. However, the head, chest and knees we see in the works can also be included in the concept of portrait. In portrait works, general proportions were determined based

on the Greek ideal dimensions. Starting from the primitive masks, portrait art has experienced a development process with the personalization of the human figure in Greek and Roman art. However, wooden plaques with portraits of certain individuals have also been found in Egyptian art. The development process of portrait art progressed in the same proportion with the development of figure painting, and increased a richness of style by moving towards Renaissance portraits, Expressionism's expressions wandering at the borders of reality, and geometric expressions of abstract art (Üner, 2013: 172).

Still life, which means inanimate nature, called still life in French "*still lifes*" has passed into our language. They are still pictures in which natural products such as flowers, vegetables and fruits are arranged together with artificial objects such as vases and bowls. Here, nature is pictured frozen for a certain period of time. It preserves its feature of being an experimental field for today's artists and artists deal with this subject by adhering to the traditional form and content of still life (Ünay, 2015: 78). It is a situation where the artists choose the objects they want and create compositions by bringing them together, and the still life setups they use create a space of freedom for the artists. The combination of objects is about the artist's freedom to create. Here, the artist combines the object he wants and creates a composition of inanimate nature.

We see the first still life examples in Ancient Egyptian tombs, Ancient Greek and Roman devar paintings, mosaics, and earthen vases. Roman still lifes depicting food such as slices of bread, eggs, vegetables, fruits, and seafood, as well as water, olive oil and wine in terracotta, glass and metal containers, and flowers and fruits arranged on the table, display realistic and decorative features. Still life began to be exhibited for the first time as a subject at the beginning of the 17th century. The type of painting that deals with images of nature is called landscape. Throughout the history of art, nature images have become one of the indispensable subjects of art production. According to Aristotle, the object of art is nature. Our natural environment has an unlimited wealth of forms and colors. Thus, nature is a rich resource for us to use pictorial elements. The theme of landscape, which has been handled in different styles from the Middle Ages to the present, was primarily used as a complementary element in religious paintings in the 15th century. The use of the landscape as a background continued until the 19th century (Üner, 2013: 180-182). It has been a source of inspiration for later artists.

In Aristotle, painting is an imitation element, as well as an imitation of nature

in landscape (Aristotle, 2012: 11). Nature and its objects are freely imitated by artists. Artists complete what nature leaves missing. Artists either imitate nature as it is or imitate it by stylized it. Beings and situations in nature are not directly considered a work of art, but sometimes a work of art emerges from the processing and arrangement of natural things by the artist. The artist is free here.

The first interior paintings were tried to be explained with symbolic lines and forms as a background in Egyptian, Ancient Greek and Roman paintings. Abstract understanding, which evokes a sense of space, for the first time gained a realistic understanding as a space, as well as taking place in the figure, with the development of perspective in the 14th century. The interior, as the subject of figurative painting, makes itself felt especially in 17th century Dutch paintings. Besides the type of painting known as indoor, outdoor is counted as the type of painting. Vermeer, Adolf von Menzel, Van Gogh are examples of artists working indoors.

Abstract painting is the genre in which the artist feels free in the art of painting. Because abstract painting freely stylises what is wanted to be expressed or the essence of the object by adding its own emotions. When we look at that work, it can reflect color, shape, geometric forms and stains in line with its own freedom.

Since abstract painting does not contain objects of reality, it also does not contain stories and plots; but with the images and associations evoked by abstract forms, it carries meanings that the painter or the viewer will attribute to the forms. Abstract art started to develop for the first time in the 19th century, with the Cubism movement, when a new perspective began to develop outside the traditional understanding of art. Abstract art is a type of painting that is usually described with color, geometric form and stains.

One of the most important developments in abstract art is that Wassily Kandinsky, the famous representative and theorist of contemporary abstract art, developed his thoughts on abstract art. "*On the Spiritual in Art (Sanatta Tinsel Olan Üzerine)*" With his original work, Husserl, the founder of phenomenology, based phenomenology. *Reflections on a Pure Phenomenology* His work was published in the same years (Tunalı, 2013: 133).

There are important artists working on abstract art from the past to the present. Artists such as Burhan Doğançay, Mustafa Ata, Bedri Baykam, Özdemir Altan, Kandinsky, Ben Nicholson are the leading names of abstract art. These

artists exhibited free action in terms of style and style in abstract painting. Today, the styles and styles of these painters are imitated.

According to Soykan, the knowledge of the field of existence in which the art of painting takes place together with other types of art is an ontological (ontological) problem. For us, the homeland of ontology is such fields. It is the human being who creates and knows this field. When it comes to knowing about an object it creates, the distinction between ontic, ontology and epistemology disappears. The creation of the picture and the knowledge of it are two different things. Thus, the painter does not have the right to say that he knows this best (Soykan, 2015: 253-254). It is important for the artist's contribution to the art of painting that he has the best knowledge in the art of painting and creates freely.

In order to be able to talk about a painting art, it, that is, painting, must first have gained knowledge as an aesthetic subject (epistemology). But Erinç *On the Critique of Painting* He says in his book, "Every work of art is an aesthetic object". Interest in every work of art begins with 'liking'. Thus, not every work of art creates aesthetic concern and does not necessarily create it (Erinç, 2016: 54).

The art of painting, which has a very important place in the history of humanity, was used as a communication tool in the cave period. Human beings, who do not have the ability to speak yet, have preferred to express their feelings and what they want to share by making figures on the cave walls. Early humans painted hunting scenes, game animals and the methods they used on the walls of caves, where they lived or sheltered. This may be because of sharing their difficulties with others or for magical purposes, as used by sorcerers who can still be seen in some cultures today. They may have thought that this way they would affect the animals and that they could hunt them more easily. In other words, cave paintings can be considered as a means of expression that reflects the beliefs and fears of early humans. "Without trying to understand the minds of primitive societies; We cannot hope to enter these strange beginnings of art without grasping the experience that leads them to see images not as beautiful things to look at but as objects full of power and use. (Grombrich, 1986: 20). Over time, art has changed in various periods in line with needs and tastes. While it is a document from time to time, it was sometimes produced purely for visual richness. This process starts with cave period paintings and continues with civilizations such as Greek-Egyptian. It can be observed that the aesthetic concerns of the Renaissance and Baroque formed their adventure, which started in Europe with Gothic.

Due to the oppressive attitude of religion and the church in this period, it seems that religion was portrayed only with the orders of the church.

It is possible to mention that there was always a rebellion at the beginning of a movement in the development of painting art during the period. In line with the conditions of the time, the interests of the artists have changed in line with their socio-political approaches. The artist's production can be important in terms of having an idea about the lifestyle and cultural effects of the period. In the modernization process, the artist's perspective on the work has changed and he has tried to get rid of the traditional structure with the help of technology. Along with various art movements, the works have varied throughout history. In terms of materials, besides oily and water-based options, different materials were used on the canvas to create a size difference.

In the Paleolithic period (chipped stone period), he painted or engraved forms in nature with no intention of making a "work of art". The Paleolithic period is a period in which cave art emerged. In this period, the examination of the walls in the cave gained great importance. In order to examine it, we need to have information about these walls. Here, the aesthetic subject is an important element. The figuratif elements described on the cave walls give us the artistic knowledge of that period. At that time, people reflected freedom with the elements they reflected on the wall.

The earliest examples of art date from the first millennium BC of the late paleolithic period. *A wise man* It is the period covered by the long-lasting migration from east to west towards Europe, where the less developed masses replaced them. *A wise man* Examples of the naturalist art of 's incised figures, patterns and paintings have been found in Southwest France and Northern Spain, hence the name "Franco-Cantabrian" (Brain, 2015: 19).

In the first cave culture, animals were freely depicted with only one leg and silhouetted in profile, without going into details, to display both legs (Brain, 2015: 19). To give an example; One of the most famous caves of the Paleolithic period is the Lascaux cave in France. There are multiple animal figures on the walls of this cave. The drawn animal figures were stylized and reflected on the wall. When we look at the wall, we do not understand that the animal figures are clearly animals, but we understand that they are animals in an abstract way. Here we see the freedom to create clearly.

We see in detail the distinctive effects of painting in the Paleolithic peri-

od. Cave walls are a branch that needs to be studied for the art of painting. In order to study a cave painting in the Paleolithic period, we need various painting concepts. These are primarily types of painting. Types of painting; portrait, figurative painting, still life (inanimate nature), landscape (landscape), abstract painting and interior. Secondly, it is necessary to examine the raw materials and principles of design. Raw materials of the design; color, tone, form, direction, texture and line. The principles of design are; balance, integrity, emphasis, visual continuity, proportion-proportion.

When cave walls are first studied as a type of painting, they are usually figurative (human-animal) elements. So we often see pictures of animals. We see the effect of abstract painting as the type of second painting. We see the abstracted, stylized form of the figurative elements on the walls. As the raw material and principle of the design, the cave walls are examined in terms of color, that is, gradient. The tonal effect of the colors on the cave walls highly reflects light and shadow. It is also examined as a whole.

In the early days of the Neolithic period, some branches of art emerged and developed well. These, the art and technique of ceramics, developed rapidly with the invention of the potter's wheel, and the development of agriculture also contributed to this development. BC In the sixth millennium BC, an orderly urban society with a well-developed fired brick and pottery industry emerged in the Jericho settlement (Brain, 2015: 24).

Early naturalistic art, though outlived in Africa and Scandinavia, ended with the Azil phase in the Franco-Cantabrian region during the Mesolithic period (10000 BC). The painted pebbles in the great Mas-d'Azil cave are evidence of an art that persisted throughout the Neolithic and tended towards the abstract (Brain, 2015: 24).

After the Paleolithic and Neolithic periods, the use of materials varies in the preliminary history. The emergence of tools and equipment in the prehistory and their use gained importance. The greatest event of the techniques developed by mankind is the discovery and use of metals. After learning how to get gold and silver, and later copper, raw, these metals were hammered before man discovered the art of casting. The discovery of the properties of the tin mixture in forming alloys made it easier to harden copper and enabled it to be used in industry as an alloy of this metal, brass and bronze (Brain, 2015: 25).

Paleolithic and Neolithic periods are also a subject. The cave period and the

stone age period are extremely important in terms of information. Wall paintings of the cave period give us information about that period. It is an element of knowledge in terms of materials, raw materials and principles, especially with the reasons for its construction.

Bronze and iron civilizations of prehistory spread over a large area and especially in Italy, Spain, Gaul, the British islands, Central and Northern Europe, Scandinavia, the Urals and the Altai mountain region. Some sculptures were found in this period, and it mostly shows itself in objects used in daily life such as kiln-fired pots, gold vases and jewelry (Brain, 2015: 26).

While the Mediterranean and Asian races found an endless source of inspiration for the plastic arts in nature itself, the peoples of Central and Northern Europe seem to have taken great pleasure in abstraction. The ornaments on the weapons and pottery of these peoples cannot develop from some sign that does not enliven tangible beings. The sacred bull horns, the double ax symbolizing thunder, the sun disk and its variants, the wheel spur, the spiral and double helix, the swastika and the symmetrical cross are examples of this. Horse head and swan are also sun symbols (Brain, 2015: 26).

Mankind made the first great effort to get rid of the dependence on nature in the Mediterranean region. He significantly expanded both his practical and intellectual development by establishing systems of politics, religion, culture, industry, and commerce. It is necessary to distinguish three great cultural centers that emerged after the fourth millennium BC. These three centers are Nile Valley, Mesopotamia (Tigris and Euphrates basins) and Aegean (Brain, 2015: 27). The important civilizations of that period are the Sumerians, Akkadians, Babylonians, Persians and Assyrians. The works of art of these civilizations, as aesthetic subjects, give us information about how the works of art of that period were.

The artists of the first civilizations could not think of beings in three dimensions. Depth theory was alien to perspective thinking. While some entities were animated as flat, others were scaled down according to the profile composition, and the composition was performed according to a spiritual hierarchy that did not take into account the relative size of the entities (Brain, 2015: 30). At that time, apart from these theories, there was a freer creativity. For example, in terms of color and shape, thoughts outside a specific plan and outside the theoretical angle were more original. At that time, the Egyptian relief technique is reminiscent of the incised depictions in caves, and in both cases the painting was used

only as an adjunct to the engraved outlines before it became a stand-alone art. These techniques have been an example from those times until today. The importance of painting continues in Ancient Greece, one of the Classical Civilizations of the Mediterranean. The fragmented specimens reached at that time help to reconstruct the history of Greek sculpture, which had many gaps. On the one hand, some pictorial works of the later corrupt period found in Pompeii, Delos and Rome have been lost. When ceramic vases are examined, it is understood that the art of painting had been stripped of its primitive restrictions and sculpture much earlier, and this led to regret that the great works in the field of painting had disappeared (Brain, 2015: 115). Later, Gothic art gained great importance. In Gothic art, the art of color is extremely important. Painting was not as strong as in Italy. This art lagged behind the arts of carpet weaving, colored glass and illumination for a long time and developed only in the second half of the fourteenth century. He produced very beautiful works of Parisian style; but few examples of these have been reflected to the present day (Brain, 2015: 213). Gothic art is a freer type of art that is slightly different from other art types. Italy presented a new style to the whole world in the art of painting. Under the influence of a new naturalist and humanist understanding pioneered by St. Francescod Assisi, a national school was liberated from the yoke of Byzantine art towards 1250 (Brain, 2015: 228). At that time, the art of painting had gained a different direction.

In the sixteenth century, important developments were experienced in the art of the Renaissance in Europe. The painter who is considered to be the initiator of Renaissance painting is Masaccio. The artist, who carefully attaches importance to the natural environment and the placement of figures in this environment and their forms, knew how to create a natural and human atmosphere with a linear approach, which is the natural attitude of Renaissance painting (Beksaç, 2000: 33).

The aesthetics of the late renaissance period, in particular, were introduced by many great artists in the first third of the sixteenth century. Leonardo da Vinci, born in 1452 and the veteran and elder of these artists, is one of the greatest geniuses of the Renaissance. He was nevertheless a Quattrocento artist because of his investigative mind and scientific genius. Other important artists, Raphael, Michelangelo, Giorgione and Tiziano, whose birth years are close to each other, were all from the same period (Brain, 2015: 319). Leonardo da Vinci painted very few paintings that later fell into disrepair because of his research on the

chemistry of colors. Leonardo completed his fifteenth-century research on the human body, but he also placed great emphasis on adding to it his discoveries in psychology. The final meal was a systematic examination of individual differences in expression; Mona Lisa, on the other hand, was intended to reveal the secrets of spiritual life. Leaving aside the harsh lines of the still striking Quattrocento sculpture-like painting in the Virgin of the Rocks, Leonardo turned to express the softness of the skin by hiding the luminous and fluid vibrations of the environment and the display of the model with the shadow and light technique called sfumato (Brain, 2015: 320). In these periods, the principles and raw materials of design became a very important element. Each artist expressed himself freely.

Raphael gave definitive form to the ideal of harmony (harmony) to which Italian art had been oriented for two centuries. He became a student of Il Perugino, where he made his first paintings (The Marriage of Mary or Sposalizio, Milan, 1504). His artist was less successful in his religious works, and this was the result of the systematic idealization of figures, resulting in a cold and dull art (Brain, 2015: 322).

In the work, where the effects of Leonardo da Vinci are felt, the different attitude of the artist in terms of color use and organization is immediately noticed. The painter, who also painted other famous contemporaries in the work, which also includes Raphael's self-portrait, fused the past with his time in this way. Raffaello also made many portraits, and these works constitute an important part of his productivity (Beksaç, 2000: 34-35). Raffaello freely practiced his art by using imitation in his portrait works. Today's artists take his work as an example and use it in their own works. Therefore, the element of imitation is seen as an act that prevents freedom for this period.

Michelangelo made important productions as a famous painter as well as his sculpture. The works, which are dominated by figures that give a significant sculptural image with the experience of his sculpture, are news of Manierism beyond the High Renaissance. The "Holy Family", also known as Tonto Doni, made around 1504 with oil painting technique, was made due to a marriage and shows a religious theme (Beksaç, 2000: 35).

Apart from these painters, artists operating in different regions of Italy were also active in the development of Renaissance Painting. Among them, Piero della Francesca drew attention with the importance he gave to perspective, while

Antonella da Messina became a bridge with Flemish painting circles (Beksaç, 2000: 35).

Albrecht Dürer is also an important Renaissance artist. The artist is a master engraver (metal printing) artist. He successfully reflected the art of engraving. In his engraving known as “The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse” in 1498, it is seen that the painter, who lived in one of the most difficult periods in Europe, reflects the belief and thought of his period in an allegorical manner (Beksaç, 2000: 48).

In the Baroque period, the painting of Italy, which was weakened after an unprecedented three-hundred-year period of creation, entered a period of decline after the Mannerist depression, which we can say that reveals the most typical representatives of the Florentine school with Vasari, Salviati, Zuccaro and Allori. Three painters of the Carracci family, who opposed this collapse, established an academy in 1595. This initiative resulted in the establishment of a school of fine arts, which aimed to return to the traditional rules of art by teaching the methods of the great masters, addressing the qualities in which each of Raphael, Titian, Michelangelo and Correggio showed their greatest competence. Thus the Carraccis created a kind of plastic “rhetoric” which they applied equally freely to religious painting as they did to mythological subjects.

At that time, Rembrandt enriched his deep understanding of nature with character-catching observations. He found a unique, materialized dye. This paint was not an elegant, light substance like Rubens’ substance. More believable was the truth, the soul, the substance itself. This paint situation is in question in his self-portraits (Turani, 2013: 476). At that time, Rembrandt reflected his works by exhibiting an imitative attitude in his portrait works.

In a country where the Inquisition was omnipotent, painting was almost completely monopolized by the Church. Palace paintings were not called much, but mythological paintings were scarce and landscapes were not encountered at all (Brain, 2015: 389).

Diega Velazquez, who grew up in Seville, made still life (inanimate nature) works and religious paintings related to culinary images during his first creative period. He never lost sight of Christianity, the imperfect understanding of human nature, which led him to take fools and sickness as models, and satirically approached mythology, which he ridiculed by creating crude forms like Los Borrachos or Vulcan’s Forge. In 1623 he was appointed chief painter of the Royal

family, and the following year he traveled to Italy, where he recognized Venetian painting, which helped him to reveal his original Caravaggiovarian style. In 1649 he made a second trip to Italy. The school's sculptor and iron abandoned its sharp viewing attitude and gave up trying to show the individuality of the forms with clear outlines and started painting with bright paint blots that reveal the vague lights that almost flow over bodies and objects (Brain, 2015: 391-392). The main thing here is to imitate the figurative elements and reflect them with all their realism.

It was active in France in the nineteenth century and was called a depression at that time. Apart from the general bankruptcy of art, only the art of painting could save itself. The reason is that although painting allows for personal expression, architecture and sculpture are basically public and social arts (Brain, 2015: 463).

Considering the number of painters, it can be said that there was an abundance of schools in the field of painting in Europe in the nineteenth century. Romanticism, let alone England, failed to find its distinctive form, and in the first half of the century, classicism was seen to be slowly disappearing. In the second half, a gloomy reality prevailed, the effects of which were hardly removed by the half-hearted adoption of impressionism at the end of the century (Brain, 2015: 481-482).

The movements that emerged and played an important role in contemporary art; They are movements such as Impressionism, Cubism, Expressionism, Purism, Futurism, Surrealism, De Stijl, Constructuralism, Pop art, Op art. In the emergence of all these movements, there was an act of the artist to reveal and reveal himself freely.

Impressionism was a naturalism. Naturalism was not an objective naturalism based on a mechanical imitation of nature, on the contrary, it was a subjective naturalism based on a sensory understanding of nature (Tunali, 2013: 121).

Art enters into an understanding that shifts from naturalism to abstract in the age we live in. In this transition period, Cezanne takes on the role of intermediary. This task, Cezanne, means determining the nature of all new art and its picture of the universe. Until the middle of the 20th century, all artistic understandings are developing in relation to the universe painting. Cezanne takes the starting point not only from Fauves and Matisse, but also from cubism (Tunali, 2013: 123). According to Merleau Ponty, "Influenced by the Impressionists

and Picasso, Cezanne does not see painting as the representation of imagined scenes or the expression of dreams, but the study of what manifests. The world of Cezanne, who rejects the art of perspective, depicts a scene where the subject, not the object, is thrown into the world, and it is an inhuman world, an alien world. Therefore, alienation reveals the inhuman nature in which man is placed” (Ponty, 1947: 15-51).

The gallerist Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, who played a major role in the spread of Cubist art, defines cubism as follows: “Just as Gil Blas critic Louis Vauxcelles came up with the names *Avangarde* and ‘*le fauves*’ in 1904-1905, he also gave the name of cubism to this art movement in a negative sense.” (Tunalı, 2013: 164). Cubism emerged as a revolutionary movement in 20th century art. This revolutionary movement takes place mostly in Latin Europe. Cubism developed in the first decade of the 20th century as a great contribution of the Latin genius to the spirit of the age, with the creation of a new form of painting. Cubism continues in parallel with German expressionism (Tunalı, 2013: 164). The painter Georges Braque, who played an important role in the establishment of Cubism, played a great role in the development of the movement. However, the most popular artist of the movement was Pablo Picasso.

Picasso often used geometric forms in his works. It refers to objects that have been purified from empirical reality and the shapes we see in reality, and geometric forms have been inserted. When Picasso looked at the objects, he painted the objects in such a form because he perceived the objects in such geometrical forms as an abstract-intellectual object of knowledge. Thus, Picasso paints an object of knowledge (epistemology) (Tunalı, 2013: 144). Since Picasso painted figures by abstracting them with geometric forms and did not use any other style, he performed an unemancipated action. Picasso’s tradition continues effectively today. Picasso wanted to portray reality by grasping the structural dynamism in which the points of view were brought together, not by perceiving the reality from a fixed perspective scene connected to a certain point of view (Haşlakoğlu, 2015: 111).

Expressionism, like cubism, does not move from external reality, but from the ‘me’ world, the inner world of the subject. There is a fluent expression in Expressionism. In Cubism, on the other hand, there is a rigid and legal commitment (Tunalı, 2013: 166).

The “*Stijl*” understanding of art is formed around the magazine “*De Stijl*”

(Neoplastic Movement) and brings with it a new art view and aesthetics. Art view and aesthetics, above all, are based on a new understanding of form. Representatives of this understanding are Theo van Doesburg, Piet Mondrian and Van der Leek (Tunalı, 2013: 178).

The understanding of art based on anti-naturalism and abstract art and the aesthetic it brings is called “neo-plasticism”. Towards 1916, Doesburg began to introduce the forms of nature, the signs of the natural pattern, into geometry by transforming them into the example of horizontal and vertical rectangles that are closely adjacent to each other. Three artists come together in a working community. J.J.P. Together with architects such as Oud, Wils, van’t Hoff and sculptors such as Georges van Tongerloo, they formed the De Stijl Group in 1917. They published a journal in October of each month. Within this group, it can be said that Doesburg and Mondrian have the biggest share in the recognition and realization of the ‘stijl’ understanding of art and aesthetics, both with their works of art and their books on the theories of their art (Tunalı, 2013: 178).

Futurism (futurism) The Futurist movement, founded by the poet Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, became active in 1908. At that time, there was an abstract understanding. Giacomo Balla, who dealt with the problem of light and color and found the technique of partitioning, the theorist and painter Umberto Boccioni, who is known for his main works of movement and Futurist expression technique, Carlo Carra, who combines cubism and Futurism with his plastic dynamism, and Luigi Russolo are the leading artists (Beksaç, 2000: 123).

Surrealism (surrealism), which is important in contemporary art, takes its thought and artistic heritage from Dadaism. Surrealist painting was active in France and spread to other countries from Paris. The surrealist influence was fused into the national art tradition of, for example, Pierre Roy, Yves Tanguy, Felix Labisse in France, Finili in England, William Blake. We can give the examples of Giorgio Chirico and his brother Albato Savinio in Italy, Picasso, Joan Miro and Salvador Dali in Spain (Tunalı, 2013: 210).

Postmodernism is not a certain art style, it is also a philosophy, an avant-garde philosophy. But its avant-garde character is not based, for example, on the categories of surrealist avant-garde such as the absurd, chance, and dream categories. On the contrary, post-modernism includes a cultural entity ranging from science to philosophy, from art to industry, with its impact and spread dimensions (Tunalı, 2013: 212).

Art, impoverished by modernity, now surpasses the one-dimensionality of modernity and enriches it with new openings in postmodernity. For example, “pop-art” led by Rauschenberg and Ducham, which initially understood painting as works of glued paper or used pieces of everyday items, industrial waste; “op-art”, which also geometricizes everyday impressions, “happening”, whose representatives are Berlew and Vasarely, which understands art as “participation in reality”; “action painting”, which is understood as a kind of expressionism, and which interprets the painting as random forms by transferring the paint randomly on the canvas with hard and continuous brush strokes and pioneered by Jackson Pollock (Tunalı, 2013: 214). The random use of brush strokes is equivalent to the artist’s feeling of freedom.

Popart and videoart are concrete examples of this. Polyphony and freedom mean a person’s rediscovery of something. Whereas in modernity, not the free creations of the individual, but the laws of reason and geometry dominate, postmodernity is directed towards the individual and the free creations of the individual. There are differences between individuals in comprehension depending on the sensitivity of the individual (Tunalı, 2013: 214).

Minimalism (Simplification), which emerged in the early 1960s, found its real material after 1964. This trend, which does not attach importance to symbols and tends towards artlessness, has tended to develop a neutral taste. Parallel to the importance of geometric forms, he attaches importance to matter and color in simplifying the usual form (Beksaç, 2000: 139). Minimalists, who aim to be pure in the use of color and form, focused on the use of industrial materials with simple volumes and geometric shapes (Beksaç, 2000: 139).

Conceptual Art, which emerged in the mid-1960s and lasted for many years, is determined by its attitude that prioritizes thought over material facts. Conceptual art is an informational art movement that focuses on conceptual ideas (Beksaç, 2000: 140).

We see the reflections of these movements in today’s painters. Among the famous and successful painters are painters such as Burhan Doğançay, Devrim Erbil, Bedri Rahmi Eyüboğlu, Özdemir Altan, Ergin İnan, Şükrü Erdiren. These painters are important people for the art of painting. They successfully reflected the types of painting, the effects of the period, color, form, direction and balance elements on their work.

The styles and styles of the painters in their works are different from each

other. They reflected the portrait, figurative, still life, landscape, interior and abstract painting styles in the painting genres. For example, Burhan Doğançay and Özdemir Altan worked on abstract painting using oil paints. Ergin Inan has works on oil painting and printmaking. Sukru Erdiren; He worked mainly on still life (inanimate nature), portrait and landscape and military themes. The styles of these artists have always progressed in the same way. When we see those works, we can say that this is an artist.

From these works, we get technical information about the style of abstract art as the “aesthetic subject”, what style the artists work in the works. He exhibited a libertarian attitude in the styles that the artists reflected in their works.

### **3.1 Artist and Freedom Relationship**

As an artist, the aesthetic subject grasps the painting with its material and technique, and creates it with his feelings and thoughts. At the same time, the artist is someone who receives and has a view of freedom. Throughout history, the concept of the artist has always existed as long as “art” as an action has revealed and maintained its existence. “How is art seen from the perspective of the artist?” is a question that includes the view that art cannot be independent of the artist. The creative activity of the artist reveals the individuality of the artist on the one hand and the social existence on the other. The artist sometimes remained loyal to the society he was in and produced by being influenced by religion, sometimes by wars affecting large parts of the world’s societies, sometimes by natural disasters, by science, and sometimes by psychological and more personal motives (Eroğlu, 2013: 100). In the history of humanity, especially since the industrial age, artists have tried to destroy certain beauty patterns, traditions and techniques and direct art to new horizons. In the emergence of art movements, there is an effort of the artist to reveal himself freely. The meaning of art can first be created with freedom and creativity (Bingöl, 2011: 95-96).

There are different approaches and experiences in the periods of history in terms of the position of the artist and the free expression of art as a form of action. For example, works of art in the Middle Ages often promoted the ideological interests of the church or popular forces that commissioned the artists. As in the Middle Ages, the aims of artists living under the pressure and yoke of religious discourse on the one hand and political conditions on the other and those who patronized them were mixed. XVI, when the Middle Ages closed but

a new understanding opened its doors. From the beginning of the 19th century, especially during the Renaissance, these influences manifest themselves in different forms of creation. Although some artists have a personal reputation, even the most famous of these artists sometimes had to use their talents to design political accessories such as heraldry, clothing and armor for their benefactors (Clark, 2017: 15). By compulsively designing these accessories, their freedom is restricted, because design is a situation in which the artist moves freely, that is, creates, thinks and acts freely. However, the periods of history could not bear witness to an era in which the artist was only in the act of creating freely.

It is also important that the artist is free in style. Every artist has their own style. We also see this in exhibitions today. For example, when we examine Devrim Erbil's works, we can understand that that work belongs to Devrim Erbil, because the line and abstraction style he uses in each of his works is the same. Another example is the famous artist Bedri Baykam. When we look at Bedri Baykam's works, we see similar abstract compositions. As it can be understood from here, each artist has his own style. Therefore, the artist is free in terms of the style he uses and is the form of freedom he prefers.

In this context, it would be a more accurate definition to say that the real freedom for the artist is "authenticity" in his act of creation. At first glance, it can be said that being original means "not being like anyone else". The original person reflects his own personal ideas, thoughts and actions in line with his own will, purpose and means. The original artist, on the other hand, paints "freely" with elements such as the technique, color and material he prefers in his works. The work that the artist paints based on his free choices is unique as it will not resemble the one that any other artist reflects. In this case, originality, although at first glance seems to be limited to the artist subject, who reveals the act of creating, in fact, it also points to the original existence and act of creation of another artist.

The problematic of the artist's freedom and originality has been discussed in the context of "imitation theory" in the history of aesthetics. The success of artistic creation was called the success of imitation until modern painting and painting techniques emerged. According to Shiner, the problem of authenticity and imitation in art can be grouped under two major headings: imitation of nature and imitation of great predecessors. The artist was free to imitate conventional models, free from the restrictions placed on fantasy, and indeed free from imitating nature exactly (Shiner, 2013: 161).

The more original and free the artist is in his works, the more free he feels, and he creates original works as long as he reflects his originality to his works. Therefore, we can say that it is a prerequisite for the artist to be free-spirited in order to be original. The artist should reflect both the freedom of thought and the freedom of creation to his work. While we can evaluate the link between the freedom of the artist and his originality as a prerequisite, we can also see the freedom of the artist as the result of his originality. The artist freely prefers the important elements of painting such as the technique, composition, line, toning, light and shading he uses, and reflects them with originality in his works. Moreover, the artist has the freedom to imitate in his works. In this way, the freedom of the artist is so wide that the artist can construct his originality by competently imitating previously revealed artistic creation objects, in line with his own choice.

We cannot say that the relation we have just established within the framework of the freedom-originality-reflection relationship of the artist in general, and the painting artist in particular in the context of this section, can be put forward as universally valid in all painting genres. Today, the freedom of the artist is restricted, especially as the “nude” painting, which is a painting genre, is gradually decreasing among the painting genres. In the past, the “nude” painting genre was one of the themes that we encountered in various exhibition areas, studied at schools and most often used by artists in their works. Today, collaboration with artists who have been removed from the exhibition areas and working on nude painting has become an undesirable situation. He devoted himself to this type of painting and while it was a situation that the artist adopted as his own painting style, it has become a prohibited and not preferred painting genre. Therefore, the artist’s freedom of creation and freedom of choice were taken away from him.

The artist’s non-compliance with today’s painting fashion is another obstacle that emerges on the basis of the artist’s freedom of creation and freedom of choice. Since the works of the artist do not comply with today’s fashion, it is in question that he cannot use color, material, period, technique as he wishes. Today’s fashion and whichever type of painting is in demand, attention is paid to it. Therefore, the artist will have difficulty in preserving his originality in the face of the popular concerns of the social life he lives in, and he loses his freedom to follow the general norms accepted in the society. Artists attend exhibitions, fairs or auctions, etc., where artistic creation becomes public. not invited because of these problems. Artists who produce works in unpopular types of painting are

forced to change the type of painting they prefer. Thus, an artist working in the aforementioned nude painting or imitation of nature changes his style and begins to work in modern painting. For example, the most preferred painting type today is abstract paintings. It is the social determinacy of the preferences of the receiver that determines the artist in terms of his preferences. In other words, the artist has become invaluable in terms of his originality in terms of the individual who will realize the aesthetic reception and has succumbed to the tools of social/mass taste.

As mentioned at the beginning of the section on the relationship between painting and freedom, comprehension, that is, receiving, comprehending and evaluating a work is important in these respects. The artist also buys, comprehends and evaluates a work. The artist's reception of a work first begins with the choice of subject and material. After receiving the subject, he decides on the material and determines in which technique he will work on that work. While grasping the work, he/she examines the object or theme he/she will paint and grasps it in detail. For example, if it is a portrait that he will paint, that human face should be examined in detail. After this decision phase, he starts to paint after evaluating the subject he will paint. These stages help the artist to receive the picture. It allows the artist to see better. Therefore, the artist is initially free to receive, comprehend and evaluate. However, since the evaluation of the artist's originality is made by others, the general aesthetic evaluation trend of the art type, which is in demand by the society, does not show that the individual freedom of the artist is realized at the same rate in public. So much so that the artist is torn between what he wants to reveal freely and what he puts into the field of public appreciation.

Where the artist exhibits his works is his individual freedom. Artists usually present their works to art lovers by arranging openings in exhibitions, fairs, art centers and paying high prices. Some artists, on the other hand, prefer to exhibit their works in nature outside of art centers. Some artists refuse to exhibit their works in closed centers, especially at high prices. This is related to the actions of the artists to rebel against those who demand high prices for arranging works. Therefore, the artist is free to decide where to exhibit.

The forms of freedom play an important role in the relationship between the artist and freedom. Freedom of thought, individual freedom, freedom of creation, freedom of choice are the conditions that affect the freedom of the artist in terms of art.

### **3.2. Art Critic and Freedom Relationship**

Art critic, who is an aesthetic subject, is a person who looks at objects with a critical eye, like an art lover. Art objects have a value in the eyes of the art critic. He attributes an aesthetic value to these objects and makes an aesthetic judgment. In order to be able to talk about art and art criticism, it is necessary to know and understand the modernity that took effect and started in the 16th century, and to wait for the 18th century, when modernism, the cultural result of modernity, came to the fore. In the 18th century, concepts such as art and criticism were also redefined or shaped (Balci, 2013: 8-9). To define it briefly, criticism is the method of reason and the legal ground of knowledge is built on criticism. Art criticism has been influential throughout all ages. Renaissance, which started to be effective in the ancient period, continued in the 18th century.

The aim of art criticism is to show the possibilities and possibilities of the transition between the viewer and the work of art, and to suggest methods on how to take that path for the viewer. But how can the critic take that path for the audience, on his behalf? Art criticism should be able to intuit how to proceed on that path and explain different ways of seeing and perceiving (Balci, 2013: 18). In other words, it should adopt the stages and stages of reception, comprehension and evaluation, that is, cognition, which are frequently mentioned in the study.

The question of how an art critic should be has been discussed since the past. First of all, an art critic should basically learn the knowledge in different fields, compare each knowledge he has learned with his previous knowledge, establish links between them, transform them and reach a meaningful whole by acting on contradictions (Balci, 2013: 19). It is important which art object and type of painting an art critic criticizes, because he should talk about the important elements that need to be emphasized through the object he criticizes. If an art critic criticizes a painting, he must first say what type of painting it has. Then, it is necessary to criticize with elements such as who the work belongs to, in which period it was performed, what technique it used, how it feels to care, how it is examined in terms of aesthetics. An art critic can only describe a painting to art lovers with such details and make them understand.

Art critic can freely judge works of art. While interpreting the art of painting or a work, it can bring various judgments to art lovers to make them understand. These; beautiful, pleasant, harmony, ugly judgments. Here, the art lover should

freely express even a work that he does not like, using these judgments sincerely. Only he can make such a true judgment about a work.

An art critic must know the history of art very well. Because, knowledge of art history is important in order to understand art, to be able to comment on it, to give information about the period of the art object. In addition to this, it is necessary to follow scientific developments and to have knowledge in many different disciplines and subjects such as history, sociology, economics, psychology, anthropology and philosophy. It is not necessary to limit only the studies related to their field. Thus, productions in different fields of art are affected by each other (Balci, 2013: 19).

The critic has a way of perceiving and comprehending objects and facts. The common denominator is the paradigm that it shares with other people and within a certain environment. As the critic performs his/her work within that paradigm, he/she can perceive and interpret the art object only within this framework (Balci, 2013: 19).

As mentioned in the reception section of the study, an art critic must perceive the art object, that is, receive, comprehend and evaluate it. These stages are important in order to be able to talk or give information about an art object. For example, in the criticism of a painting art, if that work is a portrait, it is important for basic stages such as who made that portrait, in which period, what technique was used, and the critic's conceptual point of view and evaluation, because if the critic has this information, he can receive that work. The art critic should also have the characteristics and qualities that the artist should have, so that he should be able to accurately and completely reflect the distinctive qualities of other individuals.

Another feature of the art critic is that he is too intertwined with the artist who will organize the exhibition. The critic should tend to know the artist. Knowing the artist's life, character, concerns and goals is necessary to understand the art object. But there are also negative aspects to this situation. These affinities may bring with it the danger of turning the critique away from an objective evaluation of the art object. Thus, the critic has to maintain his critical distance with the artist (Balci, 2013: 21).

The critic must constantly read. When it comes to reading, it should not only shift itself to the field of criticism, but also to other fields. For the critic, only the dictionary of plastic arts (painting, sculpture, ceramics) is not enough to be

a painting critic (Eroğlu, 2013: 120). Other types also require knowledge. The more multidisciplinary, the more comparatively he can think and convey.

The art critic combines his knowledge of what and how he will look with his method of looking for aesthetic judgment. Art critics have used different types of criticism while criticizing. When it comes to criticism in Turkey, the first work that comes to mind is Berna Moran's well-known and primarily literary reference work. *Literary Theories and Criticism* is his work. There are types of art criticism that Moran uses and focuses on while criticizing. These; "*Criticism towards the outside world and society, criticism towards the artist, criticism towards the reader and criticism towards the work*" (Balcı, 2013: 25).

By Sitki Erinç *On Painting Criticism* His book is one of the important works for art criticism. Erinç, on the other hand, examined different criticism titles such as Moran. These; Criticism that uses the official as a tool, the criticism that uses the picture as a goal, the criticism that separates the picture into its elements, the criticism that thinks the picture as a whole, the criticism that deals with the picture within its own ontic structure, and the criticism that takes the picture within its own group.

Terry Barrett, another critic *Criticizing the Art* He used different types of criticism in his book. These are modernist aesthetics and criticism, postmodernist aesthetics and criticism, Marxist criticism, psychoanalytic criticism, multicultural aesthetics and criticism. Edmund Feldman, understanding of art criticism is important. Feldman analyzed art criticism in four elements. These are academic criticism, print criticism, popular criticism and pedagogical criticism.

Kaya Özsezgin is the art critic who is the most correct art critic in Turkey. He received the art institution art writer award in 1989 and the 7th Istanbul Art Fair art critic award in 1995. Özsezgin has works in which he criticizes important painters. One of Özsezgin's important works *The Local Version of Contemporary Bedri Rahmi Eyüboğlu* Stop. In this work, he examined Bedri Rahmi Eyüboğlu and his works and successfully reflected his art critic. At the same time, he continued his art critic by making opening speeches at various exhibition openings and art fairs. On the one hand, he gave art history lectures at universities and made academic criticisms at the openings and in his books. As we can see, many art critics criticize from different angles and types. This is the ability of critics to criticize freely and to think freely from different angles.

Two types of criticism that art critics focus on and especially examine are

important. It is academic criticism and popular criticism. Today, these two types of criticism are frequently used. Academic criticism is used by people who have received an art education, while popular criticism is used by people who have not received an art education. To briefly explain the forms of academic and popular criticism, academic criticism is the type of criticism that explains the informational aspect of the painting with elements such as color, material, aesthetics, emotion, judgment, and popular criticism is a type of criticism made in terms of emotion and thought because he did not receive any art education. Thus, the person's choice and freedom depends on which type of criticism he will use.

Another important issue about art criticism is whether the aesthetic object mentioned in the subject can be received or not when we read the articles of art criticism. As it is understood from the problematic, it is not enough to just read the articles of art criticism, it is necessary to receive, comprehend and evaluate it while reading. Knowledge of art may be needed to read art reviews. If it is an art criticism article that is explained conceptually, it is also necessary to research about the concepts.

An art critic must have a good grasp of aesthetic analysis in order to criticize art. For art critics, criticizing the art of painting in terms of aesthetic subject, object, value and judgment helps individuals to grasp that object well. When the art critic leaves this analysis, that is, when he criticizes from the other conceptual point of view, he uses his freedom of choice.

Another problematic is the freedom of the art critic to write. Today, we see art critics who write about and criticize exhibitions in magazines and newspapers. Art critics cannot freely write about every type of painting. Criticisms about nude painting, which are increasingly banned nowadays, are not published much. This situation pushes the art critic to write about other painting genres. Since nude painting did not attract attention and was banned, art critics generally wrote about other painting genres such as nature, portrait, and abstract painting and criticized them. This freedom taken from the hands of the artists is also a freedom problem for the art critic. The most effective forms of freedom for the art critic are the freedom of thought and expression.

### **3.3. Art Lover and Freedom Relationship**

As art lovers, aesthetic subjects are people who attach a value to the art of painting and objects and make judgments. Art lover means a person who is happy to relate to art when given the opportunity to enjoy art. For example, when an art lover is invited to any concert or artistic activity, he comes with pleasure. However, it is not concerned with demanding art spontaneously and not when they want it (Private, 2014: 44). Art lover's interest in art is a sincere feeling, art cannot be forced or made to be loved. Being interested in and loving art is the individual's own preferred form of freedom.

The consumer who encounters the work of art is the person who shares the excitement of the artist or painter at the stage of creation. The painter's sharing of his feelings, thoughts and excitement is a situation that gives pleasure to the painter and encourages him more towards art. The interest in the works in the exhibitions is the most important example of this.

It is the artist who creates the art, but it is the art lover and the consumer who keeps it alive. Depending on the consumer's position, sometimes the art lover can sometimes be the subject. In order for the consumer to be a subject, it is important to first interpret the works of art (Private, 2014: 44). Because the art lover can also act as an art critic or comment on the works when appropriate. This situation is related to whether the art lover has an art education or not, and is also related to academic criticism or popular criticism. As mentioned in the section on art critic and freedom, the academic criticism brought by the art lover by receiving an art education criticizes the artwork correctly, but an art lover who has not received an art education can only interpret the work in terms of emotion by bringing a popular criticism. This is a situation related to the choice of the art lover himself. Whether or not to comment on the art-lover's work is related to one's own freedom.

Seeing art by the art lover and the viewer is an important issue, because artists have audiences as well as critics. The viewer's eye will develop in proportion to the pictures he has visited and seen. There are differences between the audience that stays within the national borders and the audience that has succeeded in being international. A consumer cannot see the art of painting without knowing and learning some pictorial rules. First, the viewer must have a vision and strive to be a consumer art intellectual. The consumer needs to understand and grasp the concepts such as line, light and dark, color, shadow, space, order and unity.

When an art lover attends an exhibition, they should have the freedom to buy whatever they want. The value of works of art from the past to the present has been discussed. In this situation, most of the art lovers state that the works of art do not have a material value. However, painting works are sold at very expensive prices in today's exhibitions and fairs. While the original works of famous painters were sold at high prices, the copy prints of the original works of famous artists became an alternative for art lovers who could not buy the originals. Thus, the art lover has the freedom to purchase the product of choice.

It is important for the art lover to understand the art of painting, that is, to receive, evaluate and comprehend it. The art lover must understand these concepts in order to examine the work. In order to perceive the work while visiting an exhibition, it is necessary to examine it in terms of its material, period and technique, because it is not enough to just look at the work. Thus, there is a big difference between looking at a work and receiving it.

Freedom of expression of the art lover plays an important role. An art lover should express his ideas about a work freely and accurately while making judgments. He can tell which elements he likes or dislikes in a work. These elements, from the frame of the painting to the canvas, from the space in the exhibition to where the work is hung and placed, the suitability of the concept of the painted subject in the exhibition area, the material used in the painting to the technique, are among the issues that the art lover will judge, because the art lover is most attentive to these elements with an outside eye, which is different from the artist, that is, what the artist cannot see. They are the people who can see their shortcomings or positive sides best. This is one of the situations that best reflects the freedom of expression of the art lover. Therefore, while the freedom of creation of the artist is at the forefront, the freedom of thought, expression, judgment and choice is effective for the art lover.

### **3.4. The Instructor and Freedom Relationship**

The instructor, who is the aesthetic subject, is the person who makes the students think and directs them to research. At the same time, they are the people who help the student gain the skills of self-expression, critical thinking, communication skills through art, and thinking about aesthetic concepts. When we say art educator, we can give examples of academicians or art teachers.

The instructor should first develop himself in terms of art and renew himself scientifically, and then contribute to his students in terms of aesthetics. The painting instructor should tell the students how to receive, evaluate and comprehend the work of art, that is, how to comprehend it. These concepts enable students to understand the work of art in a more qualified way. The trainer needs to explain that the individual must provide it freely while creating, thinking, designing and expressing in art. In particular, making individuals interested in art at a young age realize these features will enable them to perform art more freely in the future. Thus, the trainer should provide freedom of creation, expression and thought.

The student cannot be free while purchasing the work because there are certain rules. However, the student can be free while criticizing. Because while the student is buying the work, he must receive it academically in a separate way. For example, it would be more accurate to perceive the period, technique, who the artist is, the movement in terms of aesthetics rather than what the work expresses. For this reason, the instructor cannot go beyond these rules, and therefore cannot be free, since the student makes these elements appear.

Another of the trainer's other duties and purposes is to make him think designally from different angles. While making the student think differently, it will also enable him to produce original works. The instructor should help the student to freely reflect his/her imagination while making or creating a painting. When the imagination, which starts at a young age, is reflected in the art of painting, extraordinary designs, themes, and especially at the end, original works emerge.

The individual perspective of the trainer is important. The perspective of a conservative instructor and a non-conservative instructor in art is an important element. This situation is a determining factor in the perspective of the trainer and in which institution he works or not. While nude painting education is given in some institutions, it is prohibited in some institutions. This situation affects the freedom of students in art.

The cultural elements that determine the freedom of the educator in art are also determinative. The education level of the trainer is one of them. Where the trainer was educated, from whom he took lessons, and what types of painting he studied are the elements that should be investigated. Schools that provide education with a libertarian perspective and other schools affect the perspectives of those who receive education in terms of how they develop themselves in art.

In addition to this, where the trainer lives and grows up is at the forefront of this situation. Therefore, these situations that affect the instructor have a connection with the level of education and freedom that they reflect on the student.

The trainer is not free to choose the subject. The instructor has to show the subject in the curriculum to the student for whatever reason. For example, if the instructor is a conservative person, he still has to teach the subject of nude painting to the student. This situation restricts the freedom of the trainer.

Political attitudes experienced and exhibited among educators affect freedom. There is a conflict between traditional working trainers and contemporary art trainers. This conflict is about the political stance of the educators. Unfortunately, this stance also affects students, because a traditional working instructor has to go beyond its borders. In this case, an educator who works traditionally has to study contemporary art as well. This situation affects the freedom of the trainer.

The instructor must set a student free when painting. When creating a work, he should have his own choice about what subject he wants to paint, what colors he uses, and what technique he will use. Another situation is that by the instructor, the student should be free to express the picture, because he should be able to freely express the emotion he feels. The most effective form of freedom of the art educator is the freedom of choice and expression.

### **3.5. The Relationship between the Statesman and Freedom**

Statesmen, who are aesthetic subjects, have had different perspectives on art from past to present. There were those who supported the arts as well as those who were against the arts. They even wanted to abolish and ban certain branches or genres of art. The prohibitions experienced restrict freedom and even continue today.

Considering the conservative cultural view of the National Socialist Party in the past, it can be said that the Nazis were completely against avant-garde art and banned it from the very beginning. It is known that the Nazi leader at that time generally rejected modern art in 1937 and ostracized avant-garde artists (Clark, 2017: 80).

At that time, an exhibition called “Degenerate Art” was organized. More than 700 works of modern art were displayed in the exhibition for the sole purpose of ridicule and defamation. Most of the works were confiscated from private

collections and the artworks of nearly a hundred artists who had done modernist works were used. The exhibited works were condemned as products of “Cultural Bolshevism” and said to be a conspiracy of “Jewish Imperialism” (Clark, 2017: 82). What happened in those times was restrictive in terms of social freedom.

As mentioned in the section on the relationship between educator and freedom, a statesman’s cultural level, where he lives, the culture he is influenced by, which schools he attends, and what kind of educators he receives education affect his perspective on freedom. Because the person who influences the development of art is a statesman. The developments in the art of the statesman affect the society. It affects the progress and development in art such as the organization of exhibitions, opening of fairs, the increase of auctions, the increase of painting courses, the preference of more original and free themes, and most importantly, the prohibition of themes such as nude painting. Prohibitions in art affect freedom of thought, freedom of creation and freedom of expression, which alienates society from art.

As mentioned in the section on the relationship between educator and freedom, the political stance of the statesman affects the freedom of art. This attitude and stance are important even about where the works will be exhibited, what kind of paintings will be exhibited, and what the subject of the exhibition will be. This is the freedom of the statesman to decide.

Today, there have been prohibitions in some types of art and painting. One of them is the image of naked woman in the art of painting and sculpture, which we know as nude painting. Nude painting and sculpture artists and painters, who were influential especially in the Middle Ages and Renaissance periods, examined the structure of man and the bodily movement of the naked man after nature. This situation has given the painter and the viewer great qualities. We can give examples of İbrahim Çallı and Bedri Rahmi Eyüboğlu, who are the pioneers of nude painting and an important painter in the history of Turkish painting. There are also young artists working on nude painting today. We saw nude painting in museums, galleries, and various venues. However, recently the nude painting has been removed from various venues. In fact, the nude painting, which was drawn with a live mannequin, is gradually being removed in the drawing classes held at schools and universities. This situation restricts the freedom of seeing, knowing and examining this type of art. The statesman’s form of freedom differs. Even if a statesman has creative freedom, there is also freedom of expression and freedom of choice.

### 3.6. The Relationship between Art, Institutionalization and Freedom

Art refers to a field of activity that aims and aims to achieve beauty, truth and freedom. Art in Adorno is not free because it is the legacy of yesterday. For him, the definition of what art is is guided by what it once was. But art justifies itself “only by attaching itself to what is happening and by keeping itself open to what it strives to be and can be” (Slater, 1989: 190).

According to Adorno, the culture industry had the function of “helping the smooth functioning of the homogenized and rationalized world of modern industrial society” (Lunn, 1995: 201). For this reason, art “distributes false satisfactions that do not fulfill what it promises”, deceiving people. Works of art are ascetic and shameless, while the cultural industry is pornographic and chaste (Lunn, 1995: 201). It is no longer possible to talk about freedom in culture and art. Thus, Adorno distinguishes between works of art and the culture industry and criticizes the culture industry.

Significant differences have also occurred in the character of art commodities, making widely produced luxury consumption products accessible by making them cheaper for mass consumption. This new phase “*it is not the commodification of art; on the contrary, it is art giving up its autonomy and proudly taking its place among consumption commodities. Art as a separate genre was possible only in bourgeois society. With the negation of social purposiveness developed through the market, the freedom of art is limited in terms of commodity economy.*” (Adorno&Horkheimer, 1989: 157).

It was in the 18th century that the art museum, the secular concert, and literary criticism assumed their modern functions and meanings and spread throughout Europe. The developments in the library in the field of literature were institutionalized in the 18th century (Shiner, 2013: 132). In the art of painting, a change took place in the institutional field in this century. The canvases are not exhibited or sold together with furniture, jewelry and other household items; instead, it was displayed in intermediary art institutions such as auctions, art galleries, and museums. Here, as art collectors increased, the way to specialization opened up and the social position of those who traded paintings was increasing (Shiner, 2013: 134-135). Thus, the social use of art ceases to be a cultural problem and emerges as a pragmatism problem in parallel with the commodification criticism of Marx-

ism. The artist existed as much as the value of his signature and was also considered as an element of the market determined by the intermediary institutions.

Ideology has a place and a constructive relationship in the institutionalization story of art. The art object is no longer the only and original work of the artist and is referred to as a product. In this sense, the criticism brought by the Frankfurt school expresses the mass orientation popularized in various sub-genres of art. Some time passed between the development of public opinion and the emergence of the idea of an art exhibition of its own, or a public museum. Since then, even the idea of public museums has shown quite different developments during processes such as the expectations of art markets, the idea of tourism, and the spread of cultural indicators. Making art and the aesthetic processes on which it is based an instrument of ideology aims not only to create an instrumentality that can be used not only by mass consumption culture but also by those who control these masses.

The places where cultural heritage is collected, preserved, preserved and exhibited from those times to the present day, introducing the past to the present and carrying the past to the future are known as museums. XVIII. In the second half of the century, royal collections in various parts of Europe (London, Paris, Munich, Vienna and Rome) were partially opened to the public. The Uffizi in Florence gradually separated painting and sculpture from natural and scientific interests: so much so that by the end of the century the Uffizi had essentially become an art museum. The transformation of the Louvre into a fine arts museum during the French Revolution created an intense debate about the meaning and consequences of separation (Shiner, 2013: 135). By the end of the 18th century, these institutions, which started to rise and develop rapidly, realized the development of new fine arts, artists and aesthetic theories along with a separate market and public opinion for fine arts throughout Europe (Özkan, 2012: 15). With the development of these institutions, a more comprehensive public opinion emerged.

With this understanding, museums are one of the most important public art spaces today. Art objects and relics from historical periods are usually exhibited in museums. Harbiye Military Museum, Sakıp Sabancı Museum, Topkapı, Hagia Sophia, Archeology Museum are important places in Istanbul. The works exhibited here have a certain history and importance. For example, it is not possible to see a still life work in the area where abstract paintings are exhibited. Objects

displayed in public spaces have rules. Within the framework of these rules, the works are not exhibited as desired. Art lovers as well as those working in public museums are required to abide by the rules they set in museums. In particular, touching and photographing works of art is generally prohibited. Although this situation restricts the freedom of the art lover in the way of reception, he has to obey the rules institutionally.

There are also works of art on display outside of museums and other public exhibition spaces. For example, Cow Parade, the world's largest outdoor event, was held in Istanbul in 2007. Colorfully painted cows designed by artists, celebrities and students on the streets of Istanbul were exhibited. Different patterns were made on the cows. Cow sculptures exhibited in the most vibrant centers of the city were exhibited for 12 weeks in places such as Şişli, Nişantaşı, Harbiye, Sultanahmet, Bebek, Ortaköy (<http://arsiv.kultur.sabah.com.tr/dosya/dosya-3918.html> ). The works of art exhibited here can be visited by taking photographs and even touching them as desired, without a certain time limit and experience limitation. However, if these cow statues were exhibited in a closed area, they could not move freely. Thus, institutional closed spaces have rules that restrict the freedom of individuals.

As the Second World War is about to begin, the period is the era of party-states and dictatorships in politics. In art, it is known as the period of realism. In the 1930s, art came under the control of states and war diplomacy and lost its autonomous political power inherent in its existence. In addition, he was withdrawn from avant-garde art and banned from museums. Some museums in the world have turned into training and communication machines of the dominant information and power regimes. The art center of American modernism, "New York Museum of Modern Art" will turn into the base of the culture wars against the Soviets and communism and will be managed by intelligence agents. In all this confusion, in which museums and two conflicting blocks were transformed into official art machines, the experiments and searches of the Russian avant-garde to break up museums remained as a bad memory that no one wanted to remember either in the history of museums or in the history of art (Artun, 2016: 166-167). In the late 1940s and 1950s, more than one exhibition was organized by the Museum of Modern Art in New York, which allowed it to be imported to the whole world, and these exhibitions were carried out with a nationalist discourse, in which the curators compared the stamp of freedom in American painting with

the kitsch art of Soviet communism, which controlled people (Clark, 2017: 13). It continues to be carried out in many exhibitions today.

Curating, which fulfills functions such as installation, form, direction and determining the viewpoint of the audience in the most accurate way, which corresponds to the thematic social role of art, emerges as an important profession in terms of public reception of art. Two major developments in the brief history of curation need to be identified. These are II. The period before and after World War II. Before World War II, the organization of exhibitions was the task of so-called “museum curators”: the title implied commitment to a solid and permanent institution, and the construction and preservation of a permanent collection. This task *cure* as implied by the etymological origins of the word and by preservation, it is mainly concerned with the interpretation of art and the preservation of works of art. In the years after World War II, there was a transition from this kind of “museum curator” to “exhibition writer”, that is, the role of the “curator” as we see it today began to be defined (Madzowski, 2016: 30). This shift and shift in what a curator is and does really began in the 1960s. Over time, it has become clear that the curator’s job is more about “discovering” lesser-known artists, movements and scenes, rather than being “responsible for maintenance” in the sense of preserving art. It is a real profession shaped by graduate courses, thematic symposiums and conferences (Madzowski, 2016: 30). Curation is thus characterized in two main stages: the management of subjects and the guardianship of objects. Thus, curators can be defined as agents operating in the region between subjects and objects, or in the region where one transforms into the other. In this region, objects will be treated like subjects and subjects will be transformed into objects; Curators are actually agents, agents of a process that many people talk about but do not clearly define. This mediation position means the power to transform one into the other, and this transforming brings ethical problems with it (Madzowski, 2016: 34). Curators research, write, teach, train, facilitate, fund, plan, manage, produce; artists create, organize and preserve works and exhibitions from conception to realization and beyond. They document, promote, present and represent past projects as well as propose new projects. They build networks, compile ideas, and create public opinion; They work fluidly and independently within, against, within or outside of institutions. They articulate insights, brand and sell projects, and mediate between different poles and actors in the art field. They are a pendulum between practice and theory, art and art history. Where the critics are

missing, they take the place of the critics (Madzoski, 2016: 32).

The view of the curator, who is the aesthetic subject, is very influential in major exhibitions such as the biennial in the contemporary period. Generally, they form the conceptual framework by feeding from philosophy, political science and critical theory. They are expected to research contemporary art very well, both theoretically and in terms of art practices. Of course, there is a creative work involved here, and the curator aims to make an original exhibition in line with his intuition and experience. Capturing the spirit of the age is essential here, and they reach their own intermediate concepts by being inspired by works of art. Being innovative and bringing new methods to curatorial work requires a long-term study (Eviner, 2016: 16). It happens when a curator imposes his own limits on an artist without asking about their limits on an art exhibition. Artists are expected to fit into bogus categories. A curator must have free thought and action when organizing or creating an exhibition. While preparing an exhibition, he visualizes and designs his thoughts in advance, and decides about the interaction of works of different styles with each other. Because he needs to be free in his actions in order to reflect his own oppressive point of view and his own style. In this way, the curator presents how an exhibition will change and evolve.

Curators have limited freedom when organizing exhibitions or working in accordance with a theme in public spaces. The limitation of the curators is determined by the expectation that they place the works in accordance with the theme. They cannot place the works of their own free will. However, they can exhibit the exhibitions that take place outside the public space in any place they want. There are also painters who have examples from the past and use their houses as museums and exhibition areas and open them to the visit of art lovers. Burhan Doğançay and Devrim Erbil are painters who can be shown as examples of this situation. Painters, whose works we are used to not seeing in corporate museums, change their perspectives and exhibit their works at home or in the places they live (<https://www.sabah.com.tr/pazar/2016/04/03/hayati-renge-boyayan-in-ev-hali>). This situation changes the way they are received by art lovers and consumers, and enables them to see the works “freely” outside of public spaces. Such a situation ensures that the houses of the painters are institutionalized by turning them into museums as well as museums, which are public spaces, and they are perceived as new public art spaces.

## CONCLUSION

In this study titled “Forms of Freedom in Reception of Painting Art in the Context of Aesthetics”, what aesthetics, painting art, how the art of painting is received and which forms of freedom are evaluated.

Aesthetics has been interpreted differently by philosophers in the history of philosophy. In terms of these interpretations, how the artist positions himself as informational and assent against the art object in the aesthetic subject-object relationship is important. The object created by the artist with elements such as line, tone, balance, form and direction, which constitute the stages of creation, that is, the material used and the technical possibilities, is an aesthetic object.

In the aesthetic analysis of the art of painting, his paintings or paintings were examined with various elements. These; The emotion that the painting makes us feel, the material that the painting creates or is the raw material, the technique used by the artist, the period of the painting, what kind of information it gives to the person, the effect of art movements on reception, the cultural level of individuals and freedom are examined as problems. The artist and art lover are free in terms of examining and creating the art of painting with the concepts mentioned in this section. For example, the artist, who is an important art movement, is still free while creating his work. It has its own rules and style, but the artist is free to create his work within these rules. How to use geometric form, stain or color element is his own choice. The artist creates a space for himself here. Freedom of the painter and artist is his choice in the aesthetic analysis of painting.

The concept of freedom was explained and his views on freedom were explained by giving examples from various philosophers from the history of philosophy. These three types, though related, should not be confused: freedom of man, freedom of man as species; freedom of persons or ethical freedom and social freedom. In the history of philosophy, every philosopher has put forward

his views of freedom and it has been discussed about what kind of freedom these freedoms are. In this section, “Is man free?” and “What is social freedom?” questions are explained. Human freedom has been widely discussed in the history of philosophy and different views have been put forward. Freedom of will, personal freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of action and freedom in the judiciary are the forms of freedom, which are the forms of freedom that are the subject of our discussion within the scope of this study.

Man is a being with freedom of thought and creative freedom. It is these forms of freedom that make man human. Especially in the art of painting, which is the subject of the study, the important thing is that people reflect their creativity freely in their work by adding their free thought. Human freedom has been widely discussed in the history of philosophy and different views have been put forward. These are freedom of will, personal freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of action, freedom of choice and freedom of judgment.

In social and political freedom there have been freedoms that we can divide social freedom into several types. Social freedom is moral freedom and legal freedom. Forms of freedom such as creation, thought, will, social, expression and will affect both human and society freedom.

Freedom in art depends on actions. The more we are free in our actions, the more we are free to create or perform works. Art, “What is art?” It starts with the question. This question is both historically at the beginning of philosophy and always in the form of philosophical objectification, the object must be in such a way as to be able to raise this question. “What is Art?” Different answers are given to the question. Art is generally called an aesthetic perception or art is called seeing, understanding and grasping what I am looking at. In fact, art is the process of receiving art objects. Aesthetic *reception* an art object *clutch, evaluation ve is to understand*, because we cannot evaluate an art object without first grasping it and then understanding it. We can perceive an art object from various angles. In order for a painting and/or painting to be an art object, a painting work on paper, not on canvas, is also an art object. As mentioned in the first part of the study, it is important what we understand from the art object as “aesthetic subject”. In other words, how we receive and interpret the aesthetic object as knowledge is a process that completes the art object. In this process, each individual’s reception of the art object is different. The difference here is not an ontological confusion, but the richness of reception as an epistemological

evaluation and understanding activity. The aesthetic subject-object relationship, which stands in the middle of different conception, evaluation and understanding processes, is therefore related to the idea of freedom. It is necessary to have the ability to think freely while purchasing art objects. The more universal we think, the more original interpretations and different ideas we get.

The relationship between painting and freedom manifests itself in the main forms of freedom. These; freedom of thought, freedom of creation, freedom of choice, freedom of the creator and freedom of expression in painting. These forms of freedom reveal how we reflect ourselves in our works. As the “aesthetic subject”, we get information about the style of abstract art, what style the artists work in the works, and technical information. He exhibited a libertarian attitude in the styles that the artists reflected in their works.

Subjects (actors) of art are also called actors of art in common literature. Therefore, the connection of these subjects with freedom is also a philosophical research topic. First of all, it would be a more accurate definition to say that the real freedom for the artist, who is the aesthetic subject, is the “authenticity” in his own act of creation. At first glance, we can say that being original means “not being like anyone else”. The original person reflects his own personal ideas, thoughts and actions in line with his own will, purpose and means. The original artist, on the other hand, paints “freely” with elements such as the technique, color and material he prefers in his works. The work that the artist paints based on his free choices is unique as it will not resemble the one that any other artist reflects. In this case, originality, although at first glance seems to be limited to the artist subject, who reveals the act of creating, in fact, it also points to the original existence and act of creation of another artist.

In the relationship between the artist and freedom, freedom of thought, individual freedom, freedom of creation, freedom of choice are the conditions that affect the freedom of the artist in terms of art. These forms of freedom are decisive in terms of how the artist looks at, receives, comprehends, evaluates and comprehends art. Freedom of thought, individual freedom, freedom of creation, freedom of choice are the forms that most affect the freedom of the artist in terms of art.

We see art critics who write about and criticize exhibitions in magazines and newspapers. Art critics cannot freely write about every type of painting. Especially nowadays, the criticisms written about the nude painting, which are in-

creasingly afraid to be performed, are not published much. This situation pushes the art critic to write about other painting genres. Since nude painting did not attract attention and was banned, art critics generally wrote about other painting genres such as nature, portrait, and abstract painting and criticized them. This freedom taken from the hands of the artists is also a freedom problem for the art critic. The most effective forms of freedom for the art critic are the freedom of thought and expression.

The freedom of expression of the art lover, who is the aesthetic subject, plays an important role. An art lover should express his ideas about a work freely and accurately while making judgments. He can tell which elements he likes or dislikes in a work. These elements, from the frame of the painting to the canvas, from the space in the exhibition to where the work is hung and placed, the suitability of the concept of the painted subject in the exhibition area, the material used in the painting to the technique, are among the issues that the art lover will judge, because the art lover is most attentive to these elements with an outside eye, which is different from the artist, that is, what the artist cannot see. They are the people who can see their shortcomings or positive sides best. This is one of the situations that best reflects the freedom of expression of the art lover. While the freedom of creation of the artist is at the forefront, the freedom of thought, expression, judgment and choice is active for the art lover.

The trainer, who is the aesthetic subject, should have his own choice about what subject he wants to paint, what colors he uses, and what technique he will do while creating the work. Another situation is that by the instructor, the student should be free to express the picture, because he should be able to freely express the emotion he feels. The most effective form of freedom of the art educator is the freedom of choice and expression.

The cultural level of the statesman, who is another aesthetic subject, where he lives, the culture he is influenced by, which schools he attends, what kind of educators he receives education affect his perspective on freedom. Because the person who influences the development of art is a statesman. The developments in the art of the statesman affect the society. It affects the progress and development in art such as the organization of exhibitions, opening of fairs, the increase of auctions, the increase of painting courses, the preference of more original and free themes, and most importantly, the prohibition of themes such as nude painting. Prohibitions in art affect freedom of thought, freedom of creation and

freedom of expression, which alienates society from art. Even if a statesman has creative freedom, there is also freedom of expression and freedom of choice.

Therefore, while the artist, who is one of the subjects of art, has the freedom of creation, expression, judgment, will, and choice, the freedom of thought and expression, among other forms of freedom, is at the forefront of the art critic. On the other hand, the art lover, who is the aesthetic subject, has the freedom of thought, expression, judgment and choice rather than the freedom of creation that is effective in the artist. In the educator, the freedom of choice and expression is active, and the statesman, who is another aesthetic subject, has the freedom of expression and choice rather than the freedom to create.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arthur, K. (2013). *Art Education Theories and Methods*, Ankara: Memoir Publishing.
- Adugit, Y. (2013). A Brief History of Freedom, *Journal of Philosophy and Social Sciences*, 16, 63-93.
- Arat, N. (1979). *The Problem of Relevance Between Ethical and Aesthetic Values in 18th Century English Philosophy*, Istanbul: Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Publications, No. 2569.
- Artun, A. (2016). *The Power of Art 1917 Revolution, Avant-garde Art and Museology*, Istanbul: İletişim Publications.
- Aristotle (1902). *The Poetics of Aristoteles*, New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Aristotle (2012). *Poetics*, (Trans. İ. Tunalı), Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Aristotle (2014). *Poetics*, (Trans. S. Fırat), Istanbul: Can Sanat Publications.
- Altar, C.M. (2013). *On Philosophy of Art*, Istanbul: Pan Publishing.
- Balci, F. (2013). *Introduction to Art Criticism*, Istanbul: Criterion Publishing House.
- Barrett, T. (2014). *Criticizing Art Understanding the Contemporary*, (Trans. G. Metin), Istanbul: Hayalperest Publishing House.
- Bauman, Z. (2016). *Freedom*, (Trans. K. Eren), Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications.
- Bazin, G. (2015). *History of Art*, (Trans. S. Hilav), Istanbul: Kabalcı Publishing.
- Beksaç, E. (2000). *Introduction to European Art*, Istanbul: Engin Publishing.
- Berger, D. (2009). *Kant's Aesthetics Theory, The Beautiful and Agreeable* and New York: Continuum.
- Bingol, B. (2011). Art Freedom, *Hacettepe University Faculty of Law Journal*, 1(2), 92-139.
- Boucher, G. (2013). *Adorno with a New Look*, Istanbul: Collective Book.
- Bolt, B. (2015). *Heidegger in a New Look*, (Trans. M. Özbank), Istanbul: Collective Book.
- Cevizci, A. (2009). *History of Philosophy*, Istanbul: Say Publications.
- Collingwood R. G. (1938). *Principles of Art*, Oxford England: Clarendon Press.
- Clark, T. (2017). *Art and Propaganda Political Image in the Age of Mass Culture*, Istanbul: Details Publications.

- Chastel, A. (2017). *Table in Table*, Ankara: East West Publications.
- Cakir, M. (2015). *Art Criticism*, Istanbul: Dogu Bookstore.
- Dellaloglu, B. F. (2014). *Art and Society at the Frankfurt School*, Istanbul: Say Publications.
- Duchamp, M. (2017). *Naked Stripped Image*, (Trans. Şule Demirkol), Istanbul: Everest Publications.
- Eco, U. (1988). *The aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Eco, U. (2015). *Art and Beauty in Medieval Aesthetics*, (Translated by K. Atakay). Istanbul: Can Publications.
- Ersoy, A. (2016). *Introduction to Art Concepts*, Istanbul: Hayalperest Publishing House.
- Erinç, S. M. (2016). *On Painting Criticism*, Ankara: Utopia Publishing House.
- Eroglu, O. (2013). *How Should We Look at a Picture*, Istanbul: Tekhne Publications.
- Eroglu, O. (2018). *A Museum Critique*, Istanbul: Tekhne Publications.
- Eagleton, T. (2010). *The Ideology of Aesthetics*, (Trans. B. Gözkan, H. Hünler et al.), Istanbul: Doruk Publishing.
- Foucault, M. (2013). Bridesmaids: On Las Meninas, (Trans. S. Kılıç), Skopbulten.
- Grombrich E. H. (1986). *The Story of Art*, Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Geiger, M. (2015). *Aesthetic Understanding*, (Trans. T. Mengüşoğlu), Ankara: Doğu Batı Publications.
- Haslakoglu, O. (2015). "Picasso and Artistic Action: The Birth of Cubism", *Blue Atlas Magazine*, 108-119.
- Hacikadiroglu, V. (2002). *Ethics of Freedom*, Istanbul: Cem Publishing House.
- Hartmann, N. (2010). *Knowledge in the Light of Ontology*, (Trans. H. Tepe), Ankara: Turkish Philosophical Society.
- Heidegger, M. (2007). *Origin of Artwork*, (Trans. F. Tepebaşlı), Ankara: De Ki Publishing.
- Hegel, G. W. (1942). *Philosophy of Rights*, (Çev. Knox. T. M.), Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hegel, G. W. (1982). *Aesthetica*, (Trans. N. Bozkurt), Istanbul: Say Publications.
- Hegel, G. W. (1988). *Hegel's Aesthetics*, (Trans. T. M. Knox), New York: Oxford University Press.

- Hegel, G. W. (2012). *Lessons on Aesthetic Fine Arts I*, (Trans. T. Altuğ, H. Hünler), Istanbul: Payel Publishing House.
- Hegel, G. W. (2015). *Phenomenology of Spirit*, (Trans. A. Assisted), Istanbul: Idea Publishing House.
- Kant, (2007). *Critique of Judgement*, (Trans. James Creed Meredith), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kant, I. (2016). *Critique of Judgment*, (Trans. A. Assisted), Istanbul: Idea Publishing House.
- Kant, I. (2014). *Critique of Practical Reason*, (Trans. İ. Kuçuradi, Ü. Gökberk, F. Akatlı), Ankara: Turkish Philosophy Institution.
- Konak, C. (2016). Following in the Footsteps of Cezanne “Cubism, *Journal of Academic Social Research*, Y.4, P.16, 294-301.
- Kuçuradi, İ. (1988). *Uludag Speeches*, Ankara: Turkish Philosophical Institution.
- Kuçuradi, İ. (2009a). *Philosophical Foundations of Human Rights*, Ankara: Turkish Philosophical Institution.
- Kuçuradi, İ. (2009b). *Nietzsche and Man*, Ankara: Turkish Philosophical Institution.
- Kuçuradi, İ. (2010). *Among the Events of the Age*, Ankara: Turkish Philosophy Institution.
- Kuçuradi, I.E. (2013a). *Looking at Art with Philosophy*, Ankara: Turkish Philosophical Institution.
- Kuçuradi, İ. (2013b). *Schopenhauer and Man*, Ankara: Turkish Philosophical Institution.
- Lenin, V. İ. (2014). *On Karl Marx and Marxism*, (Trans. M. Beyhan). Istanbul: Procedure Book.
- Lukacs, G. (1978). *Aesthetic I*, (Trans. A. Cemal). Istanbul: Payel Publishing House.
- Lunn, E. (1995). *Marxism and Modernism*, (Trans.Y. Alogan), Istanbul: Alan Publications.
- Madzowski, V. (2016). *The Dialectic of Curatorial Protection and Containment*, (Trans. M. Haydaroglu), Istanbul: Koç University Press.
- Menguşoğlu, T. (2013). *Introduction to Philosophy*, Ankara: East West Publications.
- Menguşoğlu, T. (2014). *The Human Problem in Kant and Scheler*, Ankara: East West Publications.
- Nietzsche, F. (2011). *Two Lectures on Greek Tragedy*, (Trans. M. Kahraman), Istanbul:

Say Publications.

Special, A. (2014). *Aesthetics and Fundamental Theories*, Ankara: Utopia Publishing House.

Ozcan, O. (2016). *What to Expect, I think*, Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Publications, 83, 2016.

Ozkan, D. (2012). Intersubjectivity, Reflexivity and Completeness in Modern Art, *Marmara Journal of Social Studies*, 2.

Plato (2011). *State*, (Trans. S. Eyüboğlu, M. Ali Cimcoz), Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Cultural Publications.

Plato (2015). *Kratylos*, (Trans. F. Akderin), Istanbul: Say Publications.

Ponty, M. (1947). *Cezanne's Doubt*, Paris: Nagel.

Ponty, M. (2017). *Priority of Perception*, (Trans. Y. Yıldırım), Istanbul: Alfa Publications.

Rousseau, J.J. (2017). *Social Contract*, (Trans. V. Günyol), Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Publications.

Soykan, O. N. (2015). *Aesthetics and Art Philosophy*, Istanbul: Pinhan Publishing.

Schopenhauer, A. (2013). *Metaphysics of the Beautiful*, (Trans. A. Aydoğan), Istanbul: Say Publications.

Schiller, F. (1965). *A Series of Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*, (Trans. M. Özgü), Istanbul: National Education Press.

Schelling, F. (2017). *On the Essence of Human Freedom*, (Trans. M. B. Albayrak). Istanbul: Details Publications.

Shiner, L. (2013). *Invention of Art*, (Trans. İ. Türkmen), Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications.

Tansel, A. (2006). *Jean Paul Sarte's Concepts of Freedom, Responsibility and Alienation*, Ankara, Master Thesis.

Tolstoy, L. N. (2015). *What is Art*, (Trans. M. Beyhan), Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Publications.

Tunali, I. (2003). *Marxist Aesthetics*, Istanbul: Kaynak Publications.

Tunali, I. (2011a). *Greek Aesthetics*, Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.

Tunali, I. (2011b). *Art Ontology*, Istanbul: Revolution Bookstore.

Tunali, I. (2012). *Aesthetic*, Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.

Tunali, I. (2013a). *Modern Painting in the Light of Philosophy*, Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.

*Bibliography*

---

- Tunali, I. (2013b). *Design Philosophy Design Models and Industrial Design*, Istanbul: Feed Publication.
- Turgut, İ. (1993). *Art Philosophy*, Izmir: Academy Bookstore.
- Turani, A. (2013). *World Art History*, Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Timuçin, A. (2016). *Spinoza's Conception of Freedom*, Istanbul: Cloud Publications.
- Theodor, A. (2002). *Aesthetic Theory*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Theodor, A. (2006). *History and Freedom*, (Trans. Rodney Livingstone), Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Theodor, A. & Max, H. (1989). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, London: Verse.
- Uner, O. (2013). *Fundamentals of Painting Painting Education Series-I*, Istanbul: Say Publications.
- Unay, S. (2015). Today Still Life, *İnönü University Culture and Art Magazine*, Volume 1, Issue 1, 71-78.

## **YILDIRIM ONUR ERDIREN**

Yıldırım Onur Erdiren, who is the grandson of painter Şükrü Erdiren, successfully completed Yeditepe University Fine Arts Faculty Graphic Design Department in 2008 and his Master's Degree at Yeditepe University Plastic Arts Department in 2010. During his education life, he received training from the important masters and philosophers of Turkish Painting history and gained their appreciation and appreciation. In 2019, he completed his doctorate at Maltepe University Social Sciences Institute, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Philosophy with his thesis titled "Forms of Freedom in Reception of Painting Art in the Context of Aesthetics". Erdiren, who started to teach at Marmara University in 2013 as a lecturer, has been working as a lecturer at Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University since 2016. He continues his career as a academian.