

LITERARY AND ARTS SCIENCES

Geovannys Montero Zayas

Department of Theoretical Studies, Faculty of Audiovisual Media Art
University of the Arts

Calle 120 # 904 entre 9na y 23. Cubanacán. Playa, La Habana, Cuba
&

Department of Spanish-Literature, Faculty of Language and Communication
University of Camagüey

Carretera Circunvalación Norte, sin número, Camagüey, Cuba

E-mail address: gmontero@isa.cult.cu

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/my-orcid?orcid=0000-0002-4879-6883>

Edward Zygmunt Jarmoch

Theological Institute in Spišské Podhradie

Catholic University in Ružomberok

Spišská Kapitula 12, 034 01 Ružomberok, Slovakia

E-mail address: edward.zygmunt.jarmoch@ku.sk

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8351-9830>

Patrik Maturkanič

College of Applied Psychology

Akademická 409, Terezín 411 55, Czech Republic

E-mail address: patrikmat@seznam.cz

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1087-3847>

Gabriel Paľa

Department of Applied Education, Greek Catholic Faculty of Theology

University of Prešov in Prešov

Ulica biskupa Gojdiča 2, 080 01 Prešov, Slovakia

E-mail address: gabriel.pala@unipo.sk

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3544-8713>

Peter Kondrla

Institute for Research of Constantine and Methodius' Cultural Heritage

Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra

Štefánikova 67, 949 01 Nitra, Slovakia

E-mail address: pkondrla@ukf.sk

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4857-5578>

ABSTRACT

Aim. The article aims to offer a theoretical approach to the literary sciences and art, in essential aspects such as their general theoretical and methodological assumptions, the relations with other sciences, and the functions performed by the literary sciences and art in the system of culture.

Methods. The research methods used were the inductive-deductive and the analytical-synthetic.

Results. As a result, a theoretical article is presented which reveals essential issues of the literary sciences and art, from the processing of a wide literature and historical, theoretical and critical sources associated with literature and different artistic manifestations.

Conclusion. The literary and art sciences make up a complex and diverse field of knowledge, which offers transcendental knowledge in the approaches to these expressions of culture. The literary and art sciences fulfill several functions in the system of culture, given fundamentally by the spiritual needs they satisfy, oriented towards the subjectivity of cultural subjects and projected towards the survival of culture. These functions change in human cultural communities, and often determine the existence and trends in the development of literary sciences and art.

Cognitive value. The article reveals essential issues to the literary sciences and art, so it is an indispensable source in the approaches to a theory of these forms of human knowledge.

Keywords: literature, art, art history, art theory, art criticism

INTRODUCTION

To begin this article we must make clear our point of view in relation to the literary sciences and on art. It happens that we have never understood the division between literature and art, which in colloquium and everyday life can be legitimate, but not in the scientific and artistic fields. There is art, with all its manifestations and exponents, including literature and writers, that is something obvious, but it is imperative to enunciate it for the effects of the theory that is based on these pages, especially for the controversies that this conceptual positioning can generate.

Even less understandable than the dissociation between art and literature is the rupture between the literary sciences and the sciences of art, because these terms and boundaries do belong to specialists, not to midwives in a laundry. We find it foolish to talk about science over music or dance on the one hand, and science over art on the other. However, we consider it appropriate to argue our position.

To be objective, the sciences of each artistic manifestation have both the right to become independent from the magical realm called sciences over art, as well as to grow

warmly and cosily within it. Will the literary sciences be more rewarding? Should a campaign for the liberation of art sciences be launched? So would a secessionist party emerge in the sciences of art?

Such considerations, both logical and ridiculous, result from this fragmentation, which seems more like justification of academic and scientific parcel boundaries, and affects the development of art sciences, including those that study literature. We will therefore deal with the sciences of art, that is, the theories of the different artistic manifestations, the histories of art, and criticism, those “areas of knowledge that may seem useless to some and uncertain to others, but necessary for the exegesis of art as oxygen for life” (Acosta de Arriba, 2015, p. 7).

OVERVIEW OF LITERARY SCIENCES AND ART

If we glossed Roger Fayolle (1987), and even more, Roman Jakobson, we can affirm that the object of study of the sciences on art is not only art, but artisticity, that is, what makes a cultural text a work of art: “research in this field transcends description, and, in general, aims to account *for the procedures of artisticity*” (Álvarez & Barreto, 2010, p. 263).

From this point of view, it is important that artistic texts are studied “taking into consideration the time when they were written and published, as well as the different modes of reception and perception of which these texts were subject. We must place the *history of interpretations* at the centre *of the story*” (Fayolle, 1987, p. 21).

The histories of art study the concrete life of works of art in the unity of their cultural contexts, the artistic medium in its condition of complex ideological process, and linked to the ideological horizon of its time.

Anatoli V. Lunacharski (1981) in his “Theses on the tasks of Marxist criticism”, states that art and literature are important ideological weapons. For this reason, Marxist criticism “rises to an extraordinarily high position in terms of responsibility. She is called (...) to be (...) an active and energetic participant in the process of formation of the new man and the new way of life” (p. 209).

According to Lunacharski (1981) himself, a “Marxist critique is distinguished from any other, first and foremost by the fact that it cannot be without sociological character in the first place” (p. 209). This means that, without relapsing into vulgar sociology, the sciences on art, and not only criticism, must have a solid sociological basis, and art scientists will raise their studies on the sociological analysis of personalities, facts, phenomena and artistic processes, while the sociological method, together with the psychological and the biographical, lay the foundations for the dialogue of the work of art with culture (Martin et al., 2022).

The art scientist must follow, Lunacharski (1981) expands, “the line of objective investigation of the roots of a given work, of its place in the social fabric, (...) of its

influence on social life (...) and of the valuation of its formal or social merits or differences” (p. 210). The foregoing ideas are summarised in thesis number III, when it states that “sociological analysis is nevertheless a fundamental element, even more indispensable” (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 210).

Art sciences are called to “offer a comprehensive picture of all social development” (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 210), so they investigate the particularities and transcendence of the “*content* of the work, that *social essence* that was poured into it” (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 211). In our opinion, the interpretation of the meanings and semantic axiological meanings that carry the intentionality of the artistic work, is a transcendental process in the scientific study of art.

We also maintain that the examination of the artistic forms, that is, of the languages of art or specific codes of each artistic manifestation, proceeds in dialogue with the total culture, in addition to “with a whole era or a whole school” (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 212), as Lunacharski specifies, in a somewhat limited way. For this reason, the semiotic analysis of the particular artistic codes is based, fundamentally, on the methods or sociological, psychological and biographical approaches to the artistic text.

The interpretation and scientific analysis of the work of art leads to the production of texts, which can be theoretical, historical or critical-evaluative. Lunacharski (1981) states that “the *valuation factor* must be placed... in an extraordinarily high position” (p. 213).

Although we perceive a certain political paranoia in Lunacharski’s thesis, determined by the founding moment of the socialist revolution and the conflicts that it generated, and similar to that lived in Cuban culture during the sixties, seventies, eighties and nineties of the twentieth century, we reproduce some ideas to alleviate the density of the discourse.

In thesis number VIII, referring to the criteria of valuation of artistic work, Lunacharski (1981) states that:

(...) the fundamental criterion is... everything that contributes to the development and triumph of the proletarian cause is a good, everything that harms it is an evil. (...) according to this basic social energetic dominance, the Marxist critic must make his general assessment. (p. 214)

And he further points out: “knowing the psychic disposition of our enemies is very important, and it is important to take advantage of the testimonies that do not come from our spheres” (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 215).

A fundamental notion is that of ideological horizon in its relationship with the role of the artist in the perception of those ideologies that are born and developed in the vital hive of culture. A substantial error of the socialist cultural policies of the 20th century was not to appreciate the role of the artist in society. When, inspired by his fine sensibility, the artist denounced or revealed some social problem, far from taking

it as an alert to improve the revolutionary process, he opted for the most ferocious silencing or marginalisation (Navarro, 2006).

It was something like Queen Hapshepsut's acute Pharaoh Thutmose, referred to by Will Cuppy. In Ibero-American countries, we have historically suffered from a similar disease: acute enemies in the artistic and intellectual spheres, which consists of seeing one or more enemies in any direction you look, hence the habit we perfect of throwing whatever we have at hand, or in mind, the first one who stands before us, even if for reasons almost always beyond our control.

We do agree with Lunacharski (1981) that the art scientist "goes from the assessment of content to the assessment of form" (p. 216). And, although it is a difficult task, in the art sciences also the form "must correspond as much as possible to its content, giving it an extreme expressiveness and guaranteeing it the possibility of exerting the strongest influence on the circle of readers to which the work is destined" (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 216), because it is obvious, we think, that the art scientist writes to be read, and that there is an appropriation constructive action of their ideas in favour of cultural development.

Artemis Markessinis (1995), in his *Historia de la danza desde sus orígenes* [History of Dance since its origins], made explicit this concern for the affordability of his speech: "I have tried to make the narration enjoyable, so that it interests (...) I have always had passion for the history of our art and I hope I have been able to communicate this enthusiasm" (p. 10).

In Lunacharski's thesis some functions of the sciences on art are visualised, among which the educational or pedagogical one stands out. According to this theory, the Marxist critic must be a master of the artist, "an extraordinarily firm teacher, a person of exceptional taste and profound knowledge" (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 221). He must also be a master of the art-consuming audiences: "it is indispensable to teach the reader to read" (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 221). Lunacharski wrote in his essay on the plan and character of scientific-artistic research: "when we underline the particular vitality of the emotionality of guidance, [in art and art sciences] we pass in doing so, from the task of information to the tasks of orientation of feelings and will of readers" (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 305).

Beyond the delusions of the romantic period in the construction of socialism, the sciences of art fulfil social functions that justify their existence and survival in the system of any culture. We feel that in Cuba, for example, the role of art sciences is very limited, even though cultural policy requires the creation and diversification of critical spaces of art and culture, as well as a greater presence in the media and other cultural fields.

Anatoli Lunacharski, in his essay *On the Plan and Character of Scientific and Artistic Research*, argues the need "for our art science to become one of the many living forces weaving the dress of the revolution, weaving the dress of socialism to come" (Lunacharski, 1981, p. 232). And to clarify that the sciences of art are not reduced to art

criticism, Lunacharski points out that “it is not only a historical science. It’s not just a critical science. It is also a methodological and normative science” (Lunacharski, 1981, pp. 307-308).

The Cuban theorist and writer, Roberto Fernández Retamar (2014), in his essay *Theory (and Practice) of Literature*, wrote referring to literary theory, something that we contextualise in the sciences about art:

(...) we can enter that abstract house that is literary theory. In his porch we do not see written the “not between here who is not a geometer”, but we do see written many things, although we do not always understand them; and we see that the hands that wrote them once trembled, but persisted until the end. (Fernández, 2014, p. 280)

René Wellek and Austin Warren (1986) argue that: (...) the term “literary theory” could properly understand (...) the necessary “theory of literary criticism” and the “theory of literary history” (p. 49). From this point of view, the term art theory includes, in addition to art theory, the theory of art criticism and the theory of art history, that is, it is art theory and the metatheory of the sciences on art. That is the poetics that we defend today: a science about art that integrates artistic and scientific values, and theoretically and methodologically bases the different artistic manifestations and the scientific-artistic discourses that have as object of study the artisticity.

German scientist Hanz Heinz Holz (2005), in his *Teoría estética y estética de las artes plásticas* [Aesthetic Theory, and Aesthetics of the Plastic Arts], argues that:

Every theory of art has two aspects. First, it will reveal the “uniqueness of the aesthetic”, that is, the ontological and epistemological particularity of works of art with respect to everything else that exists, and it will study art in relation to human and historical realities in terms of its function and place within the general context of a cultural community. Second, it will investigate the conditions and methods under which a work of art may be interpreted and its importance (or it may cover or determine its aspects of meaning). The first approach, the ontological one, results by itself from the philosophical interest in what is traditionally known as the theory of the spirit or especially of the objective spirit. The second approach, hermeneutics, starts from the premise that the direct condition of the work of art in perception cannot be enough to understand what the given work of art expresses. (p. 46)

Heinz (2005) further expands on his text:

(...) an art theory has to develop a system of categories that allows recognition of the constitutive principles of the work of art, that is, to describe its historical and logical genesis as well as its ontological condition, not only in general, but in its specific particularity. (p. 49)

This approach demonstrates and synthesises the complexity of the cultural functions that correspond to the theories of art.

Another of the sciences that integrate this cultural fact is the history of art, which deals with the evolution of art and artisticity, almost always on the basis of historical

objectivism, and from the evolutionary dynamics of Western art. Hans Robert Jauss (2001) warns about the harmfulness of historical objectivism that has prevailed in a science that studies objects, facts, phenomena and cultural processes of a predominantly spiritual nature.

In this sense, we believe that a renewal of the history of art is required, on dialectical criteria to which the contributions of the aesthetics of reception are added, which “requires destroying the prejudices of historical objectivism, as well as grounding the aesthetics of production and traditional representation in an aesthetics of reception and effect” (Jauss, 2001, p. 206).

In relation to the history of art and criticism, it is appropriate to say what was stated for the theory. Art history is a discourse about art, about history and art criticism, and even about historical poetics. Art critique is critical appraisal discourse about art, theory, art history and critique itself. Science of art: history, theory and criticism “speaks the language of its object, it is metalanguage, “speech on a speech” (Genette, 2001, p. 153).

It illustrates the indissoluble unity between the sciences of art, the proposal of Hanz Heinz Holz (2005) that we reproduce:

Critical processing can mean several things: first, the criterion of criticism can be found in a concept of what art is and what it can contribute; this presupposes an aesthetic theory that is not content with conceiving the work of art as an end in itself and allowing its artistic character the arbitrariness of artistic decisions. Secondly, the critique can refer to the link of works of art with other products of the time or history of art, i.e. proceed from a historical and analytical point of view of style; this includes comparison with contemporary and ancient works. Thirdly, a critique that refers to the social testimony of works of art is conceivable; art is not considered as something independent, but as part of the *public network*.

A dialectical critique, that is, conceived with the aspiration of expressing in a totality the isolated phenomena, must encompass the three aspects outlined here. It should be normative, historical and political. (p. 48)

In a general sense, the sciences of art are literary scientific discourses, or artistic scientific discourses, and “what distinguishes this one from the other literary “genres” is its *second* character” (Genette, 2001, p. 154); or what is the same, the sciences of art are systems of secondary, or tertiary, modeling, while they are discourses about other discourses, which are already secondary modeling systems.

Wellek and Warren consider that the art historian “must be critical even to be a historian” (1986, p. 55). We consider that the art scientist must be a theorist, historian and art critic, even if his work and intellectual action predominate theoretical, historical or critical thinking. Among the sciences of art there is a very close interrelation, which enriches them and energises their discourse.

In short, the sciences of art:

(...) involve each other so deeply, that they make theory inconceivable (...) without criticism or without history, or criticism without theory and without history, or history without theory and without criticism. (...) The process is dialectical: a mutual interpenetration of theory and practice. (Wellek & Warren, 1986, p. 49)

RELATIONSHIPS OF LITERARY SCIENCES AND ART WITH OTHER SCIENCES

Art sciences maintain close links with other sciences, among which we will now mention, randomly, the philosophy of art, aesthetics, semiotics, the sociology of art, the psychology of art and the anthropology of art. We could talk, also randomly, about the archeology of art, the lexicographies of art and the axiology of art.

The Marxist-Leninist philosophy of art analyses objects, facts, phenomena and artistic processes, as well as personalities, as manifestations and exponents of material and spiritual culture, in close connection with practical activity, cognitive and valorative, followed by the sciences on art. Likewise, it provides the theoretical and general methodological basis for the scientific study of art, explains the relations of art with being and social consciousness, argues the ideological nature of works of art, its relationship with other ideologies, the role of the artist and art in the class struggle, the conception of the world of the artist as a factor that determines the evolutionary dynamics of art, “more than other rare things”, as the poet León Felipe would say.

Aesthetics is at a level very close to philosophy and can be considered, in its narrowest conception, a philosophy of art, as well as a general theory of art. Aesthetics offers not only the classical categorical system for the analysis of aesthetic and artistic values, but a group of theoretical criteria related to the essence of art, the variability of criteria about aesthetics and artisticity, aesthetic ideals and their role in determining the literary and artistic canon, the educability of aesthetic taste, the criteria of beauty and artisticity that determine the reception and consumption of works of art, the communicative character of art, and even notions of artistic research.

Semiotics is another general science that offers multiple theoretical and methodological foundations for the scientific study of art. The revelation of the signs and codes that make up the languages of art, the explanation of the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic dimensions of artistic semiosis, and the establishment of a conceptual system that integrates denotation and connotation, semantic and thematic fields, textual functions, semiosphere, ideological meanings and senses, intentionality, coding and decoding, disambiguation and interpreters, as well as modeling systems, tropes or rhetorical figures, structural semantics and pragmatic functions of textual structures, etc., are some of the numerous contributions of semiotics scientific studies of art. Semiotics provides the semiotic method of artistic research, one of the most complete, complex and enriching in the scientific study of art.

The sociology of art analyses the facts, phenomena and artistic processes in their relationship with the totality of social processes, policies and other manifestations of culture (Králik, 2015; Pavlikova & Tavilla, 2023). It explains the trends of art creation and consumption, the relationships between the artist's personality and society, the functioning of art, art sciences, cultural industries and institutions as socialisation agencies in the service of hegemonic culture and power groups, the role of the artist and the art scientist as agents responsible for the perpetuation of culture, cultural centre-periphery relations and their reflection in art and science on art, cultural resistance and symbolic domination, to mention some aspects. The sociology of art provides the sociological method, which supports the dialogic character of artistic research, and allows the establishment and argumentation of intertextual relationships.

(...) the Marxist sociology of literature and art (...) [has warned] the need to study “everything that receivers do with the artistic message and what the message does with them—the influence of works on social consciousness—in a word, all aspects of the pragmatic analysis of the communication process. (Navarro, 1986, p. 229)

Another science that is attributed to scientific studies of art is the psychology of art, which contextualises the general categories of activity and communication in the creation, promotion and consumption of art, explains the dialectic of material and spiritual in art and science on art, argues the relationships between content and form in art, demonstrates the importance of the daily experience of culture in the creation and satisfaction of cultural and artistic needs, provides the psychophysiological basis of the transcendent conception and the motivated character of the artistic sign, and explains the processes of meaningful and instrumental mediation in the cultural determination of personality, aspect this vital in the scientific study of art, and in the explanation of the potentialities of expression art and stylistics of artistic languages.

A fundamental role in scientific studies of art is played by the anthropology of art. This science starts from the location of art in the system of culture, and argues the relations of art and science over art with creation, heritage, cultural identity and the promotion of artistic and scientific values. The anthropology of art conceives objects, facts, phenomena and processes as manifestations of culture, as functioning structures and as institutions that satisfy cultural needs; it deals with the personality of the artist as a cultural subject that expresses in his work certain socio-historical states, in his relationship with humanised nature and his own biological being. On the other hand, the anthropology of art contextualises specific research methods such as ethnographic, phenomenological, ethnomethodological and biographical, all of great importance for the sciences of art, because of their hermeneutic nature.

The most widely discussed place among art sciences is occupied, with pure pain and a thousand excuses, by the pedagogy of art, which we prefer to call the didactics of art. The didactics of art studies the role of artistic education and teaching in the achievement of a social model, the distinctions between artistic education, aesthetic education and artistic teaching, the process of teaching and learning of the manifestations of art, its

essence, contradictions, laws and principles, the categorical system formed by the objectives, contents, methods and procedures, means of teaching and didactic resources, the evaluation of artistic learning, among other fundamental aspects for the aesthetic education of the personality.

An integral approach to the art sciences produced in present day Cuba, allows us to identify a series of deficiencies, among which we determine as the most significant:

- The almost total omission of the anthropological conception of culture and the contributions of the theories of daily life, social representations and identities, fundamentally;
- The artistic-literary conception of culture in correspondence with the tradition of cultural policies in socialist countries;
- The extensive, fragmented, descriptive, impressionistic and not contextualised artistic analysis in all its cultural magnitude;
- The partial misunderstanding of intertextual relationships;
- The limitations in the knowledge of cultural codes and, as a consequence, the reductionist view of them;
- The relative lack of understanding of the nature of the sending and receiving subjects as a system, and the text as a transmitted system, which limits the analysis that support the criteria and assessments;
- The poor perception of the pragmatic links between the textual structure or phenomenon, the coding and decoding cultures, and the sending and receiving systems as cultural subjects.
- The process of art research improves, in our opinion, from the application of scientific methods, while the art scholar interprets the multiple socio-historical, cultural, psychological and even biological determinations of the artistic text; decodes the various individual and social cultural codes embodied by the emitting system in the work, and at the same time configures the own cultural codes for the benefit of society.

The process is also enriched when the art scientist is able to analyse, through the strategy of minimum distance, the value of the artistic work as a source of historical and anthropological knowledge, in addition to assessing the integrity of structural elements of the text in its functional link with the content of the artistic work and the cultural system that determined it.

FUNCTIONS OF LITERARY SCIENCES AND ART

Another fundamental aspect that must be addressed in these generalities about the sciences on art is its cultural functions. The functions of the sciences on art appear enunciated in the work of Guy Pérez Cisneros, Juan Marinello, Mirtha Aguirre, José Antonio Portuondo, Ambrosio Fonet, Víctor Fowler, Norge Espinosa, Eduardo Morales Nieves, Amelia Duarte de la Rosa and others, although they are not clearly identified as such, and are contextualised, mostly, in the critique.

Viewed from anthropology, the art sciences are institutions that exist because they meet very clear and precise cultural needs in modern societies. These cultural needs, addressed in some way in previous paragraphs, constitute what we have defined as basic functions of the sciences on art: symbolic domination, legitimising, educational, stimulating-regulating of artistic development, cathartic, playful, aesthetic-expressive, axiological and gnoseological.

Grupo de Teoría y Crítica Literarias de la Facultad de Artes y Letras de la Universidad de La Habana (2009) maintains that it was:

Horacio (65-8 B.C.), the great Latin poet, who pointed out that the literary work was characterised by being *sweet et utile* (sweet and useful), thus leaving its basic functions: to grant pleasure, entertainment and, at the same time, to serve some social benefit. (p. 7)

This very Grupo de Teoría y Crítica Literarias de la Facultad de Artes y Letras de la Universidad de La Habana refers to the work “pojam funkcije kod Mukaiwvskog i Jakobsona” [the functions of the literary work], by Aleksandar Flaker, to establish those that we also consider functions of literary work art sciences in their capacity as socialization agencies:

- Of literary revaluation [which we call of artistic legitimation];
- Education (pedagogical) [which we call educational or symbolic domination];
- Knowledge (Gnoseological);
- Expression (expressive) [the artist manifests ideas, emotions, dreams...];
- Valuation (axiological);
- Fun (playful) [fun, entertain, enjoy] (Grupo de Teoría y Crítica Literarias de la Facultad de Artes y Letras de la Universidad de La Habana, 2009).
- Although contextualised only in art criticism, the approach of Espinosa (2011) that we cite below, is closely related to these multiple functions of science on art. Espinosa says: “... I would like the Cuban critic to be more aware of his responsibility, and to speak out from an order of frankness and sharper risk” (para. 6).

In this essay we offer some theoretical arguments as to why art sciences and art scientists are agencies and agents of socialisation, respectively. If we were to round up these ideas, we would say that the sciences on art exert the symbolic domination of the masses, by transmitting values and canons of hegemonic culture, or show forms of resistance from cultural peripheries. This is the first function of art sciences: the educational or symbolic domination, but we have identified others, more specific in relation to their link with the public, creators and promoters of art.

[Art sciences] (...) always fulfill, to a greater or lesser extent, an educative function, whose ultimate objective...can only be the formation of a new type of public and creator in the fields of literature and art. (...) our critique [we would say: our art sciences] must act as yet another instrument of the aesthetic education of the masses. (Navarro, 1986, p. 353)

It is necessary that art sciences contribute to the formation in the masses of “artistic needs and a high artistic taste”, as well as capacities to understand the languages of art and experience, as daily and positively, their content (Navarro, 1986, p. 353).

The axiological and gnoseological functions of art criticism have been treated by Román de la Calle in *Estética y Crítica* [Aesthetics and Criticism], as well as by Jean-François Lyotard and Michel Foucault, as referred by Eduardo Morales Nieves in his Reflections on art criticism as an aesthetic practice (Morales Nieves, 2015).

Literary and artistic criticism [and art sciences in general] is called into existence by a series of important cultural and social needs. It is hoped that, like certain historical manifestations of literature and art, it will offer knowledge and value judgments about works; that it (...) educates the collectivity that receives, creates and disseminates artistic works; [and] (...) strives to influence the course of the historical literary and artistic process. (Navarro, 1986, p. 338)

Another essential function of art sciences that is increasingly fading in our society, especially in the artistic fields, is to train artists, who are evaluated by artists, and legitimised many times by institutions and officials who market their artistic products almost always with their backs to their values, in blatant disregard of the public that consumes them, of the criticism that places them in their rightful place in the system of culture, and even of the cultural policy itself.

Desiderio Navarro (1986) said: “In its relations with creators, our critique must act, without a doubt, as an instrument of ideological-artistic education” (p. 338). And we ask ourselves (and answer at the same time) if that same formative commitment with creators is not essential to the theories and histories of art. We think it’s essential, Watson, that the musician knows the theory of music, or the architect draws on the contributions of the history of architecture.

In addition to the legitimising and educational functions, the sciences of art have a stimulating and regulating function of artistic development, as they “actively influence the literary and artistic process (...)” (Navarro, 1986, p. 354) This process is not only of creation or reproduction, but also of cultural consumption of art. For this reason, art sciences should not only be directed towards creators, but towards audiences, and beyond, to institutional and individual managers of artistic promotion.

Although we disagree with the idea of the functions added to the criticism, we do agree with Duarte de la Rosa (2016) when she writes:

(...) art critique informs about something that happened in the world of culture and culturally forms the public, however, beyond the added didactic training, critique informs, guides and, why not? entertains. The critic, for his part, also forms a discourse that addresses the public, debates, polemics, orientates, educates, legitimises. (p. 6)

The matter of the playful function of the sciences on art is not our story, reader of the soul. Already Émile Durkheim and Bronislaw Malinowski wrote about the ca-

thartic function of cultural artifacts. We recall ideas by Lev Semiónovich Vygotski about catharsis through communication, and by Moisei S. Kagan about what he called *homeostasis*, a concept equivalent to catharsis used to express the emotional balance that is established between the subject and culture, through the work of art.

Let's be more practical and illustrative. The authors of this essay are art scientists because, to paraphrase the Cuban poet Julián del Casal, we find in science these things ignored. We are not fiction writers or frustrated painters. We don't want to be novelists or poets, because Heaven didn't give us that gift, nor did it give us the gift of being cave painters or cabaret dancers. Much less do we suffer when we write our theoretical, historical or critical essays about art. We are literally happy as pink earthworms, we realise ourselves in them. For these and other reasons, both the art scientist and the reader of the art sciences find "ignored bliss", intellectual emotions in their consumption and appropriation. And we say no more.

CONCLUSIONS

Art sciences form a multidisciplinary field of human knowledge, which integrates sciences and theories related to each other, and dialogues with other forms of ideologies in the culture system (Judak et al., 2022; Murgas et al., 2023). This implies the existence of a transdisciplinary theoretical, methodological and practical body, which is determined by the very dynamics of the development of artistic and cultural processes.

Nowadays, it is necessary to systematise a theoretical body of sciences on art, which reveals epistemic foundations and principles, as well as methodological and stylistic fundamental aspects of sciences on art. Likewise, the need for historical and critical approaches to theories, histories and criticism of the arts is imposed.

The art sciences fulfil several functions in the system of culture, given fundamentally by the spiritual needs they satisfy, oriented towards the subjectivity of cultural subjects, and projected towards the survival of culture. These functions are changing in human cultural communities, and they determine, many times, the existence and trends of the development of science on art.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The paper was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency based on the project: Religiosity and Sustainability Values, number APVV-22-0204.

REFERENCES

- Acosta de Arriba, R. (2015). Pensar sobre arte, una empresa muy riesgosa. [Thinking about art, a very risky business]. In E. Morales Nieves (Ed.), *Pólemos críticos* [Let's get critical] (pp.1-11). Dome Editions.
- Duarte de la Rosa, A. C. (2016). *Un milagro postergado: Lunes (también) ... va a la danza* [A delayed miracle: Monday (also) ... goes to dance] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Universidad de las Artes.
- Espinosa, N. (2011). *¿La crítica y la danza que nos merecemos?* [The criticism and dance we deserve?]. ISA Universidad de las Artes. <https://isauniversidaddelasartes.wordpress.com/2011/05/05/%C2%BF1a-critica-y-la-danza-que-nos-merecemos/>
- Fayolle, R. (1987). Para una definición histórica de la literariedad [For a historical definition of literacy]. In O. Bélič, R. Fayolle, & Y. Surotsev (Eds.), *Problemas 2: Historia Literaria* [Problems 2: Literary History] (pp. 11-23). Editor of the Cuban Academy of Sciences.
- Fernández Retamar, R. (2014). *Para una teoría de la literatura hispanoamericana* [For a theory of Hispanic American literature]. Editorial Cuban Letters.
- Genette, G. (2001). Estructuralismo y crítica literaria [Structuralism and literary criticism]. In N. Araújo & T. Delgado (Eds.), *Textos de teorías y crítica literarias: (Del formalismo a los estudios postcoloniales)* [Texts of Literary Theories and Criticism: (From Formalism to Postcolonial Studies)] (pp. 153-169). Editorial Félix Varela.
- Grupo de Teoría y Crítica Literarias de la Facultad de Artes y Letras de la Universidad de La Habana. (2009). *Manual de apreciación literaria* [Literary appreciation manual]. Editorial Félix Varela.
- Heinz Holz, H. (2005). Teoría estética y estética de las artes plásticas [Aesthetic theory, and aesthetics of the plastic arts]. *Marx ahora: Revista internacional*, 20, 46-78.
- Jauss, H. R. (2001). Historia de la literatura como una provocación a la ciencia literaria [History of literature as a provocation to literary science]. In N. Araújo & T. Delgado (Eds.), *Textos de teorías y crítica literarias: (Del formalismo a los estudios postcoloniales)* [Texts of Literary Theories and Criticism: (From Formalism to Postcolonial Studies)] (pp. 205-208). Editorial Félix Varela.
- Judák, V., Mahrik T., Nowak J., Hlad, L., & Akimjaková, B. (2022). Current crisis leadership in the light of the religious paradigm in the context of the Moses example. *Acta Missiologica*, 16(2), 99-115.
- Králik, R. (2015). Key philosophical-Theological concepts of Søren Kierkegaard in the work of Paul Tillich. *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 11(4), 179-188.
- Lunacharski, A. V. (1981). *Sobre cultura, arte y literatura* [About culture, art and literatura] (P. Miranda, D. Navarro & J. Vasco, Trans). Editorial Art and Literature. (Original work published 1967).
- Markessinis, A. (1995). *Historia de la danza desde sus orígenes* [History of dance from its origins]. Sports bookstores Esteban Sanz Martier, S.L.
- Martin, J.G., Rojas, A. M., Shcherbiak, I. & Kralik, R. (2022). The singular Approach to the Concept of Truth in Kierkegaard's Pseudonymous Work Post Scriptorum. *Acta Missiologica*, 16(2), 66-79.
- Morales Nieves, E. (2015). *Pólemos críticos* [Let's get critical]. Dome Editions.
- Murgas, F., Podzimek, M., Petrovic, F., Tirpakova, A. & Kralik, R. (2023). The impact of religiosity on quality of life. *Acta Missiologica*, 17(2), 169-186.
- Navarro, D. (1986). *Cultura y marxismo: problemas y polémicas* [Culture and Marxism: problems and controversias]. Editorial Cuban Letters.
- Navarro, D. (2006). *Las causas de las cosas* [The causes of things]. Editorial Cuban Letters.
- Pavlikova, M. & Tavilla, I. (2023). Repetition as a Path to Authentic Existence in Kierkegaard's Work. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 14(2), 105-115. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2023.2.105.115>
- Wellek, R. & Warren, A. (1966). *Teoría literaria* [Literary theory]. Editorial Gredos, S.A.