

**MAN.
ART.
FORM.**

IGORS SUVAJEVS

Man is impossible, naturally impossible being. Man is a result that crystallized while searching for a possibility to be. Therefore man always is only a possibility — an ability and capability of being a man. And one of the spheres of this possibility is art, for in it man is created, reproduced, repeated. To some extent one can say that man could not exist as man without art. Art is overcoming of man's impossibility, creating the possibility for man to be to be a man. Moreover, art in no way is a depiction of the world (be it internal or external), it itself is form or structure that makes possible depiction and comprehension of the world. Art arranges the world, adjusting man in it who is able to exist there. Art is necessity — necessity of such forms or structures, which engage — re-create, transform — the human being in the regime of man's life, because, naturally, there is no realization mechanism of man's action, feeling, intentions etc... Man's phenomenon as such does not exist. Man repeats himself in art, it is not only a necessary, obligatory, but also an unavoidable form. Man cannot avoid it in his process of becoming, he finds himself in this form. And this unavoidability comprises also an inevitability, namely, this form is not to be fancied, it itself is "cause" of notions. That's why it is form because nothing in it is as a form, as it empirical course or filling-up. Moreover, it is an archetypical form (more correctly — archetypical forms), where diverse possibilities coexist. This form is overabundant, and, having landed in the power-field of its necessity, phenomenal realization of the form may be most diverse. And it is the reason why it is an archetypical anthropological form. All this can be comprehended also as extension of art's limits while art pervades the entire life, turning into some of art of life. Therefore creativity is creation — displaying of life. This feature necessarily presumes incomprehension — one cannot "know" form, it itself creates (induces,

accumulates) knowledge. But this incomprehension presumes a possibility of comprehension (only when we don't understand anything, we can understand it) — capability to be oneself. Therefore incomprehension presumes participation, without participation art does not occur as art, as search of man's probability. So this life — art always is a creative mis-fortune. But misfortunateness means also to let the "created" remain in the non-created, not allowing to reduce this art to an abundance of ideas, to identify it with any image, intention, wish, to interpret it notionally without remnant. Creation-displaying of is open to the world and history, in it the most diverse times and quests coexist. Therefore one cannot say the last word about it, still this art by no means is a chaotic totality of forms and quests — it is well-timed in its own temporality. It is the contemporary well-timed art. Nevertheless, it often manifests itself as non-art, and creativity — not as creation of something new, but as the new creation. It is corroboration of man's possibility in existential archetypes. And art works don't serve the aims of didactics or amusement, they testify not to a stylish passion, but rather to the irresolvable and ineffable elements. It is the becoming silent in the unspeakable that itself addresses man. And this conversation is to be carried on by each individual himself.