

DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0175
УДК 74.01/.09

D.V. Pivovarov's Concept of the Ideal as the Basis of Modern Theory of Fine Arts

Vladimir I. Zhukovsky

*Siberian Federal University
Krasnoyarsk, Russian Federation*

Received 14.07.2017, received in revised form 10.08.2017, accepted 23.08.2017

Abstract. The article reveals the methodological principles of the Russian researcher D.V. Pivovarov's synthetic theory of the ideal, which laid the foundation for the research of regularities of an ideal-forming process in fine arts. According to the theory, the ideal is as an intermediary between a human and the world and has a feature of a harmonious unity of the two opposite sides of being – material and spiritual. A work of fine arts is an artificial and skillfully produced ideal, a temptation which is aimed at a representative relation of the finite with the finite and the finite with the infinite. Finding the place of a work of art in the system of artistic culture, the author of the present paper argues that D.V. Pivovarov's concept of the ideal is a basis of modern theory of fine arts, it promotes the scientific study of fine arts, helps to master a difficult dialectical process of a human's (a viewer's) representative relationship with his / her soul, souls of the others, the Spirit of God.

Keywords: D.V. Pivovarov, the synthetic theory of the ideal, ideal, object model, artistic culture, fine arts, model, work of art, viewer, artistic process.

Research area: history of art.

Citation: Zhukovsky, V.I. (2020). D.V. Pivovarov's concept of the ideal as the basis of modern theory of fine arts. *J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 13(8), 1416–1423. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0175.

In January 2016 Daniil Valentinovich Pivovarov, a famous Russian philosopher, died. A researcher with a broad array of interests, D.V. Pivovarov established a scientific school "The Synthetic Paradigm in Philosophy", developed his own integrated conception of the religion which was recognized by the scientific community, defined a special dialectical-and-logical algorithm of categorial synthesis. The issues of visual thinking, culture and creativity set forth in a number of monographs and articles, some of which are written together with the author of this paper (Zhukovskii, Koptseva, Pivovarov, 2006; Zhukovskii, Pivovarov, 1991, 1998, 2010, 2015; Zhukovskii, Pivovarov, Rakhmatullin, 1988), take not the last place in his scientific pursuits.

D.V. Pivovarov's scientific and creative heritage is still in need for its researchers. Yet, we can already formulate the main provisions of D.V. Pivovarov's synthetic theory of the ideal, which became a methodological basis of an innovative concept of fine arts (Zhukovskii, 2011).

Daniil Valentinovich's synthetic theory of the ideal is extremely attractive because when applied to the solution of actual problems of fine arts it is effective for mastering an extremely complex mechanism of a viewer's representative (through an idol) relationship with his / her soul, souls of other people, the Spirit of God and the Perfection of the Fullness of Being through an artistic work as a sign complex. According to the synthetic theory of the ideal developed by the researcher, this requires an object model or its sign (a work, piece of art); a scheme of a mental action linked with the model and a viewer's subjective ability to mentally reproduce the image of a class of things, standing for the model.

The ideal is a philosophical category denoting the typical properties of eidoses, ideas, ideals and idols. According to D.V. Pivovarov, the most important of these properties are non-extended nature and immateriality, content similarity of an image and an object linked with it, an ability of image to become an entity of a human's subjective world and keep him / her informed about objective entities and phenomena (Pivovarov, 2004: 246).

Introducing such a definition, D.V. Pivovarov notes that the explanation of the nature of the ideal is determined by the philosopher's ideological position; a generally valid notion of the ideal has not been formed yet because of the difference of these positions (Pivovarov, 2004: 246). Most often the nature of the ideal is revealed through the relationship of the categories of spirit, soul, matter, embodiment, reflection, creativity.

Analyzing the spatio-temporal, substrate-and-content and epistemological aspects of the ideal, Daniil Valentinovich came to the following conclusion:

- in its spatio-temporal aspect the ideal should be understood as the involvement of the image in the eternal, free, other and non-extended, when the image lacks the substance of an object created by the standards of the image and opposed to the real and, thus, extended and material being;

- in its substrate-and-content aspect the ideal is thought to be a property of the image to link with its object, be similar with it in content, relate to it with some correspondence;

- in its epistemological aspect the ideal should be understood as the ways of subjective existence of noumenal and phenomenal characteristics of the objects in a human's activity and consciousness, whether these are the scheme of practice, sensitive and rational images or direct (mystical) knowledge of the original (Pivovarov, 2004: 246).

Turning to the source of the problem, D.V. Pivovarov states that the concept of the ideal is rooted in animism and totemism, according to which:

- a) every object has its own unique soul able to move in space and get into other objects and people in the form of steam, air or shadow;

- b) every class of people owes its origin and common characteristics to the ancestor (totem) (Pivovarov, 2004: 247).

D.V. Pivovarov revealed that a particular aspect of the animistic view on the object's soul as a specific cause of life in the being animated by it was termed as "eidos" (Latin *forma, species*) in ancient Greek culture, whereas some moments of the totemic views on the spirit of

the race and the world soul were termed as "idea" (Pivovarov, 2004: 247).

Having carefully studied the monist doctrine of the ideal, proposed by Democritus in his time, Daniil Valentinovich concluded that in this ancient Greek philosopher's conception the object is cognized through the emitted eidos. Floating in the air, the spices, duplicating the objects, are laid over in a human in the form of subjective images of the objective world as they enter the subject through his / her senses.

According to Democritus, there are three aspects of eidos:

- being a part of an object, eidos embodies its holistic characteristics; it is a material copy of a particular kind of objects and may become an immediate object of particular knowledge;

- transferring the information about certain objects or their categories from the outside world into a human, eidos plays the role of a vehicle: in other words, eidos is a material representative of some cognized object area in relation to a knowing individual;

- when in a human, eidos becomes a material image of consciousness, a building component of complex knowledge about the world in general" (Liubutin, Pivovarov, 1993: 237).

For many centuries, right up to the XVII century, the materialistic theory of knowledge was strongly attracted by the position of Democritus. However, in the process of the natural science development this theory was abandoned as the emission of eidoses was not detected by telescopes and microscopes. The searches for material duplicates of objects in the human brain and body were unsuccessful either. In this regard, thanks to Feuerbach's philosophy, the knowledge of the ideal as a subjective image of the objective world became firmly established in the materialist theory of knowledge. This knowledge is only the third aspect of Democritus's eidos. As far as the first two aspects of eidos are concerned, they turned to be completely ignored.

However, in the XX century in Russian philosophy there originated the doctrines which collectively form the basis for the revival of Democritus's theory of the ideal. "The alternative conceptions by D.I. Dubrovskii, E.V. Il'en-

kov, E.G. Klassen, A.F. Losev, M.A. Lifshits favoured the restoration of the three-aspect conception of the ideal" (Liubutin, Pivovarov, 1993: 240).

D.V. Pivovarov studied the conceptions of the abovementioned philosophers in their logical order, which is opposite to the chronology of their appearance. The reason why a human, operating with certain objects, is able to reflect their holistic, general, significant, generic features was explained by Aleksei Fiodorovich Losev and Mikhail Aleksandrovich Lifshits. According to their conclusions, there are both perfect and imperfect objects of the same kind in nature. A specific element from a group of elements can absorb their main characteristics to a greater extent than other elements of the group. So, it can serve a good representative of the group (the whole) in relation to a person, and, operating with it only, one seems to immediately reflect the whole class of objects standing for this model (Lifshits, 1997; Losev, 1993). A solid is broken by a more solid. A sharp is cut by a more sharp, etc.

Analyzing A.F. Losev's and M.A. Lifshits's theoretical messages, Daniil Valentinovich Pivovarov came to the conclusion that these philosophers discovered "a true equivalent of the first aspect of Democritus's eidos: an object does not double itself in the emitted duplicate but it is its special, perfect part with an ability of objective potential representativeness in relation to the subject that is a material copy of this or that object (object area)". According to Losev and Lifshits, the ideal is an objective perfection, a natural ideal, a model that does not contain the substances of the whole reflected class of objects, but represents the entire class to a person (Pivovarov, 2004: 249).

E.V. Il'enkov and E.G. Klassen, the Russian philosopher's, tried to answer the question about the carrier of the information about really common and universal from an object to a subject. These researchers pointed to a particular signal component of human practice, determining the formation of a subjective image of the common and universal from outside. The scheme of practice (algorithms, operations, stereotypes) is a carrier of the information about

generic properties of objects in the space between an object and a subject, and the scheme of action does not contain the substances of the object, along the contour of which the subject is moving. In this sense, the scheme or form of activity can be called the ideal (Il'enkov, 1984, Klassen, 1984).

Analyzing Klassen's and Il'enkov's conceptions, D.V. Pivovarov noticed that by their joint efforts these philosophers managed to give a modern coverage of the second aspect of Democritus's eidos: "It is not the substance of an object that is transferred to a person's subjective world but it is the scheme of activity that reads the information about the common (substantial) from an object and transports it to a person's subjective world" (Pivovarov, 2004: 250). As an ideal, the scheme of activity is independent of an individual's consciousness. At the same time, being in consistency with the peculiar features of a class of objects and modeling this class, the scheme of activity does not contain the substances of objects objectively reproducible in it. It is unreal and, thus, immaterial in this sense; as such it cannot be measured with instruments, as it cannot be perceived with the naked senses.

David Izrailevich Dubrovskii, a Russian philosopher, made an attempt to answer the question of why and how the knowledge about a certain model, formed under the influence of the activity scheme, is subjectively experienced by a person as the integrity of the object area the representative model stands for.

The information approach proposed by the researcher is linked with the identification of the human brain's extrapolation ability to create the internal conditions for the elimination of marks of the characteristic features of all previous signaling process from the consciousness and for subjective processing of the information about the object area in its "pure form", that is in the form of consciousness proper, immaterial copying of external entities. In other words, actually interacting with some fragment of a certain object, a human construes not only an immaterial image of this object as a whole entity with the help of his / her brain but also transfers his / her mental vision to all the objects of a single class. Without this unique ac-

tivity of the brain the ideal as such could not exist (Dubrovskii, 2002).

Analyzing Dubrovskii's philosophical concept, D.V. Pivovarov came to the conclusion that in this case the third aspect of Democritus's eidos turned out to be fundamentally clarified: "Eidos does not penetrate into a human in its final form, there is no eidos in real objectness, taken by itself. A subjective image is formed in the process of eliminating its signal characteristics and actualization of the content of reality the representative stands for" (Pivovarov, 2004: 251).

Comparing modern conceptions of the Russian philosophers with Democritus's ancient doctrine, D.V. Pivovarov concluded that D.I. Dubrovskii searched for the ideal on the side of the subject while contrasting the ideal as a purely subjective reality to the material nature of the world of objects, whereas E.G. Klassen and E.V. Il'enkov extended the concept of the ideal. They incorporated the forms of socio-cultural representation in it and focused on the ideal side of human activity. As for M.A. Lifshits and A.F. Losev, they further expanded this concept, analyzing the problem from an object side of the subject-object relationship. Thus, all the real sides of the relationship of the two opposites were under the materialistic research, and a generic property of the ideal – to contain not a grain of substance of the reflected object – turned to be inherent to all parts of this relationship one way or another. Indeed, the image of human consciousness is immaterial; the scheme of the activity only models the object, but it does not transfer the substance of the object in a human's subjective world; in a concentrated form an ideal object (model) embodies the system properties of a whole class of objects but not the substance of this class. All this suggested D.V. Pivovarov an idea that the ideal is not just a subjective reality, or a scheme of the activity, or object model, but a systemic quality of the whole relationship of a subject and an object (Pivovarov, 2004: 251).

Daniil Valentinovich Pivovarov fundamentally synthesized many conceptions of the ideal: "The ideal is a special medium of reproduction of common and integral characteristic features of the reality through the representa-

tives of this reality. This way is peculiar for the interaction of the subject and the object. As a way of the relationship (reflection in the Hegelian sense of the term), the ideal necessarily implies the presence of three "strong points": the object model or its sign; the scheme of practical or mental activity coupled with the model; a human's subjective ability to use his / her brain and reproduce in consciousness the idea of the class of objects the model stands for.

The ideal is not exclusively opposite to the material; as a medium of relationship it starts with the material representatives and ends with the immaterial visual image that contains not a grain of substance reproduced with the help of the representatives of the reality" (Liubutin, Pivovarov 1993: 252).

D.V. Pivovarov showed that as a specific relationship between a human and the world an ideal (through the object model or its sign) familiarization with the world is achieved by means of possessing some part of the world. But for all that, as an object model such part of the world may lack a complete, accurate and sufficient representativeness. However, a human does not always realize it, and, thus, tends to recognize it as such in the absence of other means for holistic reproduction of a specific whole being, which is sensually unavailable.

According to Pivovarov, the ideal is characterized by the unity of the sensual and the super sensual, as well as the real and the illusory (a part of an object is seen as a true model of the entire object, i.e. the whole is seen instead of the part) (Pivovarov, 2011: 26).

According to Pivovarov's synthetic conception of the ideal, the term "material" is not opposed to the term "ideal" which implies the relationship of the subject and the object, the unity of the material and immaterial poles. The true opposite of the "ideal" (a representative relationship) is "direct relationship" (Pivovarov, 2011: 26). And while there can be neither absolute directness nor absolute mediation (they reveal through each other), they are, nonetheless, two useful abstractions.

Supposing that an object of our direct relationship is a piece of canvas coated with the colour mass of different colors, then if a person interacts only with the object and nothing but

the object, such interaction can be explained by direct relationship. A human's interaction with the painted canvas as with Velázquez's portrait of, say, Philip IV, is a fundamentally different relationship in which such a new super sensual reality as the portrait of Philip IV is structured by means of the same object (a piece of canvas with a colored surface) in the space between two interacting partners. In this case we mean the ideal relationship: the physical object, perceived by senses, starts playing the role of a representative of a different reality which is at the given moment hidden from the viewer. This example leads to understanding of the theoretical meaning of opposing the ideal relationship (through an idol) to the direct one.

It is clear that the ideal relationship is impossible without direct perception of a representative (or an object model or a sign). Yet, a direct perception of a part of the reality or a body of its sign is only a mandatory prerequisite of an ideal interaction but not a product of the ideal relationship. It is only due to other component parts of the ideal process such as special schemes of actions with the representatives and the operations of the extrapolation of knowledge about the part on the hidden whole that the ideal relationship acquires the features of super sensuality and immateriality.

According to D.V. Pivovarov's synthetic theory of the ideal, the object model, the scheme of actions with it and extrapolation of knowledge about the object model onto the super sensual reality are the main components of any ideal relationship. The choice and (collective or individual) recognition of the representative of a super sensual reality are influenced by a human's attitudes, faith, conscience and knowledge available. The same is true with regard to both the scheme of action with a model of an entity (unity) and the nature of the extrapolation of the information about the model on to other object areas. It turns out that the concept of the ideal (reflection in the Hegelian sense) describes the whole totality of a human's spiritual life. The relationship of the subject and the object (the ideal) involves conscious, subconscious and unconscious acts.

Among numerous modern culturological conceptions that differently define the concept

of “culture”, it is necessary to emphasize, in our opinion, the most precise definition, thoroughly studied and analyzed by D.V. Pivovarov, the definition being the following one: “Culture is a side of human life and activities that forms the ideals” (Pivovarov, 2009).

The ideal contains all the qualities separately mentioned in the traditional analysis of culture. The ideals are what is cultivated by culture. They are the foundation of culture. It is an ability of fundamental ideals to realize its “supporting” mission that the strength and durability of culture depend on.

Not only scientific standards and industrial samples but also artistic works can represent themselves as ideals. As a distinctive feature of any culture, formation of the ideal is a process of preservation and change of models of reproduction of a specific social life in all its dimensions, revered for the ideals. It is also a process of rejection of the ideals that no longer have a life-giving influence on the growth of culture. Ideals are formed not only by people, societies and civilizations, but also by social groups and individuals. Therefore, it can be argued that in addition to the culture of the society or nation, there is a unique culture of an individual (Zhukovskii, 2013).

The carrier of culture correlates with any object not directly but only through one or another “ideal”. The relation of the carrier of culture with any sphere of life can be called ideal as it happens thanks to the ideal, acting as a representative, intermediary, and mediator.

Daniil Valentinovich Pivovarov stated that there are several models answering the question of who forms basic ideals of culture: “the elitist model”, “the collegiate model” and “the model of individual evolution”.

According to “the elitist model”, one or another basic ideal of culture is formed by a genius or an outstanding personality in a particular field of knowledge. An outstanding personality creates or opens a new ideal, while other members of the society progressively comprehend and then recognise the innovation and start cultivating it.

According to “the collegiate model”, a basic ideal of culture is formed by mutual agree-

ment or collective agreement. In this case, the ideal gets the status of law the adoption of which defines the rules and standards of behavior of all people of this society. Cultivation of the accepted ideal gradually becomes a tradition.

According to “the model of individual evolution”, everyone can become developed and independent in the matters of production and choice of cultural ideals through gradual evolution. Everyone is able to grow to the level of a creator of his / her own ideals.

For D.V. Pivovarov the “ideal” is a balance of the external and the internal. Externally (sensually) the “ideal” is presented as an “idol”, internally (super sensually) the content of the “ideal” appears as an “idea”. Thus, it can be argued that culture is a human activity of cultivation, raising, growing of ideals favouring the process of comfortable existence of each person with him / herself, other people, objects of first and second nature, and the entire universe (Pivovarov, 2013).

Artistic culture is able to generate the ideals that tend to the model ideal of harmony. Sensual representatives of the artistic culture are unique objects, things that equally reveal the material and immaterial sides. The ideal here is an intermediary between a human and the world, and it has a feature of a harmonious unity of the two opposite sides of being – a material and an immaterial ones (Liubutin, Pivovarov, 2000). The absolute-centric ideals, the works of fine arts including, have the greatest representativeness in the sphere of culture.

Fine arts is a sphere of human activity for masterly production and preservation of architectural, sculptural, pictorial, graphic and decorative works as artificial, skilful and tempting ideals. A work of fine arts is an artificial and skillfully produced ideal, an ordeal of which is aimed at the ideal (representative) relationship of the finite with the finite and the finite with the infinite. A work of art is a phenomenon which is able to act as an “illusory finite” object, the most effective means of recovery of the quality of participation of a human's individual being in self-assertion of universal Being (Zhukovskii, 2013). As a basic ideal of artistic

culture the works of art unfold as an extremely complex and contradictory dialectical process.

"Illusory finite" works of art can be defined as "one-dimensional", "two-dimensional" and "three-dimensional". These works of art are created to meet the needs of a human's "fleshly", "emotional" and "spiritual" aspects, accordingly. The representatives of an ideal relationship of the finite with the finite are mostly "one-dimensional" and "two dimensional" works of art due to a relatively large extent of the single and the specific in their "illusory finiteness". Common and universal dominate in "illusory finiteness" of "three-dimensional" works of art due to their possibility to represent an ideal relationship of the finite with the infinite.

Modern science of art has been searching for forms of scientific research of fine arts, seeking to be involved in the artistic process and analyze the trends and prospects of mod-

ern art development. Yet, even nowadays there are the conceptual provisions that are put forward and lay the foundation for the theoretical knowledge of fine arts in the integrity of works of various types and genres (Zhukovskii, 2011; Zhukovskii, Koptseva, 2004).

D.V. Pivovarov's synthetic theory of the ideal provided the basis, became the foundation for an innovative concept of fine arts. Methodological principles of the theory paved the way for the conditions to justify the elitist, collegiate, and individually evolutionary aspects of establishing the ideal and to research the regularities of an ideal-forming process in fine arts. According to the synthetic theory of the ideal, developed by the researcher, the object model or its sign (a work of art) as well as the scheme of a mental action coupled with the model contribute to the representative (ideal) relationship of a human and the Universe in their various manifestations.

References

- Dubrovskii, D.I. (2002). *Problema ideal'nogo. Sub'ektivnaia real'nost'* [The Issue of the Ideal. The subjective reality]. Moscow, Kanon+, 366 p.
- Il'enkov, E.V. (1984). *Dialekticheskaia logika [Dialectical Logic]*. Moscow, Politizdat, 318 p.
- Klassen, E.G. (1984). *Ideal'noe [The Ideal]*. Krasnoyarsk, Krasnoyarsk State University, 146 p.
- Liubutin, K.N., Pivovarov, D.V. (1993). *Dialektika sub'ekta i ob'ekta [The Dialectics of Subject and Object]*. Ekaterinburg, Ural State University, 415 p.
- Liubutin, K.N., Pivovarov, D.V. (2000). *Sinteticheskaia Teoriia [Synthetic Theory]*. Ekaterinburg; Pskov, 2000. 207 p.
- Livshits, R.L. (1997). *Dukhovnost' i bezdukhovnost' lichnosti [Spirituality and Non-Spirituality of the Individual]*. Ekaterinburg, Ural State University, 150 p.
- Losev, A.F. (1993). *Bytie. Imia. Kosmos [Being. Name. Space]*. Moscow, Mysl', 958 p.
- Pivovarov, D.V. (2004). *Ideal'noe [The Ideal]*. *Sovremennyi filosofskii slovar'*. Pod. red. V. Kemerova [Contemporary Philosophical Dictionary. Ed. by V. Kemerov]. Moscow, Academic Project, 864 p.
- Pivovarov, D.V. (2009). Problema sinteza osnovnykh definitsii kul'tury [The Problem of Synthesis of the Main Definitions of Culture], *In Bulletin of the Russian Philosophical Society*, 1, 157-161.
- Pivovarov, D.V. (2011). *Sinteticheskaia paradigma v filosofii: izbrannye stat'i [The Synthetic Paradigm in Philosophy: Selected Articles]*. Ekaterinburg, Ural State University, 536 p.
- Pivovarov, D.V. (2013). *Kul'tura i religii. Sakralizatsiia bazovykh idealov [Culture and Religion. Sacralization of Basic Ideals]*. Ekaterinburg, Ural State University, 24 p.
- Zhukovskii, V.I. (2011). *Teoriia izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva [The Theory of Fine Arts]*. St.-Petersburg, Aletheia, 496 p.
- Zhukovskii, V.I. (2013). Proizvedenie iskusstva v epitsentre khudozhestvennoi kul'tury [A Work of Art in the Epicenter of the Artistic Culture], *In Philosophy and Culture*, 11, 1613-1620. DOI: 10.7256/1999-2793.2013.11.9845
- Zhukovskii, V.I., Koptseva, N.P. (2004). *Propositsii teorii izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva [Propositions of the Theory of Fine Arts]*. Krasnoyarsk, Krasnoyarsk State University, 265 p.

Zhukovskii, V.I., Koptseva, N.P., Pivovarov, D.V. (2006). *Vizual'naiia sushchnost' religii [Visual Nature of Religion]*. Krasnoyarsk, Krasnoyarsk State University, 460 p.

Zhukovskii, V.I., Pivovarov, D.V. (1991). *Zrimaia sushchnost'. (Vizual'noe myshlenie v izobrazitel'nom iskusstve) [Visible Entity. (Visual Thinking in Fine Arts)]*. Sverdlovsk, Ural State University, 284 p.

Zhukovskii, V.I., Pivovarov D.V. (1998). *Intellektual'naiia vizualizatsiia sushchnosti [Intellectual Visualization of Entity]*. Krasnoyarsk, Krasnoyarsk State University, 222 p.

Zhukovskii, V., Pivovarov, D. (2010). Works of Art and Visual Thinking, *In European Journal of Natural History*, 2, 38-42.

Zhukovskii, V.I., Pivovarov D.V. (2015). “Diskobol” Mirona kak representant dialektiki Geraklita [“The Discus Thrower” by Myron as a Representant of Heraclitus’s Dialectics], *In Intellekt. Innovatsii. Investitsii [Intelligence. Innovations. Investments]*, 1, 142-147.

Zhukovskii, V.I., Pivovarov, D.V., Rakhmatullin, R.Iu. (1988). *Vizual'noe myshlenie v strukture nauchnogo poznaniia [Visual Thinking in the Structure of Scientific Knowledge]*. Krasnoyarsk, 188 p.

Концепция идеального Д.В. Пивоварова – фундамент современной теории изобразительного искусства

В.И. Жуковский

*Сибирский федеральный университет
Российская Федерация, Красноярск*

Аннотация. Статья раскрывает методологические положения синтетической теории идеального отечественного ученого Д. В. Пивоварова, которые легли в основу исследования закономерностей идеалообразующего процесса в изобразительном искусстве. Согласно теории, разработанной ученым, идеал выступает посредником между человеком и миром и обладает качеством гармоничного единения двух противоположных сторон бытия – материальной и духовной. А произведение изобразительного искусства есть искусственный и искусно произведенный идеал, искус которого направлен на репрезентативное отношение конечного с конечным и конечного с бесконечным. Определяя место произведения искусства в системе художественной культуры, автор статьи утверждает, что концепция идеального, разработанная Д.В. Пивоваровым, является фундаментом современной теории изобразительного искусства, способствует научному изучению изобразительного искусства, помогает освоить сложный диалектический процесс репрезентативного отношения человека (зрителя) со своей душой, душами других людей, Духом Божиим.

Ключевые слова: Д. В. Пивоваров, синтетическая теория идеального, идеал, эталон, художественная культура, изобразительное искусство, модель, художественное произведение, зритель, художественный процесс.

Научная специальность: 17.00.00 – искусствоведение.