

A DISCOURSE ON THE ALLEGORY OF THE NUDE FEMALE FORMS IN PAINTINGS: READING THEIR CONTEXTS FOR PEDAGOGICAL LEARNING

By

Zeekeyi Denison Yibowei, (Ph.D.)

Department of Fine and Applied Arts, Faculty of Environmental Sciences,
Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.

Correspondence Author: Zeekeyiyibowei@ndu.edu.ng.

Abstract

This paper explores the roles of ‘female nude’ in paintings. It argues on the prevailing roles symbolisms were used to characterize ideas: looking at their symmetric relationships from social, monarchical, personal and mythological delivery before the period of the Willendorf’s discovery in Austria, the Etruscan period, up to the High Renaissance, and the Modern periods, ‘fetishism’ of the female body – gained notoriety amongst certain classes. Its creativity of espoused mainly patronage, but the practice was gradually becoming eroded with subjectivity delimiting influences of reimagining mythological happenings. Thus, Jacques Lacan’s theory of “the gaze” was mentioned to cause a rationale for the ‘female nude’ forms. In contrast, the triangulation of the “recognition theory”, and the Epistemic theory were respectively adopted, underscoring the functionalism of each painting as content enabled beyond ‘nudity’. The paper concludes that paintings of these kinds do not merely exist as a works of art without leaving messages to ponder on, thus heightening their role as cognitive learning devices.

Keywords: Female nude, Etruscan, High Renaissance, cognitive learning.

Introduction

The substance of the ‘female flesh’ is discussed here, and there exist in its sexual overtones. Despite their palpable presence, their contours remain elusive due to the inherently polyperspectival nature of their thematic expressions. Their boundaries are clear and are appraised on the use of symbolical, theoretical, religiosity, or philosophical references to pluralise meanings—especially where questions arise: *what is it about?* This is usually a way of putting things “in-and-out of” contexts, depending on the subject matter of perspectives; and like the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein’s (1889–1951) once said, “*The aim of philosophy is to show the fly a way out of the bottle*”—and” here, the aim is clearly to help the mind (the fly) escape the constraints of viewing the raw female flesh by revealing new perspectives and a broader understanding of their allegorical meanings behind the female form. As a result of the thesis, the criticisms that may arise from it could differ, but are equally central with coherency—scarcely has the availing of beauty itself been null of *the propensity of the captivating nude*, which forms the oasis of our unconscious reaches. The aestheticism of the female body bears a questionable mix of *lust* and *temperance* amid the cavities of social nuances: the paradoxes of the images captivation is tense and indeed *subjective*, and this supplements the scope.

Fig. 1. Jean-Dominique
Bath, 1862.
canvas on
panel ; 108



Auguste-
Ingres, *The Turkish
Bath*, 1862.
Marouflaged
laminated wood
108 cm x 108 cm.

Wikiart.org

Although the image itself is ontologically stable, its semantic significance is subject to transformation through the strategic deployment of exemplary contexts that catalyse innovative interpretations of its emblematic function. This aspect is subject to multiple meanings, but we recognise the influence of symbolism, which can be powerful yet problematic—potentially leading to obsessive or exploitative interpretations of *fetishism* and *voyeurism* entanglements. The paper sheds a different light on the aforementioned with creative licensing to absolve the reading of these forms to be unjustly read as *obscene*. This is particularly especial for the nontechnical; as this is malaise of *mimesis*, tends to often lead to the contrary—the question of *agency*—is the reason why allegorical meanings are contingent to these paintings—for which each can be read in a multifaceted manner considering ‘in-and-out of’ contexts of the subject matter. Thusly, this domesticates the argument as contextualising a select artistic practice in painting since the ‘nudity’ epochs were previously conceived. This is open to different understandings, not conclusions.

To the casual observer, the nude in paintings is a voyeuristic culture, more or less; this is susceptibly a bourgeoisie hedonism and hegemony gratification—theoretically speaking, that we may rather become tired of its familiarity. But does it have far more to avail—iconographically—does it suggest a prelude to amore compelling awareness, beyond our comparative analyses, where peculiarities to epistemic learning are involved? or is it merely an image of a sensual ornament to show off luxury, wealth, and control? To answer some of these questions in a visual composition, does Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, *The Turkish Bath* (1862), suggest an evocative and uninhibited fetishism? However, Ingres’ painting depicts an apt use of symbolism to represent the “five senses”: **touch** (the two women fondling in the background), **smell**, (our olfactory senses is tasked imaginatively, to participate in the sensual ambience of both the female *bodies* therein and, seeing the perfume held by the female standing on the right); **taste** (we are not just teased by the perfume, our appetite is teased altogether seeing the tray of food in the foreground, gives us a sense of participation that does not expressly isolate us from the sight of the women); **sound** (of the guitar, conjures up a mental tune that is complimentary with the mood therein) and above all, **sight**, thus emphasizing of the importance of Ingres’s curvilinear form. Tunnelling our vision to a spectacle liberating the women from the physical presence of the male observer, except for the only male inserted in the painting by Ingres—the sultan, amongst his prized possessions, allows us to mentally participate enviably into a purely female space.

One way to look at this objectively is to rationalise this subversion of ourselves as having social and personal significance—psychoanalytically pervasive and too deep. Are these ever true of allegorical paintings? Nothing has ever been capitalist about the subject, except considering the degree of its stark expressiveness of the culture it pertains to. We are constantly made to become more aware of our own ignorance through the art—painting especially—perhaps by moderating the appearance of ‘what we see’ and ‘how we see’, and per ‘why we see’ the way we do, relying on the path other than what previous conventions have shaped us to see—we accept that “the gaze reinforces Lacan’s notion of the subject within the self” (Barrett, 2008, p. 157). Let us consider Jacques Lacan’s theory of “the gaze,” which may as well signal a split between *eye* and *sight*, by momentarily considering the group of visual reinforcements of the “female flesh,” or what we see as fetish, in relation to the semblance of *sight* and *self*. It presents to us a cluster of representations

found in the real world of persons, the application of symbolism and possible events that becomes suitable according to the “recognition theory,” and how they have been deftly contextualised, adopting the concept of ‘depiction’, or ‘representation’ which, insofar, bears a content-orientated approach in terms of their informativeness—according to Lacan’s theory, as *asymmetric*. “This is one of the few bedrock truths approved by all philosophers who have worked up opinions on the matter” (Lopes, 2006, p. 160). Thus, the experience of looking at visual art has continued to play a vital role in the way we are required to look at things differently. What a given work of art represents, as we have lately come to inherit their iconographies from the past—and of the discourses and criticisms that will be eventually made in the future—just as, for example, “the function of art as moderator of appearances, as that which ennobles the visible” (Berger, 2015), questions the realism, theory, and programme in Courbet’s *A Burial at Ornans* (1849-50). We might as well have naturally announced a recurrence of reality, just the way it seems—except: ‘This is how we appear’; as a prelude in this context, our place in history.

Naturally, questions arise concerning the ‘iconography’ of the female body represented in nude form—a dense historical article in which our perceptions of it are shouldered with great responsibility of our own comportment, neither deviating to sexuality, sadomasochism, or its fetish fervours, nor seen to be relegating our senses of the opposite sex into a somewhat tranquillized state of religious fanaticism. Thus causing existential rights and conflicts to wade into social exclusion of persons or their rights; this paper is not with such intentions, whatsoever. It will not even attempt to speak for nor against any of such margins, as its scope is not tailored in that direction, nor antagonistic whilst exploring its subject-matter.



Fig. 2. *Venus of Willendorf*, lower Austria, c.25,000-20,000 B.C.E. Limestone, height 4 1/2 in. Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna. [Pinterest.org](https://www.pinterest.org) ◀

That established, from the historical examples of the Venus of Willendorf’s discovery in 1908, at Willendorf in Austria, one would obviously be struck dumb with amazement of its stark rotund form, blemishing our sights with its strangeness. Yet, we persevered further, wondering why even the male figure would have even preferred considering wrestling in nude before their cheering spectators from the ‘Etruscan Art’, having a mix of Greek, Phoenician, and Asian influences in the artform, dated as far back as the eight century BCE. If this is convenient as it were, the *Aldobrandini Wedding* c.27 BCE–14 CE Vatican City Museum, a fresco discovered around 1601 in the remains of a Roman mansion, clearly depicts Venus attending to the bride in the centre, half

nude herself, perhaps eliciting the only thing that man has always not been impervious to—nude *beauty*—by an example of a monumental remark given by Vitruvius Pollio in c.20 BCE, when he mentioned "for the eye is always in search of beauty" (as cited in *Art that Changed the World*, p.40). It is no ordinary feat to argue this subject without looking at its diverse positions from culture, philosophy, religion, politics, and/or phenomenon, as a debate bordering history, and its well documented themes; has it, or as we have come to know from many arguments of the subject, it has peculiarly been an acceptable condition amongst bourgeois culture—to which Adorno referred as the '*aesthetic hegemony*' which was part and parcel of 'hedonism'—to 'universalise pleasure [from it as] *beauty*' (Adorno, 1997; Beech, 2009).

The specific focus of this paper is a collection of paintings exhibiting the female in nude as "Fetish"—or" perversions of *beauty*—where these paintings were originally made to satisfy the private life of a closed-public viewership and, of course, their consumption as art form by expanding the repertoire of the bourgeoisie lass. If public, as seen during the High Renaissance (1500-30) in the *Jupiter and Lo* painting by Corregio c. 1530, painted for Federico II Gonzaga, 5th Marchese of Mantua, as commission, this was suggested as a gift for Emperor Charles V., which depicts Jupiter, the Greek god who the artist represents as a burst of cloud ravishing the nymph. Lo, who naturally succumbs in the erotic abandon, is not misplaced here, especially in the soft, sensuous rendering of Lo's flesh and facial features (Welton, 2013); similarly, is the *Mars and Venus United by Love* (1575), which the artist Paolo Caliari depicted sensuously. The unification of opposites—Mars and Venus, clasping a breast to suckle Mars with her milk—suggests various themes in this mythological painting.

The preponderance of nudity tends to galvanise the rhetoric of fetishism in the *Death and the Maiden* (c. 1520–25) painting by Hans Baldung Grien's macabre and erotic intersection between the underworld and the one we so much favoured for its fleeting aesthetics. Yet the female subject in Grien's macabre painting seems to submit willingly to her fate, one chosen by death devouring the beauty off of her pale form. The woman is seen naked, submissive, with eyes round with fear as she gasped in horror: her frail attempt to stay her life was a moot point in the circumstances meted before her; skin already cold and white as an ice chip and death's carmine. Its hair was wispy and thin on its ancient head, who in other ways will be its victim's folk, to attend her in her darkness—draining her off her essence, weak with horror—as it replenishes itself as though to repair its appearance before moving on to its next victim. If you gave your sight to this, it naturally will be the preoccupation of the theme Grien wanted us to see, as though beauty is a meaningless excuse to propitiate man wholly to its whims. Thus, *The Pearl Fishers* (1570–72) by Alessandro Allori flaunts this posthaste; even if this late Mannerism work suggests something else, one would naturally attribute the painting as having the same rendering as Michelangelo's *Battle of Cascina*. The turning point in 'seeing' culture is subject to symbolism, and behind the *An Allegory with Venus and Cupid* (c. 1545), painted by Agnolo Bronzino, who was also founder of Florence's 'new art academy' at the time, his mythological painting seems to have gained traction with Cupid fondling Venus's breast, which she does not object to, while they both kiss and gaze into each other's eyes. The painting is cool and with erotic allegory. This was commissioned by the Duke of Florence, and the latter gifted it to the French King Francis I at the time.

The painting bears the treatment of Mannerism—courtly to its audience, Bronzino allows us to contemplate over the consequences of unchaste love. It, however, has been described as one not shy of incest between Cupid and his mother, Venus (the goddess of love and beauty), who is identified by her golden apple in her left hand; she deftly removes an arrow from her son’s quiver as the duo share a passionate kiss together. One would naturally surmise that this painting is personified with the concepts of **pleasure** (offering the duo a sweet honeycomb but failing to even notice a sting in her tail); the screaming figure is thought to represent **jealousy** or the disease syphilis, which was rife at the time; the old man pulling back the curtain to expose deception is regarded as **time**; with an hourglass on his back—**folly**, as is thought of in the painting, seems to shower the duo with rose petals but does not notice the thorn stuck in the foot. To some, the painting is regarded as a dark joke to even be considered a gift to the French king from the duke himself.

Too much of history—in the arts particularly—the Mannerism concept tends to reveal so much of ecstatic delight, renowned for its explicit sexual state using sophisticated themes of delicious beauty, venerated with allegories of antiquated pasts, but esoteric themes, as preferred, need no introduction amongst its diverse array of artists who have modelled and mastered the artform to suit their *court patrons* for its decorative splendour as accustomed to the time.

We will allude briefly to the main point. The allure of *Diana the Huntress* (c. 1550) by an unknown artist shows our curious eyes of an elegant female—nude, as precise the point—in her contrapposto pose, magnetises us with eroticism to a quiet place outside of the canvas, yet the allegorical portrait states more than the confines of its visual narrative in this French Mannerist art. Nudity amplifies the norm in *Cupid. Complaining to Venus* (c. 1530) by Lucas Cranach bore an aristocratic semblance of the goddess trendy in fashionable jewels and hats, seem plausible of a fetish desire, of Cranach’s patron, Fredrick the Wise of Saxony (Germany), to depict a mistress, perhaps Jan Gossaert (Mabuse) *Danaë* (c.1527) is a scantily clad Danaë—as accustomed to the gods, the disguised Zeus, who has taken the form of a shower of gold dust, is seducing her—is yet another representation of nude figures in mythologies, which is no different from the same sensualities offloaded in Niccolò dell’Abate’s *The Death of Eurydice* (c. 1557), even with death and its renowned presence in an expansive landscape, gives us a narrative of Eurydice, depicted twice—as would a time loop—or a glimpse into a future of what may happen—thus fleeing her attacker, while the other part of the Eurydice was already dying from a serpent bite. It seems much more surreal and deeply moving, but does not fail to expose nudity in its elegance of mythological subjects.

The particularity of the subject is intense, but more intense in the revelation of fetishism, spans through Bartholomeus Spranger’s *Venus and Adonis* (c.1585-90), Hans von Aachen’s *Bacchus, Cere, and Cupid* (c.1600), Peter Paul Reubens’ *The Horrors of War* (c.1638), David Teniers the Younger’s *The Archduke Leopold William in His Picture Gallery* (c. 1652), *Perseus and Andromeda* (c.1723) by Francois Lemoyne, *The Four Seasons: Summer* (c.1755) by François Boucher; the classical myth of *Bacchus and Ariadne* (c.1716), *Jupiter Kissing Ganymede* (c.1758-59) by Anton Raphael Mengs, *Cupid and Psyche* (c.1817) by Jacques-Louis David, though having a moral allegory after Napoleons defeat and the restoration of the monarchy, the painting contrast

the idealized a coarse naturalism between Cupid and Psyche as though it was a delight of the French monarch system relishing its once scuttled splendor restored.

The dramatic moment of heroic lifestyle from the past became minutely reduced somewhat of, though replaced with impressions of the evolving world, artists of the nineteenth century, evoked more of the potentialities of colour and line, respectively, but not deviating from a much-evoked symbolist mysteriousness entwined in the world of dreams and other psychoanalytic concerns. But this did not stop the exhibitions of nudity in any way. More so, the profundity of it took a different subscription, rejecting the calm exteriority of sensual perversions to a more disturbing renditioning of forces beyond our control of spectres partaking in the fetishisms equated in such paintings. Henry Fuseli, *The Nightmare* (c.1781), is a symbolic painting depicting states of the mind and themes such as sleep, dreams, death, and eroticism. Ary Scheffer's *Francesca da Rimini* (c.1835) conjures up a second circle of hell in Dante's inferno of Francesca and Paolo (lovers), whom the artists depicted in the state of their romantic hell, while Dante and his guide, the Roman Poet Virgil, observe the scene from the sidelines. If this is death – hell, or pleasure in a disturbing form – then John Everett Millais's *Ophelia* (c.1851) encapsulates the first episode of death, devoid of the detailed pleasures entailed in the nude – such fetishisms are often relieved in the loss of innocence estimated in Paul Gauguin's *Barbaric Tales* (1902) –prioritized the imagination, symbolism and the rationalism of the modern world, but was this short-lived, still baring roots to concepts of nudity playing not just erotic roles to satisfy a bourgeois few, or that artists reacted against materialism as culture, by uplifting our minds farther into mystification, preferring to communicate ideas that will eventually jar us out of complacency – into a stillness requiring rationalization through the acute power of female sexuality? Perhaps Courbet's *The Origin of the World* (1866) painting submits us into the realm of mystification and revelation of the rawness of a certain reality we are most familiar with, especially in the personification of 'creationism' depicted "in-and-out" of context in itself. Pablo Picasso's *Les Femmes d'Alger (O. J. R. M.)* (1907) takes us closer to the point where Courbet's subject pleads anonymity—Picassone's is a stark example of that invitation, into the explicit lifestyle of brothel frequents. The five women in the painting represent the prostitutes frequently engaged for their services, to which the title is a reference to Barcelona's Carrer d'Avinyo (Avignon Street), known for its notoriety for such establishments: "The figures in Picasso's painting are grossly distorted and have no trace of what is usually taken to be visual beauty" (Graham, 1997, p. 185).



Fig. 3. Pablo Picasso, *Les Femmes d'Alger (O. J. R. M.)* (1907), oil on canvas, 243.9 cm x 233.7 cm. en-wikipedia.org ◀

If Picasso's intention were to faithfully render the ugly side of voyeurism, to convey a conception we—some—may loathe, then it is only practical that his invitation into the space and that behind the curtains, which the women protect until our interests are aroused, is only imagined; then the theme, for whatever it may suggest to us, further necessitates us into becoming a learning vessel by experience—perhaps from the same sense of distance Vanessa Beecroft's *VB50.001.dr* (2002) moderates our presence therein.

No sooner is this taken preemptively, like the Artemesia Gentileschi, *Judith, and Maidservant with the Head of Holofernes*, c. 1625, that we may categorise the power of feminised atrocities, the kind depicted in *The Apparition* (c. 1876) by the founding father of symbolist painting in France, Gustave Moreau, portraying Salome, who bewitched her stepfather Herod with her dancing and demanded the head of John the Baptist as a reward; but does this portend that sensuality or eroticism should pause in the transcription of reality, much more complex than this, in the canvases of death, dreams, and eroticisms? Ferdinand Hodler, *Night* (1889–90) represents himself as rudely awakened by the figure of death, while all around him lie entwined bodies of sleeping men and women. For Hodler, the painting evokes the essence of *night* and *death* with exquisite precision and clarity of life's hard reality.



Fig.4. Lucian Freud, *Benefit Supervisor Sleeping*, (1995). Oil on canvas, 151.5 x 219 cm. Wikipedia.org

Much inclined to this was the clarity behind Lucian Freud's *The Benefit Supervisor* (1995), a searing realism with a complex atmosphere. Beyond the perplexing weight and significance of the subject's appearance, the painting is genuinely provocative beyond the criticisms struck against Courbet's *The Bathers* (1853) for the women's voluptuousness. Of course, Stanley Spencer's *Double Nude Portrait: The Artist and His Second Wife, or The Leg of Mutton Nude* (1937), vividly explains the painter's growing awareness of the succumbing of his body to ageing, as compared to the shrivelling mutton placed by the side of his wife; Georgia O'Keefe's *Jack-in-the-Pulpit No. IV*

(1930) seems to evade the concept, vividly disavowing Stanley's realisations; O'Keefe gives us a somewhat revitalisation of the sexual organ of a female in a sort of botanical blossoming of carefree disposition in all of its intensity with colour-sensation. Whereas, we naturally become startled by equating not just Balthus's *The Guitar Lesson* (1934), *Theresa Dreaming* (1938) paintings as lesbianism eroticism, making him an acute observer of today's socio-sexual neuroses (Thompson, 2006), but to disorient our visions further with Egon Schiele's *Black-Haired Girl with Skirt Turned Up* (1911), *Standing Nude* (1911), and *Moa* (1911) as subjects of corruption of minor, it conjures up moments of social delinquency in a more ambiguous character as a state of mind, Edouard Manet's *Olympia* (1863) is no different from the way the he reinforced the expression of the female suggesting her availability – “she is also delivering a moral provocation to the viewer with her gaze” (Thompson, 2006, p.16) Yasumasa Morimura's *Self-portrait (actress) Red Marilyn* (1996) pushes the boundaries such that, as we begin to wonder the thin line between act and self-discovery of something other than originality, the intent becomes questionable, more so, instantaneously disturbing in the rude joke of the female body as feeble in Sarah Lucas's *Pauline Bunny* (1997), as Richard Cork puts it sparingly, "Today all old hierarchies have definitely given way to a more flexible, open-ended, and improvisatory dynamic" (Cox, 2013, p. 7). What he meant to say is thus, art has taken a more dizzying freewheeling attitude since post-post-impressionism, and this is peculiarly defiantly pin down by artists of this era to find stimuli in the terrain of creativity—fascinated by creative freedom or artistic licensing, territorial boundaries are broken, and the world is vulnerable to newer portfolios that the artist is willing to show.

The pleasure of the mind is greatly contested when we are completely encapsulated to describe our experiences as from the above—visually—of reflections on the subject, to which bodies and pleasure are evinced, sustained as a convention and from conventions, and developed by reflection, which may be sentimental, at best, subjective, particularly anatomising nudity since the classical and extending to the modern epoch. The paper involves us in the visual experiences of a complex mixture of the “otherness” of the visual meanings and events behind each of the paintings that informs the discourse here. However, the variety tends to be enormous, and attention to the complexity of it is ever involved; amongst other things, it cannot be fully exhausted here. Thus, we would consider looking at it two ways: by isolating the proclivity of the nude subject, for this is established; hedonism and hegemony are nonessential given the limitations of the paper, for which this has been taken elsewhere (see); rather, a consideration of the paradigmatic exchange each work possesses and its extent of context can only be imagined, from themes, composition, and creatively technical execution of the subject—allegorically, bearing in mind the framework of using *art* and *cognition*.

Epistemic Learning

Pressing on, ‘Art and Cognition’ embodies the imagination, sensible enough to teach us knowledgeably, especially under circumstances of creative merits, which can be cognitivist sometimes. “Moreover, most cognitivists correctly hold that there is a wide variety of different kinds of knowledge that art can impart to its appreciator: propositional knowledge, know-how (skills), phenomenal knowledge (knowledge of what it is like to experience something), conceptual knowledge, knowledge of values and of significance, for example” (Gaut, 2006, p. 115). But from the widely accepted argument given the subject, let us quickly consider looking at

the **Epistemic Claim** that art (considering the title: reflecting the symbolisms or meanings/insights each painting mentioned here) can nontrivially teach us not only about ourselves but inclusively of the world we live in. Though Stolnitz (1992) dismisses this, particularly disavowing that the potentiality of fictional learning to produce ‘truth’ as cognitive learning is unattainable, Gaut (2003) argues otherwise that Stolnitz had merely failed to rationalise that fictional learning also creates awareness of associating ‘truth’ to known circumstances—even those of other persons—and contributes towards the extent of gaining cognitively by testimony in the same way art can teach us by guiding our own imaginations to its given subject matter. If this is so, then it is no surprise that even *An Allegory with Venus and Cupid* (c. 1545), painted by Agnolo Bronzino, provides the associational experience, perhaps extending into Stanley Spencer’s *Double Nude Portrait: The Artist and His Second Wife or The Leg of Mutton Nude* (1937), vividly explaining the painter’s growing concerns and awareness of his body succumbing to ageing when compared to the shrivelling mutton placed by the side of his wife. However counterfactual Stolnitz’s dismissals may imply, it is only *subjective* a remark as ascertained in the opening of this paper. Milan Kundera’s view is essential to mean that “characters are not born like people, of a woman; they are born out of a situation, a sentence, a metaphor containing in a nutshell a basic human possibility that the author thinks no one else has discovered or said something essential about” (Kundera, 1984, p. 221). This in context is to say that creative symbolisms—the particularity sustained visually by exploring ‘female nudity’ and the subject interchanging the real and the imagined—are only born out of situations. While the artist supplements these metaphorically, he thinks a more cognitive learning approach is needed to enforce a paradigm shift; through cogency and coherency, truth is eventually achieved by considering subjective cognitive. “Art is most valuable when it serves as a source of understanding” (Graham, 1997, p. 62). We might as well extend this thought to what our subject matter deploys amongst the paintings mentioned here, which is no different from Rembrandt’s self-portrait serving as stark observations of mood and character. The paintings summarily serve as psychoanalytical vessels not just in the understanding of historiography but to point out our character indexes—challenging the norm—causative of the frailties we must eventually succumb to in Courbet’s *A Burial at Ornans*.

Conclusion

Naturally, questions may arise on the subject, each having a remark or two that may have gone unattended to, but this is obvious and unintentional. The paper, having this in mind, argued at the level of the potential impact the concept and propensity of ‘nude’ impressions have in art as a vehicle for raising existential and collective awareness in terms of situational examples as messages of legitimacy to their audience’s receptivity to it. The paper went on to delimit its scope by pruning out already overcompensated debates spanning social delinquencies, aestheticism, theoretical impalements on hedonism, and hegemony of bourgeoisie capitulations, but based its material as an overview with particular interest in delivering coherent views and of its cogency to the nontechnical, that is, supposed if a message possesses essential value to potential receivers, prejudices that may of course inhibit its receptivity are minimized. The paper had brought to the fore reflections on the subject and specific insights to underscore the rhetoric of epistemic learning as acceptable learning and understanding of the paintings mentioned. “Furthermore, in the modern world, the fact remains that no messages will be received unless they are sent” (Luna, 2014, p. 25).

References

- Adorno, T. (1997). *Aesthetic Theory*. Translated by Robert Hullot-Kentor, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barrett, T. (2008). *Why Is That Art? Aesthetics and Criticisms of Contemporary Art*. Oxford University Press, New York, p.157.
- Beech, D. (2009). *Art and the Politics of Beauty*, in *Beauty: Documents of Contemporary Art*. Whitechapel and The MIT Press.
- Berger, J. (2015). *Portraits: John Berger on Artists*; introduction by Overton, T., Verso, UK: London, p.
- Cox, R. (2013). *An Introduction*, in *Contemporary Art: The Essential Guide to 200 Groundbreaking Artists*, Goodman Book, p.7.
- Graham, G. (1997). *Philosophy of the Arts: An Introduction to Aesthetics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kundera, M. (1984). *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, trans. Heim, M. New York: Harper and Row, p.221.
- Luna, C. (2014). *Techno-Humanity Paintings: Art as Social Commentary in the Digital Age*. An Unpublished Master of Fine Arts Thesis, Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado, p.25.
- Lopes, D.M. (2006). *The Domain of Depiction*, in *Contemporary Debates in Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art*. Blackwell Publishing, p.160.
- Thompson, J. (2006). *How To Read A Modern Painting: Lessons from the Modern Masters*. Abrams: New York.
- Welton, J. (2013). *Renaissance and Mannerism*, in *Art that Changed the World*, DK: London, p.107.
- Zaczek, I. (2013). *Ancient and Medieval*, in *Art that Changed the World*, DK: London, p.40