

Estética de lo repugnante. Posibilidad de la representación estética de lo repugnante en el arte

*Aesthetics of the Disgusting. Possibility of the Aesthetic Representation of
the Disgusting in Art*

*Estética do nojento. Possibilidade da representação estética do repugnante
na arte*

Enrique Jesús Rodríguez Bárcenas

Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, Facultad de Bellas Artes, Querétaro, México

enrique.jesus.rodriguez@uaq.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3980-6752>

Resumen

Este trabajo partió de la idea de que lo repugnante en sí mismo no puede ser arte ni, por tanto, fuente de placer estético. El objetivo de este artículo fue el análisis de las teorías del asco más recientes y, en función de ello, determinar las consecuencias para una teoría o categorización estética de lo repugnante. Las fuentes que se han revisado han permitido vislumbrar que el asco tiene que ver con aquello constitutivo de lo humano o que lo determina como tal, por lo cual existe una antropología del asco. El asco y lo asqueroso han jugado un papel muy importante en las diversas culturas, en las artes y, por consecuencia, en la estética. La metodología usada fue descriptiva, como instrumento se recurrió a la investigación documental. Como resultado, se pudo establecer que el asco previene del peligro del exceso: al prohibirse el contacto con lo asqueroso, ese límite y prohibición prometen algo hermoso e inaccesible. La transgresión tiene algo de fascinante, pero solo con seguridad y ausencia de daño hay placer estético: ese placer es la consecuencia de concebir la forma sensible que el artista, a partir de su trabajo, le da a lo asqueroso. Al ser lo asqueroso recreado y representado por el arte, permite explorar lo inhumano salvaguardando a la humanidad a través de la imitación, la representación y la ficción. Se concluye que, siguiendo a Colin McGinn (2016), el placer que puede ofrecer lo asqueroso en el ámbito de lo humano y de la cultura está a

merced de un proceso de purificación y perfeccionamiento del trabajo artístico que permita acceder a su forma estética.

Palabras clave: asco, asqueroso, cultura, estética, humano, peligro.

Abstract

This work started from the idea that the disgusting in itself can not be art nor, therefore, source of aesthetic pleasure. The objective of this article was the analysis of the most recent theories of disgust and, depending on this, to determine the consequences for a theory or aesthetic categorization of the disgusting. The sources that have been reviewed have allowed to glimpse that the disgust has to do with that constitutive of the human thing or determines it as such, for which there exists an anthropology of disgust. Disgust and revolting have played a very important role in different cultures, in the arts and, consequently, in aesthetics. The methodology used was descriptive, as an instrument was resorted to documentary research based on some theorists of disgust. As a result, it could be established that disgust prevents the danger of excess: by prohibiting contact with the disgusting, this limit and prohibition promise something beautiful and inaccessible. The transgression has something fascinating, but only with safety and absence of damage there is aesthetic pleasure: that pleasure is the consequence of conceiving the sensitive form that the artist, from his work, gives to the disgusting. Being the gross recreated and represented by art, it allows us to explore the unclean by safeguarding humanity through imitation, representation and fiction. It is concluded that, following Colin McGinn (2016), the pleasure that can offer the disgusting in the field of human and culture is at the mercy of a process of purification and improvement of the artistic work that allows access to its aesthetic form.

Keywords: disgust, disgusting, culture, aesthetic, human, danger.

Resumo

Este trabalho partiu da ideia de que o repugnante em si não pode ser arte nem, portanto, fonte de prazer estético. O objetivo deste artigo foi a análise das teorias mais recentes de repugnância e, dependendo disso, determinar as conseqüências para uma teoria ou categorização estética do repugnante. As fontes que foram revistas permitiram vislumbrar que o desgosto tem a ver com aquele constitutivo do humano ou que o determina como tal, pelo que existe uma antropologia do repulsa. Repulsa e nojo desempenharam um papel muito importante em diferentes culturas, nas artes e, conseqüentemente, na estética. A metodologia utilizada foi descritiva, pois foi utilizado um instrumento para pesquisa documental. Como resultado, ficou estabelecido que o nojo evita o perigo do excesso: proibindo o contato com o bruto, esse limite e a proibição prometem algo belo e inacessível. A transgressão tem algo de fascinante, mas só com segurança e ausência de dano há prazer estético: esse prazer é a conseqüência de conceber a forma sensível que o artista, a partir de sua obra, dá ao repugnante. Sendo o bruto recriado e representado pela arte, permite-nos explorar o impuro salvaguardando a humanidade através da imitação, representação e ficção. Conclui-se que, seguindo Colin McGinn (2016), o prazer que o repugnante pode oferecer na esfera humana e cultural está à mercê de um processo de purificação e aprimoramento do trabalho artístico que permita o acesso à sua forma estética.

Palavras-chave: nojo, repugnante, cultura, estética, humana, perigo.

Fecha Recepción: Julio 2018

Fecha Aceptación: Diciembre 2018

Introduction

Semantically, disgust carries an emotional character, as it is experienced by the body itself that is involved. It would be necessary to take into account, for example, the alteration that it provokes, from the chills to the incitement to vomit. The disgust implies the opposition between two things, the aversion to someone or something, resistance that opposes to consent or do something, as well as the incompatibility between two attributes or qualities of the same thing (Dictionary of the Spanish language, 2014).

Now, several decades have already been presented in the artistic sphere works made with disgusting elements and looking for repulsive effects or the sense of shock in the viewer.

Danto (2005) comments:

The discourse of aesthetic redemption assures us that, sooner or later, all art will seem beautiful to us, no matter how ugly it was at first. Try to see it as something beautiful! It becomes something like an imperative for those who contemplate an art that does not seem beautiful at all. Someone told me that I had found beauty in the worms that infest the head of the cow, cut and in visible putrefaction, put in a showcase by the young British artist Damien Hirst (p. 91)

Danto himself (2005), in *The Abuse of Beauty*, pointed out that if critics can applaud the use of the disgusting in contemporary art, it is not because they have a new aesthetic at their disposal, but because they are applauding the use of it. do the artists. He explains that Dadaism emerged in the 20th century as a response to the confusion of the role of beauty (Danto, 2005). This movement refused to create beautiful objects and helped to show that art did not necessarily have to be beautiful. Dadaism shows an abhorrence to beauty, taking as its axis disgust or disgust. From the perspective of Danto (2005), beauty ceases to be treated as it was due to the fall into disuse of the traditional definition of art and the arrival of the belief that beauty trivializes the object that possesses it.

This previously updated the discussion that Kant (2001) mentioned a while ago: the true antinomy of the aesthetic is between the beautiful and the unpleasant and not between the beautiful and the ugly, since this last quality can be appreciated through the art.

For Kant (2001), disgust was a mode of ugliness resistant to the kind of pleasure that even the most unpleasant things are capable of causing when they are represented as beautiful by works of art. What causes disgust can not be represented according to nature without destroying all aesthetic satisfaction. Kant (2001) says about it:

Only a type of ugliness can not be represented to tell me about nature without destroying at the same time all aesthetic satisfaction, that is, the beauty of art, namely, that which arouses disgust. For in this peculiar sensation that rests on pure fantasy, the object is represented, so to speak, as if it were forced to accept a joy against which, however, we reveal ourselves with force, so that the artistic representation of the object already it does not differ in our sense of the nature of the same object and, in such a case, it is not possible in any way to consider it beautiful (p. 279).

It is convenient to say that the Kantian concept of Ekel is translated here as repugnance. This concept has been treated by Jacques Derrida (1975), in his text *Economimesis*, and by Pablo Oyarzún (2008) in "Strange sensation, Kant on disgust". Both, from their respective sides, give an explanatory framework that specifies the place of disgust as the surplus to any possibility of producing aesthetic judgments and emphasize that it is not the opposite of beauty or the sublime, but of an experience that swims it has to do with fine arts and aesthetic discipline. Thus, it is a surplus to all possible opposition and its character of unrepresentable makes it ineffable or unspeakable. At this point, moreover, the link it has with bodily enjoyment in a movement of simultaneity, in which the distances between subjectivity and object are lost, becomes relevant.

For Kant, Danto supposed (2005), the representation of a thing or repulsive substance has the same effect as the presentation of a thing or repulsive substance.

Since the purpose of art should supposedly be that of producing pleasure, only the most perverse of artists would undertake the representation of the disgusting, which can not, "according to nature" produce pleasure in normal viewers (Danto, 2005, p. 92).

Danto (2005) takes up the sentence of Jean Clair:¹ the end of art is also the end of taste, and disgust would now occupy the position that in the past occupied taste. For Danto (2005), when the artists who dedicate themselves to represent repulsive things do not think about this special sector of their audience, what is tried, precisely, is to use their art to provoke

¹ Seudónimo de Gérard Régner, escritor, historiador de arte, polemista y académico francés. Fue director del Museo Picasso de París. Es miembro de la Academia Francesa desde mayo del 2008.

sensations against which, in the words of Kant (2001).), "We reveal ourselves with strength" (p 279). In this way, according to Danto (2005), Kant would have had no choice but to contemplate this as a perversion of art. To these artists it would be useless if the taste for the repulsive were normalized. In that sense, it is essential that the repulsive remains repulsive, not that the public learns to feel pleasure with it or to find it beautiful in one way or another, with what would seem to have fulfilled the predictions of Jean Clair.

At this point it is worth mentioning that for Sanchez (1992) not everything aesthetic is artistic, but everything artistic is aesthetic. Thus, artistic practices should aspire to produce an aesthetic sensation in the viewer. The aesthetic experience is based on the fact that the artistic object allows the subject experiencing it to objectify his feelings in this: "The subject regains his freedom, his reflective and critical power, his ability to accept a new reality (...) is found in aesthetic perception with a more human reality than that which is familiar to him" (Sánchez, 1992, p.142).

This position, the practice of the disgusting in the arts that has the purpose of provoking the repulsion in the spectator, contradicts what Sanchez (1992) and other formalist aesthetic authors understand by aesthetic experience or aesthetic pleasure. For example, for Beuchot (2012) the aesthetic reveals its objectivity and universality, since, although it does not please everyone, it speaks to everyone, it says something to everyone, it alludes to every human being. Even the unpleasantness in the work of art has a certain unity and forms a whole. The pleasure and enjoyment that the aesthetic offers, according to Beuchot (2012), is revealed through the proportion or harmony that does not reach to see the senses, but that captures the intellect.

The two exposed positions put the disgusting in art before a dilemma: either the arts that make use of the disgusting are proposing a new aesthetic, or it would be something that has nothing to do with aesthetics or with art.

Justification

Research on the aesthetics of the disgusting, through the theories of disgust, allows us to rethink and update the discussion of art and aesthetics regarding how it establishes the possibility that something that by its nature is inclined to avoid is in its representation or use in art an aesthetic object.

Objective

Analyze the theories of disgust and disgust that motivate the rethinking of aesthetics as a philosophy of art while representing something that is naturally avoided.

Hypothesis

The theories of disgust and disgust motivate the rethinking of aesthetics as a philosophy of art while representing something that is naturally avoided.

Methods

The way of proceeding was, at first, the historical analysis of the conformation of the theories of disgust from Darwin until the beginning of the 21st century: William I. Miller (1997) with his *Anatomy of Asco*, Martha Nussbaum (2006) with *The concealment of the human, disgust, shame and law*, the text of Aurel Kolnai (2013) *Asco, arrogance, hatred. Phenomenology of hostile feelings*, Colin McGinn (2016) with *The meaning of disgust* and Eco (2018) in *The history of ugliness*. From the reading of these texts, shared topics were extracted that will be exposed in the results. Later, authors that address the disgust in art were contrasted: to Kristeva (2006) with *Powers of Perversion* and Ben-Zvi (2013) with "Beckett and the theory of disgust". To, finally, move on to the discussion and conclusions.

Historical journey of the theoretical-scientific treatment of disgust

- 1) According to Darwin, in his text *Expressions of Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872), disgust is an emotion resulting from an aversion to food (disgust), which protects humans against what they perceive concretely or imagine vividly as a harmful object, showing themselves gesturally in the mouth.

- 2) For A. Kolnai (1929), in his text *On Disgust*, the disgusting is a reminder of the vulnerability of the human body and its process of decline towards death.
- 3) While for Miller (1997), in *Anatomy of disgust*, disgust is a central emotion that contributes to the structuring of different social, moral and political orders. What causes disgust is a truth that humans strive to avoid: the animality displaced towards animals and that acts as a sign of shared condition.
- 4) According to Nussbaum (2004), in his book *The concealment of the human*. Disgust, shame and law, the disgust has been used by individuals and societies to deny their own human nature, transferring the offensive and repulsive elements of the body to others - Jews and homosexuals, for example - to which this author will compare with detestable animals like cockroaches, vermin and rats. This displacement creates the social and political hierarchies formed by the normative community to denigrate and stigmatize others, thereby denying humanity shared by the entire population.
- 5) In the meaning of disgust, Colin McGinn (2016) analyzes what is at the bottom of disgust: life and death. He argues that disgust is a kind of philosophical emotion that reflects the human attitude toward the biological world, but that, in the human sphere, restrains the insatiable desire, the result of our powerful imagination about death.
- 6) Finally, Eco (2018) in *The History of Ugliness* states that, unlike the beautiful, which could be reconstructed based on a long series of theoretical testimonies that allows inferring the tastes of an era, ugliness should seek his testimonies in visual or verbal representations of things considered "ugly". But it has a relationship with the beautiful through its vicissitudes, from the classical period, through the Middle Ages and Renaissance, to the modern and contemporary eras. Eco, based on Nietzsche, emphasizes that beauty and ugliness are narcissistically anthropomorphic, defined under a specific model.

Likewise, Eco (2018) mentions that we must distinguish between ugliness in itself (an excrement, decomposing carrion, etc.) and formal ugliness, as an imbalance in the organic relationship between the parts of a whole. And coupled with the above, Eco (2018) differentiates two types of reactions to the ugly: react passionately to disgust and react to the lack of proportion or lack of quality of an object. However, there may be the artistic

representation of both, and only from the latter can aesthetically infer any of the above, which does not leave aside that being in the ugly artistic evoke the disinterest, such as beauty, or passion of disgust, as rejection.

Topics in the theory of disgust and disgust

Disgust: a primitive aesthetic

Disgust is aesthetic, it is presented to the senses. According to distance, it is its intensity: stronger for smell, followed by touch, then taste and, finally, sight and hearing. The aesthetics and ontology of the disgusting or disgusting are linked, it is enough that what causes it appears as disgusting to be so (Colin, 2016). There is no disgusting in itself but in terms of a subject, belonging to a human or cultural way that perceives it as such, but it is enough for it to perceive it to be so. Almost anything can cause repulsion: from feces, worms, to a lack of spelling (disgust has migrated to symbolic and intellectual levels of each culture and in each person, also reveals a positive assessment according to rules and their performance).

The disgusting to the touch

The qualities of consistency and feeling to touch make up a large part of our vocabulary about the disgusting. The disgusting is presented in an oxymoron, in pairs of opposites that determine its geography establishing order and limits: flexible versus rigid, moist versus dry, sticky versus non-sticky, rough versus smooth, viscous versus fluid, meandering and slippery in front of hard. Presence or absence: greasy, membranous, curdled, sticky, slimy or grimy (Colin, 2016). In any case, the vocabulary of the disgusting to the touch refers to an intermediate state of uncertainty and indeterminate between liquid and solid, a state that is neither one nor the other, something similar to a state of plasma or gelatin.

The margins between what is disgusting have a gradual and calorific reference: the warm. At minus 0 ° C is the world of purity, beyond 100 ° C a world purified by fire is positioned. The warm reflects a temperature and intermediate state in which life is boiling, that is, neither too high nor too cold to kill it.

The disgust seems not to occur naturally, it seems that it is predisposed to him, by the signs that manifest gesturally or physiologically, such as nausea, vomiting, body shivering, goosebumps and bristling of hair. For any of them to occur requires the association or developed cognitive or psychic activity, which manifests itself as a warning of danger, that realizes that one is facing the disgusting; It is so powerful the imagination that can arouse these reactions without having the present object, just imagine it (Miller, 1997).

Disgust is aversive. The facial expressions that are given through the disgust repel or fold as a protection. The disgusting appears as dangerous and alert about the distance that must be taken in the face of that danger. The disgust, through the disgusting, value (negatively), makes clear a differentiation, from more to less. The disgust shows the risk of contact with what is considered mean and inferior, but that, in its repulsion, reveals the power and danger before the inferior, shows the vulnerability of those who experience it (Nussbaum, 2004). Even if it's just a stain, a splash, the disgust is already an excess and exuberance. The expressions "I was filled with ...!" Are not uncommon, even if it was only a stain or a splash.

The power of the lower is that, however minimal in quantity, it contaminates the superior. The higher demands, upon contact with the lower, the immediate purification (Douglas, 1973). Unlike other emotions, fear drives people to flee for safety and relief; the disgust entails the obligation to cleanse and purify itself, it is a more intense and problematic task than mere escape. Disgust creates and testifies in favor of inequality; hatred tends to embody the resentment of an annoying admission of equality. The horror, the terrible, prevents the option to flee and cancels the option to fight. The horror is meaningless if it is not like intense experience, the disgust is gradual (Colin, 2016).

The sense of disgust alerts to avoid ingestion and contact with certain toxic substances, which could or may cause damage or disease. Disgust announces and prevents contagion, the human being is predisposed to it (Darwin, 1988).

The main triggers of disgust have the characteristic of being what is considered the breeding ground of life or the living body or of what is in transition of life and death: secretions and excretions of the body (feces, blood, wounds, secretion). nasal, vomiting, menstrual blood); body parts, products and actions of the living body: eat, defecate, fornicate, procreate, die, rot and regenerate (feces lead the list in almost all cultures); food and rotting

bodies; certain living beings (spiders, rats, worms). From a biological standpoint, it is common that all these triggers are potentially transmitters of diseases (Miller, 1997).

The disgusting features are the slobbery, the slippery, the exuberant, the overly abundant. Disgust appears as an embodied and visceral emotion, has a terrain and constantly monitors what comes out and enters the body. The disgusting appears as a barrier or boundary, between the inside and the outside, between the living and the dead; between the permissible and the transgression.

The foundation and territory of disgust is not life or death but an intermediate state: life and death, this process is dirty and gives off substances and smells that make us doubt ourselves and fear our fellow human beings.

The inorganic is not usually disgusting unless it has traits that remind us of organic things that do disgust us. The ability to live and not only because life involves death and decomposition, but because of their loss of unity and integrity. It is not the end of the process of life, but part of a cycle that repeats itself eternally.

It is not taste the preferred sense of disgust

Smell and touch (more than taste), in relation to the other senses, are more involved in capturing the disgusting. The sense of taste has gained importance due to the word dislike, contrary to taste or liking, and the fact of how it is shown physiologically: through facial expressions and interjections that denote actions such as spitting, vomiting or expelling polluting substances beyond the lips. However, not all disgusting facial expressions are focused on taste. If flavors produce disgust, this is a function of their excess (Miller, 1997).

The smells are penetrating, invisible and threatening, they constitute a way for contagion. The stench is especially polluting and much more dangerous than the concrete substances that can be brought to the mouth. Smell, and not taste, is the sense that most of the defensive work of ingestion performs.

Before the germ theory existed, it was believed that nauseating odors transmitted diseases, while good odors were attributed healing powers (this belief has not gone out of fashion, the smell of disinfectant is more comforting and dogmatic than some other smells that only give the idea of masking the disgusting). Rottenness smells like disease; the

perfumed looks health, cleanliness and order, the odorless smells hygiene or, at least, pretends it.

The vocabulary of smell is very limited, normally it has to act by converting into an adjective the thing that produces the smell. The excrement smells of excrement, the roses are roses, the meat is putrefied with flesh, the smells refer to the fetid, the smelly, the stinking, the pestilent, the rancid, the filthy, the disgusting, the nauseating or the repulsive.

What is in the nose produces disgust, not only for what can enter it but also for what can come out of it, snot is polluting, its color and transparency also communicate its polluting power.

The mouth, lips and nose have a close or at least metaphorical relationship with the penis, vagina and anus. In analogy to what is introduced and expelled from the body, the excesses of some pleasures become sins such as lust and gluttony.

The ear at the time of feeling disgust, if it does, is in relation to unpleasant visual images, nausea and disgusting contacts, or because of its relation to the disgusting to other senses.

The sounds count a lot when it comes to generating the disgust that is used to recognize violence: screams, shrieks, the sound of a leg or arm breaking. In addition, the ear suffers the indignity of producing wax: this substance, although it is usually less threatening than other waste, is also disgusting.

The sight captures the excess from a considerable distance, which comes out of the limit of the animal body unit: disembowelment, vexations or violence, the transfer of the limit.

However, it is the easiest sense to deceive. The production of disgust through sight almost always refers to the lack of order or structure, the lack of form with a previously admitted system, insofar as it allows to capture the distant (putting in parentheses the other senses), leave room for the security of grasping and contemplating the disgusting.

Holes and body waste

The disgusting is strange and alien. It is a threat, it presents the risk or danger of contacting us. The first contact hazard zone is the skin, the orifices of the body also become extremely vulnerable zones that entail the danger of letting in what can be stained or damaged from the outside. The skin and the holes also present the risk of letting the interior of the body

escape. What comes out of the bodily unit is also a threat to other bodies, their own excretions and secretions also pollute. The skin covers the disgusting things that are inside us and they are always at risk leaving, swarming, contaminating and damaging the surface of the skin and what comes in contact with it (Colin, 2014).

The skin as an organ has glands that secrete sweat and fat; But perhaps the most polluting substance of all the body produces is associated with damage to the skin, which is where the suppuration takes place, pus, the product of their injuries.

The disgust that arises when the body is opened with a knife or penetrates a bullet is not limited only to the crap that comes out, but above all to the incorrect thing that is to destroy the integrity of the seal of the body. But this seal is already broken in several holes, which must bear the burden of opposition between inside and outside, because in them is where the danger of lack of clarity and disorder lies. The holes that allow the entry and exit of what pollutes.

The skin between the outside and the inside, daily battles are fought hard about their appearance. The idea of purity surely emerged as a triumph of concealment and deviation from the attention of others. The expressions "How good you look!", Or "How well you smell!", Are sarcastic phrases that reflect the danger and concealment that requires always keeping an eye on personal care.

The disgusting is a source of culture

Disgust is as specifically human as laughter and tears. Discriminate and establish differences. It helps establish cultural and self limits. The contagion, the contamination and the capacity to produce disgust are inherent in both the alien and the own.

The disgust, humanly, is universal, appears in almost all cultures, in the ways in which the human appears; What varies from one culture to another is the content of the disgusting and, within each, varies from one individual to another. The capacity to feel disgust is something human and confers humanity, those that would be outside this category would be children, crazy and saints; proto, infra and suprahumanos, respectively.

Culture and education determine to a certain extent the moment in which a large part of the content and the specific scope of the disgusting appears, but the true manifestations of disgust have to wait for the capacity to perform such mental discrimination to develop.

The culture, the way of being human, marks the line that delimits what you should not have contact with. Culture establishes limits and restrictions, and its way of transmitting is through education or teaching, in order to make what is barely human potential. Culture separates the purity of impurity, the clean from the dirty, the immaculate from the stain; crucial limits that disgust is responsible for controlling. The universal of disgust lies in the fact that some things and behaviors are disgusting. As already mentioned, the content of the disgusting varies from one culture to another and changes over time within the same culture and in the same person. In that sense, the awareness of what causes it is historical, but also individual.

Disgust seems to be intimately related to the creation of culture; it is something so human that, like language, it allows us to differentiate ourselves from other animals.

It is a feeling about something and that it occurs in response to something. The disgust consists, in part, in realizing what it feels like, in being aware of it, it reveals the psychological aspect of the disgusting, its cognitive and connotative power, it is not a primitive reflex that triggers automatically.

Disgust paint the world in a special way: misanthropic and melancholic (Colin, 2016). It is related to a series of ways of being, moods and other psychological: *tedium vitae*, hopelessness, boredom, depression, melancholy, boredom, annoyance or laziness. In other words, disgust.

Civilization has fostered our sensitivity towards disgust until we have turned it into a key element of social control and psychic order: the fear of being tainted by the inferior. The residues of the human and animal body are polluting, not because they are obviously harmful, but because they imply "inferiority".

The fear of disgust promotes rituals and behaviors, it is the germ of culture, in the sense of caring for oneself. The disgust, understood in this way, acts to prevent him from being indulgent with the actions or things that cause it. Try to prevent one from getting too

close, acting as a barrier against unconscious desire or barely recognized fascination or furtive curiosity, although it is only one of its facets.

Discussion and results

If one speaks of an aesthetic of the pleasant in a modern way, it rests on the basis of an aesthetic of the unpleasant and disgusting, that is, of a consciousness and appreciation of sensory stimuli that are considered negative and of which one intends to get rid of, and avoid. What is now called cosmetic and makeup reveals the degree of beauty they produce, superficial. This appearance of beauty marks the triumph of order over disorder, of purity over dirt, of order over chaos.

The appearance of order is thus, the concealment of the unpleasant and disgusting, its domination and domestication have the effect of dissimulation. The concealment and distancing of the disgusting reveal their power. The appearance of order, cleanliness and purity are symbols of civility and humanity, are effects of concealment, control and dominion of the unclean.

The dirt, in its origin, depends on a previous scheme, the order. Oxymoron is similar to clean and dirty, cosmos and chaos. If we accept that in modern anthropology the human is conceived as a microcosm, his oxymoron turns out to be the unclean, which is conceived not only as an agent of rejection and contempt, but as a threat of distinction and difference made, as an effort that implies organize both the interior and the exterior.

In the theories of art and aesthetics two opposing opinions are presented regarding the disgusting as a source of aesthetic pleasure. On the one hand, Kant (2001) denies the disgusting and the disgusting the possibility of offering aesthetic pleasure, understanding the disgusting as the cause of disgust, impossible to reconcile with the aesthetic or the pleasure that it can offer. On the other hand, the position of Bataille-Kristeva, who see in the disgusting a source of pleasure and enjoyment, precisely because the disgusting allows the viewer to experience, through the transgression of the forbidden, a joy. From this second position on the disgusting (the abject in the context of Kristeva (2006) and his book Powers of perversion), art and religion, under various modalities, have tried to purify it. For this reason, he dares to maintain that the artistic experience and the essence of religiosity are rooted in

where it is purified (Kristeva, 2006). The disgusting allows a jouissance that is based, according to Kristeva (2006), on the archaism of the pre-Boetal relationship, where the contour of the thing signified is lost - where such affectation is possible there is not yet a sign. The abject confronts those fragile states where man errs in the territory of the animal.

Beuchot (2012), in your text *Beauty and analogy*. An introduction to aesthetics, part of the idea that aesthetics aims to explain the conditions of the beautiful object and taste judgment, which is a product of proportion and analogy. The aesthetic is characterized in Beuchot (2012) especially by the so-called symbolic character, the symbol that always refers to something more than what is manifested in it; something that has the capacity to show that which is ordinarily hidden, and which, nevertheless, shines in it. From this perspective, the work of art is described as a symbol. The aesthetic reveals its objectivity and universality, since, although it does not please everyone, it speaks to everyone; He says something to everyone, he refers to every human being. Even the unpleasantness in the work of art has a certain unity, forms a whole. The pleasure and enjoyment that the aesthetic offers, according to Beuchot (2012), is revealed through the proportion or harmony that does not reach to see the senses, but that captures the intellect.

In both positions it can be seen that art can make use of the disgusting, one purifying it and the other from its character as a symbol. However, the former aspires to a non-conceptualisable or representable enjoyment, and in that ineffable sense, and the other grants a pleasure and enjoyment, at least intellectual. Other treatments on the disgusting allow to deepen this discussion.

Ben-Zvi (2013), analyzed how aesthetically worked the disgust in the work of Beckett. There he specifies that Beckett illustrates that humanity is vulnerability. By becoming aware of this and translating it into his work, even under its disgusting character, as something that all humans share, one finds that "Beckett's work is beautiful."

Within the literature, Yansi Pérez (2013) argues that the metamorphosis stories, such as stories of change, mutation, progression, instability and ambiguity, can serve to approach a political, historical and cultural situation that they question the very definition of the human, of humanity, by including and merging with an other that is almost always an animal or a

space marked by the abject, the impure, the denied, the dirty, the dark. The art of literature finds humanity in the inhuman.

Velásquez (2007), meanwhile, in his analysis of the photography of the abject, mentions that many artists of the 90, from various procedures of dismantling the human, as the recurrence of the monstrous in man, in his behaviors and in their reading of contexts that subverted order, tradition and law; these artists, as they said, deconstructed many traditional representations of the body and the conformed subject, by virtue of their retrospective return to a previous, animal condition, prior to the constitution as being of individuals consolidated by language, social norms and, Of course, rationality.

Thus, the disgust is aesthetic, it is presented to the senses, the disgusting manifests itself in them according to their distance and intensity. The disgusting is based on a subject, belonging to a human mode or culture that perceives it as such, but it is enough for it to perceive it to be so. The disgusting appears as dangerous and alert about the distance that must be taken before this danger, to avoid contagion.

The disgust establishes a criterion that allows to distinguish between what humanizes and dehumanizes, distinguishes what is to be rejected and viscerally avoided: the lack of care of what humanizes and humanizes, losing the care for the disgusting is presenting in a natural the excessive. It is enough to ignore the borders of the human and the world without any effort. The pleasure or taste that can be felt by the disgusting has to overcome the disgust. If the disgust warns of the danger of contact with filthy and contamination, the pleasure that can offer the disgusting in the field of the human and the culture is at the mercy of a process of purification and improvement.

The disgusting is germ of culture not only because it is cultivated and learned to avoid and reject it, but humanized is analogous to decaffeinated coffee and lactose-free milk: it can be consumed without any harm, but this requires work, effort and technique to represent in its pure form, free from all danger.

Conclusion

Disgust as emotion has no aesthetic possibility as long as it enjoys. To enjoy feeling disgust and what is disgusting in itself is to break and to transcend the limits of the human in the modalities in which it occurs. As limit and barrier, danger and damage, the disgusting demands, for its aesthetic treatment, to really get rid of that which produces disgust. Religion and art turn the disgusting and disgusting, through its respective ritual and technical formalization, into objects worthy of appreciation and enjoyment, objects already purified and free of all danger or damage to those who contemplate it. It would be a contradiction to understand the disgusting as something already human or humanized. The human and cultural require constant care before the danger of the disgusting, in function of which it puts the human activity into activity to maintain its integrity, unity and purity in order to remain distinct and away from its polluting power. To assume that the disgusting fascinates and is a source of pleasure simply because it is forbidden is, rather than metaphysical, non-human precisely because the territory of the human has been transgressed.

The aesthetic pleasure offered by the disgusting through art is given as a function of incorporating a distance necessary for enjoyment, which would be disgusting if it were lost. The disgusting is framed as a frontier, beyond which disgust approaches enjoyment, or, being an excess, in the impossibility of assigning a representation through language. The use of what is disgusting in art reveals the marginality of the culture in which it is gestated, because on the internal level it appeals to its reservations and discriminations, and to the outside to what it violates and endangers its order.

References

- Ben-Zvi, L. (2013). Debates sobre el asco. *Beckettiana*, 12, 17-24.
- Beuchot, M. (2012). *Belleza y analogía. Una introducción a la estética*. México: Ediciones Paulinas.
- Colin, M. (2016). *El significado del asco*. España: Cátedra.
- Cortés, J. (1997). *Orden y caos. Un estudio cultural sobre lo monstruoso en el arte*. Barcelona, España: Anagrama.
- Danto, A. (2005). *El abuso de la belleza. La estética y el concepto de arte*. Barcelona, España: Paidós.
- Darwin, C. (1988). *La expresión de las emociones en los animales y en el hombre*. Madrid, España: Alianza
- Douglas, M. (1973). *Pureza y peligro. Un análisis de los conceptos de contaminación y tabú*. Madrid, España: Siglo XXI
- Eco, U. (2018). *Historia de la fealdad*. Barcelona, España: Lumen.
- Kant, I. (2001). *Crítica del discernimiento*. Madrid, España: Mínimo Transito
- Kolnai, A. (2013). *Asco, soberbia, odio. Fenomenología de los sentimientos hostiles*. Madrid, España: Ediciones Encuentro
- Kristeva, J. (2006). *Poderes de la perversión. Ensayo sobre Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (6.^a ed.). México: Siglo XXI.
- Miller, W. (1997). *Anatomía del Asco*, Madrid, España: Taurus
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). *El ocultamiento de lo humano, repugnancia, vergüenza y ley*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Katz
- Pérez. Y. (2013). Historias de metamorfosis: Lo abyecto, los límites entre lo animal y lo humano, en la literatura centroamericana de posguerra. *Revista Iberoamericana*, 79(242), 163-181.
- Sánchez, A., (1992). *Invitación a la Estética*. México: Grijalbo
- Velásquez, B. D. (2007). Abiectum: un estudio de lo abyecto desde la fotografía. *Revista Científica*, 9, 10-28.