

Free art market

[Business](#), [Marketing](#)



ART1 Free Art Market The downside to a free art market is a lack of a safety net, or comfort zone, for the artist. Although the artist in a freemarket is free to choose their own subject matter, they are also not protected from external changes in the market environment and forces of competition, as they would be under a patronage based system. In other words, they are free to succeed or go bankrupt, whereas in the patronage system, the continuing line of the church or monarch (and their happiness) virtually guarantees financial success, or at least stability. One can see how some artists preferred to work for an established patron, because of the abovementioned idea of the comfort factor. As long as the church or monarch is happy with the artist's output, they are guaranteed many perks as well, such as a closeness to the court and perhaps even the monarch. In Madrid, Velasquez still managed to create many innovative leaps forwards in perspective and composition, even though he worked within a monarchical patronage system, and therefore painted a great deal of court subjects. Rembrandt, however, was more isolated from the patronage system, and "as a result of his increasing isolation... Rembrandt achieved a particular personal independence that doubtless contributed to his distinctive and evocative suggestion of the timeless human world of quiet yet deep emotional states" (History, 2009). In terms of which system I prefer, it is the free market system. I am a product of my times and culture, and I tend to look upon the patronage system as one in which the artist is naturally limited in terms of subject matter, and not free to pursue their own interests and ideas formally. This is not to say that I am not a fan of Velasquez; my culture and upbringing, however, have not made me a fan of monarchies.

REFERENCE

History of art—Baroque and Rococo (2009). <http://www.all-art.org/history252-21.html>