



I believe that the essence of absurdism in ceramic art does not merely lie in the creation of the "bizarre" or "grotesque," but rather in the ability of a work to provoke reflection on everyday logic, functionality, and meaning. In practice, this can be achieved through the deliberate subversion or distortion of traditional ceramic forms, functions, and aesthetic conventions, eliciting a sense of confusion, absurdity, or even amusement in the viewer.

This piece presents a "grotesque," "meaningless," and "illogical" surrealist ceramic artwork, emphasising irrational forms, cracked glazes, and anomalous details, thereby evoking the philosophical atmosphere of absurdism. In my own practice, I consider that absurdism can manifest across concept, material, and form. For instance, ceramics have traditionally been associated with practical functionality—such as bowls, plates, cups, and teapots. To convey an absurdist quality, one might render these functions contradictory or entirely obsolete.

Similarly, in contemporary ceramic art, techniques such as throwing, hand-building, slab construction, and slip casting may be employed while intentionally retaining traces of "imperfection" or "distortion." Alternatively, one might intervene in later stages by cutting, reassembling, elongating, or compressing certain parts of an object. By emphasising asymmetry, deformation, irregularity, or displacement, these works disrupt conventional expectations of "beauty" or "utility." An example could be an oversized cup with an excessively thin wall, or a miniature teapot featuring an absurdly elongated and oversized spout. Another approach is the "grotesque assemblage"—the fusion of disparate elements from different species, objects, or

contexts into a single ceramic form. Exhibition methods, too, may subvert conventional presentation formats. Ceramic works might be suspended mid-air, placed upside down on the floor, or wedged within the crevices of walls, challenging the viewer's perception of how ceramics should be displayed and engaged with.

This leads me to a fundamental question: If ceramics are stripped of their functionality and aesthetic value, what meaning do they retain? In what form do they then exist?