

## **KINDS, FORMS AND ATTRIBUTES OF CULTURAL ACTIVITY**

*PECULIARITIES OF HUMAN PERCEPTION IN THE TWO-WAY COMMUNICATIVE PROCESS OF CREATING/PERCEIVING AESTHETIC OBJECTS OF POETRY*

**Vasil Rainov**

*Academy of Science, Bulgaria*

**Keywords:** Emotion, mnestic processes, regularity, rhyme, mirror words, palindrome, hemisphere dominance, rhythmical speech, social technology of feeling

### **Contents**

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Creation and Perception of aesthetic objects
  - 2.1. 'Mirrored phrases' in poetry
  - 2.2. Verbal Games
- Acknowledgement
- Glossary
- Bibliography
- Biographical Sketch

### **Summary**

'Art is a form of communication' which activates the emotional and mnestic processes man needs. Works of art have significance for satisfying our aesthetic needs, Uznadze claims, in as much as they provide us with an opportunity to activate the relevant values and mental acts. Creating and perceiving poetic speech may be reduced to comprehending the content elements and the systematic influence of regularity: rhyme or aesthetic elements. Using mirror words as stimuli in psycholinguistic experiments has been defined terminologically by experimental psychology as 'palindrome'. It is well-known that in the process of mastering speech or writing children do such reversal all too often, both in graphics and articulation. Many researchers report similar phenomena and so have we, but mainly from the point of view of hemisphere dominance and leading hand. No psychic or psycho-physiological explanations for artists' preferences in creating rhythmical speech have been made, yet one thing is certain: what has been created is always awaiting its reader – it will be perceived; it will evoke certain associations; it will turn into a mental act.

### **1. Introduction**

The accumulation of facts and speculations that have to do with the peculiarities of human perception regarding art's communicative processes leads to emphasising art's essential characteristic: 'art is a form of communication' which activates the emotional and mnestic processes man needs. Works of art have significance for satisfying our aesthetic needs, Uznadze claims, in as much as they provide us with an opportunity to activate the relevant values and mental acts.

By introducing Uzandze's cognitive concept of *Einstellung*, we find it possible to create a link between the peculiarities of perception and the artistic creation of a new reality by the intimate *Einstellung* outlined by Uznadze (1973). The focus of our discussion here will be one of the few studies of this problem done by a psycholinguist: Leontiev's observation (1973) devoted to art as a specific form of communication between people.

"What matters is not what relations are being evoked by art forms and not even the material through which they are evoked, since static signs do not give communication its specificity but only define the character of this specificity. What matters is the very form of communication that evokes these relations", remarks Leontiev.

The above-mentioned author upholds the original claim that he would disregard semantic research, which treats art as a sign system with a specific language. Despite using known semantic elements, like words, signs, forms and color combinations, art, according to Leontiev, incorporates these into a wholly independent functional *Gestalt*. "In this connection the artistic image based on a verbal sign is simple but far from being the only quasi-object of human art", states Leontiev.

According to Vigotski (1968), art operates with quasi-language elements, which have been transformed in order to metamorphosize the material in every work of art, thus metamorphosing feeling: "Thus the meaning and function of a poem on sorrow are not related to conveying the sorrow of the author ... but are meant to recreate sorrow in a manner that reveals a new insight into life's truth." (see *Artists*)

These interpretations show the influence of Aristotle's catharsis tradition and ancient Greek drama. Leontiev believes that the most pedantic analysis of simple quasi-objects used in art is only 'dead' material that does nothing but mediate the live activity of art that, even when subjected to this kind of analysis, always remains a mystery. "Hence, the mystery of language resides in the crossing point of knowledge through language and communication by language. Whereas the secret of art resides in the crossing point of knowledge about art and communication by art."

Reliving or empathy in art is probably the communicative event known to theoreticians and defined as anthropomorphic force. Consequently, art seems to emerge out of a new reality of intimate *Einstellung* in exteriorized forms pointing outwards (i.e. intentional forms): directed at everybody to be perceived and co-experienced.

This contains the 'great magic' of creating and experiencing again the aesthetic communicative events. In other words, this is an exchange in which "art becomes a social technology of feeling" (Vigotski 1968).

-  
-  
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE 11 PAGES OF THIS CHAPTER,  
Visit: <http://www.eolss.net/Eolss-sampleAllChapter.aspx>

## Bibliography

- BROWN, R.W. (1961) *Psycholinguistics*. New York, Free Press. [on the psychology of language]
- DAVIS, A.E., J.A.WADA (1977) *Brain and language*, 4, 23-31. [how the brain processes language]
- ECO, U.(1972) *Das offene Kunstwerk*. Frankfurt, Suhrkamp. [on certain mostly modern forms of art which do not conform to received aesthetic norms]
- TREVARTEN, C. (1974) "Cerebral Embriology and the Split Brain. In: M. Kinsbourne, ed. Springfield, Thomas. [on the physiology of the brain, and the function of different hemispheres]
- GONCHAROV, B. P. (1986) *Art Communication in Poetry*. Moskva, Nauka. [how poetry communicates]
- JAKOBSON, R.(1960) *Style of Language*. New York, Springer. [on the formal and stylistic aspects of language, and what they communicate]
- LEONTIEV, A. A. (1973) *Art as Communication*. Tbilisi, Mecniereba.
- MCKAY, D. (1972) *Formal Analysis of Communicative Process*. Cambridge, Univ. Press.
- RAYNOV, V. (1984) *Perception and Mimics Reaction*. Sofia, BAN.
- RAYNOV, V. (1986) *About Some Pathological Aspects of the Verbal Behaviour* (Diss.) Sofia.
- UZNADZE, D. N. (1973) *Psychological Investigations*. Tbilisi, Mecniereba.

## Biographical Sketch

**Prof. Dr Vassil Rainov**, Dr Sc, born 19 September 1942, Sofia, Bulgarien, Institut für bulgarische Sprache der Bulgarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; studied philology at the University of Sofia, phonetics and linguistics at the – Karls Universität, Prag (Ph D), was a Humboldt – Stipendiat, (5 repeats Institut für Phonetik und Kommunikation, Uni-Bonn; Psychophysiologische Abteilung der Neurochirurgische Klinik der Uni-Bonn). Obtained a Dr Sc , Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikation. He was employed by the Bulgarische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Hirnforschungsinstitut bis 1993; from 1993 Leiter der Abteilung für Phonetik und Kommunikation des Instituts für bulgarische Sprache, Vice Direktor des Instituts 1994-1999