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DISTINCTION BETWEEN ARTISTIC PERCEPTION AND PERCEPTION IN GENERAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL PERCEPTION

Though Aristotle is generally regarded as the father of Western Aesthetics, which is a distinct branch of Knowledge, yet we may find traces of criticism in Western and Eastern Philosophies even prior to Aristotle. With regard to the definition of Art there are different theories in Western aesthetics such as Formalism, Voluntarism, Emotionalism, Intellectualism, Socialist Realism, Intuitionism and Organic theory. Various thinkers have tried to define Art from their respective points of view. According to some, Art is a "Significant form" or "Expression", according to others it is an "Intuition" while others define it as an "Objectified Pleasure". Thus definitions of Art are various and numerous. But very few of them, however, have made an attempt to determine and clarify the perceptual process involved in Artistic creation and its enjoyment.

Thus, in Indian aesthetics we find three main schools of Philosophy of fine art: (1) RASA-BRAHMA-VADA, (2) NADA-BRAHMA-BADA, and (3) BASTU-BRAHMA-VADA. Poetry and Drama belong to Rasa-Brahma. Poetry is the highest of all Arts, and drama is the highest of all forms of poetry. Music or "Sangita" belongs to Nada-Brahma, and architecture belongs to Bastu Brahma.
The problem of aesthetics has been studied in India not with reference to music or Plastic or Pictorial representation, but mainly in the context of the Dramatic Presentation. It was thought that painting and music are the auxiliaries to the Drama. Only drama can reproduce various situations of life and appeals to the eye and ear, our aesthetic senses.¹

So, in Indian aesthetics also the perceptual problem in Art, has not been approached in detail.

Artistic knowledge is a kind of knowledge, and to have it the Artist has to perceive the object, Susanne. K. Lenger⁴ rightly describes art as the practice of creative perceptible forms expressive of human feeling.

The same attitude of aesthetic we find in Sanskrit Poetics. The poet Māgha says -

'That which reveals newer and newer aspects every moment, is the Beautiful'. What is true of aesthetic theory is that, whenever and wherever the Beautiful (which is the chief subject matter of Art) appears, novelty accompanies it, greatly surprising the beholder. So, we may say that the essential

---

2. Philosophical Sketches, p. 76.
characteristics of Art, which deals with the Beautiful, are the new perception of things from which arise the pleasures of imagination.

When the latent aesthetic energy is tapped by novelty, the reflecting soul is stirred up and the inner and the outer self melting into one sweet harmony, mingle in a beauty that is beyond description. The sprouting and flowering of the aesthetic sense primarily depend upon the perception of Novelty which is relative to the fineness and transparency of the soul.

There is a famous Indian proverb that, "Beautiful is in the eye of him who sees it". In western history of aesthetic we find the same voice, Dr. Bosanquet\(^1\) says, "All beauty is in the perception or Imagination". R.W. Emerson in his "Essay on Art", says "Though we travel the world over to find the beautiful, we must carry it with us, or we find it not". The same statement we find in George Santayana's\(^2\) writings, that is "Beauty, as we have seen is a value, it cannot be conceived as an independent existence which affects our senses and which we consequently perceive. It exists in perception, and cannot exist otherwise. A beauty not perceived and a pleasure not felt are a contradiction.".

\(^1\) A history of Aesthetic, p. 3.
\(^2\) The Sense of Beauty, p. 48.
To solve these problems we have to discuss the very nature of perception and see whether there is any distinction between artistic perception and common-Ordinary perception.

It is said, that "Perception" is the process by means of which one comes to know the world. It is the way in which one experiences the world of object and events, we may say that a percept is an impression of an object obtained solely by use of the senses.

Though sensation is a bare awareness of its objects, perception is the awareness of its object as particular. It is a specific sort of consciousness. Gestalt psychologists regard perception as the basis of all knowledge. According to those psychologists, only positive and concrete knowledge is perception. They attempt to explain that the object of perception is a unit or whole with an organisation so that it is indivisible.

The object perceived is not a separate entity but a whole situation related to past experience. Attention selects from this situation one or more of its parts. Even this selected part, as it is perceived or attended to, is a whole pattern of a figure against its ground.

Thus, the relation of figure and ground is an essential element in general perception as well as artistic perception.
So, perception plays a vital role in Aesthetic. Though expressionist thinkers attach much importance to expression, yet before expression, perception is an essential part of aesthetic creation and enjoyment. Now, is this perception a form of ordinary perception or is it a special kind of perception which is peculiarly aesthetic in nature? This precisely, is the problem of perception in Art. Again, does the Artist objectify his subjective or personal perception in the Art and prepare the perception of common perceivers? This question is also relevant to the said problem.

Thus we are faced with two major problems of perception in Art. The first is concerned with the perception of the Artist, who produces the work of Art. The second is the problem of perception of the Connoisseur in Art works. The first problem is the problem of grasping, whether that grasping process is personal and subjective for the Artist or whether it is a capacity common to all. Can an Artist alone exercise this capacity or is it a common capacity, which the Artist puts to use. Is there any definite way to perceive something aesthetically? How can an Artist project his own artistic idea upon the object after ordinary perception. These are some of the questions connected with the first problem. The second problem is that of expression, communication between artist and beholder. With these problems we have to include the linguistic ability of Art works.
Ordinary perceptual process, which is a whole, has the following characteristics:

1. In perception presentative and representative materials are unified.

2. Perception involves automatic assimilation and differentiation.

3. The object perceived is partially and temporally localised.

4. Perception involves implicit memory and recognition.

5. Perception involves the fusion of various sensations.

6. Perception is a form of habit.

7. Perception involves an implicit belief in the reality of the object perceived.

But when we come to the question of perception in Art, we notice a fundamental difference between the common empirical perception and artistic perception. In ordinary perception we receive impressions through all the five sense-organs, namely, eye, ear, touch, nose and tongue. But in artistic perception only two of them, that is, eye and ear, are involved. The contribution of the remaining three organs to artistic perception is insignificant. So, the range of artistic perception is narrower than that of ordinary perception; because other three sense organs are not directly functioning here.
According to Roger Fry¹ Man has the possibility of a double life, an actual life lived in the world, and an imaginative life created by imagination. Here the word "Man" has been used in a general sense, ignoring the distinction between the artist and the ordinary perceiver. Roger Fry expresses the distinction which lies between the two lives mentioned above.

In our actual life we act in response to instinctive urges and emotional impulses. But in the life of Imagination the needs of our life do not play any important part in our motivation. In imagination, life is quite different from that of actual life. So in the imaginative life, the whole of our consciousness may be focussed upon the perceptive and emotional aspects of our experience. Accordingly, a different set of values and a different kind of perception come to the surface.

The chief organ of the imaginative life is Art. It is by 'art' that it is stimulated and controlled. It is also distinguished from ordinary life by a greater degree of clearness of perception and a greater purity and freedom of emotion.

Following Roger Fry we may say that 'perception-in-general' is highly selective. Because the needs of our actual life are so imperative that the visual and audible senses are highly specialised in their service. With an admirable power

¹ Roger Fry, Vision and Design.
of economy we learn to see only so much as is necessary for our practical purposes. In fact, in ordinary perception we perceive and recognize things selectively, with a view to fulfilling the needs of our practical life.

But in artistic perception we look at things and objects freely, not for meeting any of the needs of empirical life. We may say that it is a perception free from instinctive urges and impulses. Even an ordinary man adopts an artistic attitude when his perception is abstracted from the necessity.

Another Formalist thinker Clive Bell\(^1\) gives us some new information about such artistic perception. He says that when an artist—a real artist—looks at objects (the contents of a room for instance) he perceives them as pure forms in certain relations to one another and feels emotion for them on their own account. These are his moments of inspiration when the perception is followed by a desire to express what has been felt. The emotion that the artist feels in his moment of inspiration is not felt for the objects seen as means to an end, but for the objects contemplated as pure forms, that is, ends in themselves, for example, he does not feel an emotion for a chair as a means to his physical comfort.

---

nor as an object associated with the life of the family, nor as the seat where some friend took his seat, saying things which are unforgettable, nor even as a thing bound up with the lives of hundred of men and women by many subtle ties; doubtless the artist does often feel emotions such as these for the things that he sees, but at the moment of aesthetic vision he sees objects, not as means shrouded in associations, but as pure forms. It is for or at any rate through, pure form that he feels his inspired emotion.

Here Clive Bell is perhaps claiming that genuinely aesthetic perception is possible if and only if the object, say, a painting, is not a representation of something else. Otherwise it will divert the attention of the perceiver from itself to the 'real life' object. Pure form is free from this danger. Since it stands for nothing else, it is a thing of intrinsic interest in itself.

Another recent writer E.H.Combrich\(^1\) denied the passive character of perception. According to him perception always plays an active role in our daily knowledge and that active character is also true in case of artistic perception.

---

Perception is never 'just seeing' or vacant look. The mind always brings with it and employs models of how things of various kinds are expected to look, so that whatever is seen, is seen as filling into one of these 'Schemata'. The hold of the schema on the mind is so great that sometimes we see just what we think or we ought to see, sometimes even without our realizing it, important properties of the object are distorted or ignored. Thus 'Schemata' is the indispensable condition of all perception. In case of artistic perception this 'Schema' cannot be ignored.

If we discuss the conception of perception according to Gombrich in details, we find that he regarded perception as primarily the modification of an anticipation. It is always an active process, conditioned by our expectations and adapted to situations. We cannot take in all we see in a room, but we notice if something is changed.

In artistic perception we come to the object with our receivers already attuned. We expect to be presented with a certain notation, a certain sign, situation, and make ready to cope with it. Here, if we take an example of the perception of sculpture, the point will be more clear. Suppose, we step in front of a 'hust', we understand what we are expected to look for. As a rule, we do not take it to be a representation of a cut-off head, we take in the situation and know that this
belongs to the institution or convention called 'bust' with which we have been familiar even before we grew up.

Psychologically this mental condition of expectation is called 'Mental Set'. All perceptions, either ordinary perception of daily life or artistic perception, depend on the interplay between expectation and observation.

Gombrich says that all art originates in the human mind, in our reactions to the world, rather than in the visible world itself.

So, in case of an artist, the 'Schemata' or 'mental set' or 'expected observation', whatever we may call it, the artistic perceptions are largely the 'Stylistic conventions' of his time. It is precisely because all art is 'conceptual', that all representations are recognizable by their style. A style, like a culture or climate of opinion, sets up a horizon of expectation, a mental set, which registers deviations and modifications with exaggerated sensitivity. Actually the style, like the medium, creates a mental set which makes the artist look for certain aspects in the scene surrounding himself. And stylistic convention means here a convention which is used for the style of that age. The Artist is influenced by that style, and consciously perceives the object through that conventional style. As Gombrich puts it "the
artist (tends) to see what he paints rather than to paint what he sees.

Dr. Ramayan Mukherji⁴ puts the same ideas of poetic image in quite different manner. He says - "The Artist perceives objects in organised wholes and all his perceptions are in terms of patterns. As he communicates the result of this perception - the total experience, he is to take naturally the help of an indivisible medium - the whole image having an integral pattern of its own. An image having no pattern of its own, but built out of combination of certain small incongruous images is not in a position to represent the whole meaningful experience of the creative artist". Diagrammatically the distinction of perceptual process may be shown in this way.

\[\text{Observing Subject} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{As}} \quad \text{Observation} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{As}} \quad \text{Physical Object}\]

\[\text{Mental things - } \xrightarrow{\text{As}} \quad \text{@ Holophrastic Perception} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{As}} \quad \text{Matter-Material Things}\]

\[\text{Prehending Subject} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{As}} \quad \text{Artistic Perception} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{As}} \quad \text{Aesthetic object}\]

1. Dr. Ramayan Mukherji, Imagery in Poetry, p. 125.
0 Holophrastic - means a word that suggests something in which much is compacted both in that non-special kind of perception and in its non-special mode of expression in 'ordinary language'.

According to a most recent writer, Jerome Stolnits, there is indeed an attitude with which we come to those things which we perceive aesthetically. He explained Aesthetic perception in terms of the "aesthetic attitude." It is the attitude we adopt which determines how we perceive the world. An attitude is a way of directing and controlling our perception. We never see or hear every thing in our surrounding environment indiscriminately. Rather we pay 'attention' to some things whereas we apprehend others only dimly or not at all.

There are so many psychological theories regarding 'attention', which is a general mental faculty. Which makes object of consciousness clear and distinct and facilitates knowledge. The term 'attention' may be used in two senses, one, in a too wide sense, that is, there is no distinction between attention and consciousness; and second, in the narrow sense, in which attention means consciousness focussed or centred on its object. This last meaning of the term is usually accepted by psychologists.

If we carefully analyse attention we get at least six essential characteristics:

1. Attention is co-extensive with mental life as a whole.

2. Attention has a purposive direction towards making its object clearly and distinctly known.

3. Attention is selective. It selects from the field of consciousness only that object which is conducive to the attainment of its purpose.

4. Attention is fluctuating in character and oscillates like a pendulum.

5. It is a 'continuum' on which Ward and Stout have laid stress. An object is known as part of a wider whole, which forms itself into a group or class. There is no gap or break in the attention continuum.

6. Attention, though a subjective faculty, establishes a relation between its objects.

After accepting these general characteristics of attention, as essential materials of perceptual process, the difficulty arises in case of the span of attention. And this
difficulty is accentuated in case of artistic perception. Though in case of ordinary perception the range of attention is found to be limited to four, five or six objects, an artist of genius may indeed have a wider range of attention.

If we take an example of a vocal singer, representing his performance in a function, we see that he or she is found to sing, to play on harmonium or tenpura, to keep watch over the 'Sengat' or rhythmic beating of different musical instruments, such as 'tabla' flute, etc. The singer at the same time observes alertly the reactions of the audience. So, a vocal artist here pays attention at least to four different objects in the same situation. In case of film making this range of attention plays a more vital role, and the success of a motion picture depends upon the director's range of attention.

Thus, though attention is the guiding factor of aesthetic perception, yet Jerome Stolnitz describe the aesthetic attitude as 'disinterested and sympathetic attention to and contemplation of any object of awareness whatever, for its own sake alone'. So, if we analyse the above definition, we get at least three main characteristics of aesthetic perception.
1. The first character is 'disinterestedness', which means that it has no concern for any ulterior purpose. This 'disinterested' character of aesthetic perception is highly controversial.

We find two opposite attitudes towards art as 'disinterested'. The one is well represented by the famous writer on aesthetics, Clive Bell; in his statement that "to appreciate a work of art we need bring with us nothing from life, no knowledge of its ideas and affairs, no familiarity with its emotions." On the other hand, we get the contrary point of view from the following quotation of Van Meter Ames' writing: "Anything in the world which satisfies any desire be regarded as beautiful ...... anyone who uses intelligence and skill to fill a need is an artist; and every work of man which ministers to want is a work of art."

In socialist thinking we find the same motive of art work and aesthetic value. From 'Marxist-Leninist Aesthetics and Life' we can quote some lines to support our views, "Spiritual values embody the aims and ideals of people. In a class society art expresses those spiritual and aesthetic values which promote awareness of the community of interests of

1. Van Meter Ames, Introduction to Beauty - p. II.
particular classes and serve as a support in the class struggle. Art reflects reality through the prism of class interests; it expresses and defends the interests of a class and it is in this that its ideological function consists.  

Actually there is no peculiar elementary aesthetic interest in art. In ordinary perception, interest is occupied with real objects and is satisfied through a course of action leading to a goal that involves interaction with the real environment, either physical or social. But in case of aesthetic perception, interest is directed upon immanent or fictitious objects, and is satisfied, not through a course of action leading to a distant goal, but in present, given experience.

Let us suppose, we are perceiving a still life "picture cup" and 'real cup'. Then the sensory material of our perception in each case with regard to the item of the 'cup' is much the same i.e. colour and shape. Even the interpretation of this sensory material is the same in both cases; it is interpreted through the idea or meaning 'cup'. But when we perceive both objects, 'picture cup' and 'real cup' we get two different experiences. For while the interests that centre in the real cup, such as filling it and drinking out

---

of it, may be satisfied by a series of actions and interactions with it, these same interests cannot be so satisfied with regard to the still life 'picture cup'. Yet by the appearance of the 'cup' certain impulses can be satisfied in ourselves, as if the 'cup' were seen in a dream. We can still imagine ourselves touching it and filling it and drinking out of it. In both cases the satisfaction would be a satisfaction in a given sensuous shape and in the immediacy of an idea or meaning, rather than a satisfaction in a course of action upon a real thing which this shape and this meaning might suggest. This is what Kant meant, when he said that aesthetic satisfaction is 'disinterested' - a satisfaction in mere representation of objects, independent of anything that we can get out of the real existence of the objects.

After the publication of Kant's critique of judgement, disinterestedness has been commonly recognised as characteristic of the aesthetic perception. The object of an 'entirely disinterested .............. satisfaction,' says Kant, 'is called beautiful.' 1

In recent years such detachment from practical interests is emphasized by a distinguished British psychologist, Edward Bulloch, in his concept of 'psychical

George Santayana, another distinguished philosopher says disinterestedness of aesthetic delight is not truly fundamental. Appreciation of a picture is not identical with the desire of buying it, but it is or ought to be closely related and preliminary to that desire. Even plastic beauties can often not be enjoyed except by a few, on account of the necessity of travel or other difficulties of access, and then this aesthetic enjoyment is selfishly pursued like other enjoyments. He admits that actually, this disinterested character is not only true of all enjoyments. Every real pleasure is in one sense disinterested. But, simply if we are not interested in beauty for the purposes of pleasure it does not matter whether things are beautiful or ugly.

2. The second is the 'Sympathetic' character, which means to accept the object on its own terms to appreciate it. As Bergson puts it, "........ the object of art is to put to sleep the active or rather resistant powers of our personality, and thus to bring us into a state of perfect responsiveness, in which we realise the idea that is suggested to us and 'Sympathetic' with the feeling that is expressed.

1. Edward Bulloch, Aesthetics (Browes & Bowes), pp. 91-130.
3. The third characteristic is 'contemplative', which means perception directed towards the object in its own right, where the spectator is not concerned to analyse it or ask questions about it. Though Clive Bell, Roger Fry, Jerome Stolnitz and others believe the distinctive character of aesthetic perception, there are also opposite view points, in which we cannot separate the two perceptions. We get such a view in Henry P. Rolligh's article. Here we quote the paragraph. 'Actually there is no evidence that art teaches us to see differently. We suppose, both practically and for the purposes of critical operations, that all viewers of the Art object see it, in exactly the same way. If art could promote changes in the perception of reality this would indeed be considered a contribution to knowledge. Still, we know that an Impressionist painting of a bowl of flowers is different from an Expressionist treatment of the same subject and both in turn are quite different from the real bowl of flowers that may have served as inspiration for the paintings. But we know, as well, that the Artist sees the original bowl of flowers just like us—only their presented forms are different. It is the stability of perception that handily allows us to distinguish the paintings from one another and from the object of reality.

After a survey of the statements of the above thinkers from different point of view, in respect of perception in general and aesthetic perception, we come to the conclusion that, though aesthetic perception is not a completely different type of perception, it has some specific characteristics.

The relation between perception in general and aesthetic perception is just like the relation of genus and species. Though the potentiality of artistic perception exists in every individual, only a few of them can notice and exercise it.

The relation may be shown diagrammatically thus:

![Perception Diagram]
One subordinate problem related to the first problem is that, if we accept the theory that aesthetic perception is quite specific and different from ordinary perception, then can an artist alone exercise such aesthetic perception or is it a common capacity, which the artist puts to use.

Maxim Gorky puts forward the maxim that 'men is by nature an artist'. John Dewey\(^1\) the distinguished American philosopher also says that "By temperament, perhaps by inclination and aspiration, we are all artists - upto a certain point."

But Immanuel Kant,\(^2\) distinguishes the Artist as a genius, from common people, and beautiful art is possible only through 'genius', which Kant defines as the "innate mental disposition through which nature gives the rule to art. If we analyse Kantian 'genius', we get these characteristics:

1. **Genius is a talent for producing that for which no definite rule can be given; it is not a mere aptitude for what can be learnt by a rule. Hence originality must be its first property.**

---

2. Ibid., p. 315.
(2) Its product must be models, i.e. exemplary, and they consequently ought not to spring from imitation, but must serve as a standard or rule of judgement for others.

(3) 'It cannot describe or indicate scientifically how it brings about its product, but it gives the rule just as nature does. Hence the author of a product for which he is indebted to his genius does not know himself how he has come by his ideas; and he has not the power to devise the like at pleasure or in accordance with a plan, and to communicate it to others in percepts that will enable them to produce similar products'.

(4) 'Nature, by the medium of genius, does not prescribe rules to science but to art, and to it only in so far as it is to be beautiful art'.

So, specially by the third point Kant tries to solve the problem saying that the artist alone has that capacity of perceptual representation.

Though John Dewey admits the ability of artistic perception in ordinary beings upto a certain point, yet extraordinary capacity of the artist consists in his power to convert that perception into an authentic medium of expression.
The rest of us require many channels to give expression to what we should like to say. In ordinary perception we depend upon contribution from a variety of sources for our understanding of the meaning. But artistic use of a medium signifies that irrelevant aids are excluded and one sense quality is intensely used to do the work.

Joyce Cary, the Irish Novelist says that the Artist always starts with the sense of a discovery. This delight is the discovery of something new in or about the world is natural and primitive thing. All children have it. And it often continues until the age of twenty or twenty five, even throughout life. Children's pleasure in exploring the world is the same, thing as the intuition of the artist. The 'joy of discovery' is the starting point of all art. But this 'joy of discovery' often dies away after twenty or twenty-five years of age in case of ordinary adults. But the Artist tries to maintain it throughout his life.

The second problem is: how does the artist prepare the aesthetic perception of his audience or reader or connoisseur. Here naturally arises some of the subordinate questions: These are: if the artist 'prepared' the

perception of his audience or reader, then surely he created his art object with an audience or reader in his mind? or is it that in art-works an artist can express only what he felt ignoring wholly the existence of the audience?

This is the 'problem of expression' for artist, or from the opposite point of view the 'problem of prepared perception' for the audience. These problems of communication between artist and audience are one of the central themes of modern aesthetics.

According to the Leo Tolstoy\(^1\) aesthetic perception prepares one person with the object of joining another or others to himself in one and the same feeling, expressed by certain external indications. In this connection Tolstoy gives us an example. He says, let us suppose a boy to have been pursued in the forest by a bear. If he returns to the village and merely states that he was pursued by a bear and escaped, that would be an ordinary perceptual means of communicating facts and ideas. But if he describes himself, his state first of heedlessness, then of sudden alarm and terror as the bear appears, the surroundings, the wood, the distance between himself and the bear and so on,

1. Leo Tolstoy, What is Art, p. 121 (Oxford University Press)
and if the description, infects the audience and compels them to perceive what he had perceived already then it would be prepared aesthetic perception. Even if the boy had not seen a bear but had frequently been afraid of one, if he invented an encounter with a bear and recounted it so as to make his audience share the feeling— that would also be a prepared aesthetic perception.

Tolstoy attaches great importance to man's capacity of being infected by art; without it, people might be almost more savage and above all, more separated from, and more hostile to each other.

R.G. Collingwood¹ believes that an artist can communicate with his audience in two different ways. He can arouse emotion to affect his audience in a way in which he himself is not necessarily affected. He and his audience or reader stand in quite different relations to the act, very much as a physician and his patient stand in quite different relations towards a drug administered by the one and taken by the other. In other types of communication, as where an artist is expressing an emotion, he is treating himself and his audience in the same kind of way, he is making his emotions clear to his audience and that is what

he is doing to himself. It is addressed primarily to the artist himself, and secondarily to any one who can understand the creation of that artist.

Long before Collingwood, in Aristotle's thinking we get the same idea of art. He also says that it is of two kinds and that an artist can prepare it in two different ways: Firstly as that of medicine, where nature has failed to produce a healthy body, the physician helps it to complete the work. Secondly, as creating something new, which we call the fine arts in modern times.

According to Aristotle, common man perceives only the particular object, but the artist perceives the universal in the particular and prepares or idealises nature to exhibit the universal in it. Hence, for example, a sculptor, does not depict the individual man, but rather the type-man, the perfection of his kind. The modern painter, surrealist, impressionist and others are not concerned to paint a faithful image of their models, but take the model merely as a suggestion, and seize upon that essential and eternal thought, which they perceive through the 'sensuous materials' (as model) in which it is imprisoned.

Again, Collingwood says that, an 'artist' setting out to produce a certain emotion in his audience is setting out to produce not an individual emotion, but an emotion of a certain kind.

Thus he finally says that there is no definite technique through which the artist can prepare the perception of audience. The artist cannot understand his emotion until he has expressed it. The artist has to follow a certain directed end, but the end is not something foreseen and preconceived, to which appropriate means can be thought out in the light of our knowledge of its special character.

John Dewey\(^1\) discusses various aspect of art experience in connection with the preparation of aesthetic perception. He does not separate these two activities, that is, the aesthetic perception of the creator, and preparation or production of that enjoyment. According to him the very word 'Aesthetic' refers to experience as appreciative, perceiving, and enjoying. This is a continuous process. The hand moves with chisels or brush or pen. The eye attends and reports consequence of what is done. Again in case of music, vocal organs or musical instruments produce sounds and play symphony. The ear attends

---

1. John Dewey, The art as experience,
and reports the consequence of what is heard. This relation is so close that it controls simultaneously both the doing and the perception. One individual doing or making is 'artistic' when the perceived result is of such a nature that its qualities 'as perceived' have controlled the question of production. The act of producing is directed by intent to produce something, that is enjoyed in the immediate experience of perceiving. Actually the artist embodies in himself the attitude of the perceiver while he is engaged in the preparation of aesthetic creation.

According to Dewey passion is an important element in all aesthetic perception. Yet when artists and connoisseurs are overwhelmed by passion, as in extreme fear or jealously the communication between the creator and the beholder becomes impossible. Because the artist cannot feel any relationship between his 'enjoyed perception' which is the source of his energy and inspiration, and the 'identical perception', which he perceives continuously at the time of creation and through which he overcomes all the errors of his creation. Again, the beholder, cannot have the same experience, which the artist wants to communicate to him. Excess and uncontrolled passion may upset his balance and proportion of perceptual capacity.
It is also to be noted that until the artist is satisfied in perception, with what he is doing, he continues shaping and reshaping. The preparation comes to an end when its result is perceived as satisfactory. In comparison with other people, an artist has specially gifted powers of execution and unusual sensitivity. This sensitivity also directs his preparation of artistic creation.

In the preparation of aesthetic object 'anticipation' is another important element. Suppose, the potter shapes his clay to make a pot useful for holding water, but he makes it in a way so regulated by the series of perceptions that sum up the serial acts of making, that the pot is marked by enduring grace and charm. The common situation remains the same in painting a picture or shaping a sculpture. Even, at each stage there is 'anticipation' of what is to come. The 'anticipation' is the connecting link, between every step in the process and its outcome for the perceiver. So, what is 'done', and what is 'undergone' are thus reciprocally and continually instrumental to each other. Without this relation to each other to form a whole in aesthetic perception, creation of aesthetic object is incomplete. In Dewey's thinking, 'retrace' is another important faculty of the artist, whether he is a writer, a musician, a painter or a sculptor. Artists can 'retrace', during the process of creation, what they have previously done.
When such 'retracing' does not seem to be satisfactory in the perceptual phase of experience they can to some degree start it afresh.

Dewey also discusses in this connection the role of connoisseur's perception. He thinks that aesthetic experience is receptive. It involves surrender. Perception is an act of the going out of energy in order to receive, not a withholding of energy. He does not support that aesthetic perception is an affair for odd moments, which is the reason for the backwardness of arts among us.

To perceive an art object, a beholder must create his own experience. And his creation must include relations comparable to those which the original producer underwent. Without an act of re-creation the object is not perceived as a work of art. The artist in his creation must have selected, simplified, clarified, abridged and condensed according to his interest. The beholder must also go through these operations according to his point of view and interest. In both of them an act of abstraction, that is of extraction of what is significant takes place. There is work done on the part of the beholder as there is on the part of the artist. If an individual, is lazy or temperamentally unfit to perform this work he will not perceive an artistic creation.
Sigmund Freud, the famous psychoanalyst, in his essay 'The relation of the poet to day dreaming' also discusses artistic activity as a fulfilment of wishes. An adult must put aside childish play, but he substitutes phantasy, in the form of day dreams or night dreams. An artist has additional resources. By means of certain technique he can deflect his psychic energy into channels of creative endeavour.

Freud points out three such technical methods by means of which the artist can prepare his day dreams so as to make them enjoyable to others: these are (1) By the transformation of the fantasy; (2) By the elaboration of its content in such a way as to represent the fantasy; and (3) By the effect of aesthetic principles in this elaboration.

(1) The artist has to reject all that is egotistical and egocentric from the original day dream before it can be transformed into a work of art. For that purpose an artist must have to remove everything, which is personal, from the day-dream. All that could be considered repulsive in the wishes represented by the work of art has to be tempered in order completely to conceal its origin in forbidden sources.

(2) The second means of abolishing the barriers between one's own and other people's egos, is the artist's mysterious faculty of being able to mould a certain material so that the
fantasy expressed therein appears as a new kind of reality - an image of reality. The foundation of this magical technique lies in the pleasure principle. It originates in a very early period of psychic development, at which the individual still looks upon himself as omnipotent because wishes are experienced at this period as if their fulfilment in reality were achieved by the mere act of wishing. This stage can be called as 'omnipotence of thought'.

(3) The third and last means which the artist adopts is to follow certain laws of beauty, during the reconstruction of the material, whose investigation belongs to the field of aesthetics. These aesthetic features in the work of art are particularly suited to excite those who enjoy it.

An artist also knows how this reflection of his phantasy-life can be so transformed as to be a source of stream of pleasure, so that, for a time at least, the repressions are out balanced and completely disguised. When he can do all this, he opens out to others the way back to the comfort and consolation of their own unconscious sources of pleasure, and thereby earns their gratitude and admiration. Thus he has earned through his phantasy - what before he could only win in phantasy namely, honour, power and the 'love of woman'. 
Marxist interpretation of the said problem is that the artist must have to create art-work with an idea of social development in mind. Aesthetic creation, from this point of view, must offer a creative interpretation of life, otherwise it becomes nothing more than a mirror reflecting what is in front of it, or it becomes a simple formalism.

Marxist art movement is mainly based upon socialist realism. The founders of socialist realism are - Gorky, Mayakovsky, Sergli, Prokofiev and others. According to socialistic realism, the artist prepares a concrete perception of reality in which separate phenomena are seen as socially interconnected and conditioned in the light of their historical significance - a perception which takes each individual element as part of the whole and reveals the social background and historical scale of facts.

Here, again, we can remember Plato's viewpoint which is most important for showing the contrary trend of thinking. Plato says that the artist does not work by reason, but by inspiration. 'He does not, or should not create the beautiful by means of rules or by the application of principles'.

1. Marxist, Leninist Aesthetics, p. 266.
It is only after the work of art is created that the critic discovers rules in it. The artist follows rules unconsciously and instinctively. Plato calls it 'divine madness'. It is 'divine', because the artist produces beautiful things, but 'madness', because he himself does not know how or why he has done it. He merely feels, and does not understand anything.

There are also direct and indirect approaches of the artist in the preparation of aesthetic perception. The conventional approach is an indirect one. Suppose in literature to say 'I am happy' is to describe one's certain emotion, that is reporting, not Art. The word or words in which it is expressed need not contain any reference to happiness as such at all.

The indirect approach of the creator we find in drama or in a film. When there are intimate moments or dialogues we seem to perceive the scene or overhear the dialogue, without the knowledge of actors. In painting or in sculpture this indirect approach follows the same direction. Direct perception of painting seems 'poster', which is intentionally and commercially prepared to affect audience. This is a lower category of painting.

Though the indirect process is the traditional process yet at present in drama, music, film, literature, and in painting we find many direct approaches to construct the
connoisseur's perception. In recent literary movement, specially in novel, poetry or drama, the author himself is the hero of his novel or drama. He approaches his audiences directly to create neo-realistic atmosphere for his work. So direct approach to create beholder's perception is not always damaging in artistic creation.

John Hooper's view is that the audience should feel the same kind of emotions as the artist seems to be simply not true. Perhaps, in the lyric poems and some works of music, the listener may feel an emotion of the same kind as the artist once felt, but in many cases this is not so at all. Even when we do feel emotion in response to a work of art, the art is often of a quite different sort. If the author has expressed anger, we feel not anger, but perhaps horror or repulsion if he has expressed anguish, we may feel not anguish, but pity, and so on.

So an Artist, may or may not prepare aesthetic perception with an audience in his mind, but exact communication between artist and an audience or a reader is not possible.

1. Problems in Aesthetic. The Concept of Artistic Expression, pp. 210-211.
In this regard he suggests two major points, viz: how an artist should communicate with his beholder.

Firstly, if the artist wants to communicate the whole of his experience to the audience, the details of the process of creation, the technical details of execution, the aesthetic perception will be useless and disgusting for the audience. It is only a selected part of artist's perception in creation which should be communicated. So, we may say after Hogarth, that we perceive the prepared aspect (By Artist) of artistic creation, never the entire process of creation behind it.

Secondly, when the artist is under the spell of an emotion, he is too inclined to be the victim and not the master of it, and therefore, not to be in a good position to create a work of art. To create something an Artist should maintain a certain detachment and distance as well as considerable lucidity and self-discipline.

Henri Matisse\(^1\), one of the giants of modern art, in this regard describe his experience in these lines:

"Supposing, I want to paint the body of a woman: First of all, I endow it with grace and charm but I know that something

---

more than that is necessary. I try to condense the meaning of this body by drawing its essential lines. The charm will then become less apparent at first glance but in the long run it will begin to emanate from the new image. This image at the same time will be enriched by a wider meaning, a more comprehensively human one, while the charm, being less apparent, will not be its only characteristic.

Again in the following lines he says: 'Perhaps, I might be satisfied momentarily with a work finished at one sitting but I would soon get bored looking at it, therefore, I prefer to continue working on it so that later I may recognise it as a work of my mind'.

So, we never find Matisse prepare the aesthetic creation with an audience in mind. He says: 'I try to put serenity into my pictures and work at them until I feel that I have succeeded.

After surveying the subject from different points of view we come to the conclusion that, the artist may create with an audience in mind, which we get in socialist realism, or the artist can express what he feels without any further reference, which we get in the works of artists from Plato to Matisse.

But the artist cannot or should not communicate the whole of his perception and technical details to the beholder.
Perceptual communication requires the co-operation of both the sides viz: the artist and the beholder.

Maxim Rylsky, an Ukrainian poet, raises the question, has every reader, spectator and hearer the right to consider himself an incontestable, "indisputable" connoisseur of art in all its forms? Actually, there are some who are capable of perceiving music, the word of painting, and some who are actually or figuratively deaf, or colour-blind. So he gives the answer to his own question thus: 'Writing books and painting pictures require ability. But what about reading books and seeing pictures? This also requires ability'.

1. Art belongs to the people, p. 73
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