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INTRODUCTION

Two of the more important recent developments in art education have been: (1) the shift in goals toward the aesthetic in human experience in the context of general education; and (2) the identification of sources of content among the concepts and facts of art related disciplines such as aesthetics and art criticism. Although differences of opinion will continue concerning what the goals for aesthetic education should be, general goals have been formulated and considerable progress made in the identification of approaches to study and sources of content.

A major contribution to curriculum development for aesthetic education appeared in 1970 in CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Curriculum Program Guidelines. The Guidelines was designed as a handbook for curriculum development in a discipline centered program of education. Much of the Guidelines is devoted to the cataloging of concepts from aesthetics and criticism. Responding and producing are identified as approaches to study and concepts and facts that pertain to responding and producing aesthetic qualities are identified as sources of content. Many concepts representing different points of view are

---

offered as sources of content for the curriculum designer.

In aesthetics and criticism there are many unresolved issues. Definitive answers have yet to be given to such questions as the nature of the aesthetic encounter, what constitutes aesthetic significance, and the value of the aesthetic in the life of man. The various theories of aesthetics and criticism are proposed answers to such questions and their answers they generate definitions and categories of distinctions. While different theories may be seen to be viable and contending, they are pedagogically useful. This kind of usefulness is noted by Morris Weitz in his essay, "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics."

In his conclusions he notes:

If we take the aesthetic theories literally, as we have seen, they all fail; but if we reconstrue them, in terms of their function and point, as serious and argued for recommendations to concentrate on certain criteria of excellence in art, we shall see that aesthetic theory is far from worthless. In deed, it becomes as central as anything in aesthetics, in our understanding of art, for it teaches us what to look for and how to look for it in art.

Weitz's argument is ultimately a problem for philosophers and objections to his essay have been made. In noting the heuristic value of aesthetic theory he provides a rationale for the curriculum

---


designer's work.

A discipline centered conception of curriculum demands that the selection of content be responsible to the kinds of questions professionals ask and the ways they conceive and act upon them. If curriculum is to represent in its content questions of current concern, the curriculum designer might be wise to incorporate in curriculum those concepts that reflect polarities of thought. If he is to do this effectively he must: (1) have some familiarity with the nature of the continuing debates within the discipline from which he selects concepts, and (2) have some knowledge of what the concepts would provide when functioning in curriculum. In other words, there should be some demonstration of the concepts' abilities to achieve the educational goals they are expected to serve.

In the Guidelines a general program for curriculum development is outlined and many concepts and facts useful in the obtaining of various goals identified. However, a problem not discussed is that of choosing from among the many and viable theories those to serve as content for curriculum. A question the curriculum designer must face is what will particular concepts provide when translated into curriculum? Whatever selection is made, it is always one from among alternatives. Among alternative and contending concepts one may reveal


greater potential to accomplish a particular instructional goal than the other. This suggests that in the event contending concepts are combined in curriculum, the combination should be made on the basis of knowledge concerning what each concept is capable of providing when functioning in curriculum.

This study is an examination of the curriculum consequences of two theories of criticism. Specifically, it is an examination of the aesthetic categories of Monroe Beardsley and Eugene Kaelin and their implications for curriculum. These theories were chosen for study because their categories appear to be powerful in their ability to discriminate aesthetic features. An attendant reason for their choice is that they represent two viable and contending hypotheses concerning aesthetic experience which suggests the question of what the differences are between the categories of the two theories. The revealed potential of the two categories to discriminate aesthetic features would determine their respective value for curriculum.

The position of the study with respect to the two theories is value neutral. The purpose is not to rank one theory above the other. The study relates to current concerns in art education having to do with the problems of examining and translating concepts from the disciplines of aesthetics and criticism into curriculum. The central concern is to demonstrate that the distinctions found in different theories of criticism, i.e., categories of aesthetic analysis, have potential to accomplish different instructional goals and if incorporated into curriculum will lead to different consequences.

Certain risks are apparent when inquiry necessitates the
crossing of discipline boundaries such as from art education into aesthetics. The most likely offense is that important distinctions may be confused or slurred over. This may be a problem that is unavoidable in its entirety and perhaps the best defense is to acknowledge it. It is hoped that this study will contribute to art teaching by identifying some of the curriculum consequences of two major theories of art criticism.
CHAPTER I

ART EDUCATION CURRICULUM AND THEORIES OF CRITICISM

In this chapter the recent emphasis within art education on aesthetics and art criticism is briefly reviewed and the curriculum implications that result from various theories of aesthetics and criticism are suggested. The descriptive categories of Monroe Beardsley and Eugene Kaelin are identified as potential sources of curriculum content. The chapter concludes with a statement of the problem, questions to which the study will be directed, and the method of investigation.

Art Education and Aesthetic Education

Until 1965 the theory and practice of art education in the public schools was concerned for the student primarily as a producer of art and revealed little interest in him as one who observes and responds to art. The student as a discriminating viewer and his resulting behavior as an indication of his aesthetic response were not considered major objectives for education in art.

Since 1966 activity in American art education has revealed a developing commitment to the aesthetic dimensions of human experience
and to their role in general education. A major purpose of general education is to engage the student in activities that will enable him to fulfill his potential as a rational, sensitive and responsive individual. Many choices and decisions that affect the quality of life in our society are aesthetic or have aesthetic consequences. The freedom of the individual and the welfare of society depend on each individual's ability to make intelligent and reasoned responses to aesthetic qualities. To do so he must have the conceptual instruments that will enable him to seek and respond to the variety of aesthetic qualities encountered in art and the visual environment.

To provide activities that will encourage the development of the understandings necessary to the student's ability to derive meaning from his visual environment, art education is drawing upon concepts and facts from such disciplines as aesthetics, art criticism and art history. Several new publications reflect the emphasis on what aesthetics and art criticism might provide in the way of content and


approaches to study in the visual arts. This emphasis is also reflected in curriculum and art appreciation institutes, the Aesthetic Education Curriculum Program, and seminars on aesthetic education.

Art Education and Art Criticism

Art education's commitment to aesthetic education and to the goal of learning to view and talk about art has drawn attention to art

---

(c) Manuel Barkan and Laura Chapman, Guidelines for Art Instruction Through Television for the Elementary Schools (Bloomington: National Center for School and College Television, 1967).

5(a) Improving the Teaching of Art Appreciation, Research and Development Team for the Improvement of Teaching Art Appreciation in the Secondary Schools, David Ecker, Project Director, Cooperative Research Project No. V-006, (Columbus: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1966).
(b) Institute for Advanced Study in Art Appreciation, U.S. Office of Education as authorized under the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, David Ecker, Director, The Ohio State University, Summer, 1966.


criticism as a source of content. 8 Within art criticism two professional roles may be distinguished: the critic and the philosopher of criticism. Generally, the task of the critic is conceived to be that of explaining and sometimes evaluating the work of art. His criticism, or talk about art, proceeds from his assumptions concerning the nature of art, its purposes and functions. The study of criticism, what the critic does or should do and the methods and procedures he should employ, is a concern of the philosopher of criticism. His task is to explain criticism. The nature of criticism, how one talks about art and what one talks about when doing so, is his primary concern. His explanations (concepts of criticism) are the result of his efforts to conceptualize the problems of criticism. Theories of criticism are philosophers' systematic answers to what they take criticism to be when "properly" conducted.

Philosophers of criticism agree that criticism exists for the general purpose of extending or disclosing one's experience with art. Their theories reflect their differing views regarding the critical components of the art experience. The different theories of criticism

(c) Barkan and Chapman, Guidelines for Art Instruction Through Television.
(d) Barkan, Chapman, and Kern, Guidelines.
have been seen by some art educators as alternative sources of concepts that may function as content in the training of students and teachers to talk about art.

One instance of research utilizing concepts of criticism is the previously mentioned Guidelines published by CEMREL. Included in the Guidelines is a large inventory of concepts pertaining to response to and performance in the arts. The concepts, abstracted from the writings of philosophers, historians, critics, artists, and performers are meant to serve curriculum writers in their attempts to identify goals, content, instructional materials and activities. Within the publication are several concepts related to language and criticism.

A study by MacGregor represents a second instance of research utilizing concepts of criticism. In her inquiry she undertakes two questions: (1) can alternative concepts of art criticism be made to function in a unit of instruction for the education of pre-service art teachers, and (2) can the unit increase the teacher's ability to talk critically about works of art? The concepts of Frank Sibley,

---

9 Barkan, Chapman, and Kern, Guidelines.


Charles Stevenson, \(^{12}\) and Morris Weitz\(^{13}\) were utilized in unit of instruction for what they suggest as content and method for ways of talking about art. The unit was used in the training of pre-service teachers. The effect of the training was measured as the difference in the teacher's talk about art before training and in their student teaching. MacGregor found that concepts of criticism translated into curriculum do have the power to effect the substance of students' talk about art.

**Implications of Theories of Criticism**

Theories of criticism suggest what criticism is or should be when properly conducted. There are many different theories and each one calls attention to the properties it holds to be important to the process of criticism. Because criticism often is concerned with calling attention to what is aesthetically significant in art, theories of criticism may be associated with aesthetic theories which in turn may be differentiated in terms of their methods or the aspects of art they emphasize. By suggesting various approaches to art and emphasizing certain aspects of experience, theories of aesthetics and criticism generate distinctions which may in turn be applied to works of art in our attempts to better understand them.

---


Theories of aesthetics and criticism divide the subject matter of art in different ways. The differences between theories result from different methods and procedures the philosopher uses and the kinds of questions he asks in his attempts to understand art. In his search for understanding he may focus on the peculiar nature of the object of art, the kinds of meanings it affords, its impact on the viewer, or the way we talk about it. Various theories may be classified according to the particular aspects emphasized. Formalist, Expressionist, Symbolist, Instrumentalist, Phenomenological and Linguistic are some classifications. Others may be found in the literature of aesthetics.  

For example, Formalist theories place emphasis on the "formal" or organizational properties of art. Aesthetic value is seen to result from the properties of art objects having to do with their ability to sustain perceptual interest. The formalist holds that works of art may serve other purposes but they are good or bad as art in terms of their formal properties. Some important exponents of a formalist position are Roger Fry and Clive Bell.  

Expressionist theories identify the aesthetic with emotions, feelings, ideas and associations. Aesthetic value is associated with

---


15 Roger Fry, Vision and Design (New York: Peter Smith, 1924).  

the power of art over the mental processes of the viewer. The expressionist does not deny the formal aspects of art but emphasizes the significance of the thoughts, emotions, and associations resulting from them. Benedetto Croce and R. G. Collingwood are two important expressionist philosophers.

Symbolist theories call attention to the meanings and ideas that may be derived from a careful investigation of the signs and symbols of art. Art is seen to be a symbol of human feeling or an iconic sign of psychological processes. Heinrich Wolfflin, Erwin Panofsky, and Suzanne Langer are exponents of this view.

Instrumentalist theories emphasize the fact that the experience of art may be understood as a transaction between individual and object. With ideas, concepts and memories as "instruments" the viewer acts upon the object which reciprocates with its own features. Art is seen to be a quality of experience resulting from this interaction.

---


between viewer and object. The most influential exponent of the
instrumentalist position is John Dewey. Another philosopher who
holds this position is Thomas Munro.

Phenomenological theories emphasize the experience of the
individual but only as it is mediated by qualities of an object and
the viewer's consciousness. Aesthetic response is seen to be control-
led by an object but its understanding comes in the immediacy of the
viewer's perception of the object and his own consciousness of himself
perceiving the object. Different points of view are to be found among
philosophers within this orientation. Two philosophers holding a
phenomenological view are Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Eugene Kaelin.

Linguistic theories result from the examination of the language
used to talk about art. Philosophers holding this view emphasize the
language of art, the terms and concepts critics often use when discus-
sing art. They believe that important insights can be gained through
an analysis of the way we talk when discussing works of art (or prob-
lems in aesthetics). Some exponents of this general view are

23Thomas Munro, The Arts and Their Interrelations (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1949).
Monroe Beardsley,26 Morris Weitz,27 Frank Sibley,28 Joseph Margolis,29 and Virgil Aldrich.30

The fact that theories of aesthetics and criticism generate different kinds of distinctions suggests important implications for curriculum. Their distinctions call attention to various aspects of art and thereby suggest goals for art education and the way content may be structured to attain them. For example, distinctions drawn from formalist theories could be used to increase the student's awareness of the unique perceptual qualities of art. Formalist theories often inventory perceptual features of art and suggest the attitude of the viewer necessary to his perception of them. By so doing they suggest ways the student might be made more sensitive to the visual qualities of art and his world. Within Bell's idea of art as "significant form" and Fry's "emotional elements of design" there are distinctions that may be useful in directing attention to the perceptual qualities of art.

Distinctions drawn from expressionist theories could be used

28 Frank Sibley, "Aesthetic Concepts."
to direct the student's attention to the expressive qualities of art. The fact that various meanings occur to the viewer that are not analyzable in terms of the visual phenomena is noted and explained in various expressionist theories. Some of these theories draw attention to the affective dimension of art and could be used to direct attention to that dimension of experience. Conceptions of the art experience such as "intuition," "self-expression," and "emotional embodiment" are rich in suggestive power for approaches to understanding the ideational and emotional contents of art.

**Symbolist** theories are suggestive of ways of attending to the relationship that so often appears to hold between art and other things. They suggest the student could be brought to see the kinds of structural similarities between visual forms and human feelings and concepts. Symbolist theories may be used to draw attention to the iconic signs and their meanings that occur as an important dimension of experience with many works of art.

**Instrumental** theories suggest that the student's attention should be directed to the features that differentiate experience when it is characterized by aesthetic quality. They often distinguish between the qualities of ordinary experience and experience that is intrinsically meaningful. Instrumental theories are suggestive of ways the student could be made more cognizant of the quality of his own experience with art and other phenomena.

**Phenomenal** theories suggest that much of aesthetic value is to be derived by attention to the contents of one's own consciousness as it is controlled by the structures of the aesthetic object. These
theories suggest methods for isolating objects from concepts of them and from their relations to other things. They suggest possibilities of content directed to the goals of making the student more critical of his own language, more sensitive to the dimensions of critical language and insistent on clarity in his own discourse and that of others. Linguistic theories also suggest criteria for the examination of the student's talk as an indicator of his response to works of art.

Some implications of phenomenological and linguistic theories have been developed. Evan J. Kern identifies the aesthetic, cognitive and expressive as three major content areas for curriculum. By adding the category of function to Eugene Kaelin's categories of surface and depth Kern develops a curriculum model that provides content for all three areas. Some implications of linguistic theories have been developed by Nancy MacGregor and David Ecker. MacGregor's research utilizing concepts of criticism from the theories of Morris Weitz, Charles Stevenson and Frank Sibley was noted earlier in this chapter. In the analysis and description of children's talk in the classroom, Ecker finds that their language categories differ in important ways from those suggested by philosophers and which are often prescribed as

---


32 MacGregor, "The Use of Selected Concepts of Art Criticism."

guides for teachers and students in their talk about art. Ecker notes that when unrestricted, children's language contains levels of aesthetic inquiry not accounted for by categories of critical language. He warns against a commitment to categories that are appropriate only to a single level of aesthetic inquiry because it may result in the oversight of other levels of talk.

This characterization of a few selected theories is for the purpose of indicating in a very general way the implications various kinds of theories may have for curriculum. The description of the theories surveyed is admittedly loose and general. The significant point is that each theory suggests modes of attending to art that differ in some important respects from other theories. Each theory emphasizes through the distinctions it makes some particular aspects out of the whole subject matter of art. Each theory offers in its distinctions a potential source of content that may be translated into curriculum.

**Beardsley's and Kaelin's Theories of Criticism**

From the many theories of criticism there are two in particular that have importance for curriculum. The theories of Monroe Beardsley and Eugene Kaelin suggest categories of aesthetic analysis that appear to be powerful in their ability to discriminate aesthetic features. The categories are unique in their specificity and detail and appear to be generalizable to a host of curriculum concerns such as instructional goals, activities for teacher and students, and materials.

There are significant differences between Beardsley's and
Kaelin's categories. They inventory different features and if utilized in curriculum they would draw attention to different aspects of experience. An explanation of the differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories is found in the philosophical orientation of the two philosophers and the differences in their theories.

Beardsley is one of a group classified as "ordinary language" philosophers. "Ordinary language" philosophy belongs to the general philosophic orientation known as empiricism which stresses the role of observation, experience, or the senses in the attainment of knowledge. Two general directions can be noted among aestheticians working within the empiricist framework: (1) problems are organized into questions about matters of fact to be answered by empirical science (and in the case of aesthetics, psychology in particular), and (2) questions about concepts and methods to be answered by philosophical analysis.

Analytical philosophy originated with G. E. Moore who held the Realist position that "what is experienced is often distinct and logically independent of our experience of it...." He saw analysis as the appropriate method for obtaining insight into various puzzles.

---

34 Monroe C. Beardsley, "Aesthetics, History of," Encyclopedia


and problems. Some aestheticians working within the school of
philosophical analysis have set out to re-examine some of the founda-
tions and methods of aesthetics. They believe that many philosophical
problems are the result of misconceptions about language. They see the
task of philosophy to be that of analyzing the language and reasoning
of critics in hopes of resolving some of the difficulties. 38

Analytical philosophy often begins with the study of language
in its "actual usage" and for this reason it is sometimes called
"ordinary language" philosophy. "Ordinary language" philosophy is not
a name for a methodology nor does it denote a group of philosophers
in total agreement concerning what the problems of philosophy are. It
is a term used to classify a group of philosophers who believe many
philosophical problems are amenable to inquiry by means of a careful
examination of language. Beardsley notes:

They see philosophical puzzles as arising from insensi-
tivity to the full flexibility and many-valued uses of
the language in which we talk about art. We try to force
words to behave in ways they were not designed for (as
when we expect "form" to have one and only one meaning, or
assume that all the objects denoted by "tragedy" have some
set of common properties). We misconceive the "grammar"
(or natural role) of a word, or misunderstand the sort of
"language game" that is going on (is the critic, for
example, in judging a work of art, doing something like
grading apples, or awarding a prize, or handing down a
verdict?). The cure for all such puzzles is to dissolve
them by becoming aware of our language—seeing how it
works, what can be expected of it, and what cannot.


39 Monroe C. Beardsley, Aesthetics from Classical Greece to
Kaelin has developed what he terms a phenomenological theory of aesthetics and art criticism. Phenomenology may be defined as a study of appearances. As a contemporary philosophical movement, phenomenology began with Edmund Husserl who saw it as a return "to the things themselves." Husserl was convinced that philosophers had become accustomed to rationalizing their experiences and constructing elaborate systems of reasoning to the neglect of what he saw to be the foundation of truth and knowledge, the human consciousness. A return "to the things themselves" was to be a "return to that world which precedes knowledge, of which knowledge always speaks and in relation to which every scientific schematization is an abstract and derivative sign language..."40

A position held by phenomenologists from the beginning of the movement is that phenomenology is a non-empirical science; it does not describe empirically observable matters of fact.41 The purpose of phenomenology is to describe whatever appears in "immediate experience." By this they do not mean sensory observations or "raw sense data" prior to any interpretation or classification. However, they do believe that much of value is lost because of a predisposition to view the world through concepts.


Any object or quality of consciousness may be considered a phenomenon and an object of investigation. Having selected a particular area of study, such as "beauty," "language," or "art," the phenomenologist tries to grasp, to the fullest extent possible, what is actually experienced, and to describe it faithfully. In order to do this he believes he must set aside all presuppositions that he may have about the area of study. Of utmost concern to the phenomenologist is the contents of his experience. He wishes to be aware of what is in fact given, avoiding to the extent possible the explanations and concepts that may tend to influence him toward the perceptions of others.

That there are important differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories may be demonstrated by the following glossary in which certain terms with "aesthetic" as an adjective are defined from the point of view of each philosopher.

aesthetic experience: (Beardsley) the experience of phenomenally objective presentations that differ in magnitude in terms of their unity, complexity and intensity.

(Kaelin) the felt or experienced expressiveness of all phenomena as they fund or come to closure.

aesthetic features: (Beardsley) the heterogeneous but interrelated components of a phenomenally objective field.

(Kaelin) the contents of consciousness, both sensuous and imaginative, as they are controlled by an aesthetic object.

aesthetic value: (Beardsley) having the capacity to produce experiences of some magnitude of unity, complexity and intensity.

(Kaelin) the felt expressiveness of all phenomena as they fund or come to closure in a single experience.
aesthetic encounter: (Beardsley) the perceiving of the properties of a phenomenally objective field.

(Kaelin) the awareness of the functional interrelatedness of experiences when controlled by the aesthetic object.

aesthetic judgment: (Beardsley) evaluation in which there is a direct or indirect appeal to the critical standards of unity, complexity, and intensity of the phenomenally objective field.

(Kaelin) an assessment on the basis of the extent to which various phenomena fund in an interrelatedness within a context.

The glossary suggests that aesthetic experience in Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories is identified with different things. Beardsley places emphasis on the phenomenally objective features of the perceptual object and Kaelin on the contents of consciousness when controlled by the aesthetic object. The evidence is that aesthetic experience in Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories does not mean the same thing. Their theories represent contending philosophical orientations and their aesthetic categories channel the viewer's attention in different directions: Beardsley's to the phenomenally objective features of the perceptual object and Kaelin's to one's own subjective states.

However, the fact that their theories offer different sets of categories suggests the usefulness of their categories in curriculum. Categories from the two theories could be utilized as sources of content for the teaching of aesthetic concepts representing contending aesthetic doctrines. A question, the answer to which offers very important implications for curriculum is what differences there are between the two theories in the kinds of experience they lead to and consider to have aesthetic value. What appears necessary is a demonstration of the differences between the categories of the two theories. Such a
demonstration would provide the kind of knowledge essential for the effective deployment of the two theories in curriculum.

The categories of aesthetic analysis of Beardsley and Kaelin are not explicitly formulated in their theories but are contained in each philosopher's conception of critical description. Both philosophers agree that aesthetic features are the objects of critical description but disagree concerning the role of critical description, i.e., the particular features they take for their objects. To obtain categories of analysis representing Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories requires an examination of the role of critical description in the two theories. After the two sets of categories are obtained they may be examined and utilized in a demonstration of their potential usefulness in curriculum.

Formation of Aesthetic Concepts

A further question for this study is how may different categories of aesthetic analysis as offered in Beardsley's and Kaelin's philosophies be utilized to make available a richer and more varied array of aesthetic concepts for the student? Through what instructional procedures may such concepts be learned?

One answer to the question of how concepts are learned is suggested by Roger Brown and John Carroll. Although they do not deal with concepts of criticism, their observations seem to be generalizable to the problem of formation of concepts of aesthetic features. After their contribution is identified, their respective views will be extended to the operation of criticism as viewed from Beardsley's and
Kaelin's theories.

Brown describes the process of the formation of a concept and the application of a linguistic label to it as "the original word game." He describes the game as one between two players who participate in the formation and testing of a concept.

The tutor names things in accordance with the semantic custom of his community. The player forms hypotheses about the categorical nature of the things named. He tests his hypotheses by trying to name new things correctly. The tutor compares the player's utterances with his own anticipations of such utterances and in this way checks the accuracy of fit between his own categories and those of the player. He improves the fit by correction. We play this game as long as we continue to extend our vocabulary.

Evidence of concept attainment is the subject's ability to identify new instances of it without further training. "Similarly, the referent of a word cannot be said to be fully understood until it can be correctly extended to entities that one has not heard labelled."43

Carroll notes two necessary conditions for effective concept formation:

(1) the individual must have a series of experiences that are in one or more respects similar; the constellation of "respects" in which they are similar constitutes the "concept" that underlies them, and

(2) the series of experiences embodying the concept must be preceded, interspersed, or followed by other experiences


43 Ibid.
that constitutes negative instances of the concept. 

Carroll further notes,

...exactly what conditions are sufficient for the formation of a concept cannot yet be stated but in all probability they will be a matter of: (1) the number, sequencing, or timing of the instances presented to the individual, (2) the reinforcements given to the individual's response, and (3) the individual's orientation to the task.

Brown's and Carroll's views may be generalized to the operation of criticism as suggested by various theories. It was noted earlier in this chapter that differences between theories often have to do with their categories of distinctions and the directions in which they channel attention. Each of the theories reviewed are suggestive of activities on the part of the "tutor" if he is to effectively participate in the "game" of formation and testing of aesthetic concepts.

For instance, the "tutor" (critic, teacher or other) may emphasize formalist, expressionist, symbolic, or other categories and distinctions. Whatever categories of analysis he uses, the "tutor" provides through the particular features he names and describes a basis for the "player's" hypothesis of the categorical nature of aesthetic features. New experiences of naming and illustrating the particular aesthetic features stressed, interspersed with negative instances of them, and subsequent corrections by the "tutor" of the "player's" attempts to correctly identify those features may result in

---


45 Ibid.
the establishment of concepts of aesthetic features. The established concepts then become aesthetic sets, channeling the "player's" attention toward those features. The significant point is that different theories provide different sets of distinctions, such as categories of aesthetic features, for the "tutor" and "player."

In suggesting how concepts are learned Brown and Carroll suggest how the aesthetic categories from Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories may be utilized in teaching concepts of aesthetic features. Theories of the two philosophers can supply categories of aesthetic analysis for instruction modeled after "the original word game." The two sets of categories may provide a rich source of curriculum content for the teaching of concepts of aesthetic features representing contending aesthetic theories.

If art education is to reflect the kinds of questions professionals ask and the ways they conceive and act upon them, it must provide the student with aesthetic concepts representing alternative points of view. To do this conceptions of aesthetic features from differing theories must be translated into curriculum content. Such translation should consider: (1) what each theory uniquely provides in the way of categories of aesthetic features, and (2) how those categories may be utilized so as to equip the student with alternative aesthetic points of view.

Curriculum researchers in art education have not investigated the categories of aesthetic analysis in contending theories of criticism for what they might provide. Specifically, questions that need attention are: (1) what aesthetic features do categories of aesthetic
analysis in Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories of criticism direct attention to or have the power to reveal in the encounter with works of art, and (2) how may what they reveal be utilized in curriculum towards the goal of formation of aesthetic concepts?

Statement of Problem

Implications the theories of Beardsley and Kaelin offer for curriculum may now be phrased as questions:

1. What are the differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories of aesthetic analysis?

2. What differences do their categories make in how one attends to works of art?

3. What implications for curriculum may be drawn from the different features Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories reveal in a work of art?

4. How may categories of aesthetic analysis from Beardsey's and Kaelin's theories be made to function in a unit of instruction for the development of concepts of aesthetic features?

In order to answer these questions Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories of criticism will be studied with respect to the differing role they give to aesthetic description. Attention will be focused on the different features aesthetic descriptions from the two theories reveal in a work of art. In light of these respective differences aesthetic categories representing the two theories will be incorporated into a unit of instruction.

Beardsley and Kaelin place emphasis on aesthetic descriptions but differ in fundamental respects concerning what the describable or aesthetic features are. Beardsley suggests that aesthetic response is
to the perceptual features of a phenomenal object and descriptions function to reveal those features. For Kaelin aesthetic features are identified with the viewer's consciousness as it is controlled by the object. The viewer's consciousness may include sensuous features, representations of objects, ideas, symbols and feelings. For Kaelin aesthetic description is the only relevant category of critical discourse.

**Premise**

This study is based on the premise that it is possible to ascertain what the aesthetic categories are in a given philosophy of criticism through the examination of the role of aesthetic description within the philosophy as a whole. The differences in the role assigned aesthetic descriptions in contending theories of criticism can serve to dramatize the differences in the aesthetic categories of the theories. Aesthetic descriptions of works of art utilizing the aesthetic categories from contending theories of criticism will direct attention to very different features.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate: (1) differences between the aesthetic categories of Monroe Beardsley's and Eugene Kaelin's theories of criticism and their respective potential for illuminating aesthetic features in a particular work of art, and (2) how aesthetic categories from two different theories of criticism may be combined in a single unit of instruction for the purpose of
developing alternative concepts of aesthetic features. This study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What are Beardsley's and Kaelin's conceptions of aesthetic description and what are the differences between them?

2. What kinds of features do each of the two philosophers hold to be the aesthetic ones?

3. What features of a particular work of art does criticism utilizing the aesthetic categories of the two theories reveal or show potential for revealing?

4. How may aesthetic categories representing the two theories be combined in a unit of instruction so as to facilitate the broadening of students' concepts of aesthetic features?

5. What implications do the results of this study have for the development of curriculum and further research in art education?

**Method of Investigation**

This study is conducted in three phases. In the first phase Beardsley's and Kaelin's conceptions of aesthetic description is used to develop categories of aesthetic analysis representing the two theories. The second phase of the study is the drawing of implications for curriculum from the demonstrated merits of the two sets of categories to reveal aesthetic features. The development of a unit of instruction using as content the two sets of categories with respect to their demonstrated potential to illuminate aesthetic features in a work of art is the third and final phase of the study. Components of the study, corresponding to each of the following chapters, are summarized:

**Chapter II.** Beardsley's and Kaelin's conceptions of aesthetic description are examined and some significant differences between them
noted. On the basis of observed distinctions implications are noted for curriculum.

**Chapter III.** Concepts that identify and explain the kinds of features held to be describable in the two theories are collected and assembled into categories. The resulting two categories of aesthetic features are compared and contrasted.

**Chapter IV.** The potential of the two categories to illuminate various features is demonstrated by using them to describe a work of art. The resulting two descriptions are compared for what features they revealed or failed to reveal. On the basis of this demonstration implications concerning how the categories could function in curriculum are noted.

**Chapter V.** On the basis of the demonstration of the potential on the two categories representing the aesthetic features of the two theories, a unit of instruction is designed for the purpose of developing concepts of aesthetic features. The unit of instruction serves as a demonstration of how contending conceptions of aesthetic features may be incorporated in a single unit of instruction.

**Limitations of Study**

One limitation of this study is that it deals only with the theoretical and curricular aspects of a problem and terminates in the development of a unit of instruction. The unit may be evaluated on empirical or theoretical grounds. An empirical evaluation must be made on the basis of the unit's observed ability to achieve those goals for which it was designed with a designated population of students.
The theoretical assessment would be made in terms of how the content of the unit coheres with established knowledge in the field or discipline from which the content is derived. This second type of evaluation would be in terms of the unit's ability to achieve the purposes and goals for which it is designed.

For the purpose of this study the evaluation of the unit will be done in the latter way, i.e., in terms of the unit's potential to facilitate the acquisition of concepts of aesthetic features. Assessment of the unit will be on the grounds of the purposes and goals it is designed to serve and whether it appears to be structured so as to facilitate the development of alternative concepts of aesthetic features.
In Chapter I it was suggested that an examination of Beardsley's and Kaelin's views of aesthetic description is necessary to understand their categories of aesthetic analysis. In this chapter Beardsley's and Kaelin's conceptions of aesthetic descriptions are discussed and some of the differences between them noted. On the basis of these differences implications are drawn for curriculum.

**Beardsley's Conception of Aesthetic Description**

For Beardsley criticism is kinds of statements made in response to works of art. A critical statement is any statement that is about such objects as poems, paintings, plays and symphonies. External and internal are the two kinds of statements one can make about art objects. External statements are about the object's cause and effects. Internal statements are "statements about the aesthetic object as such; its blueness, its 'meaning,' its beauty." In terms of this distinction critical statements are internal statements about an aesthetic object. External statements are important only as they are relevant

---

2 Ibid., p. 64.
3 Ibid.
to the verification of internal statements. 4

Within his classification of internal statements, Beardsley distinguishes between three sub-classes of statements: (1) description, (2) interpretation, and (3) evaluation. Descriptions and interpretations are non-normative. Descriptions are "statements that inform us about the colors and shapes of a painting, or summarize the plot of a motion picture, or classify an operatic aria as being of the A B A form..."5 Interpretations are statements that declare the "meaning" of the work where "meaning" is taken as a semantical relation between the work and something outside the work.6 Evaluative statements are normative. They generally incorporate appraisive terms and apply to works of art words such as "good," "great," "beautiful," their negatives, or other predicates definable in terms of them.7

Of the three sub-classes of internal statements--those he considers critical statements in the stricter sense--Beardsley considers descriptions to be the least difficult to analyze. The fact they are not as difficult as the other two kinds of statements does not imply less significance. In fact, they are highly significant because it is on description that interpretation and evaluation depend. If the critic plans to interpret or evaluate the work he must be able to state those features upon which his interpretation and evaluation rest, and in so doing he must describe.8

The purpose of description is to bring the viewer to see those

---

4 Ibid., pp. 64-65.  
5 Ibid., p. 10.  
6 Ibid., p. 9.  
7 Ibid., p. 9.  
8 Ibid., p. 75.
features of the aesthetic object that may be responded to (emotionally). Beardsley notes that critical descriptions are of different levels of "precision and specificity but they are most helpful when they discriminate and articulate details, and give us an insight into the inner nature of the object. Such a description is called an analysis..."

For Beardsley the distinction between analysis and description is this. Analysis is the process by which the critic investigates the relationships between the parts and the way they relate to the whole of the aesthetic object. The process of analysis involves distinguishing, discrimination and description in detail. Analysis does not proceed uninformed. In analysis the critic "proceeds on certain assumptions about what kinds of detail it is important for the critic to note." The critic brings to bear in his analysis and description categories of basic distinctions. The critic approaches the object with concepts of what may be found to which aesthetic value may be ascribed. These concepts or categories may be discovered by the same method as his categories of critical statements—by an analysis of what critics say and where they have located significance among the features of an aesthetic object.

One other feature of Beardsley's theory of criticism important to his concept of description is his idea of the aesthetic object. His argument for the existence of an object to which the critic
responds is not made from metaphysical grounds but from the way critics use language in talking about it. As he notes:

> It does seem to be presupposed by critics, and each of us when he discusses plays and poems and statues, that there is something that can be discriminated out from the process of creation and contemplation, something that can be experienced, studied, enjoyed, and judged. 13

Beardsley uses the term "object" to "refer to any entity that can be named and talked about, that characteristics can be attributed to." 14 However, he does not provide a definition for "aesthetic object" but states that they can be distinguished from other perceptual objects by their characteristics. 15 "To speak of the aesthetic object is to speak of it in respect to its perceptual qualities." 16 To speak of an aesthetic object is to speak of an object that exists separate and apart from the perceiver. It is to speak of an object that has properties or qualities of color, shape, etc., which qualities are given to the viewer's awareness in perception.

**Kaelin's Conception of Aesthetic Description**

For Kaelin, the job of the critic is not to state what an art work means, or to evaluate it in the sense of saying it is good or bad. The critic's task is to show how it is constructed and of what it is constructed so a third person may experience its significance as an act of integral perception. It is by means of description that the experience is revealed. Description is the only appropriate use of language

---


in the critical enterprise. Critical descriptions are not those of conceptual or essential analysis but existential, which is to say they are descriptions of the critic's own experience with the work. For description the critic does not need a set of categories which result from classifications of the contents of other works of art. He does not approach the work with conceptions of what he may, or should, find of value. "Only descriptions of art works and their embodied values as mediating the consciousness ... are relevant to the aesthetic procedure."\(^{17}\)

For Kaelin aesthetic descriptions take as their objects the intentional acts of consciousness. "Intention" denotes that which appears to consciousness and guides it. Intentions are the pre-rational contents of one's own "lived world." As Kaelin indicates:

> Intentions are, thus, first bodily phenomena, and they define a corporal schema by the arc subtending the physical body and its pre-objectively constituted world. So is seeing a bodily phenomenon; at rock bottom it is a tension felt within our phenomenal field of possible action.\(^{18}\)

Aesthetic descriptions take as their object "a series of emergent strands of experience," or the structures of a visual phenomenal field. "The objects of criticism appear to the consciousness that lets


\(^{19}\)Ibid., pp. 54-55.
itself be guided by the visual structures of the painterly universe." 19 Basic, fundamental to, and controlling all other experiences with a work of art is the **sensuous surface**. In the case of a visual phenomenal field the sensuous surface is the colored spaces that constitute and organize the surface. In the case of painting the viewer sees colors and shapes which have been organized into some structure. Without question the viewer is aware of these and they form one major strand of his experience. However, colored spaces are intentional objects and therefore are not to be located in the physical object (painting) but in "the body proper of the perceiving individual." 20 The organization of the sensuous surface is meaningful in that "the tensions of the colored planes are the felt correlates of the differentiations perceived." 21

A second strand of experience occurs if the colors and spaces (sensuous surface) are so organized as to produce surface tensions by which objects appear. Such is the case of representational paintings. This stratum of experience is that of the objects represented. In non-objective painting there is no other significance but that of the sensuous surface. Further, the nature of the viewer's experience is modulated and controlled by the manner of the object's depiction. For example, consider the difference between the representation of common household objects in a cubist painting by Braque versus the realistic manner of Chardin. The viewer's experience is significantly different.

in each instance.

For Kaelin the third strand of experience is the ideas that emerge due to the relations between represented objects. "They constitute the third and final stratum of the visual object." This strand is more obvious in realistic painting. The third strand of experience, that of ideas, is readily apparent in a painting such as The Death of Socrates by David where it seems everything is subordinate to the idea which is death preferred to the surrender of ideals.

The representation of objects, the suggestion of images and the conception of ideas (the second and third strands of experience) Kaelin terms depth qualities. Depth is an important dimension of experience with those works of art in which the surface thickens and objects, whether real or unreal, appear. In those works of art where representation does not occur there is no depth and experience is only that of the sensuous surface. Some music and non-objective paintings are examples of works of art where all significance is in the sensuous surface.

The experience of the viewer in the aesthetic encounter is not limited to surface and depth. The viewer is also aware of his own feelings and emotions when attending to surface and depth qualities. Feelings and emotions are also intentional acts of consciousness and therefore objects for description. In painting the tensions perceived among colored spaces may produce feelings of quietness and calm or restlessness and turmoil. Feelings resulting from surface qualities

---

22 Ibid., p. 56.
are often vague and ambiguous in contrast to those that result from depth qualities. Feelings and emotions resulting from depth qualities may be more definite. For example a painting of Napoleon may evoke feelings of awe, distaste, revulsion or admiration. Whatever definite feelings result from depth qualities, they are always the viewer's response to particular objects and events, images or ideas.

For Kaelin the aesthetic expressiveness is the experienced relatedness of the sensuous surface to represented depth. Everything necessary for expression is in the work of art. Since experience is ultimately a result of perceptions, all experience of a work is traceable to the sensuous surface. When the viewer gives himself to his perceptions by the phenomenological reduction (the forsaking of the natural attitude), the expressive qualities of surface and depth control all perceptions including feelings, moods and associations. The experienced relatedness of surface and depth define the total context of the aesthetic encounter. All significance to be found in a work of art is to be found in this context. The relatedness of surface and depth is an intentional act of consciousness and also an object for description.

The complete analysis of a work of art would seem to call for an ability to relate the surface and depth into a single unified experience. The total expressiveness would be a description of that experience. While the "counters" of surface and depth may be described

---

and certain aspects of their relatedness noted, Kaelin indicates that the total expressiveness of the piece cannot be described. "Being felt, or experienced, this experience is not discursive; it is had or it is missed, but it cannot be rendered into words whose function is to purvey information." 24

The following quotation from Kaelin serves as a summary of his theory.

All works of art display some sort of organized sensuous surface, capable of expressing some sort of vague feeling or mood. In addition, some works have surfaces so organized as to suggest further interpretation: an object may be represented, or an idea, by a relationship between represented objects; and ideas may call out further images, which are guaged to be relevant or irrelevant on the basis of their fittingness to the context being developed. We may refer to the representational elements—objects, ideas, and images—as experiential "depth." And lastly, the total expressiveness of the representational piece will be found to be a functional relationship between the surface and depth counters of the context. 25

For Kaelin, descriptions are the only relevant category of critical language. They are not exhaustive analyses of the aesthetic object because they apply only to the intentional objects of the viewer's consciousness. Descriptions take as their objects qualities of surface and depth in their relatedness and resulting vague and definite feelings. The total expressiveness cannot be rendered in discursive terms.

24 Ibid., p. 293.
...the significance of a work of art is precisely the felt expressiveness of the funding counters; and any verbal expression concerning the value of that expressiveness merely gives an added bit of information—
that in the light of the given experience the counters had funded, or failed to do so, or tended to do so or not. 26

To conclude this discussion of concepts of description, the differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's views will be summarized. The differences are presented in chart form at Figure 1. Beardsley approaches the problem of criticism through an analysis of language and Kaelin through an analysis of experience. For Beardsley, descriptions are one kind of statement that can be made about the work of art. The object of description exists outside the viewer. It is a perceptual object whose qualities are phenomenally objective. Descriptions are objective; they can be verified by examination of the perceptual object. For Beardsley, descriptions serve to bring the viewer to see particular features to which he may respond. Description is the basis for statements of interpretation and evaluation. In description the critic brings to bear categories of basic distinctions resulting from past experiences with works of art.

For Kaelin, descriptions are reports of one's experience with a work of art. Anything other than a "correct" description (the intentional objects of the viewer's consciousness) of the aesthetic object is irrelevant to his procedure. That language is used in description is incidental to Kaelin's theory. Of primary significance are the strata of experiences and their relatedness. Description

26Ibid., p. 34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICISM</th>
<th>BEARDSLEY</th>
<th>KALELIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KINDS OF CRITICAL STATEMENTS</td>
<td>kinds of statements</td>
<td>descriptions of art works and their embodied values as mediating the consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETIC DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>description, interpretation, evaluation</td>
<td>description only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE OF DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>one of three kinds of &quot;internal&quot; statements one can make about an aesthetic object</td>
<td>only aesthetically relevant kind of critical discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to bring viewer to see features of the aesthetic object that may be responded to...to discriminate and articulate details</td>
<td>analyzing the experience for the purpose of reflecting upon the relatedness among the various &quot;counters&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT OF DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>visual perceptual qualities</td>
<td>intentional acts of consciousness...contents of critic's own experience with the work of art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION FOR DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>assumptions about what kinds of detail it is important for the critic to note...categories of basic distinctions...concepts of what may be found to which aesthetic value may be ascribed</td>
<td>(1) performance of the phenomenological epoche (reduction), (2) knowledge of general characteristics of possible aesthetic objects, (3) &quot;openness&quot; to the presentations of the object, (4) no particular background or expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Comparison of Beardsley's and Kaelin's Conceptions of Aesthetic Description
serves the primary purpose of analyzing experience in order to reflect on the relatedness of its "counters." Consciousness as modulated by the work of art is the object of description, not the object existing apart from consciousness.

There are significant differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories that have important implications for curriculum. The first has to do with the role of past experience in deriving aesthetic value from works of art. Beardsley demands more in the way of a rich background of experience with art that has resulted in a large number of concepts of aesthetic features. Kaelin requires that the individual have a grasp of some general characteristics of aesthetic objects and an ability to perform the phenomenological reduction, but he need not have a wealth of past experience.

The second difference has to do with the way aesthetic quality is determined. Beardsley suggests aesthetic quality is objectively based. Statements about the aesthetic merits of an object are open to verification and disputes may be settled through an appeal to the perceptual features of the object. Because he places aesthetic value in the experience of the individual, Kaelin's theory does not allow for public verification. Aesthetic quality for Kaelin is when there is a funding between all counters in experience. Two parties may only agree or disagree over the extent to which the counters do or do not fund. Their judgments are ultimately only reports of their experience. Goodness for Kaelin is a quality of the individual's experience and is to be found there, not in the object.

The implications are that a curriculum based on Beardsley's
theory would:

1. Expose the student to many works of art for the purpose of comparing and contrasting them in terms of their perceptual features.

2. Engage the student in determining the relative aesthetic merits of works of art through appeal to their sensuous features.

3. Place emphasis on the language of criticism; on the kinds of statements the student makes when discussing works of art.

4. Finally, because of his claim for objectivity of aesthetic quality Beardsley's theory seems to call for more expertise on the part of the teacher with respect to his or her background and experience with art. His theory confers a more central role to the teacher in the adjudication of disputes pertaining to the aesthetic merits of various objects.

The implications are that curriculum based on Kaelin's theory would:

1. Treat works of art as autonomous objects. They would not be compared with respect to their objective features but in terms of the quality of experience they afford.

2. Engage the student in determining the relative aesthetic merits of works of art through an appeal to the quality of the individual's experience with them.

3. Give attention to the method of making phenomenological descriptions of experience with aesthetic objects.

4. Because aesthetic quality is to be found in the experience of the individual and not in the features of an object, the teacher must assume a more peripheral role in the resolving of disputes concerning aesthetic value.

This chapter has served to bring some of the differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories into sharper focus by examining the role aesthetic description has in each of the theories and suggesting some of the implications the two theories have for curriculum. These differences provide a framework for the next question and the central
problem for the next chapter, i.e., What features are the aesthetic ones in each of the two theories?
CHAPTER III

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CATEGORIES
OF THE TWO THEORIES AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

In Chapter II some of the important differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's conceptions of aesthetic description were noted. Differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories may be further demonstrated by a more detailed examination of aesthetic descriptions in their theories. It will become apparent that for each of these philosophers aesthetic descriptions function in radically different ways. For purposes of curriculum it is important to understand their respective categories of aesthetic descriptions and the differences between them.

The central problem for this chapter is to determine what features do Beardsley and Kaelin hold to be the describable ones. What are the kinds of features to which each of the two philosophers ascribe aesthetic significance and what are some of the implications for curriculum that can be drawn from them? The specific questions to be dealt with are: (1) what kinds of features are considered to be aesthetically meaningful in each of the two theories, (2) what differences or similarities appear between the two theories with respect to these features, and (3) what implications for curriculum can be identified. These questions in the order of their statement
are those to which inquiry will be directed.

Development of Categories

The answer to the first question was attempted by means of the development of categories of aesthetic description representing each of the two theories. Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories of criticism were utilized as sources for concepts that explain the kinds of features from which aesthetic meaning may be derived. Since both philosophers locate aesthetic value in the describable contents of experience, it is to their respective views of what is describable that attention was directed. Concepts of aesthetic features, drawn from the writings of the two philosophers were inventoried and classified. The resulting categories reveal the kinds of features to which aesthetic value is ascribed by each of the two theories.

The development of the categories was undertaken on the assumption they would be useful in the following ways:

(1) make explicit what kinds of features are aesthetically meaningful in each of the two theories,

(2) allow for a comparison of the categories for the purpose of assessing what differences and similarities exist between them, and

(3) provide inventories of aesthetic features that could function as conceptual tools in the analysis of art and other objects.

The development of the categories proceeded in two stages. The objective of the first stage was to select from the two theories concepts that explain the kinds of features judged to be describable. Writings of the two philosophers were reviewed and concepts that
identify and explain the describable features collected.\textsuperscript{1} The second stage involved classifying and sorting the concepts. Categories of aesthetic features representing Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories, with one or more concepts explaining each item of the categories, resulted from this procedure. The categories are included in Appendix A.

\textbf{Review of Beardsley's Categories}

Parts of the work, relations between parts and the \textit{regional qualities} of wholes or parts are the three primary distinctions found in Beardsley's categories of aesthetic description.

\textbf{Parts of the Work}

A part is anything discriminable within the whole of the work. Parts are of two sorts: \textit{elementary areas} and \textit{complex areas}. Elementary areas are absolutely partless. No divisions can be perceived within them. Elementary areas are characterized by \textit{number} and \textit{local qualities}. Local qualities are features such as \textit{shape}, \textit{size}, \textit{position} (relative to the boundaries of the picture plane) and \textit{tone} or \textit{color}. Complex areas are parts of the work within which further parts can be discriminated. Complex areas are discriminated as wholes due to their perceptual regional properties or qualities. The regional qualities of complex areas are qualities resulting from relationships among their constituent parts.

\textsuperscript{1}Beardsley's concepts were taken from his book, \textit{Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism}. Kaelin's concepts were taken from his book, \textit{An Existentialist Aesthetic: The Theories of Sartre and Merleau-Ponty} and recent essays.
Relations Between Parts

Relations between parts are the internal relations which may exist among elementary areas, complex areas or elementary areas and complex areas. Relations between parts of the work are always comparative. An elementary or complex part may be dominant or subordinate. Dominance and subordinance are regional properties depending on the visual density of a part resulting from the local qualities of size, brightness, saturation of tone and contrast with background.

Descriptions of relations among elements and among complexes are descriptions of form. Form descriptions are always relational. They may be structural in that they describe the relatively large-scale relations among the main parts of the object. They may be textural in that they describe the small-scale relations among the subordinate parts.

Dual and serial are the kinds of relations that can exist among the parts of a visual design. Dual relations are those that hold between two parts of the design. Dual relations are usually structural in that they hold between relatively large segments of the object. Dual relations may be with respect to shape, color, orientation or size. They may be similar, contrasting or indifferently different.

Three dual relations that Beardsley notes as having great structural significance in visual designs are density, color and movement. Visual density may be in balance, contrasting or neither. Color between two segments may be harmonious, clashing or indifferent. Movement may be generated and be said to be in equilibrium or
disequilibrium.

Serial relations are those that hold between three or more simple or complex parts of a design. With respect to their color, shape, size, orientation, position, etc., they may exhibit some commonality and form a series by repetition. They may vary in some regular way with respect to their color, shape, size, orientation, position, etc., and form a series by directional change. Finally, there may be no serial relation that connects them.

Regional Qualities of the Whole or Parts

Regional qualities are those properties that belong to a complex but not to any of its parts. They are not found in parts when separated from the whole. However, they do depend upon the parts and their relations. Changes among the parts that constitute a regional quality always result in a change in the quality. Regional qualities may be extensive, i.e., they prevail over a larger or smaller portion of a sensory field. They may be intensive as when the properties upon which a particular regional quality depends are intensified. Finally, a regional quality may be persistent in time, i.e., a series of events having dramatic quality are regarded as a whole in time.

For a summarization of Beardsley's categories, see the chart at Figure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTS OF THE WORK</th>
<th>RELATIONS BETWEEN PARTS</th>
<th>REGIONAL QUALITIES OF WHOLE OR PARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Parts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regional Qualities of Whole or Parts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Non-Human Regional Qualities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Relations Between Elementary Parts</td>
<td>Wholeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Qualities</td>
<td>Large Scale Relations</td>
<td>Fusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape</td>
<td>dual</td>
<td>Dominant Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size</td>
<td>similar</td>
<td>Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>contrasting</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tone or color</td>
<td>indifferently different</td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hue</td>
<td><strong>Relations Between Complex Parts</strong></td>
<td>Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lightness</td>
<td><strong>Large Scale Relations</strong></td>
<td>completeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saturation</td>
<td>serial</td>
<td>coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directional change</td>
<td>balance and equilibrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no serial change</td>
<td>harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Small Scale Relations (Recurrent)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complexity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>texture</td>
<td><strong>Human Regional Qualities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Chart Summarizing Beardsley’s Categories of Aesthetic Description**
Some Distinctions Within Beardsley's Theory

Perception

For Beardsley aesthetic significance is in the part-to-whole relationships of the perceptual object. The perceptual object consists of those qualities given in perception that appear as belonging to the object. They are phenomenally objective, which is to say they are experienced as being out there and not here. They are given to the senses and appear to the perceiver as qualities of the object.

Perceptual Object and the Physical Object

Beardsley distinguishes between the perceptual object and its physical base. The perceptual and physical are not two objects but two aspects of the same object.\(^2\) The perceptual object we know through sense data; the physical object through physical measurement and observation. That there are differences between the two can be illustrated by considering the procedures that would result in the verification of statements about either. Redness in a painting is a perceptual quality. To establish its presence one need only look. Evidence that the painting is eight feet wide or weighs twenty pounds is gained by the application of standardized measurements. Only perceptual qualities are directly accessible to perception, not physical ones.

Various art forms differ from one another with respect to the

---

manner of their presentation or the mode by which they enter the consciousness of the perceiver. Music is sound, painting is color and film is sound and color with the dimension of movement. For Beardsley the description of a painting is the description of its visual perceptual features. A painting is a spread of areas of differentiated color. The colors in their organization—parts, relations between parts and regional qualities—comprise the perceptual painting. An example of what Beardsley's categories suggest to be a description of the perceptual painting is the following excerpt from Rudolf Arnheim's description of Cezanne's Madame Cezanne in a Yellow Chair.

A scale of increasing slimness, which leads from the background toward the observer was noted above. This crescendo effect is enhanced by a number of other features. The three main elements of the picture overlap each other spatially: a scale of three planes leads from the background over the chair to the figure. This three-dimensional scale is supported by a two-dimensional one—a series of steps—that rises from the small fraction of the dark band at the extreme left over the corner of the chair to the head. Similarly, a scale of increasing brightness leads from the dark band to the light face and hands, which represent the two focuses of the composition. The bright red of the coat also makes the figure advance. All these factors combine to a powerful stepwise forward movement.

Statements concerning how the painting was produced or its physical base may be relevant to some concerns but not the aesthetic. For Beardsley the fact that Giotto's Lamentation is a fresco painting or Botticelli's Birth of Venus tempera on canvas is irrelevant to an aesthetic understanding of these paintings.

It may be argued that when viewing a painting such as Giotto's Lamentation one is aware of a host of different kinds of phenomena. Colors, shapes, figures, sky and angels along with the viewer's emotions comprise awareness. The viewer may notice the intense blue of the sky, the lamenting figures, the intensity of their facial expressions and body gestures and the covey of fluttering winged creatures. He may think of who the figures are and what the painting depicts. He may recognize the anguish and sadness of the mourners and be aware of his own response as he shares in his own body the grief of the occasion. Although these may all be the contents of the viewer's consciousness, only the phenomenally objective qualities (those of the perceptual object) are aesthetically significant to Beardsley.

**Representation**

The fact that when viewing a painting--such as Giotto's Lamentation--one is aware of figures, the event represented and one's own cognitive and emotional response is not unaccounted for in Beardsley's theory of criticism. The appearance of figures, or the awareness of the fact that certain objects or persons are represented is due to an *interpretation* of the presented perceptual phenomena. Certain complex areas often appear as objects and are said to be representations of objects. For Beardsley representations are also objective. They are given in awareness and appear as qualities of the phenomenal object. However, they are not objective to the degree that perceptual qualities (describable features) are. For example, in Giotto's Lamentation the angels and distressed figures appear as
qualities of the phenomenal object. While their appearance is logically dependent upon the organization of the painting—parts, relations between parts and regional qualities—one does not verify statements about them in the same way one would statements of description. To verify the claim that there are angels in Giotto's painting would lead to an appeal to evidence outside the painting. To verify the statement that the color "blue" appears in Giotto's painting calls for a close examination of the painting.

Emotions

Beardsley accounts for the phenomena of feelings and emotions by his distinction between phenomenally objective and phenomenally subjective qualities. Emotions are experienced as occurring in the viewer. They are attributes of the perceiver and occur here, not there. Although they result from phenomenally objective qualities—properties of the perceptual object—they are to be distinguished from them. For example, the Fall of Man as portrayed in Massaccio's Expulsion from the Garden has qualities of sorrow, fear and hopelessness. Adam covers his face in grief and Eve, in agonizing futility, clutches at her nakedness. These are qualities of Massaccio's painting and are given in awareness, but not the same kind of awareness as the describable features. They are attributes of the painting; they are phenomenally objective, which is to say they are experienced as being there. However, sorrow and hopelessness may also be the effect of the painting on the viewer. If so, they are qualities of the viewer. They are phenomenally subjective; they occur here not there.
Seeing, thinking, imagining and feeling are all modes of awareness for Beardsley and all play vital roles in our encounter with works of art. The defining mark of phenomenal objectivity is not immediate presentation but experienced independence of the self.\(^4\) When viewing a painting the viewer may be aware of many things. His awareness may include such things as colors, figures, events and emotional qualities that appear as aspects of the painting and his own emotional response to it. Those qualities that appear as features of the perceptual object appear out there and are objective. Those that appear as features of the self are here and are subjective. "Cheerfulness" may be an attribute of the painting when it is said: "The painting is cheerful." It may also be a subjective quality as when we say: "The painting makes me feel cheerful."\(^5\)

**Human and Non-Human Regional Qualities**

On the basis of his distinction between phenomenally objective and phenomenally subjective qualities, Beardsley distinguishes between human and non-human regional qualities. Non-human qualities are those qualities given in perception and appear as features of the perceptual object. They appear as being there. Description of non-human regional qualities takes no account of the perceiver's affective state. They are reports of his perception only. Non-human description is empirical and open to verification. "This is a triangular dominant pattern" or


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 38.
"The design is unified" are descriptions of non-human regional qualities. "Triangular dominant pattern" and "unified" are properties of the perceptual object. The determination of the truthfulness of such statements calls for a closer inspection of the object.

Human regional qualities are those that take into account the subjective state of the perceiver. Descriptions of human regional qualities include "as part of their meaning some reference to the effect of the work on the percipient..." To say that the work is "vigorous", "frolicsome", "indecisive" or "deliberate" is to describe it in terms of its human regional qualities. Beardsley notes that descriptions of this sort, "though at first glance subjective, actually turn out to be objectively descriptive." Many descriptions may include as part of their meanings ascriptions to both objective and subjective qualities.

These distinctions within Beardsley's theory are reflected in his categories and are necessary to an understanding of them. They are fundamental to his plea that we be careful to distinguish between the phenomena to which we respond and the phenomena of our response. Beardsley holds that aesthetic quality is in the properties of the phenomenal object, but the value of aesthetic quality is the emotional response we make to it. Aesthetic descriptions are reports of those qualities to which we respond emotionally.

---

6 Ibid., p. 42.
7 Ibid.
Review of Kaelin's Categories

For Kaelin the aesthetic encounter is composed of strands of experience that are functionally related and fund in a total expressiveness. They are sensuous surface, vague feelings, depth and definite feelings. Aesthetic expressiveness (total expressiveness) is always context bound, which is to say it is always composed of and controlled by the "counters" of the artistic expression. Counters simply are descriminable features of experience that appear and function in the aesthetic context. Kaelin prefers the value neutral term "counter" to terminology associated with "form" versus "content" distinctions. They may be colored spaces, lines, vague or definite feelings or represented objects. Whatever kind of experience, they are ultimately controlled by the counters of the sensuous surface. No counter has absolute significance. "Each counter has only that significance made apparent by a relationship to some other counter within context." Kaelin noted the importance of counters in his views of criticism:

...the problem of determining relevance in the discourse used to describe works of art comes down to being able to find ways of categorizing the manner in which "counters" function in the determination of significance in the particular context.

---


9 Ibid., p. 32.

10 Ibid., p. 30.
Sensuous Surface

The sensuous surface is the perceptual qualities (organized sensory stimuli) by which the work of art enters the consciousness of the viewer. It is the "medial symbols, markers, elements with which the artist must think in solving his qualitative problems."\(^11\) In the making of a work of art the artist organizes his material into a form or object which is the artistic expression. A painting presents the viewer with color, line, shapes, and textures; architecture with planes, mass, and volume; poetry with combinations of words and music with sounds. All works of art have some kind of organized sensuous surface.

The sensuous surface is "sensuous" in that it is experienced as sensations. The term "surface" indicates its position in the aesthetic encounter relative to other experiences. It is the surface of one's lived world when his world is controlled exclusively by the objective structures of the artistic expression. The sensuous surface is the controlling factor and ultimate source of all aesthetic meaning and significance.

The significance of the sensuous surface is to be found in two strands of experience. These strands are the objective and affective correlates of one's perception of the surface. The surface is itself meaningful. Its significance is in its organization, in the tensions and qualitative differentiations that comprise the objective structure of the work. In painting, the colored spaces, advancing and receding...
planes, and other like phenomena constitute the perceived objective structures of the work.

Correlative to one's perceptual experience are certain affective responses. The sensuous surface has the capacity to express feelings and moods. The feelings of the viewer—termed vague feelings—are significant only when controlled by the objective structures of the aesthetic object. While often vague and ambiguous, the affective correlates may be expressed with terms such as "calm", "warm", "active", or other similar ones.

Describing the sensuous surface is describing the objective and affective correlates of one's experience, or the sensuous surface and vague feelings. The following description by Kaelin serves as an illustration of criticism of a work where all significance is in the sensuous surface. The work described is Ernst Wilhelm Nay's Serenity.

Nay's Serenity ..., seems at first blush to be misnamed: the violence of color contrast and the almost ferocious activity of spiraling lines connote everything but peace and serenity. The serenity, then, is that following upon violent activity. The peace of youth, rather than that of old age; the peace that encloses, rather than excludes the bustle of life. The activity is apparent, but the enclosing peace and serenity is achieved in the balance of opposing counters of the surface: the reds by the greens, the yellows by the blues. The activity of the lines, darting in and out and around interstitial planes of the tension of contrast, bursts with energy—but not outside the bounds of balanced structure.

———

Depth

Depth comprises the second major category of Kaelin's aesthetic descriptions. This depth is not spatial. It is experiential in that it is due to the thickening of the surface of one's phenomenal or lived world. Depth is a concept incorporating various levels of meaning and significance to be found in works of art in which objects are represented.

When the space tensions of one's phenomenal visual field (sensuous surface in the case of painting) are modulated in certain ways, objects appear or may be said to be represented. When objects are represented, as in realistic or abstract paintings, they provide for one or more levels of meaning in the experience of the viewer. The objects represented may be meaningful for what they are as objects, for the ideas they represent, and for the images that come through the experience of association of things outside the work with the objects and ideas represented within it. Descriptions of objects, ideas, and images are depth descriptions.

Objects. In certain paintings the sensuous surface is organized so as to suggest the recognizable forms of nature. Trees, houses, people, rocks or other objects may appear as important strands of the viewer's experience. As objects they appear as tensions in the perceiver's visual field. As phenomena they are relatable to and controlled by the colored spaces of the surface. Descriptions of objects or events, whether real or imaginary, that appear in the work are object descriptions. Mountains, goddesses, centaurs, thunderstorms
and kings may be represented. Their perception is an act of imagination acting on particular counters of the sensuous surface.

**Ideas.** Constituting the second strand of experience among depth counters is that of ideas. Ideas result from relationships between objects. A young child in the arms of a young woman may suggest maternity, and Degas' *The Glass of Absinthe*, loneliness. A child dressed in rags suggests poverty; three soldiers of the American Revolution marching abreast with fife, bugle and drum suggests the ideas of devotion to a common cause, bravery, and determination. *American Gothic* by Grant Wood suggests the human barrier of suspicion and distrust. The ideas of maternity, loneliness, etc., are due to the objects represented and their relationships one to the other. As ideas they are always due to the objects represented and their perceived relationships.

**Images.** The third and last strand of experience among depth qualities is that of images (or symbols). They constitute the deepest level of significance. Images emerge as responses to ideas represented in the work. They are kinds of associations called up by ideas. The representation of a young child in the arms of a woman may suggest the idea of maternity. However, at a deeper level of interpretation it may be a Christian symbol, archetypal in nature. In like manner the soldiers with fife, bugle and drum may represent ideas of devotion to cause, bravery, and comradship. However, they may also symbolize to the viewer "Americanism" which results from an association of the ideas represented in the work with certain meanings outside the work.
Perhaps the relation of images to ideas and objects needs further clarification. The familiar figure of "Uncle Sam" can be analyzed in terms of its depth counters. First, there is the represented object, a man dressed in red, white and blue. He wears a high top hat, has a white beard, a long tailed coat, shoes with white spats, etc. The qualities of represented objects in relation further represent ideas of stateliness, determination, strength of character, a certain robustness and bravery. The perceiving of these objects and ideas call up associations that are not in the work to the extent that objects and ideas are. Nevertheless, the ideas represented do control the associations. "Uncle Sam" is a visual symbol which may remind the American citizen of his political heritage and the more shared concepts of his country, such as patriotic feelings. It should not go unnoticed that there are other possible interpretations of the same visual symbol that could be made by other individuals within other contexts, i.e., from the position of a citizen of a state antagonistic toward the United States.

Correlative to the experience of depth qualities are definite feelings. When viewing a work of art, one is often conscious of feelings that arise in response to things represented in the work. An emaciated figure with outstretched arms may bring forth feelings of pity; a dancing figure joy and gaiety. Definite feelings are those affective responses made to objects, events, ideas or images represented in the work. They are "definite" in that they are more definable and concrete--hence expressable--than those vague feelings resulting from qualities of surface. The only definite feelings
relevant in the aesthetic encounter are those controlled by the phenomenally objective structures of the work itself.

Not only are definite feelings controlled by represented objects, but by their manner of depiction. A woman represented in painting in two different styles will result in somewhat different affective consequences for the viewer. The feelings one has when viewing Picasso's *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* and his *Mother and Child* are strikingly different. The women represented in the sharp, uncompromising forms of cubism may produce feelings of revulsion, while the woman represented in the solid, voluminous forms of Picasso's classical period may produce feelings of warmth and joy.

The idea of motherhood may be expressed in a work of art and the viewer may respond with definite feelings of warmth and human compassion. This is the case in Picasso's *Mother and Child*. On the other hand, the idea of motherhood may be expressed in a saccharine and sentimental way and produce feelings of repulsion and disgust.

Definite feelings are also produced by images and symbols such as those of religious or political nature. The lamb with a shepherd's crook in Grunewald's *The Crucifixion* from the Isenheim Altarpiece leads the viewer, through the ideas represented, to associations of Christian meanings and values. In the context of the other contents of the painting, the lamb is an image or symbol and as such produces definite feelings of awe, wonder, and amazement.

**Total Expressiveness**

Kaelin's final category of aesthetic analysis is total expressiveness. It is not a descriptive category in the same sense that
sensuous surface and depth are because it cannot be translated into
discursive terms. Total expressiveness is the experience of the
relatedness of the surface counters and, in the case of representa­
tional works, depth counters as they fund or come to closure in a
single experience. The task of the critic is to note how surface and
depth counters are related and fund in his experience. This he may do
by describing the counters and their relations. But the total expres­
siveness, the meanings and significances that is the critic's exper­
ience cannot be adequately rendered in language. Criticism is a
description of surface and depth counters and their relationships.
By so doing the critic may bring his audience to some awareness of the
features and relationships that are the grounds for his experience.

The following criticism by Kaelin illustrates how his categories
function in the description of a representational work. The painting
described is Lucas Cranach's Ecce Homo.

Figure 1 is a depth-dominated piece in which we
find not only the representations of Christ, the world,
angels and the heavens, but the further representation of
a religiously significant event for the life of all
Christians: the torture of the Savior prior to his ulti­
mate crucifixion. Moreover, in a piece of representa­
tional foreshortening, the wounds clearly visible indicate
that this Christ has already been crucified, and the body
we see, elongated to emphasize the effects of the passion,
is that of the resurrected Son of God. As such, the figure
spans heaven and earth. The feet seem to be straining to
lift off the orb of the earth as the projection of the
body moves upward into the heavenly vault. The vault
itself is designated heavenly by the presence of the choir
of angels, rejoicing at the return of the divine son.

Behind the vault is the void, lit up and made significant
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by the figure of the sacrificial Christ, who seems to generate his own light, reflected onto the objects around. The historical dominance of Christ's role as Savior of mankind (an idea) is hence pictured in the dominance within the structure of the represented universe of the painting, of the figure of Christ. And the second dominance, achieved by the size and detailed expressiveness of the central figure, is emphasized by the light-dark contrast of the surface. Easy symmetry is avoided by the canted head, still suffering for the sins of mankind; but symmetry there still is. It may be taken to betoken another idea, the success of divine Providence as a unifying plan for the will of God and the actions of men. The symmetry of the design, the light-dark contrast surrounded by the muted blue-grey mist of the heavens, the stance and gesture of the dominant figure, all stand in harmonious relation to the depth content of the painting: Jesus Christ as God the Son uniting heaven and earth through the act of his sacrifice; through his sorrow there will be everlasting joy, as sung by the choir of innocents.

Kaelin's categories place emphasis, not on the phenomenally objective features of the aesthetic object but on the contents of consciousness resulting from the perception of them. The perceptual object is important but only as it modulates the consciousness of the individual. It is the contents of consciousness as controlled by the perceptions of an object that are aesthetically significant. These contents are categorized as sensuous surface, experiential depth, and the affective components of vague and definite feelings. A diagram illustrating the relations between Kaelin's categories of aesthetic description is shown at Figure 3.

---

Kaelin, "The Visibility of Things Seen," p. 46.
Figure 3. Diagram of Kaelin's Categories of Aesthetic Description
Some Criticisms of Beardsley's and Kaelin's Theories

Critics of Beardsley have opposed his theory from the standpoints of his methodology and the nature of the aesthetic object and our response to it. David Ecker and Eugene Kaelin call attention to the "remoteness of linguistic-analytic inquiries from the description of the concrete conditions under which individual works of art are experienced and enjoyed." They object to the fact that Beardsley's categories are in fact "second order language." His categories do not result from the encounter with expressive objects but from an examination of critical language. For Ecker and Kaelin adequate aesthetic categories can only result from the "isolation of repeatable features which may be shared by many works of art."

A second criticism of Beardsley is concerned with the distinction he makes between the "physical object" and the presentations of the "aesthetic object." Beardsley maintains one does not experience physical qualities in perception, only phenomenal ones. The aesthetic object is only known through the phenomena of visual sensory perception. It exists somewhere between the physical object and its several presentations. Perceptions (of presentations) may be "veridical" (true) or "illusory" (mistaken). If they are true they are of the aesthetic object. If mistaken, they are of something else. If true

---


16 Ibid., p. 583.
they are of the objective perceptual field that constitutes the aesthetic object. False (illusory) presentations result from subjectivity as when the viewer submits to outside influences that cause him to read into the work something that is not there.

Paul Ziff has criticized the attitude that proposes some illusory or imaginary object to be the work of art. He maintains there are not two kinds of objects but two ways of talking when describing the same object.

The ordinary painting hanging in the museum is the work of art, not some illusion or hallucination. There are not two things being referred to when we say, in the carpenter's shop, "The painting is flat," and when we say, in the gallery, "The painting has great depth." There is just one, and it is the painting. There are two descriptions, not two objects.  

Virgil Aldrich calls attention to the difficulty of Beardsley's demand that aesthetic perception be objective in the context of his view of an illusive aesthetic object. The assumption that a series of immediate sensory presentations constitute a single durable aesthetic object still allows for a systematic illusion. Aldrich's question is, How does one know when he is in contact with the aesthetic object?

Phenomenalists such as Kaelin hold the view that having performed the phenomenalist's "reduction", the appearances are the aesthetic object. According to his view there is no need to posit

---


some "hidden" object beneath what appears. Kaelin has further noted that Beardsley's categories are atomistic. They are restrictive and do not allow for the relating of other than perceptual experience. They are "formalist" and not responsive to other dimensions of art.

As a survey of his categories reveals, Beardsley's concept of aesthetic description does not account for much of what is ordinarily considered to be experience with works of art. Representations of objects, ideas and images (symbolism) are not accounted for in his descriptive categories. These features are accounted for in his theory of criticism in his category of interpretation but not by his descriptive (aesthetic) categories.

Beardsley's categories do appear to have considerable potential value for art education. This value is in their apparent usefulness for discriminating the visual perceptual features of objects. There seems to be little in the way of visual relationships that could not be analyzed using his categories. This apparent strength suggests the value of his categories in curriculum in the teaching of awareness of those visual perceptual features characteristic of art and non-art objects.

Kaelin suggests that the viewer can at will establish and maintain a position of "openness" to the phenomena that comprise experience with a work of art. He offers the guarantee that, having performed the phenomenological reduction, the viewer will experience the full expressiveness of the work. There is with Kaelin a kind of a claim for objectivity in that the objective structures of the phenomenal object determine all aesthetically relevant experience on the part of
Stevenson, Sparshott and Beardsley would reject the kind of objectivity Kaelin suggests. Stevenson does so in his four phases of criticism. The critic (1) seeks ways the work can be experienced, (2) examines the work under varying conditions, (3) "decides" how to observe the work under a specific condition and in a certain way, and (4) makes statements about the properties of the work. While they seem to be predicated on the physical work, their reference to the work's appearance is indirect. Statements about the work's appearance are to be taken as interpretations or persuasions for the viewer to see as the critic sees under the conditions determined by him. For Stevenson, descriptions are not objective but only interpretations or persuasions for the viewer to see the work in a particular way.

Sparshott's concept of criticism has some parallels with that of Stevenson. In his discussion of descriptions Sparshott notes that "every description must select for attention certain features of what it describes; and this selection is likely to be based on a prior evaluation which it effectively embodies, and which it is designed to support." Beardsley notes that aesthetic analysis, "proceeds on certain assumptions about what kinds of detail it is important for the critic to note. The analyst employs certain categories of basic


Stevenson, Sparshott and Beardsley reject Kaelin's idea of "openness" on the part of the viewer. They suggest that description is selective and what is illuminated by the critic results from decisions he has made or concepts he brings to the critical procedure. Criticism for Stevenson is the result of an interaction between critic and object. The critic selects what features he wishes to call attention to, and after close examination of them, renders his criticism. His descriptions are not reports of everything he is conscious of but only those aspects he wishes his audience to attend to. Sparshott believes that description is selective in that it embodies the critic's evaluations. Beardsley suggests that aesthetic assumptions and categories determine what the critic reveals in his criticism. These three philosophers see description as a cognitive operation. The critic approaches the work with a range of concepts, ideas, or beliefs and utilizes the ones that appear to be most promising for illuminating the features he sees to be the most significant.

It should be recognized that Kaelin's categories seem to provide a broad accounting of the various aspects of experience with works of art. The fact is that one's consciousness before a representational painting includes things such as colors, shapes, objects, ideas, images and feelings and some kind of relatedness among them. The usefulness of Kaelin's theory for curriculum is in part due to its providing the categories of surface, depth and feelings within which much of those

---

21 Beardsley, Aesthetics, p. 77.
experiences with works of art fall.

**Curriculum Consequences**

The kinds of features contained in the categories of the two theories of criticism support the claim that aesthetic description does not mean the same thing in the two theories. A curriculum which includes the categories of one of the theories would direct attention to those features considered to be significant by the theory from which it was derived and would, in all probability, fail to direct attention to features considered to be significant in the other theory. The fact that each theory provides categories not found in the other suggests possibilities for each theory. For example, the fact that Beardsley's categories are primarily an inventory of the perceptual features of a visual phenomenal field suggests their usefulness in curriculum directed to the goals of increasing the student's awareness of the perceptual features of art objects. Because they inventory a broader range of experience, Kaelin's categories are suggestive of curriculum directed to the goals of increasing the student's awareness of the different strata of expressive meanings characteristic of works of art. Some of the ways categories from the two theories could function in a curriculum will now be discussed.

**Beardsley**

*Developing Awareness of Talk About Visual Features.* Curriculum could be designed for the purpose of developing an awareness of talk about the visual qualities of works of art. Beardsley's categories
could provide criteria for the examination of what the student or some other person has said or written about works of art. Such an examination might reveal to what extent the talk has been about perceptual features or to what extent the talk about perceptual features has been utilized in the elucidation of the meaning or significance of the work.

**Increasing Awareness of Formal Relationships.** Beardsley's basic categories of parts, relations between parts, and regional qualities are characterized by a logical interrelationship and increasing complexity. To increase the student's awareness of the internal complexity of visual forms, these basic distinctions within the categories may be utilized. To bring the student to see a particular aspect of a painting, say the dominance (regional quality) of the turban in Jan Van Eyck's *Man in a Red Turban*, the instructor can point to the area of dominance, describe the quality and note the parts and relations between parts that support the dominance. In such instances the instructor may progress from elements to complexes or from complexes to elements.

**Stylistic Analysis.** Beardsley's categories could function in the analysis and description of the distinctive perceptual differences between styles. His basic category of relations between parts provides concepts useful in the explaining of the structural and textural qualities unique to such styles as Cubism and Impressionism. Works that differ stylistically but which are from the hand of the same artist, or those similar stylistically but by different artists, might be analyzed in similar fashion.
Kaelin

Developing Awareness of Talk About Kinds of Experience. Curriculum could be developed for the purpose of increasing the student's awareness of talk about the kinds of experience works of art provide. Kaelin's categories could provide criteria for the analysis of what the student or some other person has said or written about works of art. Such an analysis might reveal the kinds of phenomena to which aesthetic quality has been ascribed in the viewer's experience.

Developing Awareness of Relationships Among Kinds of Experience. Students could be encouraged to utilize Kaelin's categories in the analysis of their experiences for the purpose of developing a greater awareness of the relationships between sensuous qualities and depth qualities in works of art. Curriculum might be so structured as to provide opportunity for students to relate objects, ideas and images to the qualities of surface and their own feelings. By so doing, an understanding of art as an experienced relatedness among different phenomena might be effected.

Examining Humanistic Contents of Art Objects. Kaelin's categories could be used in the analysis of experience with those objects that are addressed in a forceful manner to the human predicament. Concepts of the human situation such as "alienation", "hope", and "despair" find expression in art and other features of the environment. Kaelin's categories could be employed in attempts to understand experience as it is controlled by such objects.
Beardsley and Kaelin

Units of instruction could be developed for the study of ways of attending to the phenomena of art and other objects. The features one would notice using either of the two theories would be emphasized. Such a unit would illuminate the differences between the two theories by revealing the aesthetic consequences of each. Differences between the theories could be dramatized through the use of audio-visual or multi-media presentations. The following are suggestions of ways such presentations might be organized.

(1) Slide-tape shows could be designed that visually and audibly guide the viewer through the analysis of paintings and other objects from the viewpoints of both theories. A particular work could be explored using the concepts of the two theories with prepared slides and a dissolve unit. A single work might be analyzed, or two or more works compared and contrasted, using this method. A carefully planned and executed slide-tape show could provide the opportunity of heightened experience for the viewer through controlled sequence and timing in an uninterrupted presentation. Slide-tape shows could be made to serve as lessons within units of individually programmed instruction, as outside of class assignments or in remedial or accelerated programs.

(2) Instructional manuals might be designed around an idea such as "two ways of looking" at art. The manual would contain appropriate textual material, diagrams and reproductions of paintings with overlays illustrating the aesthetic concepts of each theory. Beardsley's basic categories of parts, relations between parts, and regional
qualities and Kaelin's categories of surface and depth (objects, ideas and images) appear to be readily adaptable to materials of this kind.

(3) Reproductions of paintings accompanied by tape analyses from the viewpoints of both theories could be provided as library materials for inclusion in class or outside of class assignments.

(4) Curriculum materials might be developed that place emphasis on the viewer's choice by allowing him to "select" from the categories of both theories those concepts of features that best account for his experience with a work of art.
CHAPTER IV

FUNCTIONAL MERITS OF TWO CATEGORIES
OF AESTHETIC DESCRIPTION

The translation of concepts of criticism into curriculum content should proceed on the demonstrated basis of their potential to function in the attainment of particular educational objectives. In the previous chapter it was argued that concepts from Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories would lead to very different curriculum implications. This chapter serves to provide additional evidence in support of those implications by showing that: (1) Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories can be found to be operative in the writings of critics (this to be taken as evidence that one or both of the theories are viable), and (2) the categories of each of the two philosophers discriminate aspects of a work of art that are sufficiently different in character to demonstrate their utility in illuminating various aspects of works of art. To show that the categories are those that can be found in the writings of critics, four criticisms of Chagall's I and The Village will be analyzed in terms of the categories of Beardsley and Kaelin. To show that the categories of each philosopher discriminate different aspects of a work of art they are used to guide two criticisms of Chagall's painting by the writer. The resulting criticisms are compared and implications are drawn concerning how the categories may be made to function in a unit of instruction. Chapter V
provides such a unit.

Questions to be Pursued

The kinds of features credited with aesthetic significance by the two theories of criticism have been inventoried and discussed in the preceding chapter. The implications of the categories for curriculum drawn at the conclusion of that chapter require that the categories have potential to perform in two ways. First, they must be able to discriminate features of critical language. Second, they must draw attention to aesthetic features in works of art. A demonstration of the ability of the categories to function in these areas requires evidence that they are categories that can be found in criticism and that they do have the potential to reveal particular kinds of aesthetic features when used in the analysis of various objects. Evidence that the categories can perform in these ways will provide a substantive basis for decisions as to how they may be utilized in curriculum. It is to the question of the functional merits of the categories representing the two theories of criticism that this chapter is addressed. The primary objective is to examine the categories with the view to obtaining answers to the following questions:

(1) Are Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories those that can be found in the writings of critics?

(2) What do the categories of Beardsley and Kaelin each illuminate of the sensuous and expressive features of a particular work of art?

(3) What benefits for education may be derived from the respective merits of the two categories as revealed in this chapter?
Procedures

Answers to the above questions are obtained by analyzing criticisms and conducting criticisms of Marc Chagall's painting *I and The Village*. Chagall's painting was chosen because it is characterized by a complex formal organization and some difficult extrasensuous dimensions of meaning. Since Beardsley's categories are weighted toward the objective or formal aspects of experience and Kaelin's toward broader spectrum of meanings, criticism of this painting seemed to offer a good test of the two categories.

The answer to Question 1 is obtained by examining the writings of four critics using Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories. Four criticisms of *I and The Village* were selected from art history and appreciation texts. Each criticism was examined using Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories. Those kinds of aesthetic features contained in Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories and discovered in the criticisms are indicated in the two marginal columns. A comparison of the text with each column is an indication of the ability of each of the two theories to account for various aspects of the critic's language. A comparison of the two columns indicates some of the differences and correspondences that exist between the aesthetic categories of Beardsley and Kaelin.

The answer to Question 2 is obtained by means of a comparison of two separate criticisms of *I and The Village* by this writer. Guided by the aesthetic categories of each of the two theories, two brief critical essays, hereafter termed Criticism "A" and Criticism "B", were written while viewing a reproduction of Chagall's painting. In Criticism "A" Beardsley's categories were used to guide the analysis of
the work. In Criticism "B" Kaelin's categories were used. The two
criticisms are included along with marginal notations indicating the
kinds of aesthetic features the categories of Beardsley and Kaelin draw
attention to in Chagall's painting. Some of the aesthetic features of
the painting illuminated by the categories are illustrated through the
use of diagrams. The diagrams accompany the text of Criticism "A". It
was found that Criticism "B" did not lend itself to diagraming of this
sort.

The two criticisms are not to be considered a prescription for
the use of the categories of either philosopher. They are not exhaus-
tive analyses of the painting nor do they utilize all of the items of
both categories. The purpose of the criticisms is to present what the
categories of aesthetic description derived from Beardsley's and
Kaelin's theories make clear in Chagall's painting. What they illumi-
nate in Chagall's painting is considered to be an adequate demonstration
of their potential to reveal aesthetic features in other works of art
and to function successfully in curriculum.

It will be noted that interpretation and description are the
kinds of statements identified in Criticism "A" while description only
is identified in Criticism "B". It should be recalled that Beardsley's
categories of criticism are description, interpretation and evaluation.
For Kaelin all criticism is description. In the interest of obtaining
two essays representative of the two theories, interpretation is
included in Criticism "A" and is identified along with various kinds of
descriptions in the margin. The inclusion of interpretation in the
criticism using Beardsley's theory also provides a better basis for comparing the merits of the two theories.
The following criticism is taken from Chagall by Lionello Venturi, trans. by S. J. C. Harrison and James Emmons (New York: Albert Skira, 1956), pp. 33-34.

The process of assimilation is now complete and Chagall regains his unity of style in "I and The Village" (1911). The ring in the center encloses part of the painter's face, the cow's muzzle and the base of the snow-covered hill. This circle is poised on the triangle containing the sprig which Chagall is respectfully offering to the cow. This is the central motif on which the composition hinges, but skirting it are secondary vignettes, frankly irrational: a dairymaid milking a miniature cow in the head of the larger one, a peasant on the hillside beside a woman standing on her head. These of course are dreams and memories of life in his native town. The muzzle of a cow reminds him of the entire animal, but distantly remembered, so it is scaled down in accordance not with a physical but a psychological perspective. The color scheme is consistently bright: the green of the face and the blue of the muzzle are banked up against the shimmering reds and pinks in midpicture. The green of the face is wholly arbitrary, even though it plays its part in the general concord of the color scheme. Strictly speaking, however, this concord produces not a color harmony, but a suggestion of the unreal and enchanted.
Before this Chagall had dabbled in the unreal but not in the extravagant. A violinist fiddling on the housetops is not an everyday sight, but there is nothing impossible about it. The same can't be said of a woman with her head where her feet ought to be; here imagination plays havoc with the experience of reality and in gay pursuit of its own dreams breaks into the magic circle of the irrational. Memory becomes contemporary with what is remembered and invalidates the notions of time and space. From now on Chagall's imagination soared above the "conventions" of visual reality and made itself happily at home in a world of pure imagination.


The imaginative, private world of Marc Chagall (b. 1889), which he painted in "I and the Village" while living in Paris in 1911, differs from that of De Chirico by its abundant qualities of joyfulness, warm sensuality, fragrance, and delightful vertigo. In his private souvenir of a childhood in Vitebsk, Chagall painted a green-faced boy holding a sprig of blossoms and confronted by the transparent head of a donkey. Surface and depth, right side up and upside down freely interchange, as Chagall's picture of loving, pleasurable memories resists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEARDSLEY</th>
<th>KAE LIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Depth-objects, ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Depth-objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Depth-ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human RQ</td>
<td>Feelings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
translation into the normal language and syntax of rational painting. Both Chagall and De Chirico bring to modern painting the practice of free association whereby the selection and conjunction of objects or motifs are irrationally suggested to the artist during his conception or execution of the work. Chagall felt, however, that these associations had also to work in terms of the structural needs of his painting. The circle and X forms in the lower center of the painting may have had some private symbolism for the artist, but they also serve to unite disparate formal motifs on a common surface. De Chirico restored to painting the dramatic power of deep, clear space, whereas Chagall created an immeasurable, untraversable environment in which one cannot write of solids and voids, or the consistent diminution of size related to a fixed viewpoint. Scale, color, and solidity, or transparency, of figures and houses are not the function of a detached or objective observer from whose physical vantage point the scene is constructed. Rather, these properties reflect the weight and impulse of feeling and fantasy in the painter. Older artists interpreted another person's vision in pictorial terms that, like the literature in which dream experiences were recorded, served to codify the means of dealing with the irrational. Chagall, De Chirico, and the artists that follow their example fight codification or intelligibility on a public level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEARDSLEY</th>
<th>KAELEIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>Depth-objects, ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ-dominant pattern</strong></td>
<td>Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCP-style Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>Depth-objects, ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In "I and My Village" the cow dreams happily of a milkmaid, the lovers are on their way to the fields, one right side up and one upside down. These free fantasies range from the fairly literal fairy-tale realism of the village in the snow to the semi-abstraction of "I and My Village", with occasional relationships to expressionism.


"I and the Village" is a Cubist fairy tale that weaves dreamlike memories of Russian folk tales, Jewish proverbs, and the Russian countryside into one glowing vision. Here, as in many later works, Chagall relives the experiences of his childhood; these were so important to him that his imagination shaped and reshaped them for years without their persistence being diminished.
Chagall's I and The Village is an abstract painting in which there is a happy confusion of objective and non-objective features. Scenes of rural peasant life alternate with diverse shapes and colors. A man with a green face, a white goat and a cluster of lacy foliage which the man offers to the goat dominate the near space of the painting. Among and beyond these primary features is a maid milking a white goat, a man returning from the fields and a woman who stands on the rooftops of houses in a village at the top of the painting.

The design of the painting consists primarily of geometrically derived shapes that approximate circles, triangles and rectangles. Bright colors in primary and secondary hues and contrasting in lightness suggest the fractionated quality of light. The overall breakup of the painting with shapes and colors advancing and receding with seeming little regard for the objects represented create the appearance of a world seen through the diffracting lense of a kaleidoscope. Various objects juxtaposed with a seeming disregard for their logical relationships suggests the content of a dream or the soliloquies of thought.
Figure 4. "I and the Village"
Designated Complex "A", "B" and "C", three large divisions can be distinguished within the total composition. Tending to the left and downward, each of these divisions are major complexes within which other complexes can be noted. Complex "A" corresponds with the upper left and top margins of the design. Its bottom edge corresponds with the arc originating at the edge of the bill of the man's cap and proceeds along the base of the village through the head of the goat and downward. The darker areas of the painting fall within this major complex. The colors of Complex "B" are lighter and lower in saturation than the colors of the two large complexes that bracket it. Pinkish hues and whites are predominant. Complex "C" is generally triangular in shape. Within this portion of the design the strongest contrasts in hue occur, as between the green of the face and the red area immediately to the left of it.

Small complexes make up the major ones just noted. They are designated "A-1", "A-2", "B-1", etc.
Figure 5. Diagram "A-1"
Centered between the right and left margins of the design and approximately one third of the total vertical dimension of the painting from the bottom margin is a large circular area. It is divided into four somewhat equal segments. The circle appears as a focal area for the entire design. It shares parts with Complex "B" and "C".

Into the circle from the left is thrust the muzzle of a goat, from the right the face of a man, and from the bottom a cluster of foliage. Overlapping the lower left segment of the circle is a small red and white sphere suggestive of a satellite form of the large circle or the moon.
Figure 6. Diagram "A-2"
The head of the goat, the man, and the proffered foliage are the more outstanding areas of the design. Of the three, the head of the man is more outstanding. His face is a verdant green. It advances, thrust forward by its size and opposition, by virtue of its color, to the red of the circle over which it seems superimposed. The face has a quality of awed and pleasant persistence as the eye meets the piercing gaze of the goat. In contrast to the weight and mass of the man's face, the goat's head is partially transparent, revealing space within and beyond. The head of the goat is spatially subordinate to that of the man. It recedes in space and is nearer the hill that the farmer climbs into the village. Paradoxically, the gaze of the goat dominates that of the man. The concentric shapes of pupil and iris and the near maximum contrasts of white and black effects an intensity that prevails over the design of the painting. Positioned beneath the eye of the goat and within the contours of the goat's head is the maid milking a white goat. This small vignette appears to be between the viewer and the head of the goat but within the scope of the goat's vision.
Figure 7. Diagram "A-3"
Beyond and a little above the line describing the encounter of goat and man the farmer carrying a sickle strides toward the village at the top of the hill. His path is obstructed by a woman in an inverted position. She wears a blue skirt and her feet are positioned on the roof of one of the upside down houses of the village. The man and woman, their proximity one to the other and the colors and shapes that comprise them, suggest a clockwise rotating movement. The movement is arrested somewhat by the line established along the handle of the farmer's sickle and the forearms of the woman. This line leads from the eye of the green face to the priest that looks from the church in the village.

The clockwise movement of man and woman is in opposition to the counter-clockwise movement of the large circle forming the focus of goat, man and foliage in the center of the painting. The effect of the larger circle is produced not so much by the properties of the circle but the features of the visual field around it working in conjunction with certain features of the circle. The shape of the goat being milked thrusts to the left and is positioned so as to create a tangential movement off the top edge of the circle. This thrust is propelled by the intensity of contrast between the red of the circle and the green of the man's face at the opposite side of the circle.

Other circular movements are implied. Although "pie" or wedge-like shapes dominate the composition, the arc or circular motif is repeated throughout the design. Serving a unifying or harmonizing function, some other instances of arcing movements are to be found in the foliage, the sky above the village, the man's cap and the edges of the shapes that describe the head of the goat.
Figure 8. Diagram "A-4"
The shapes and colors of the church and houses of the village provide a staccato accent for the design. The bright colored houses glow in joyful defiance of the darkness around them. The dark sky perceptually relates to the deep space of the neck of the goat and the dark behind the foliage at the bottom of the design. These three dark areas work together to hold the activity of the interior of the design intact.

The fragmentation of the design and the illogical relationships among the represented features produce a disjointed and somewhat disquieting effect on the viewer. A saving degree of unity is provided by the strategic location of whites throughout the composition and the harmonizing effect of color division. Soft transitions of color within large areas offset the unsteadying effect of planes shifting in near and deep space.

Besides vignettes of memories of village life, the significance of Chagall's painting must be tied to the complex perceptual dynamics of the design as a visual field.
Figure 9. Diagram "A-5"
"I and The Village" is a depth-dominated painting that is complex in surface qualities and depth meanings. The surface is composed of bright intense colors and the geometric forms of circles, triangles and rectangles. The overall effect is exhilarating. It is something like that of a carnival or celebration. Colored planes advance and recede, producing feelings of joyful suspense and anticipation. The profile of a man's face, the head of a goat and a cluster of foliage dominate the painting. Many of the colors are not those of the natural world. Bright blues, yellows and vermillion reds repeat. Medium and dark viridian greens and blue-blacks form the darkest and most recessive planes of the painting and hold the more intense colors in tension.

The fractionated color, the advancing and receding planes and the objects that appear are distributed so as to create a space unrestrained by the laws of linear perspective. There is no horizon or plane that stabilizes the space. The relations between shapes and colors and their location in space create an effect irreconcilable with a world of physical objects possessing weight and mass.

Dominating the right side of the painting is the face of a man in sharp profile. It is green and masklike. It would be difficult to conceive of a color farther from physical reality than the green of this face. The face is pressed into a frozen smile. The man's eye is dilated. He is awed by all he observes.

The man with the green face is dressed in the peasant costume of the Baltic countries. He wears a billed cap and yellow shirt. Around his neck hang beads and a small cross. His head is tilted slightly upward so that his eye receives the intense gaze of the goat whose head dominates the left side of the painting. In the man's hand is a single stem of delicate foliage which he offers to the goat.

The eye of the man and the eye of the goat are fixed on each other. The force of the goat's large eye is magical and awesome. His countenance
contradicts the submissiveness of the goat being milked. The location of the maid milking suggests an experience of the goat recalled to consciousness from the recesses of memory.

The intensity of the goat's eye and the contrasting light and dark spaces in that segment of the painting create a forcefulness that contrasts with the passivity of the man's face. A faint line traces their vision, emphasizing a reciprocal penetration of animal and human thought. The proximity of the goat's head to that of the man, the circle that creates a focal area for the two heads and the cluster of foliage suggests an interdependence between goat and man. The circle also belongs to the ground plane thereby including the earth in the circle of interdependence.

A village forms the background against which the goat and man appear. Its location in the space of the painting is spatially ambiguous, alternating between a position in deep space or existing on approximately the same plane as the green face in profile. The village also is not an object of visual experience painted with attention to physical realities. The brightness of the colors of the houses and the fact that two of the houses rest on their roofs suggest the irrational or ecstatic. The position and gesture of the maid, also upside down, suggests a state of ecstasy or some condition of mind or spirit transcending the physical. Her attention is wholly given to the man with the sickle returning from the field. He seems to be either totally unaware of or avoiding her presence.

Peering from the sanctuary of the church, a priest observes all that takes place before him. He watches in the interest of the church and with the eye of God. But he is only an observer and exercises little control over the events that transpire before him.

What is the meaning of Chagall's painting? We are presented with an expression of consciousness. The expression is not discursive nor does it provide us with a logical space or series of events. It is best understood as a cluster of impressions that flow from the realm of dreams and rememberances. Chagall's painting is the expression of an optimistic naturalism. It is a celebration of life. Earth, man, plant and animal are inextricably bound together and sustain and support one another. The events of significance in life are not the grand celebrations but the joys of moments, such as those
of childhood, when one's everyday environs are a constant source of awe and wonder. They are those moments lived in peaceful coexistence with one's environment. They are those moments when the world is understood pre-rationally. They are those moments lived in peaceful coexistence beneath the watchful eye of a benign Creator.
Results of Analyses

Four Criticisms

The analysis of the four criticisms from art history and appreciation texts using Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories provides an answer to Question 1. The aesthetic categories of both philosophers are those that can be identified in the writings of critics. On the basis of this evidence it may be assumed that the language of criticism is analyzable by the concepts provided by Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories.

The analysis of the four criticisms also serves to reveal some of the respective merits of the two categories. A comparison of the two columns of analysis reveals that perceptual features analyzed as surface features using Kaelin's categories are given more specific identification (parts, relations between parts, or regional qualities) using Beardsley's categories. The merit of Beardsley's categories is their ability to account for specific sensuous features to which significance is given by the critic. On the other hand, the extra-sensuous expressive meanings to which significance is given are more completely revealed using Kaelin's categories. Criticism identified as interpretation by Beardsley's theory is identified as object, idea or symbol using Kaelin's categories. An important point to emerge from this demonstration is that each of the two theories provide aesthetic categories with different potentials to reveal the contents of criticism.
Criticisms "A" and "B"

The answer to Question 2 results from a comparison of the two critical essays. Criticism "A", guided by the aesthetic categories of Beardsley's theory, illuminates many of the formal aspects of the painting. Attention is drawn to the sensuous elements and the relations between them. Beardsley's categories reveal the painting as a visual perceptual whole within which parts can be discriminated. His categories focus attention on the features that contribute to the complexities of the visual structure of the painting. They promote a careful visual exploration of the visual organization, i.e., the ways colors and shapes interact to produce the total visual effect of the work. The tensions among colors and shapes and the implied movements that produce the expressive "kaleidoscopic" effect of the painting are noted. Besides drawing attention to the complexities of the visual form, Beardsley's categories provide for exhaustive exploration of the logical relationships among the visual features. For example, the expressive quality of tension (a regional quality) may be noted. Although according to Beardsley's theory the quality is not analyzable into its parts, the perceptual conditions upon which the quality depends, such as relations between parts, can be analyzed.

Although Criticism "A" accounts for a wide range of phenomena it focuses attention on the perceptual ones. The majority of the criticism is given to the tracing out and relating of various elements, complexes and regional qualities of the painting and in so doing promotes an understanding of the painting as a perceptual object. Beardsley's categories draw the viewer's attention through the
representational features and his own emotional response to the underlying visual structures upon which such features depend. Beardsley's categories promote the understanding of Chagall's painting as a complex visual field whose features may yield different meanings but whose ultimate meaning (aesthetic) is to be found among its perceptual qualities. Thematic, ideational, symbolic features and personally affective states are revealed by interpretations. They are second order features which result from first order features, i.e., the various aspects of the phenomenal object.

Criticism "B", using Kaelin's aesthetic categories, reveals a wide range of phenomena also. Attention is drawn to the sensuous as well as the thematic, ideational, symbolic and affective aspects. Although several sensuous features are revealed in Criticism "B" such as advancing and receding planes, movement and sensations of space, Kaelin's categories focus attention on the kinds of features that result from the sensuous surface of the painting. His categories account for the viewer's emotional responses and the objects that are represented such as people, animals, houses, vegetation, earth and sky. The man and the goat, dominant figures in the painting, are revealed as important strands of experience.

The various kinds of meaning resulting from relationships among objects are illuminated by Kaelin's categories. The "awareness" that occurs between the goat and man, the "ecstatic" or "irrational" suggested by the upside down woman and the upside down houses are some of the features of Chagall's painting revealed by Criticism "B". The criticism using Kaelin's categories focuses on some of the more
complex levels of meaning. Various objects and their relations are revealed for what they symbolize or point to outside the visual structures of the work. The man, goat, foliage and other objects can be seen in the context of their relations as referents to a world view such as is suggested. Also, the subjective state of the viewer, his feelings in response to the depth qualities of objects, ideas, and images or symbols may be accounted for by criticism using Kaelin's categories.

Finally, the two criticisms suggest that the utilization of Beardsley's theory gives greater emphasis to the various visual features; Kaelin's to various strata of meanings. The subject matter and content aspects are accounted for in both theories. However, in Kaelin's theory they are given a kind of first order status. In Beardsley's theory they have a second order status. For Kaelin they are the contents of consciousness and are located on the same level of significance as surface features. For Beardsley they are interpretations on the part of the viewer resulting from his encounter with the various perceptual features of the work.

Conclusion

One point emerges clearly from the demonstrations of this chapter. The analysis of criticism or the viewing of a work of art through the aesthetic concepts of more than one theoretical position can be very beneficial. Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories each have strengths the other does not. The concepts of the two philosophers as reflected in their categories of aesthetic description provide the
viewer with different perspectives from which to examine an object. Different perspectives suggest different procedures or ways of viewing. Beardsley's categories call for a careful scrutiny of the visual features of an object. They place the viewer before an object that is assumed to have definite features which will reveal themselves to analytical attention. Kaelin's categories place the object in the consciousness of the viewer. They call for an analysis of the contents of experience as it is controlled by the object. They place the viewer before an object that is assumed to have no features other than those of which the viewer is conscious.

The results of the comparison of the two criticisms suggest important implications for curriculum. If concepts of aesthetic features perform a guiding role in experience of art objects, the student who had only the categories of either Beardsley's or Kaelin's theories would be somewhat restricted in his search for aesthetic meaning. With the categories of Beardsley's theory he could probe the painting in terms of its visual structures, but he would not be disposed to credit the representational aspects (Kaelin's depth features) with aesthetic significance. With Kaelin's categories he could probe depth features and their relations to surface features. However, since Kaelin's categories do not provide an inventory of surface features the student's experience would depend on his previous experience with such features.

In answer to Question 3 it appears that a considerable educational benefit might result if the demonstrated strengths of both categories were utilized in curriculum. Evidence indicates that the
student would be in a position to derive a richer range of aesthetic meanings from Chagall's painting if he had categories from both theories. The fact that the two categories direct attention to different phenomena suggests that a combination of them might provide what they cannot provide separately. Since both theories provide concepts important to the development of aesthetic awareness, their combination would appear to insure categories more responsive to a wider range of sensuous and expressive meanings to be discovered in Chagall's painting and other visual objects.

The problem of combining the categories and the development of a unit of instruction demonstrating how the combined categories might be taught as concepts of aesthetic features will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

DEVELOPMENT OF A UNIT OF INSTRUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the problems of designing a unit of instruction which: (1) incorporates Beardsley's and Kaelin's aesthetic categories with respect to their effectiveness as demonstrated in Chapter IV, and (2) is designed for the express purpose of developing verbal concepts of aesthetic features.

The chapter is divided into three major divisions. The first is a discussion of the method by which Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories are brought together for incorporation in the unit of instruction. The second part of the chapter is given to a discussion of the development of the unit. The various curriculum components are discussed. Part two terminates with the unit of instruction. Implications for further study and conclusions constitute the third and last section of the chapter.

Combining Beardsley's and Kaelin's Categories

It has been noted that the critical theories of Beardsley and Kaelin should be utilized in curriculum by the criteria of their demonstrated potential to reveal sensuous and expressive features. The descriptions offered in Chapter IV indicate that Beardsley's and Kaelin's concepts of aesthetic features, as reflected in the two
categories, account for certain features in Chagall's painting but neglect others. The strength of Beardsley's categories was shown to be their ability to discriminate the sensuous and formal features of the painting. The strength of Kaelin's categories was in their ability to reveal the various kinds of meanings and affective dimensions of the painting.

The student's ability to discriminate aesthetic qualities in his environment is dependent upon his having a broad range of concepts of aesthetic features. On the premise that aesthetic awareness is an awareness of and responsiveness to the sensuous and expressive features of one's environment, education for aesthetic awareness should serve to increase sensitivity to the objective and phenomenal dimensions of experience. As the essays of Chapter IV reveal, the aesthetic categories of either of the two theories do only partial justice to the full range of sensuous and expressive meanings derivable from Chagall's I and The Village. In order to derive a greater benefit from the wide range of features in the painting the student should be able to attend to both objective and phenomenal qualities. To do so he must have categories of aesthetic features that can account for both kinds of experience.

Method of Combining the Categories

In combining the categories the first task is that of noting what correspondence there may be between the categories of the two philosophers. The closest correspondence or similarity occurs between Beardsley's parts, relations between parts, and regional qualities and
Kaelin’s sensuous surface. Figure 10 illustrates the correspondence between the two categories.

There seems to be considerable agreement between the two philosophers concerning the kinds of sensuous features that can have aesthetic significance. Their differences have more to do with how they are significant. For Beardsley a small red area can have aesthetic value in and of itself. For Kaelin the red area is significant only within a context of relatedness in which it funds with other features of experience.

Figure 10 also serves to demonstrate the results of the descriptions of Chapter IV, i.e., the kind of inverse correspondence between the two categories with respect to their power to reveal aesthetic features. Beardsley’s categories were dominant in their ability to reveal certain sensuous features of the painting but did not account for “depth” meanings or affective responses. Kaelin’s categories were strong in their ability to reveal qualities of “depth” and affective responses but weakest in their power to reveal specific kinds of sensuous features.

Figure 11 illustrates how the descriptive categories of Beardsley and Kaelin can be combined to obtain categories more responsive to the diverse qualities of visual objects. It will be observed that Beardsley’s categories have become sub-categories within Kaelin’s category of sensuous surface.

Figure 12 illustrates the combined categories without distinction as to their sources in Beardsley’s and Kaelin’s theories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEARDSLEY'S CATEGORIES</th>
<th>KAE LIN'S CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(condensed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>Sensuous Surface (R) Vague Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relations Between Parts</td>
<td>Depth (R) Definite Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Qualities</td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>images</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the interest of space, Beardsley's categories are included in their condensed form.

Figure 10. Correspondence Between Beardsley's and Kaelin's Categories
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Figure 11. Combination of Bearsley's and Kaelin's Categories as Suggested by Their Function in Description of Chagall's Painting.
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Figure 12. Combined Categories of Aesthetic Analysis
What Combined Categories Provide

The combining of Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories provides a system of categories more responsive to the wide range of aesthetic features one may encounter. In their combined form they do not discriminate against the objective or phenomenal aspects of experience. Instead, they allow for and encourage a systematic exploration of the relationships that may hold between objective and phenomenal features of experience. Beardsley's categories provide for many of the kinds of visually objective features one might encounter. Kaelin's categories provide for the representational, ideational, symbolic and affective dimensions of experience. In combination the categories promise a more powerful system of categories for aesthetic analysis than they do individually.

For the student the combined categories could become an effective conceptual tool. Art and non-art objects are diverse in their visual characteristics as well as they emotional, ideational, and symbolic content. Many objects appear to be dominant in some of these respects. For example, non-objective painting is dominant in its visual-affective qualities. Representational painting is often more dominant in its ideational-affective or symbolic-affective qualities although it can also be dominant in its visual-affective aspects. Various kinds of advertising may also be characterized in like fashion. A blighted urban area or a new modern skyscraper are dominant in their visual-affective qualities. The combined categories would appear to allow for the student's discriminating the various aspects of his
experience with art and non-art objects. They would allow him to examine the relations between components and arrive at his own personal decision regarding how and to what degree they fund into aesthetic expressiveness.

The combined categories are true to the kinds of questions philosophers of art and art criticism ask such as what features provide aesthetic meaning. Individual theories emphasize through their categories particular features. This debate over what particular features of experience are to be identified with the aesthetic is a basic question in aesthetics and art criticism. For the curriculum developer to ignore this fact and subscribe to the categories of a single theory would be to act irresponsibly.

In summary, some of the positive aspects of the combined categories with respect to their value for aesthetic education appear to be the following: (1) they are responsive to a broad range of aesthetic phenomena, (2) they provide alternative approaches in search of aesthetic significance, (3) they reveal the interrelationship and interdependence among various strands of meaning of art and non-art objects, and (4) they provide categories that are flexible and responsive to the diverse forms of art, environment, as well as the personal needs of the individual.
A Unit of Instruction

Having established Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories of aesthetic description in their combined form as potential curriculum content, the next question is how the categories may be utilized in a unit of instruction. At this point the study passes from the problem of examination and selection of possible content to that of structuring the selected content into curriculum consistent with specific goals and instructional outcomes for a particular body of students. The development of a unit of instruction necessitates the consideration of several curriculum questions if the unit is to be effective and serve the purposes for which it is designed. Some of these questions have to do with how the categories may be utilized in instruction, for whom, toward what goals, what teacher and student activities are required, and how learning or instructional outcomes be assessed.

Three primary sources are used in the development of the unit. The Guidelines is the source for direction in specifying goals, determining approaches to study, selecting content, designing lessons and supplying criteria for evaluation of the unit. The components of each lesson are purpose, instructional objectives, content, instructional materials, teacher and student activities and evaluation of learning. Eight criteria supplied by the Guidelines for evaluation of units of instruction are utilized in its design. The criteria are: (1) the unit must be designed to achieve specific goals consistent with general goals, (2) the unit must be appropriate for the range of knowledge and skill found in the student population for which it is designed, (3) the unit must be self-contained and self-explanatory,
(4) it must be pedagogically sound and (5) conceptually sound, (6) it must identify or represent an aesthetic phenomenon and provide relevant concepts for its identification or understanding, (7) the unit must identify all necessary instructional materials and (8) specify the required student and teacher activities in sufficient detail.

The content for the unit is suggested by Chapters III and IV. Theories of criticism are potential sources of curriculum content directed to the goals of perceiving and responding to aesthetic phenomena. Theories of criticism developed out of philosophical orientations of "ordinary language" and phenomenological aesthetics such as those of Beardsley and Kaelin suggest alternative ways of verbally responding to the sensuous and expressive features of art objects. Concepts of description from their theories provide alternative categories of aesthetic analysis. When brought to bear on visual objects the two categories illuminate different features. On the evidence of their respective merits the concepts derived from Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories may be utilized as a source of content in curriculum. They may be useful in bringing the student to perceive objective and depth features, describing them and developing an awareness of them in the writings of critics.

The method of instruction takes into consideration the views of John Carroll and Roger Brown concerning the nature of concepts and the conditions favorable to the formation of verbal concepts as reviewed in Chapter I of this study. Instructional activities are patterned after Brown's "the original word game." The instructor names a particular aesthetic quality and points to its occurance in
various works of art and other visual phenomena. The formation of the concept may be aided by the instructor also pointing to negative instances of the concept, indicating where it does not occur. Upon some evidence of a grasp of the concept the student is given opportunity to locate and name the quality in unfamiliar contexts. Success in doing so is an indication of his mastery of the concept.

General Description of the Unit

The unit of instruction is composed of lessons, each containing verbal response type objectives. By means of explanation and demonstration by the instructor and trial and error attempts by the student, the student is encouraged to bring his verbal responses to various visual phenomena into conformity with the aesthetic categories of the combined categories. The mode of response is verbal description. The ability to locate and describe aesthetic features in art and non-art objects with which the student has had no previous experience in accordance with the combined categories is assumed to be evidence of concept attainment.

The unit is composed of four lessons designed to be taught in the sequence in which they are numbered. Lesson One introduces the major categories of objective and depth features and gives attention to the importance of these features to the emotions of the viewer. Lesson Two introduces the aesthetic features that comprise the sub-categories of objective features. Emphasis is placed on the student's grasp of parts, relations between parts and regional qualities. Lesson Three introduces the kinds of features that comprise the
sub-category of depth features. Emphasis is placed on the student's grasp of the concepts of objects, ideas, and images and their relations to emotions. Lesson Four provides an opportunity for the student to develop fluency with the combined categories and to recognize their occurrence in the writings of critics.

Student Population

The unit of instruction is designed for general college students enrolled in humanities, art appreciation, art survey or introduction to art courses. In such courses the student's understanding of art is developed through a variety of means that differ with the purposes of the course, faculty interest and competency, facilities, resources and other factors. Often the student's understanding is developed primarily through visual analysis of works directed by the teacher. The instructor directs the student's perception of the various objects studied by means of language and facsimiles of the object in the form of slides or reproductions. It is usually in courses of this general type that the student receives his first formal instruction in the visual arts and begins to acquire the language and concepts that will influence him in his future encounters with art and non-art objects.

With minor adjustments the unit would be appropriate for other groups of students. For example, changes could be made in the objects examined to make the unit more relevant to the experience of younger age groups. Other kinds of objects could be examined such as cartoons, commercial packaging and displays as well as architecture. With
attention to the perceptual and verbal abilities of students the unit has relevancy to any situation where visual objects are examined and discussed in terms of their aesthetic aspects.

General Goals

The Guidelines notes: "The general goal for aesthetic education is to increase the student's capacity for experiencing aesthetic qualities in the arts and the general environment."¹ One of the primary goals for education in a democratic society is to provide the individual with those conceptual "tools" whereby he can personally respond to and intelligently express his response to his visual world. It follows from this goal that one of the central tasks for instruction in the visual arts is to produce students who can not only discriminate aesthetic qualities but be able to use language in a precise manner when doing so. The student should have verbal concepts appropriate to the task of analyzing and describing his response to the sensuous and expressive features of his visual environment. Besides being able to verbalize his response to aesthetic features, he should know how art critics employ language in their attempts to illuminate the various aspects of works of art.

Specific Goals

One major goal and two sub-goals for the unit of instruction

can now be stated.

**Major Goal**

The student is able to perceive **objective** and **depth** features in art and the environment.

**Sub-Goal No. 1**

The student is able to describe in a precise manner **objective** and **depth** features he perceives in art and the environment.

**Sub-Goal No. 2**

The student is aware of the way critics refer to **objective** and **depth** features of art in their criticism.

**Lesson One**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this lesson is to introduce the student to two broad categories of sensuous and expressive features to be found in art and non-art objects: **objective** and **depth** features.

**Instructional Objectives**

1. The student is able to describe some general **objective** features of paintings, advertising and urban scenes.

2. The student is able to describe some general **depth** features of paintings, advertising and urban scenes.

3. The student is able to describe his **feelings** that result from viewing **objective** and **depth** features of paintings, advertising and urban scenes.
Content

Concepts of aesthetic features: objective features and depth features.

Aesthetic phenomena: objective and depth features in slide reproductions listed under instructional materials.

Instructional Materials

35mm slide projector
2" x 2" color slides of the following:

A Soul Called Ida by Albright
Comtesse D'Haussonville by Ingres
Sirus II by Vasarely
Come to Where the Flavor Is (Marlboró advertisement)
Urban Scene (slide of blighten urban environment)

Instructional Activities

The instructor shows a slide of the painting A Soul Called Ida. He asks what kinds of emotions or feelings result from viewing the painting.

The students reply that they experience feelings of disgust and revulsion.

The instructor asks what in the painting produces these feelings.

The students reply with statements about the grotesque physical features of Ida, the furniture, the musty room, Ida's clothing and her expression of sadness. Some students note the colors of the painting and its "moldy" texture.

The instructor distinguishes between two sources of feelings by noting various objective and depth features of the painting. He discusses how feelings may result from both formal and representational
aspects of a painting.

The instructor shows a slide of the painting Comtesse D'Haussonville. He asks the students to describe their emotions when viewing the painting.

The students describe feelings of pleasantness, warmth, strength and general well-being.

The instructor asks the students to describe some objective features of the painting.

The students describe colors, lines, shapes, etc.

The instructor asks the students to describe some of the depth qualities of the painting.

The students describe the woman, her dress, her grooming and the room in which she stands.

The instructor calls the students' attention to the differences in their emotional responses to A Soul Called Ida and Comtesse D'Haussonville and reviews the differences in the objective and depth features of the two paintings.

The instructor shows a slide of the painting Sirus II. He asks the students to describe the depth features of the painting.

The students have difficulty locating depth features. Some students reply with statements about what seems to be suggested in the painting.

The instructor notes that there are no depth features since the painting is non-objective and nothing is represented. He asks the students to describe some objective qualities of the painting.

The students describe colors, shapes and note advancing and
receding planes of color.

The instructor asks what kinds of emotions or feelings result from viewing the painting.

The students reply that they experience feelings of excitement, strength, uneasiness, etc.

The instructor notes that these feelings originate in the objective features of the painting.

The instructor shows a slide of the advertisement from a current popular magazine, *Come to Where the Flavor Is*. He asks the students to describe the advertisement in terms of its objective and depth features.

The students reply with descriptions of the man pictured in the advertisement, the clothing he wears, and the objects around him such as horses, a wagon and trees. Some students attempt to describe his activity with statements such as "a cowboy taking a cigarette break", "a rancher resting after a morning's work", etc. Other students describe the objective qualities of colors, shapes of shadow areas and lines.

The instructor asks what kinds of feelings, emotions, or desires are stimulated by their viewing the advertisement.

The students reply that they experience feelings of peacefulness, warmth, contentedness, and some admiration for the man in the ad.

The instructor shows the students a slide of a depressed urban scene. He asks what kinds of emotions or feelings result from their viewing the scene.

The students reply that they have feelings of depression,
despair, hopelessness, etc.

The instructor asks what they see in the scene that produce these feelings.

The students reply with statements about the dirty, soot covered buildings, faded signs, cluttered streets and sidewalks, unkept storefronts, etc. Some students note the drab colors, disorganization of shapes, and the general quality of visual confusion.

The instructor again distinguishes between the two sources of feelings in the advertisement and the urban scene. He notes that colors and shapes and their organization in our visual environment affect our feelings. Not only do we respond to these objective features of the environment but we also have feelings resulting from objects, whether real or represented. The instructor notes that the features that produce feelings of pleasure or displeasure in art are the features that produce similar feelings in our environment. They are the objective and depth qualities of our experience.

**Evaluation of Learning**

The evaluation of the student's learning is in terms of his ability to describe some general objective and depth features in the examples of painting, advertising and urban scenes projected during the lesson and to relate the features to his feelings.
Lesson Two

Purpose

The purpose of this lesson is to help students develop verbal concepts of objective features of different visual phenomena. Specifically, the lesson will introduce the student to Beardsley's categories of parts, relations between parts, and regional qualities.

Instructional Objectives

1. The student is able to identify and describe visual parts, relations between parts, and regional qualities of painting, advertising and urban scenes.

2. The student is able to identify and describe parts and relations between parts that occur within an area having some specific regional quality in painting, advertising and urban scenes.

Content

Concepts of aesthetic features: Beardsley's categories of parts, relations between parts and regional qualities.

Aesthetic phenomena: Parts, relations between parts and regional qualities of paintings, advertising and urban scene listed as instructional materials.

Instructional Materials

2 35mm slide projectors
dissolve unit
2" x 2" color slides of the following:

A Soul Called Ida by Albright
Comtesse D'Haussonville by Ingres
Siris II by Vasarely
Come to Where the Flavor Is (Marlboro advertisement)
Urban Scene (slide showing blighted urban environment)
Slides in which the visual parts of the above slides have been diagramed.

**Instructional Activities**

The instructor shows the slide of *Sirus II*. Using the dissolve unit the instructor alternately projects the painting and diagrams of the painting that reveal some of the parts, relations between parts and regional qualities of *Sirus II*. The instructor describes the painting as a visual phenomenal field which can be analyzed using Beardsley's categories.

The instructor locates an area of the painting having a particular regional quality such as *unity*. He names the quality and points to other examples of it in the painting. The instructor locates other areas of the painting not having the quality of *unity*. He describes the parts and relations between parts within the area possessing *unity*. He discusses how regional qualities are not analyzable into their constituent parts but do depend upon them for their characteristics.

The instructor asks the students to locate other areas in the painting characterized by the quality of *unity* and describe the parts and relations among them.

The students locate other areas of the painting characterized by unity and describe the parts and relations between parts that comprise them.

The instructor projects the slides of *A Soul Called Ida* and *Comtesse D'Haussonville*. He asks the students to locate examples of *unity* in the two paintings and describe the parts and relations
between parts within the areas noted.

With varying degrees of success the students locate areas of the two paintings characterized by unity and give descriptions of parts and relations between parts.

The instructor introduces other regional qualities. Using the dissolve unit the slides in which the objective features of the two paintings are diagramed the instructor follows the same procedure as with Sirus II. He asks the students to locate other instances of regional qualities and describe their parts and relations.

The instructor evaluates the descriptions of the students, giving attention to the correction of concepts.

The instructor shows the slide Come to Where the Flavor Is. He asks the students to analyze the ad using Beardsley’s categories.

With increasing success the students describe the ad.

The instructor shows the slide Urban Scene. He asks the students to analyze the scene using Beardsley’s categories.

With varying degrees of success the students describe the scene.

Using the slide Urban Scene and other slides diagraming its visual parts, the instructor corrects the students' concepts as revealed in their descriptions.

Evaluation of Learning

The student's learning is evaluated in terms of his ability to locate and describe particular regional qualities and the parts and relations between parts that make them up. The student is evaluated only on his performance with features he has not heard described.
His ability to locate and describe **objective** features in two of the several slides projected in the lesson is considered an adequate indication of his understanding of the categories.

Lesson Three

**Purpose**

The purpose of this lesson is to help students develop verbal concepts of depth qualities. Specifically, the lesson will introduce the student to Kaelin's categories of **objects**, **ideas** and **images**.

**Instructional Objectives**

1. The student is able to identify and describe the depth features of **objects**, **ideas** and **images** when they occur in painting, advertising and urban scenes.

2. The student is able to describe feelings that result from **objects**, **ideas** and **images** in painting advertising and urban scenes.

**Content**

**Concepts of aesthetic features**: Kaelin's categories of depth features—**objects**, **ideas** and **images**.

**Aesthetic phenomena**: **objects**, **ideas** and **images** as they occur in paintings, advertising and urban scenes listed as instructional materials.

**Instructional Materials**

35mm slide projector
2" x 2" color slides of the following:

_A Soul Called Ida_ by Albright
_Comtesse D'Haussonville_ by Ingres
Instructional Activities

The instructor shows the slide of A Soul Called Ida. He describes some of the objects in the painting. He describes areas of the painting where objects do not appear. Through the use of close-up viewing he notes areas where features of objects are not discernible. He asks the students to describe other objects in the painting.

The students describe other objects.

The instructor asks how the various objects appear; what visual evidence the viewer has of their existence.

The students discuss the shapes, colors, visual textures and the three dimensional "look" of the objects.

The instructor notes that these are objective qualities. He notes that the appearance of objects is always due to particular relationships among objective features.

The instructor describes ideas represented in the painting such as "poverty", "waste", and "degeneration" and describes the relations between represented objects that give rise to these ideas.

The instructor shows slides of Comtesse D'Haussonville, Come to Where the Flavor Is and Urban Scene. He asks the students to describe ideas that emerge when viewing the slides and note the relations between objects that give rise to the ideas.

The students describe ideas and relations between objects giving rise to them.
The instructor evaluates the descriptions giving attention to the correction of the concept of ideas, as well as the represented objects giving rise to them.

The instructor asks the students to describe their feelings that result from the perception of objects or ideas in the three slides.

The students describe their emotional responses.

The instructor shows a slide of Come to Where the Flavor Is. He discusses the depth quality of images (symbolism) and asks the students to locate instances of this quality in the advertisement.

The students have difficulty locating examples of images.

The instructor calls attention to the crest on the Marlboro package. He explains the relationship between a represented object and its symbolic meaning.

Some students see the western clothing of the man in the ad as symbolism.

The instructor attempts to correct the concept through the use of other examples of symbolism such as a flag, a cross, various acts or gestures, etc.

The instructor shows the slide of Urban Scene and asks the students to write descriptions of their encounter with the scene giving attention to the depth qualities of objects, ideas and images and the kinds of emotions and feelings that appear to originate in these features.
Evaluation of Learning

The student's learning of the concepts is evaluated by the criteria of ability to describe objects, ideas and images as they occur in the ad Come to Where the Flavor Is and Urban Scene.

Lesson Four

Purpose

The purpose of this lesson is to better acquaint the student with the combined categories. The purpose is to further demonstrate the utility of the categories in examining the aesthetic features of painting, advertising and the visual environment and understanding the ways critics refer to objective and depth features in their criticisms.

Instructional Objectives

1. The student is able to describe objective and depth features in painting, advertising and urban scenes he has not previously seen.

2. The student is able to identify objective and depth features in the writings of critics.

Content

Concepts of aesthetic features: categories of objective features and depth features.

Aesthetic phenomena: objective and depth features in slides of paintings, advertising and environment listed beneath instructional materials.
Instructional Materials

35mm slide projector
memographed criticisms by Albert Elsen and William Fleming of
The City by Leger
2" x 2" color slides of the following:

Mont Sainte-Victoire by Cezanne
Las Meninas by Velasquez
The City by Leger
America's Favorite Cigarette Break (Benson and Hedges ad)
Urban Scene (view of industrial complex)

Instructional Activities

The instructor reviews the concepts of objective and depth
features in the combined categories. He discusses the two categories
of aesthetic features with respect to the viewpoints of the theories
from which they were derived.

The instructor projects the slides of Mont Sainte-Victoire
and Las Meninas. He asks the students to write a short criticism of
each painting using the items of the combined categories.

The instructor and students review and discuss the criticisms.
The instructor asks the students to note to what extent each criticism
includes objective and depth features.

The students observe that they tended to use objective cate-
gories more in their criticisms of Cezanne's painting and depth
categories more in their criticisms of the painting by Velasquez. The
students also observe that the extent to which both categories were
used varies from student to student.

The instructor projects the slide of The City by Leger. He
distributes memographed copies of criticisms of the painting by Elsen
and Fleming. He asks the students to analyze the criticisms in terms of the extent to which objective and depth features are noted by each critic. He requests that the students circle language pertaining to objective features and underline language pertaining to depth features.

The analyses of the two criticisms are discussed. The students note that Elsen's criticisms includes more reference to objective features and Fleming's more reference to depth features.

The instructor discusses the two criticisms. He emphasizes the point that critics tend to conduct their criticisms from their own personal points of view concerning the location of significance in works of art. He uses the students' criticisms of the paintings by Cezanne and Velasquez to make his point. He also notes that the critic's viewpoints may be seen to vary somewhat from one work of art to another. He stresses the importance of noting the extent to which each critic places emphasis on particular aesthetic features to the neglect of other possible ones.

The instructor asks the students to write brief criticisms of the projected slides, America's Favorite Cigarette Break and Urban Scene, again utilizing the items from the combined categories.

The students complete the assignment.

The instructor discusses the criticisms. He emphasizes the utility of the categories in the analysis of any visual phenomena in terms of its aesthetic significance.

Evaluation of Learning

The students are evaluated by the criteria of their demonstrated fluency with the categories of aesthetic analysis in analyzing
the paintings, advertising and urban scene and the language of the two criticisms by Elsen and Fleming.

**Evaluation of Unit**

The design of the unit of instruction is evaluated by the criteria followed in the unit's construction. The specific goals for the unit are consistent with the general goals for aesthetic education. Also, the specific objectives of each lesson are consistent with at least one of the specific goals for the unit. The unit is considered to be appropriate for the range of knowledge and skills of the student population for which it is designed. The unit is self contained in that instructional objectives, content, instructional materials, teacher and student activities and criteria for evaluation of learning are identified. The unit is pedagogically sound in that it reflects current knowledge about teaching and learning. It is conceptually sound in that the concepts and their combination represent the nature of the discipline under study. The necessary content and phenomena for the unit are clearly identified. The instructional materials are listed and the specific teacher and student activities are specified in sufficient detail.

**Conclusions and Implications**

To reveal some of the dimensions of the problem of concepts from contending aesthetic theories as curriculum content, the aesthetic categories from Monroe Beardsley's and Eugene Kaelin's theories of criticism were examined in this study. The questions posed in the
statement of the problem were: (1) what are the differences between Beardsley's and Kaelin's aesthetic categories with respect to what they ascribe aesthetic meaning to and have the power to reveal in a work of art, (2) what implications for curriculum in art education can be drawn from the features revealed by their categories, and (3) how may different aesthetic categories be made to function in a unit of instruction for the development of concepts of aesthetic features?

It was found that Beardsley's theory ascribes aesthetic meaning to the perceptual features of a visual field and Kaelin's to the sensuous as well as the representational, ideational, symbolic and affective strands of experience. When used in the analysis of Chagall's painting the respective merits of the two categories of aesthetic description were revealed. Beardsley's categories illuminated many of the sensuous aspects of the painting but did not reveal the representational, ideational, symbolic and affective aspects. Kaelin's categories drew attention to the sensuous as well as the several extra-sensuous dimensions of meaning. However, they were weak in their ability to illuminate particular sensuous features.

Three important implications for curriculum are suggested by what Beardsley's and Kaelin's categories did reveal of Chagall's painting. The first is the individual strengths of categories from different theories suggests their use in the obtaining of different instructional goals. The second implication is that curriculum content drawn from aesthetics and art criticism should reflect different points of view. The third implication may be the most significant in view of current practices of translating concepts from aesthetics and
art criticism into curriculum content. The features revealed in Chagall's painting indicates that aesthetic description does not mean the same thing in the two theories. This fact suggests that other concepts of critical language may vary significantly in meaning from one theory to the next.

To demonstrate how contending aesthetic categories can be made to function in a unit of instruction the categories derived from Beardsley's and Kaelin's theories were combined by the criteria of their demonstrated potential to reveal aesthetic features. The combination served to produce categories more responsive to the wide range of sensuous and expressive meanings to be found in art and other objects. Using the combined categories as content a unit of instruction was designed for the purpose of developing concepts of aesthetic features representative of both theories.

Some observations relative to the conducting of the study and results may now be made. This study was restricted to the examination and comparison of aesthetic categories from two contending theories of criticism. The theories of Beardsley and Kaelin were compared with respect to what features are considered to be the aesthetic ones. A thorough comparison of the two theories would necessitate the inclusion of Beardsley's categories of interpretation and evaluation.

The study had dealt with the theoretical and curricular aspects of a problem and terminates with the development of a unit of instruction. The assessment of the unit is on theoretical grounds. On these grounds the content of the unit is judged to be consistent with established knowledge in the fields of aesthetics and art criticism. The
method of instruction is in accord with a theory of concept formation. Although the study could be extended by an empirical investigation of the unit's ability to achieve the goals for which it is designed with the designated population of students, the results of such inquiry would not reflect on the methods or results of the study as reported here.

With respect to the general antecedents of the investigation, another observation should be made. The general problem to which this study contributes some understanding is that of choosing from among alternative concepts those to serve as content in curriculum. The demonstration of the fact that aesthetic description does not mean the same thing in the two theories suggests its meaning may vary among other theories. Other concepts such as explanation, interpretation, and evaluation may have meanings that also vary significantly from one theory of criticism to the next. As this study demonstrates, aesthetic concepts carry with them the philosophical assumptions of the theory from which they are derived. When incorporated into curriculum they have the power to influence the student toward a particular theoretical position. Since they do have the power to influence the student toward ways of examining his visual world, the art educator would be well advised to know the respective merits of concepts before incorporating them in curriculum.

Finally, four of the implications this study has for further research and development should be noted.

1. An empirical study might be conducted using the proposed unit of instruction with students in introduction to art or similar
level courses. The study would include the use of control and experimental groups. Instruments would be developed for the analysis of students' verbal performance. The data collected could be analyzed to reveal evidence of alteration or extension of aesthetic categories.

2. The unit of instruction might be altered for use with younger students. It could be redesigned for use with elementary or secondary school students. Alterations to the unit for these groups would involve attention to works of art used, length of individual lessons, difficulty of language concepts and the perceptual tasks required of the students. A unit of instruction of this general type might also be made the basis of an empirical study.

3. A study might be conducted to measure the effect of the unit on the art making ability of students of various age groups. Such a study would attempt to determine the effect of learning aesthetic concepts on the art products of particular groups. Control and experimental groups would be used. The experimental group would be involved in the study of aesthetic concepts over a period of time during which they are also engaged in art making activities.

4. Packaged materials for individual instruction might be developed using the concepts of the combined categories. The materials would be organized into units containing several lessons. The unit would include a text explaining the procedures of the unit. Each lesson would include instructions for the student, concepts to be learned, instructional materials in the form of reproductions and various other visuals such as overlays, diagrams and analysis sheets. Each lesson might also include taped and printed examples of criticism for
analysis by the student. Each lesson would also include criteria and procedures for self evaluation. The unit insofar as the aesthetic phenomena is concerned might center around the features of a wide variety of objects. Art, nature, commercial design, environments or specialized art studies offer possibilities for emphasis. Units of the kind described could be developed for different age and interest groups. They might be made available as library materials or be designed to function in museum and gallery visits. They might be designed for auxiliary study in teacher training, studio classes and in relation to humanities studies. Empirical studies might be conducted to assess the effective strength of any of the units suggested.
The categories of aesthetic description that follow were collected from the writings of Monroe Beardsley and Eugene Kaelin. The procedure followed in the development of the categories is discussed on pages 48 and 49 of this study. Beardsley's categories are derived from one source, Chapters 2 and 4 of his book, *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*. The organization of his categories as presented here follows his categories of descriptive criticism, i.e., parts, relations between parts, and regional qualities of wholes or parts.

Kaelin's categories are not complete in any one literary source. His categories, along with concepts that explain them, were assembled from several of his writings. The number preceding the page reference for each concept designates one of the following literary sources.


1.0 PARTS OF THE WORK

1.1 Elementary Areas

"An absolutely homogeneous part of the field is partless, and such a partless part may be called an element of the field. Analysis stops with the elements." (p. 83)

"The parts of a visual design are its actual parts, as perceived. Considered one way, a visual design is a spread of elementary patches, which may be called areas, and its surface, the set of all its areas, is the picture-plane." (p. 89)

1.11 Number of Elementary Areas

"But there seems to be no new kind of thing that ought to be part of the description: no matter how complicated we made the figure, the true statements describing it would fall into the same basic categories. There are statements about the number and local qualities of elements, about complexes and their regional qualities, about relations between elements or between complexes." (p. 85)

1.12 Local Qualities of Elementary Areas

(see preceding concept)

"Such an elementary part must have some qualities, otherwise we could not perceive it: its darkness, its shape. Let us call such qualities local qualities. The white area inside the 'o' in the word 'local' is an element of this printed page, and its whiteness is therefore a local quality." (p. 83)

"Two areas can differ from each other in shape, size, position, and tone, or color quality." (p. 89)

"But shape, size, and position—and also, of course, color—are independent properties of areas: each can be varied, within limits, while the others are kept constant." (p. 90)

1.121 Shape of Elementary Area

"The shape of an elementary area is its configuration. 'Round,' 'jagged,' and 'vertical' are terms used in describing shape." (p. 90)
1.122 **Size of Elementary Area**

"Size' means scale, not as measured by the ruler but as relative to the frame, or boundaries of the whole picture plane." (p. 90)

1.123 **Position of Elementary Area**

"Position is also relative to the boundaries of the picture-plane; it includes both the location of the area...and the lie, or orientation, of the area....." (p. 90)

1.124 **Tone of Elementary Area**

"But for the purpose of classifying and cataloging tones, it is customary to select three of the ways in which they differ and treat these as the basic tonal dimensions. For it turns out that when each of these has been specified the tone and its relations to other tones is uniquely fixed, and all its other qualities are determined. These three basic dimensions are familiar. Two tones may differ in hue, as red differs from green, or garnet from maroon, claret, and crimson. Two tones of the same hue may differ in lightness or darkness, as one part of the wall differs from another where there is less light; this is sometimes called 'value,' sometimes 'intensity,' sometimes 'brightness.' Two tones of the same hue and lightness may differ in saturation, or color strength, as pastel shades from richer tones; this is sometimes called 'hue-intensity,' sometimes 'chroma.' Black and white and shades of gray are tones, but hueless, 'achromatic,' ones; in other words, they have zero saturation." (pp. 90-91)

"To name a tone in such a way that it will not be mistaken for another tone, it is only necessary to refer to the three basic dimensions, for a tone of a certain hue, lightness, and saturation will always have the same specific degree of warmth, advancingness, brightness, and so forth. But to describe the tone fully, you must mention these other characteristics. For they are no less 'in' the tone than the basic ones." (p. 91)

1.2 **Complex Areas**

"Any part of a sensory field is then itself a complex if further parts can be discriminated within it." (p. 83)
1.21 Regional Quality of Complex Areas

"Let us call a property, or characteristic, that belongs to a complex but not to any of its parts a regional property of that complex." (p. 83)

"Some regional properties can be perceived by the senses; some cannot. Your weighing 150 pounds is not directly perceivable—it has to be measured on a scale, or inferred in some other way—but your being heavy-set or thin is perceivable. In our descriptions of aesthetic objects we are interested in the perceivable properties, for which we shall reserve the word 'qualities.' Thus when I speak of the regional qualities of a complex, I mean its perceptual regional properties." (p. 83)

"...the existence of a regional quality of a complex depends upon the elements and their relations: they are the perceptual conditions of the quality." (p. 87)

2.0 RELATIONS BETWEEN PARTS

Dominance of Simple or Complex Parts

"Every area in the picture plane, simple or complex, stands out to a certain degree for attention, or makes its presence known, so to speak, in comparison with other areas. It has a degree of dominance, or subordination. This quality depends partly on its position within the picture plane—for the framing of any area automatically sets up a kind of field, in which certain positions, at or about the middle, are more dominating than others. But it also depends on what might be called the visual density of the area, its quality of impenetrability or of opacity. One area has more to it than another. The degree of visual density is a resultant of size, brightness and saturation of tone, contrast with the background, and other local qualities. We are still on the two-dimensional surface, and not yet in the realm of three-dimensional objects." (p. 96)

2.1 Relations Between Elementary Areas

2.2 Relations Between Complex Parts (Form Descriptions)

"And in terms of the categories we have already introduced, there is a clear distinction that can be made between (1) those statements that describe the local qualities of elements, and the regional qualities of complexes, within a visual design or a musical composition, and (2) those statements that describe
internal relations among the elements and among the complexes within the object. These latter statements we may call 'form-statements.'" (pp. 166-7)

"Similarly, if I say that in a visual design one side contrasts with another, or one area is darker than another, or one part of the picture space is deeper than another, I am talking about form." (p. 167)

"If from the class of critical descriptions we abstract all the form-statements, what remains? First, there will be statements about the elements and complex parts to be found in the work: ...the painting contains some patches of coral red, or two main solids. Second, there will be statements about the regional qualities of the work or of its parts: ...the painting is bright and lively. It is convenient to have a name for these descriptions that are not formal descriptions, but there is no thoroughly satisfactory one available." (p. 167)

"Form' naturally takes 'content' as its complement, and we may accede to this custom. 'Content-statement' is a poor term in one respect, for among the things that musical compositions and visual designs contain, in a perfectly good sense, are the relations among the parts as well as the parts and their qualities. For the most part I shall get along without using the word 'content' at all, but when I do it will be in this sense: a content-statement is a description that is not a form-statement." (p. 167)

"Are form and content separable? Surely not, and it is a serious mistake to confuse distinguishability and separability." (p. 168)

"As was pointed out in Chapter II, #6, the quality of a complex is a function of the elements and their relations, or, as we might say, both its form and content, and if either of these is changed--if different notes or colors are substituted, or if the music is speeded up or the color areas are rearranged--that particular quality will change or disappear." (p. 168)

"...the form of an aesthetic object is the total web of relations among its parts, ..." (p. 168)

Structure and Texture

"Thus there are relatively large-scale relations among the main parts and relatively small-scale relations among the subordinate parts--or, in other words, there are relations among large, and perhaps distant, regions, and there are relations among neighboring regions, of the object. Hence we shall distinguish two
species of aesthetic form: structure and texture." (pp. 168-9)

2.21 Large Scale Relations (Structure)

"In other words, any statement about the composition of a design is a statement about its structure." (p. 170)

"The term 'composition' is, then, definable in our categories of analysis. When it means, as it does to some writers, the 'arrangement' of all the areas of the design—that is, their relations—then it is synonymous with 'form.' If it is limited to large-scale relations and/or dominant patterns, it is synonymous with 'structure.'" (p. 170)

2.2.1 Dual Relations

"What are the possible relations that can subsist among parts of the visual design? The main ones we can conveniently divide into two groups. First there are dual relations, that is, relations that hold between two parts of the design. These are in the logical sense symmetrical; that is, if they hold from A to B, then they hold from B to A. These relations are chiefly important as constituting structure, that is, in so far as they hold between relatively large segments of the object." (pp. 174-5)

"The dual relations may be further subdivided. ... If we consider a particular characteristic—say, shape, color, orientation, or size—there are three possibilities to distinguish. They may be similar in that respect, though not exactly; or they may be contrasting in that respect, as dark vs. light, or large vs. small, or smooth vs. jagged, or they may be indifferently different, that is, they may not stand out as either much alike or much opposed." (p. 175)

"Among these dual relations, there are three in particular that have great structural significance in visual design. The first appears when we compare two parts of the design with respect to their visual density. They may be similar in density, that is nearly equal, in which case they are said to be in balance; they may be contrasting; or they may be neither." (p. 175)

"The second appears when we compare two parts of the design with respect to their color, or color-tonality. They may be harmonious—the colors go well together. They may be clashing or conflicting—the colors are disturbed by each other's presence. Or they may simply be indifferent. Color-harmony is one sort of similarity, like shape-harmony or size-harmony. (p. 175)
"The third dual relation arises when we compare two parts of a design with respect to their movement, including not only the amount of thrust in the movement but the direction as well. Two black figures on a white background may, for example, seem to move in the same direction, say toward the upper left-hand corner. Or they may seem to move together, as if pulled by internal forces, or to drive each other apart, depending on their shape, size, position, and so on. Or there may be other figures that counteract these tendencies, so that a stable tension is generated, and the figures appear to be held in position. Thus, two such figures are either in equilibrium or in disequilibrium." (pp. 175-6)

2.2.12 Serial Relations

"Besides the dual relations, there can be serial relations within a visual design. Consider any three or more figures, whether complex or simple, in relation to each other. And set aside for the moment the dual relations that may hold between any two of them. There are three possibilities that remain. First, they may all have some characteristic in common, their color, shape, size, orientation, position, etc. In that case we shall say that they form a series by repetition, ... Second, they may vary in some regular way, in color, shape, size, orientation, or position: for example, A may be darker than, larger than, to the left of, B, and B darker than, larger than, to the left of, C. In this case the relation between A and B is similar to the relation between B and C, and we shall say they form a series by directional change. Or third, there may be no serial relation that connects all of the figures." (p. 176)

"These purely formal distinctions can be either structural or textural, of course, depending on whether we are considering major or minor parts of the design." (p. 176)

2.22 Recurrent Small Scale Relations (Texture and/or Style)

2.2.21 Texture

"The term 'texture' is often used by fine-arts critics in a sense that is not exactly the one I propose. ... This is what I mean by 'texture': the texture of the visual design at any location within it consists of the relations among the small parts at that location. We can also generalize about the texture of the whole, that is, certain small-scale relations that turn up at various locations." (p. 169)
"Of course the distinction between structure and texture is relative; if we start to magnify a texture, or make the whole field smaller, we will come to the point where the elements are major, rather than minor, parts of the design. But that will be a different design. It is perfectly clear that when you look at a painting it almost always has certain large divisions, and when you look at bathroom tiles or a brick wall there are no large divisions, though there are small ones." (pp. 169-70)

2.222 Style

"We may summarize our discussion of style in visual design, then, as follows: first, when this term is applied to individual objects, it is best used to refer to recurrent features of texture, and this usage corresponds fairly well to that of art critics, if one ignores their tendency toward intentionalism when they offer to define the term. Second, when the term is applied to groups of objects, to the oeuvre of a given age or of a given painter, it usually refers to recurrent features of texture and structure." (p. 173)

3.0 REGIONAL QUALITIES OF THE WHOLE OR PARTS

(see concepts under Regional Qualities of Complex Areas)

"What is important for discourse about art is that the regional qualities of a complex have two aspects: they have novelty, in that they are not to be found in the parts when separated, but they also depend upon the parts and their relations." (pp. 84-5)

"A regional quality may be more or less extensive, that is, it may prevail over a larger or smaller portion of a sensory field. For example, we might make the figure and its circles larger or smaller, keeping the proportions the same. A regional quality may be more or less intensive. For example, we might insert more circles between the others to make the squarishness more pronounced, or on the other hand, we might increase the distances between the circles so that the squarishness becomes more and more indistinct until it disappears. A regional quality may be more or less persistent in time. That is, it may characterize an object, as above, or an event, or a series of events regarded as a whole in time. For example, it is not a single event on a stage, but a series of events that has dramatic quality." (pp. 85-6)
3.1 Non-Human Regional Qualities

3.11 Dominant Pattern

"...any large shape that stands out within the picture, emerging from the subordinate patterns because of certain strong lines between them... The dominant pattern of a design is not a set of relations, but a regional quality that depends upon those relations." (p. 170)

3.12 Wholeness

"When the complex A-B has its own regional quality, it may be said to be a whole. It segregates itself for perception from its environment; it takes on individuality. Wholeness is another regional quality, which a complex may possess in various degrees, depending upon the intensity of the other regional qualities that bind its parts together; ..." (p. 86)

"Wholeness,' like the names of all regional qualities, can only be ostensively defined, that is, the quality must be pointed out in examples." (p. 86)

3.13 Fusion

"When two elements or complexes, A and B, are both parts of a larger complex that has a relatively intense regional quality, then A and B seem to belong together in an important way. Without losing their individuality, they take on, if one may speak metaphorically, a kind of awareness of each other; in that case, let us say they are perceptually joined. They do not merely accompany each other, but fuse." (p. 86)

3.14 Depth

"But it is almost impossible for a complex design to remain completely flat: some of the colors will thrust themselves before others; some of its shapes, on account of their stability or regularity, will push others into the background; the superposition of one figure upon another will create a differentiation and recession of planes; there may be modeling or linear or atmospheric (aerial) perspective. What emerges under such local conditions is a new regional quality—depth. The space of the picture takes on a third dimension, and becomes more than a picture-plane; it is a picture-space." (p. 96)
3.15  **Mass**

"...the painting is now said to possess visual volume, and that volume consists partly of filled space—solid, or three-dimensional, mass—and, for the rest, of void—the mountain seen at a distance has nothing, visually speaking, in front of it. Mass is therefore a regional quality." (p. 96)

3.16  **Tension**

"Lines and figures, when they have certain characteristics—certain shapes and orientations—take on a kind of directed instability. They appear to be moving, or to be about to move, or to be straining in a direction in which they could move. ... This implicit movement, as we may call it, to distinguish it from the actual movement of a car or train, is not a matter of imagination, but something presented in the visual field.

... This opposition of movements, or of movement and obstacles to movement, sets up the quality of tension in a visual design. Tension, then, is a regional quality of a design in which implicit movement is checked or counteracted." (pp. 96-7)

3.17  **Unity**

"When we speak of the unity of an aesthetic object, or say that one object is more or less unified than another, we mean to refer to a quality that different objects can possess in different degrees." (p. 191)

"In critical discourse, we are not concerned with the unity possessed by elements of aesthetic objects, but only of complexes; in this context, unity, if it is a quality at all, will always be a regional quality." (p. 191)

"There are two distinguishable components in the concept of unity. ... One component I shall call completeness, the other coherence." (p. 192)

3.171  **Completeness**

"To say that it has completeness is to say that it appears to require, or call upon, nothing outside itself; it has all that it needs; it is all there. This is not a definition: completeness is a simple quality that must be pointed out. All we can do here is talk around it, give examples, and try with the help of synonymous expressions to show where to look. ... But completeness is not going to be analyzable into any simpler qualities." (p. 192)
3.172 Coherence

"For the term 'coherence' there are roughly synonymous expressions that we can use to help direct attention to this quality where it is to be found; the coherent design contains nothing that does not belong; it all fits together. But the quality is itself simple; therefore the term cannot be given the sort of definition that analyzes a concept into parts. We can say something, however, about the phenomenal conditions of coherence, and in this indirect way make reasonably sure that we are talking about the same thing.

Not that we can lay down an exhaustive list of conditions that will tend to make a design coherent or that will tend to make it incoherent. . . . We can set up some broad categories and perhaps in a way make room for all possible types of coherence-conditions, but we must remember this is only a convenience for the critic, and in no way reflects upon the originality of painters or restricts the future of painting." (pp. 193-4)

"We might speak of the 'principles' of coherence; . . . And these principles may be grouped in three large classes." (p. 194)

3.1721 Focus

"Coherence is promoted by focus. A focus is the dominant pattern, or compositional scheme, if it stands out clearly from the whole painting, or it may be that part of the painting that has the greatest perceptual strikingness or to which the eye is led from various directions by the convergence of strong lines." (p. 194)

3.1722 Balance and Equilibrium

"Coherence is also promoted by balance and equilibrium, of which examples were given in the preceding section." (p. 194) (See Category 2.211 Dual Relations)

"The concept of balance can be extended to relations in depth within the picture-space." (p. 194)

3.1723 Harmony

"Third, coherence is promoted by similarities among the parts of the design. This principle is often called the principle of harmony, and I think it is also what many people mean by 'order' in this context." (p. 195)
"Similarity of texture, or, in other words, consistency of style, throughout the design, is one of the most powerful perceptual conditions of coherence." (p. 195)

"These brief notes on completeness and coherence in visual design are only a summary of many complex and subtle matters. Our problem here is, however, not to discover exactly what conditions tend toward unity in painting, and what do not. That is the critic's task. We want to see, if we can, what he is doing and assure ourselves, if not him, that it can be done. It is an empirical question that we are dealing with." (p. 195)

3.18 Complexity

"...there is one more concept that we should deal with, though briefly, and it comes in appropriately enough here because it often plays an important role in the description and comparison of visual designs and musical compositions, as a correlative term to 'unity.' It is the term 'complexity.' ... Complexity is, roughly, the number of parts, and of differences between them, to be found within the aesthetic object." (p. 205)

"It should be clear, now, that unity and complexity are distinct things, and can vary independently within limits. Within limits, because, first, the simplest things cannot but have a fairly high degree of unity; and, second, the most complex things will be difficult to unify and perhaps cannot be as completely unified as less complex things. Unity and complexity are set over against each other; very broadly speaking, the former is increased by similarities of parts, the latter by differences." (p. 208)

3.2 Human Regional Qualities

"Some regional qualities are similar to qualities of human behavior, especially to mental states and processes: sobriety, serenity, frolicsome, determination, calm, voluptuousness, indecisiveness, for example. Let us call such qualities human qualities." (p. 328)
SENSUOUS SURFACE

"The context of an aesthetic expression, and hence of its significance, is constructed uniquely and exhaustively by the network of relations set up by the counters of the given medium. I refer here to the medial symbols, markers, or elements with which the artist must think in solving his qualitative problems and which, taken in relation, form the sensuous surface of the work." (2, p. 290)

"Painting, the visual medium, has for its context of significance anything that may be seen: lines and forms, colors and space; architecture, mass and force, etc." (2, p. 291)

"A painting, whether it is figurative or not, always presents a sensuous surface; and an aesthetic object is the object perceived." (3, p. 45)

"It is aesthetically insignificant to state that red occurs in a painting; its meaning depends upon a relationship to other colors and other spaces. All significance in a visual field is differentiation, and the least differentiation perceivable is some form of color contrast." (3, p. 55)

"It is fitting, then, to begin my account of the structures of a visual phenomenal field with the organization of the sensuous surface; at bottom, colored spaces. The tensions of the colored planes are the felt correlatives of the differentiations perceived. These are given in every visual phenomenon, and it is to Merleau-Ponty's credit to have located these experiences in the body proper of the perceiving individual." (3, p. 55)

"The gamut of visibility may thus be conceived as a series of emergent strands of experience: the organization of a surface is itself meaningful—as significance is felt in the qualitative differentiations perceived in a visual field. And in non-objective paintings there is no other significance." (3, p. 56)

"But to call a painting, for example, a spatial arrangement of colors is systematically misleading, for we experience the spatial arrangement in terms of the intrinsic values of colors or forms used to arrange the spatiality of the painting. We are talking the physical language when we describe a painting as possessing reds and greens; we are using the aesthetic or phenomenological language when we describe the tensions created by juxtaposing a red and a green." (4, p. 30)
"An aesthetic context is composed of counters and their relations, either surface or surface and depth." (4, p.32)

"No aesthetic counter has absolute significance; i.e., each has only that significance which is made apparent by a relationship to some other counter within context." (4, p. 32)

"Once we have performed the reduction, we may observe the following sorts of counters. All works of art display some sort of organized sensuous surface, capable of expressing some sort of vague feeling or mood." (4, p. 32)

**DEPTH**

"...when the lines and forms of painting suggest recognizable forms of nature, when the masses and forces of structural concrete or steel permit and intensify the life within, the context of analysis must broaden to allow for the inclusion of this intellectual 'depth.' Representation of objects, suggestion of images, and conception of ideas—all depth qualities—may add considerably to and enrich the context of relatedness which is the artist's expression." (2, p. 293)

"But along with their perceptual values, be they aural or visual, one will find a second level of articulation; that of meaning. Any meanings represented constitute the depth of the work; and theoretically at least, there are no limits to the levels of meaning one can find as valid constituents of the aesthetic object." (2, p. 293)

**Objects**

"However, when the space tensions are modulated in such a way as to depict objects, the surface of our phenomenal, or lived, universe thickens, and a depth is represented." (3, pp. 55-6)

"But when surface tensions are set up in which represented objects appear, there emerges a second 'stratum' or strand of the experience. The meaning of these representations is given in their manner of depiction. This is clearer, perhaps, in abstract paintings than in realistic representations, since in the latter, ideas usually emerge in the pattern of relations obtaining between represented objects. Beyond this third strand a painting cannot function; any attempt to push the painter's art beyond the presentation of an idea is risking the possibility of losing contact with the sensuous surface, and of lapsing into insignificance." (3, pp. 56-7)
Ideas

"Ideas constitute the third and final stratum of the visual object; and these too may be traced back to the basic sensuous surface. They can be expressed, but only as a relationship between represented objects. And here again, there is no need to appeal to a realm of existents external to the system of relations set up within the universe of the painting; an experience of the painting is self-contained. A relationship between represented objects, the idea will not exist if the objects are not represented; and the objects cannot be represented in a visual medium without a basis in color perception."

(3, p. 56)

Images

"In addition, some works have surfaces so organized as to suggest further interpretation: an object may be represented, or an idea, by a relationship between represented objects; and ideas may call out further images, which are guaged to be relevant or irrelevant on the basis of their fittingness to the context being developed. We may refer to the representational elements—objects, ideas, and images—as experiential ‘depth.’"

(4, p. 32)

TOTAL EXPRESSIVENESS

"What cannot be translated into discursive concepts is the significance, which must be perceived to be understood."

(1, p. 353)

"Postulate 3. The aesthetic expressiveness of a work of art is the experience of the relatedness of the surface counters and their representations, out of which the total context is constructed." (2, p. 292)

"Being felt, or experienced, this expressiveness is not discursive; it is had or it is missed, but it cannot be rendered into words whose function it is to purvey information."

(2, p. 293)

"All the critic can do is to put a perceptive and imaginative individual into a receptive mood; he cannot verbalize the total expressiveness of the aesthetic object, which must be felt according to the patterning of human feeling determined by the textural-structural relations of the aesthetic context."

(2, p. 297)
"The significance of the context is the felt expressiveness of all the counters as they fund or come to closure in a single experience." (4, p. 32)

"And lastly, the total expressiveness of the representational piece will be found to be a functional relationship between the surface and depth counters of the context." (4, p. 32)

"According to the last postulate of contextual meaning, the significance of a work of art is precisely the felt expressiveness of the funding counters; and any verbal expression concerning the value of that expressiveness merely gives an added bit of information—that in the light of the given experience the counters had funded, or failed to do so, or tended to do so or not. Thus when we say a work is good, bad, or indifferent, we mean to convey the corresponding information concerning the functioning of aesthetic counters within the context in question." (4, p. 34)

"Aesthetic experiences are brought to closure by an act of perception which lays the groundwork for approval or disapproval; this, in turn, may be linguistically expressed." (4, p. 39)
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