

THE INTEGRATED APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF ART

TATYANA SHOPOVA

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR PHD
HEAD OF THE CENTER FOR NEW MEDIA AND DIGITAL CULTURE
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL STUDIES, FACULTY OF ARTS
SOUTH-WEST UNIVERSITY „NEOFIT RILSKI“, BLAGOEVGRAD

BULGARIA

TSHOPOVA9@GMAIL.COM

ABSTRACT: AT THE PRESENT STAGE OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT OF ART THE QUESTION IS CURRENTLY DISCUSSED. THIS KNOWLEDGE HOWEVER IS NOT A CONGLOMERATE FROM SCIENTIFIC INTERESTS OF THE VARIOUS SCIENCES, EACH OF ALL RESEARCHES FOR ITS PLACE IN ITS OWN SUBJECT. THERE IS SOME OTHER SYSTEM TOO FROM THE KNOWLEDGE, WHICH IS DEVOTED TO THE ART AS A UNIQUE SUBJECT, A SCIENCE WITH DEFINITE INTERNAL STRUCTURE, METHODS AND ALL NECESSARIES IN THIS CASE RELATED TO INTERNAL THEMATIC AND LOGIC CONNECTIONS.

THERE ARE MANY REASONS TO ASSERT THAT THE OPENING PANORAMA FROM SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF ART IS AN ORIGINAL SYSTEM, WHICH IS ORGANIZED OR SHOULD BE ORGANIZED, AT THE SAME TIME FROM A DIDACTIC POINT OF VIEW. IN THIS COMPLICATED TOTAL SYSTEM OF KNOWLEDGE COULD BE SHOWN BASIC COMPONENTS: ART KNOWLEDGE, WHICH GIVE SEPARATE PRIVATE SCIENCES IN SOCIAL SCIENCE AND NATURAL SCIENCE; THEORIES OR SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF ART; THEORIES AND COMPREHENSIONS, WHICH ARE DERIVED FROM ART PRACTICE; PHILOSOPHY OF ART AND AESTHETICS; THE LAST ONE IS ORGANICALLY CONNECTED WITH THIS SCIENCE.

KNOWLEDGE OF ART RECEIVED FROM VARIOUS SCIENCES, HOWEVER, SHOULD BE INTEGRATED. THE NEED FOR SUCH UNIFICATION IS DETERMINED BY THE SPECIFIC NATURE OF THE STUDIED OBJECT, BECAUSE ART AS A KIND OF ORGANIC PHENOMENON REQUIRES COMPLETE INTEGRITY AND KNOWLEDGE ABOUT IT.

THE MODEL OF INTERRELATED KNOWLEDGE OF ART COULD BE DEFINED AS "ART STUDIES". IN THAT WAY THE DISCUSSING PROBLEMS ABOUT THE CORRECTNESS OF TRADITIONAL CONCEPT "ART STUDIES" IN HANDS AS A SIMPLE SUM OF ALL SCIENCES AND THEORIES FOR DIFFERENT ARTS COULD BE TAKEN DOWN FROM THEIR DISCUSSIONS.

KEY WORDS: WORDS: ART, SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF ART, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO ART.

INTRODUCTION

The centuries-old effort to explain the art, along with all other results, demonstrated in an indisputable way the truth about its versatility. It is a complex and integral social phenomenon showing signs of different viewpoints. There are many reasons to consider art as a creative human activity and at the same time - as a form of social impact, as a kind of human communication, an emotional-aesthetic attitude of the human towards the surrounding world, a specific informational process, an effective educational instrument, etc. (Shopova, 2003).

THIS versatile feature of art turns it into a subject of attention by many and various sciences. As we know, sociological, psychological, theoretical and informational, educational and even many other areas of science and scientific knowledge are interested in it. Each one of these sciences and fields of science, which has included art in its subject, approached it from a certain perspective. Psychology examines the psychological laws and processes,

mainly of art creation and perception. The system of art activity, considered as a part of the social system, is investigated by the sociology, which wants to reveal as art genesis, as well as its functions in the society. Art can be considered as an educational instrument and thereby represents an interest for the pedagogic. Art as a specific sign system is a subject of study from a semiotic point of view. The investigation of the art system from an information point of view is a subject of information theory, which comprehends the art work as specific art emotional information about the corresponding addressee. Aesthetics explains the art as an aesthetical phenomenon, as a fullest expression of the aesthetical attitude. And so on.

WHEN studying and explaining the various features of art, however, the researcher cannot omit its integrity. The art structure is a dynamic system, not a mechanical unity or a simple sum of parts. Even Aristotle regarded art as something integral, parts of which are combined so that if one of them is moved or taken, the whole will be changed or shattered. Art represents an organic unity from functional perspective. Despite its versatility, art is and remains a "unity of diversity". It may be regarded as "a living organism", whose elements are arranged in a certain way according to certain objective laws determining its operation as a whole. After all, it is a complex and clearly specified structure in the spiritual life of humanity, which strengthened its position through the centuries.

IN today's stage of development of art scientific knowledge, however, this question is still being discussed of whether that knowledge is not a conglomerate of the scientific interests of the various sciences, each of which seeks the place of art in its own subject. Or together with this there is another system of knowledge, entirely devoted to art as a single subject, a science with a certain internal structure, methods and all necessary in such a case internal thematic and logical connections?

WITH the interest of the particular sciences (mainly of sociology) and the ambitions of aesthetics to implement the function of a complex art knowledge, in the scientific literature and scientific practice still continue to express themselves other intermediate sciences and scientific fields, which also claim its place in the system of knowledge of art. Some of them show a clear tendency to comprehensiveness or the reverse - to the striving to deny the need for such comprehensiveness. We are witnesses to events in the scientific literature, similar to its relation to the cultural studies, which is often presented only as applied knowledge or as a forced and abstract combination of knowledge about various cultural phenomena.

TO this, all we can add is the fact that almost every field of art now has as a scientific support its own theory or system of knowledge that sometimes are reasonably presented as separate studies in the system of science in general. We should only mention literary theory and musicology, along with a whole series of such scientific fields, to make sure that either separately or together this is a very thorough and extensive field that cannot be neglected by any author as a component of the overall system of cultural studies.

A reason to talk about such a system is that along with research activities regarding the art, the scientific knowledge about it is being completed, often very extensively, by different fields of art criticism - literary, music, theater, etc. To this, we can also add the whole series of studies on art and its nature carried out by its most prominent representatives (e.g. Eisenstein and Rene Claire in film-making, Leonardo da Vinci and Wassily Kandinsky in painting, Hugo or Tolstoy in literature, Kabalevsky in music, etc.).

IN short not only researchers or teachers, but even ordinary readers or lovers of art are facing a large and diverse body of scientific knowledge about art, which despite its diversity,

is not and cannot be an accidental co-existence or a mechanical accumulation of knowledge regarding its nature, occurrence and development.

FOR A SYSTEM OF THE SCIENCES OF ART

THERE are many reasons and grounds to argue that this panorama of knowledge is still a peculiar system and as such it is organized or can be organized including from a didactic perspective. This system of scientific knowledge of art has its methodological background.

AND the first element of this background is the truth about the objective correlation between the object and subject of research on the one hand, and the system of methods for its studying and explanation on the other.

IN today's epistemology the stipulation that in the same subject of knowledge the different sciences can separate their own specific aspects and features without revoking the opportunity to have a special science or scientific field for its versatile knowledge, is generally accepted. However there is another thing that is well known. The presence of such science does not exclude the possibility of another independent scientific interest of the other sciences. In the case of art that originates from its essence as an organized and developing organic whole.

HENCE arises another important conclusion – the sciences, which study art, are also a part of some particular scientific system where there are objectively determined links and relations between them. For example we can say with confidence that none of the isolated scientific methods of research of art is able to explain the artistic phenomenon as a whole. Only the synthesis of different viewpoints can provide a study of art in its integrity and dynamics. Sciences, which provide knowledge of one or another aspect of the art phenomenon, should perceive this as a major methodological principle which gives them beforehand a confidence that their specific features of art are a part of another greater and more systemic whole. As much as art really represents organic integrity, the interrelation and unity of the various sciences can turn out to be essential for its further profound scientific research.

THIS scientific prerequisite is crucial to the very artistic practice. And, of course, last but not least, it is crucial to art and culture education as a part of an overall system of spiritual reproduction of society.

TODAY'S development of scientific knowledge, distinguished not only by differentiation, but by the integration of different sciences, cannot reflect on the study of the nature of art. Reasonably its researchers face the problem of the complex (integrated) approach to this versatile, complex dynamic phenomenon. Art became the subject of research by various scientific disciplines. And this is completely understandable. The nature and specifics of art imposed the use of the integrated approach to it.

IN the complex study of art the convergence of aesthetics with other areas of scientific knowledge becomes possible. As shown above, the issues of artistic creativity and artistic perception can be studied with the help of sociology, psychology, semiotics and other formal sciences. Many processes and phenomena, which were part of the subject of traditional aesthetics and art studies, became the subject of research by other scientific disciplines, including disciplines which are far from aesthetics (mathematics, cybernetics, semiotics, theory of information, heuristics etc.). The research methods of these sciences became one

with the aesthetics, as well as new scientific concepts. In its interaction with the other areas of scientific knowledge, new borderline disciplines were formed.

THE comprehensive study of art non-accidentally became one of the main methodological principles of art studies. You could say that interest in contemporary issues of the integrated study of the art phenomena is more and more increasing. The concept, that if the idea of systematic, comprehensive approach to the study of art is not applied it will not be possible to fully disclose its complex versatile character and multi-structure, won recognition.

THIS is required by the very nature and structure of art. It is a complicated and versatile set that can not be scientifically formed and revealed without the active efforts and competence of the relevant sciences. The artistic creative work under the influence of present conditions of development of scientific knowledge became the subject of research in different aspects.

IN today's situation of study of art when more interest is shown towards science, the question of how to obtain the integrity, synthesis and particular knowledge of art becomes very important. Thus is arises the necessity of introducing order in the cumulative knowledge of art. An issue outlines of how to determine a systematic framework in which knowledge of art can be integrated. Transition from the analytical studies of various aspects of art to synthesis, to obtaining synthetic knowledge for studied object, is required. The issue that stands out is: is there such an art science which can be a systematized collection of individual knowledge given by the various art sciences? Can the sum of different approaches in the study of art outline its specificity?

THE methodological reflections of Weber (1998), concerning the objectivity of social-science knowledge are important for the successful settlement of these issues. According to him, the knowledge of cultural reality, which suggests the specific and "one-sided" points of view of the empirical knowledge, is determined by the researcher values and ideas. Without complying with the values and ideas that control the researcher and his age, there would be no selection principle of material and any meaningful knowledge of the particular truth. "It would be nonsense to imagine a system of culture sciences even as a definite, objectively valid, classifying fixing of the issues and areas subject to the examination..." (Weber, 1998: 57) The question that emerges to the researcher is – why the theory and the theoretical concepts of organizing knowledge of cultural reality are so important. We are not speaking of confrontation between "abstract"-theoretical method and empirical research but for achieving a synthesis, based on the building of "ideal types" (ratiocinations based on values), which add to the empirical a cognitive value and significance.

THE importance of the study of art concepts expressed by Weber is particularly clear, which attracts the efforts and methods of various formal sciences. We can certainly say that the meaning of systematic approach in the study of art is that when involving a certain stage of studying of aspects of various sciences, it does not to stop here, but goes further to research synthesis. This approach requires not only the differentiation of the art sciences, but also their integration and organic connection. Weber himself in his study "The Meaning of Value-freedom in Sociology and Economics" is indicating the way the empirical art history and empirical sociology of art approach to the artistic phenomena. For example, addressing to the art of Gothic architecture, art history and sociology of art reveal these factual, technical, social and psychological conditions of the new style, which puts an end to their purely empirical task. However they do not "appreciate" the architectural works, they do not see their aesthetic

value. According to Weber (1998) we can find similar processes in the history of music, painting, etc. "The complete detachment of the values from the empirical sphere is expressed characteristically through the fact that the use of certain ... technique tells us nothing about the aesthetic value of the painting ... in terms of empirical-causal examination, however, exactly the changes in the "technique" ... are the most important generally specified moment of development of art (p. 229-230). Based on this understanding of the empirical study of art, Weber concludes that this type of research of the works of art is impossible without aesthetic evaluation, i.e. without the foundation of the aesthetic experience. This idea of Weber lays the groundwork of our attempt to integrate the scientific knowledge about art.

THE separate art sciences can only enrich our knowledge of one or another aspect of this complex multilateral phenomenon. Individually they cannot embrace the fullness of art, which represents more than its parts.

NOT even one of the sciences with art as a subject of interest should bring any single part to its overall unity. And knowledge that it gives refers to certain aspects; it cannot be the sum of knowledge about the separate aspects which other art sciences give. Only the integrated approach, in which the integrity of the object is considered as a starting point setting the functional expedience of the parts, can lead to a synthetic knowledge of the art.

ART STUDIES AS A "COORDINATOR" OF THE DIFFERENT KNOWLEDGE OF ART

THE coordination of the variety of scientific approaches to the study of art arising from its multilateral nature, can be accomplished within the bounds of art studies, but not understood in the traditional sense as history and theory of art, but as a complete system of scientific knowledge about art. Art studies became an area of equal rights of scientific knowledge in the second half of the XIX century as a synthesis of history and theory of art. Nowadays, however, there is a process of not only expanding, but also deepening of both differentiation and integration of various branches of knowledge about art in the art studies themselves. The object is one - the art and the subjects are those parts of the object, which are involved in one or another field of the art. From this point of view results the differentiation of the subjects of various fields of art.

IN art studies can be identified two major strata: *horizontal* (it includes individual theories and history of the different types of arts - theory and history of literature, music, sculpture, painting, architecture, cinema, theater, etc.) and *vertical* (this includes the study of various aspects of art by different formal sciences - sociology of art, psychology of art, semiotics of art, etc.). Besides these two fields we talk about another, third field of art studies - *general theory of art* that can be identified with aesthetics, but only to some extent - namely as a science for the general laws of art.

AS it was already stressed, aesthetics is a broader subject of the general theory of art, as it explores various forms of aesthetic human perception of world, the whole set of aesthetic phenomena. Art as the supreme form of aesthetic consciousness of man and the aesthetic transformation of reality inevitably becomes a subject of aesthetics. While revealing the common principles of artistic creation and perception of art works, aesthetics forms general theory of artistic creativity and artistic perception. But aesthetics is not only a general theory of art, but also of other forms of aesthetic perception of human reality. Art studies, however, include only that part, which addresses the art and its general theory.

AESTHETICS is the science of the essence of aesthetic, namely the aesthetic is primarily providing unity among different types of arts; the common between them, the thing that unites them. Thus exactly aesthetics is the science that gives a comprehensive picture of art. In fact it is a cognitive image of its real integrity. Therefore, aesthetics can perform the function of general theory of art. Aesthetics, unlike other art sciences (which study particular features, special laws of development), examines the general qualities, indications and principles of historical development and functioning of art. That is why there is no need of a general theory of art, separate from the aesthetics.

BOTH art criticism and aesthetics have the same subject of study - art, but they differ. Theory and history of the various arts are individual sciences regarding aesthetics as they do not study the general (valid for all kinds of artistic works) in art and its specific manifestation in particular (as in music or literature or painting, etc.).

AESTHETICS is a science for aesthetic out of art. Not elsewhere but in the art, the aesthetic finds its most complete manifestation. From this viewpoint aesthetics emerged as a science primarily for aesthetic nature of art, for aesthetic value of artistic creations.

IN aesthetics art is considered as a kind of aesthetic activity and consciousness, which defines the close connection of the concepts of the aesthetic and specificity of art. The aesthetic is an ontological attribute of human interaction with the world; it is some kind of integrity, activity interrelation of the subject to the object. Examining the art in regard of the aesthetic science suggests both clarification in its artistic quality of a specific phenomenon (the reveal of this common point, which is inherent to all artistic works: features, content and form, part and whole, elements and structure, space and time, etc.) and its explanation, i.e. describing its essential characteristics (clarifying its relations with the reality of the life of society), which focuses the researcher attention primarily to reveal the connection artistic creativity - work - artistic perception of the system of art in its entirety.

WHEN explaining the nature of artistic phenomenon aesthetics necessarily turns to other sciences, which include art with one or another feature in the object of their research. Thus aesthetics analyzes the issues of artistic creativity and artistic perception with the help of sociology, psychology, semiotics and other sciences. But using their principles, aesthetics does not go beyond its subject, but goes deeper in it.

IN the outlined structure of art studies, there are two levels: the *general* and the *specific*. As a science for the general laws and categories of art, its development and nature, aesthetics is a field of the general in the system of art studies. The other art sciences, on one hand the formal sciences, which study certain aspects of the artistic object, and on other hand, history and theories of individual arts, are a field of the specific.

THE relation and interaction between art studies and other sciences develop in different ways: the first way is the use of the data, means and methods of other sciences by the art, the second way is the help provided to those sciences dealing with artistic creation in its special aspects, the third way is the systematic study of art in the interaction of the efforts of all sciences, which may participate to a certain degree in the study of this complex area of human spiritual life.

ART studies can enrich their methodology using the methods of exact art sciences. But the methods and the stipulations of those sciences when studying art require creative rethinking according to the nature of the subject taught. The question about the place and

limits of use of scientific research methods in modern art study is being examined according to the specificity of art itself and not abstractly. The individual methods of research that may be useful in clarifying certain aspects of art, if being left to methodological absolutization, miss the opportunity for true study of the object.

THE theoretical study of arts strives to reveal the specifics of one or another type of art, the laws of the genre or the genus, different art styles, methods and trends. It is interested in the relation between artistic and non-artistic in particular forms of art (the image of the three-dimensional object on the two-dimensional plane in the fine arts, in theory of literature - the problem of the relationship between prototype and type, natural and poetic language, in architecture - the problem of the relationship between utilitarian and artistic features). The integral approach in the study of art is urging us to see in theoretical study of arts, hypothetical as it is one transitive field of science, which can take the system of concepts necessary for the understanding of art works. Aesthetics as a general theory of art will play a methodological role in respect of art research.

THE historic study of art, which seeks to study the individual in art events, using various technical means in one or other art, individual representatives of schools, the creative biography of artists, experiences a need of aesthetics to enrich its theoretical and methodological approaches, in particular the development of ways and methods for typological study of artistic phenomena. It needs the aesthetic "value judgments" (Weber), for "understanding" the works of art.

CONCLUSION

IN summary, we can say that art, as a multilateral, but overall phenomenon, can be studied only in complex. The versatile structure of art is determined by the fact that art includes the reality as a source, the artist, creating artistic values and works of art as a result of artistic creativity, and the audience, creatively co-experiencing and participating in the foundation of the artistic world. This complex nature of art suggests an appropriate use of the achievements of various sciences, which using their means of knowledge refer to the study of one or another aspect of the artistic phenomenon. Only one science is not able to cover art as a whole. Each of the sciences, with art as a subject of interest, gives its contribution to the study of this complex phenomenon from one or another point of view.). Our confidence in the "over-empirical validity of the utmost and supreme valuable ideas ... doesn't eliminate the concrete points of view, which attach the importance to empirical reality, but even supposes that... ". M. Weber draws attention to the true mastership, which "consists in the ability of creating some new things, which base on the relationship of known facts to known points of view" (Weber, 1998: 83).

KNOWLEDGE of art received from various sciences, however, should be integrated. The need for such unification is determined by the specific nature of the studied object, because art as a kind of organic phenomenon requires complete integrity and knowledge about it.

STUDY of art can play the role of "coordinator" of different knowledge of art. While specifying the traditional definition of its structure we identify three main fields of study of arts: 1/ general theory of art (aesthetics), 2/ horizontal section (individual theories and stories of different types of arts) and 3/ vertical section (specific scientific knowledge about certain aspects of art). Regarding the horizontal and vertical layers in art, aesthetics adopts the function of a common methodology. Thus we arrive at the conclusion that not a single science, but namely the study of arts as a knowledge of art in general, as an total knowledge

can be extended to all sciences, which refer to studying the artistic object. In this sense, knowledge of art can be indicated by the term "*collective study of art*".

REFERENCES

1. **SHOPOVA, T. ,2003:** ART IN THE SYSTEM OF THE SCIENCES, BLAGOEVGRAD: UNIVERSITY PRESS "N. RILSKI"
2. **WEBER, M., 1998:** MEANING AND VALUE, SOFIA: CRITIQUE AND HUMANISM PUBLISHING HOUSE

SOCIOBRAINS