

UDC 82.0

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/1-2

ANNA STEPANOVA

*Doctor of Science in Philology, Full Professor,
European and Oriental Languages and Translation Department,
Alfred Nobel University (Dnipro)*

ILONA DOROHAN

*PhD in Philology, Assistant Professor,
Department of Fine Arts and Design,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University*

AESTHETIC VS ARTISTIC CONSCIOUSNESS: TYPOLOGY OF AESTHETICS AND LITERATURE INTERACTION

Метою роботи є дослідження специфіки естетичної і художньої свідомості в їх взаємодії в аспекті літературознавчого осмислення філософських понять; визначення рівнів взаємодії естетики і літератури як чинника формування естетичних домінант літературного напрямку і художнього методу. Спрямованість роботи обумовлює використання культурно-історичного, історико-літературного, філософсько-естетичного методів дослідження.

Під естетичною свідомістю розуміється модус інтелектуально-чуттєвого сприйняття і оцінки емпіричної дійсності, що обумовлює тип художньої свідомості і відображений у художньому творі. Виділяються три рівня співвідношення естетичної свідомості і дійсності: синкретичний, – на якому естетична свідомість змикається з емпіричною, а ідеал прекрасного відповідає науковим уявленням про навколишній світ і людину; дискретний, що акцентує певну автономність естетичної свідомості від емпіричної, її спрямованість на вираження якоїсь ідейної або ідеальної сутності; синтетичний, що представляє діалектичну взаємодію і взаємовплив естетичної і емпіричної свідомості, що народжує гармонію і цілісність змісту і форми.

Визначається специфіка взаємовідносин між естетичною і художньою свідомістю. Процес взаємодії естетичної і художньої свідомості як взаємодії естетики і літератури відбувається на двох рівнях. Перший рівень являє собою трансформацію системи естетико-філософських теорій і характеризує стан естетичної свідомості як сукупності естетичних поглядів епохи. Другий рівень характеризує процес переходу категорій художнього в загальнокультурне. Даний процес являє собою зміну світоглядних стереотипів, коли література, продукуючи власні духовні цінності і антицидентності, виявляється здатною переорієнтувати суспільну свідомість і суспільну психологію, формувати умонастрій, смаки, специфіку повсякденної культури.

У висновках наголошується, що зближення естетичної свідомості і літератури, актуалізація принципу можливостей, що почалися у добу романтизму, багато в чому визначили характер розвитку естетичної свідомості на межі XIX-XX ст., коли її взаємодія з літературою стає настільки щільною, що переходить в цілісність. Розмежування естетики і літератури практично зникає, відкриваючи новий етап культурної переорієнтації естетики і мистецтва.

Ключові слова: естетична свідомість, емпірична свідомість, Художня свідомість, естетичний образ, художня творчість, архітектонічна і композиційна форми, естетичний ідеал.

For citation: Stepanova, A., Dorohan, I. (2023). Aesthetic VS Artistic Consciousness: Typology of Aesthetics and Literature Interaction. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 2, issue 26/1, pp. 21-31, DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/1-2

One of the research problems of aesthetic consciousness in science is based on the correlation between aesthetic consciousness and reality (empirical consciousness), conditioned by the nature of the aesthetic ideal of the beautiful and its origin. It is conditionally possible to single out three levels of such relations: the *syncretic*, at which the aesthetic consciousness merges with the empirical, dissolving into reality, and the ideal of beauty corresponds to scientific ideas about the surrounding world and man. This level of relations is typical for ancient art, which, according to A.F. Losev, “is not even terminologically distinguished from craft and science – τέχνη” and “is not opposed to nature as a product of the free creative activity of the imagination, but is regarded as an imitation of it (*mimesis*), and the emphasis is placed on the coincidence of artistic work with natural phenomena”, and the aesthetic ideal is formed in accordance with scientific ideas about the abstract design of the classical body, i.e. with the doctrine of number, measure, rhythm, and harmony of the elements that make up the cosmic integrity. Thus, the aesthetic ideal of Antiquity is the ideal of “numerical harmony and corporeal symmetry” [Losev, 1970, p. 571], which is a plastic, corporeal essence. A similar trend, to a certain extent, applies to the aesthetics of the Renaissance, which is characterised by the resurrection of the ancient ideal and “the desire for a purely optical integrity and orderliness of the artistic image – the introduction of a linear perspective, the proclamation of the proportions of the human body as the canon of the artistic representation” [Losev, 1970, p. 571]. In addition, the Renaissance proclaimed the cult of the well-educated person and the priority of scientific knowledge, which closely links aesthetic consciousness with empirical and scientific consciousness and gives rise to the phenomenon of the ‘artist-scientist’ (Leonardo da Vinci, Leon Battista Alberti, Francis Bacon, Francois Rabelais, Erasmus of Rotterdam, etc.). The syncretic level of relations between aesthetic and empirical consciousness is also manifested in Baroque aesthetics, in which, according to A.V. Mikhailov, scientific and artistic are brought together, and the differences between them, as they appear in the texts, rest on the possible implicitness, undisclosedness of what could be called (conventionally) the artistic intent of the text; ...everything ‘artistic’ demonstrates the mystery by being likened to knowledge and the world – the world as necessarily including the secret, the unknown and the unknowable [Mikhailov, 1998]. The fusion of aesthetic consciousness and reality is characteristic of Classicism when the rationalistic tradition is seen as the aesthetic’s source, emphasising the aesthetic’s intellectual-cognitive, rational aspect [Losev, 1970, p. 571]; it also becomes relevant for the positivist basis of Naturalism when attempts are made to apply Darwin’s theory to aesthetics, and empirical theories explain aesthetic phenomena with the data of specific sciences – Literature and Art are put on a par with the Exact Sciences (Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry), as a result of which the data of specific sciences explain the aesthetic phenomena.

The *discrete* level of relations between aesthetic consciousness and reality reveals a certain detachment and autonomy of aesthetic consciousness from empirical consciousness, its orientation towards the expression of some ideological or ideal essence. In this case, the aesthetic ideal is characterised not by plasticity or corporeality but by expressing some out-of-body, spiritual content, which can be revealed only approximately symbolically in sensual perception. In this situation, the aesthetic value becomes the artistic form, which comes to the forefront. This type of relationship is characteristic of the aesthetics of the Middle Ages, in which “everything sensual not only in art but also in nature is only a reflection and representation (symbolic – A.S.) of the forbidden, supersensual world” [Losev, 1970, p. 571]. Aesthetic consciousness, therefore, is oriented not toward empirical reality but toward the otherworldly theistic ideal. A certain autonomy of aesthetic consciousness is characteristic of Romanticism, Symbolism, and some modernist styles, in which aesthetic consciousness and art give rise to an alternative artistic reality that reflects not historical reality but the inner cosmos of the individual, representing the highest aesthetic value (expressionism, stream of consciousness, etc.); or they absolutise the aesthetic sphere, which leads to the emergence of the theory of “art for art’s sake”, declaring artistic creativity as self-valuable and self-sufficient, opposing life and morality (aestheticism).

Finally, the third level of relations between aesthetic and empirical consciousness – the *synthetic* – is their dialectical interaction and mutual influence, giving rise to harmony and aesthetic value of the unity of content and form. In this case, a situation arises when, according to M.M. Bakhtin, no reality in itself, no neutral reality can be opposed to art: by the very fact that we talk

about it and oppose it to something, we somehow define and evaluate it; we only need to come to clarity with ourselves and understand the actual direction of our evaluation... Reality can be opposed to art only as something good or something true – beauty [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 284]. This type of relationship, it seems to us, became relevant in the Age of Enlightenment and Realism.

Thus, the types of relations between aesthetic and empirical consciousness are conditioned by the orientation of human perception, accentuation in the process of perception of reality of this or that value, which expresses a particular type of artistic consciousness and underlies the creative method. In this regard, it seems relevant to investigate the specifics of the interaction between aesthetic and artistic as the types of consciousness.

The *objective* of the work is to study the specifics of aesthetic and artistic consciousness in their interaction in terms of literary comprehension of philosophical concepts; to highlight the levels of interaction between aesthetics and literature as a factor in the formation of aesthetic dominants of the literary trend and creative method. The focus of the work determines the use of cultural-historical, historical-literary, philosophical, and aesthetic research *methods*.

The category of aesthetic consciousness in modern science is traditionally and firmly assigned to the sphere of aesthetics and philosophy. However, the existing inconsistency (inconsistency) of definitions and a certain one-sidedness, limited understanding of this phenomenon, allows us to assume that in the field of philosophy and aesthetics, the study of aesthetic consciousness, its separation as an independent concept is still under development. It seems that philosophers themselves also recognise this; for instance, V. Bychkov notes that “due to its extremely complex structure and functions, aesthetic consciousness has not reached the level of philosophical reflection for a long time” [Bychkov, 2007, p. 1115].

Literary theory, undoubtedly, recognises the conceptual closeness of the processes of mutual influence of aesthetics and art; however, while exploring the role and place of aesthetic categories (the beautiful, the ugly, the heroic, etc.) in literary analysis and comprehending the concepts of aesthetic value, aesthetic taste, aesthetic experience, aesthetic distance, etc. from the standpoint of literary studies, it essentially bypasses the category of aesthetic consciousness, basically leaving it outside its scientific interests, as it seems to us, undeservedly. It should be noted that at the present stage of science development, being a part (component) of methodological knowledge, the category of aesthetic consciousness acquires special significance for literary studies. In his time, speaking about the problem of the boundaries of cultural areas, M.M. Bakhtin noted that “a cultural area has no internal territory: it is all located on the boundaries, the boundaries pass everywhere, through every moment of it, the systematic unity of culture goes into the atoms of cultural life, as the sun is reflected in every drop of it. Every cultural act essentially exists on boundaries: that is, its seriousness and significance; detached from boundaries, it loses ground, becomes empty, arrogant, degenerates, and dies.... Only in its specific systematicity, i.e. in its direct relation and orientation in the unity of culture, does the phenomenon cease to be just a present, bare fact, then it acquires significance and meaning, becomes a kind of monad that reflects everything in itself, and is reflected in everything” [Bakhtin, 1990, pp. 282]. This relatedness in the unity of culture opens the boundaries of humanities knowledge, making it not only possible but also necessary to assimilate scientific terms, categories, and research methods into “neighbouring”, “frontier” scientific branches. Aesthetic consciousness, which finds its embodiment exclusively in artistic creation, in art (in our case, in literature), is such an act of culture and, as a scientific concept, “lives” on the boundaries of philosophy, aesthetics, and literary studies. Taking into account the direct influence of aesthetic consciousness on the formation of literary processes, the specificity of the creative method, the originality of the modelling principles of oral lore and the poetics of work of fiction, and, in a certain sense, the nature of the approach to the study of the literary text, we believe it is relevant to clarify the meaning and specificity of this category and to outline the ways of researching aesthetic consciousness in literary studies.

In 1922, M.I. Kagan, in an article dedicated to the memory of Hermann Cohen, wrote, “For aesthetics to be independent, it must also have its own clear special *kind of consciousness*” [Kagan, 1922, p. 119]. At the same time, M.M. Bakhtin, considering aesthetic perception as a “recognised and evaluated by an act” comprehension of reality [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 283], reveals the anthropological prerequisites of aesthetic thinking at the level of the ‘author-hero’ relationship,

defining aesthetic consciousness as “loving and value-based consciousness; aesthetic consciousness is a consciousness of consciousness, the author’s consciousness as the ‘I’ of the character’s consciousness — the ‘other’, in an aesthetic event we have a meeting of two consciousnesses, fundamentally inseparable, and the author’s consciousness relates to the hero’s consciousness not from the point of view of its subject composition, subject-objective significance, but from the point of view of its vital subjective unity, and this hero’s consciousness is concretely localised, embodied and lovingly completed. The author’s consciousness, like the epistemological consciousness, is incomplete” [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 161].

The mention of aesthetic consciousness is found in the later writings of B. Croce in the context of understanding aesthetics as a science of intuitive or expressive cognition [Croce, 1999, pp. 401–402]; in the works of J. Mukařovský, who singles out the moment of subjectivation in the aesthetic, the intensity of the impact of an object on consciousness [Mukařovský, 1970, p. 19–20]; in the studies of R. Ingarden, who claims that an aesthetic object is constructed from consciousness, freely created by consciousness [Ingarden, 1985, pp. 133–135], in the works on ancient aesthetics by A.F. Losev, who treats aesthetic consciousness as “the identity of ‘knowledge’ and ‘opinion’, ‘knowledge’ and ‘sensuality’, or, generally speaking, the identity of the meaningful and the nonsensical, rational and irrational, ideal and real” [Losev, 2000, p. 482].

Modern definitions of aesthetic consciousness are based on the traditional understanding of the aesthetic as “sensually perceived..., a special kind of emotionally-evaluating human mastering of reality” [Khalisev, 2000, p. 16] and emphasise the sensual side of the aesthetic. Thus, A.L. Zolkin defines aesthetic consciousness as a holistic, emotionally rich reflection of reality in the unity of its essential definitions and sensual uniqueness. The peculiarity of aesthetic consciousness is its emotional character. In aesthetic consciousness, there is a sensual reflection of the universality and personal meaning of all phenomena of reality [Zolkin, 2008]. The specificity of aesthetic consciousness, Ye.G. Yakovlev notes, is the perception of being and all its forms and types in the concepts of aesthetics through the prism of the *aesthetic ideal*. The aesthetic consciousness of each era absorbs all the reflections on beauty and art that exist in it. It includes common ideas about the nature of art and its language, artistic tastes, needs, ideals, aesthetic concepts, artistic judgments, and criteria formed by aesthetic thought [Yakovlev, 2001, p. 302].

The psychological approach in the interpretation of aesthetic consciousness is found in the concept of V.V. Bychkov, who considers this category as “a set of reflective verbal information related to the sphere of aesthetics and the aesthetic essence of art, plus a realm of spiritual-subconscious, typically non-verbalised or difficult to verbalise processes that make up the essence of a person’s aesthetic experience or a certain sociocultural community” [Bychkov, 2007, p. 1115].

In the philosophical interpretation of aesthetic consciousness that has developed in science as a subjectively sensual perception of reality, in our opinion, two essential points are missed, which appear to be very significant for literary studies. Firstly, like aesthetic activity, aesthetic consciousness transubstantiates itself and is embodied exclusively in art. As the basis of artistic consciousness, it determines the critical function of aesthetic activity: creating a new vision of the world as a different reality. “The artist and art in general”, M.M. Bakhtin noted, “create a completely new vision of the world, the image of the world, the reality of the mortal flesh of the world, which none of the other cultural and creative activities knows” [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 248]. In this other reality, aesthetic consciousness gives rise to the image of the world’s unity, “linking culturally all supra-individual values” [Kohn, 1921, p. 223]. Such an approach to the aesthetic as an extraordinary (other) reality determines the connection between aesthetic and artistic consciousness, in which, according to B. Christiansen, “by reincarnating, an individual expands the value of his self, joins from within the humanly significant” [Christiansen, 1911, p. 153].

It is important to note that the significance of the cultural function of aesthetic consciousness lies not only in the fact that it, conditioning the orientation of artistic consciousness, produces artistic values and not only in the very possibility of creating a different, artistic reality but also in the aesthetic systematicity and orderliness that characterise the aesthetic perception of empirical reality. The result of aesthetic activity is embodied in a work of fiction design of external and internal, phenomenon and essence in the relationship between form and content, the structure of the architectonics of the work of fiction. Here lies a distinctive feature of aesthetic activity – the creation of artistic reality as a transformation, pre-embodiment of the empirical

– as “overcoming the material” through “*immanent improvement* in a certain, necessary direction” [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 250]. The struggle with the material and its overcoming, according to B. Eikhenbaum, is the central moment of artistic creation [Eikhenbaum, 1987, pp. 326–327]. Furthermore, in this sense, we can say that there is an overcoming of the chaos of empirical reality in aesthetic consciousness.

Secondly, it is crucial to consider that aesthetic consciousness is, initially, *consciousness*, i.e. the ability *to be aware* of an object (according to Hegel). The activity of consciousness, emphasises A. Spirkin, is primarily aimed at cognition. It is manifested in the selectivity and purposefulness of perception, in the abstracting activity of thought, in acts of fantasy, and in productive imagination associated with creating new ideas and ideals [Spirkin, 1988, p. 243]. In this regard, M.M. Bakhtin insisted that aesthetic reality is a “reality that is recognised and evaluated by ethical action” [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 283]. The importance of the intellectual element in aesthetic consciousness was also emphasised by T. Adorno, “The pure immediacy of feeling is no longer sufficient to comprehend aesthetic experience. Along with involuntariness, it also needs a conscious volitional effort, a concentration of consciousness” [Adorno, 2004, p. 103].

Considering the above, we propose to define aesthetic consciousness as a mode of intellectual-sensory perception (and assessment) of empirical reality, which determines the type of artistic consciousness and is reflected in a work of art. In the aesthetic consciousness, which indirectly produces an artistic image, according to P. Natorp, the conflict between cognitive and ethical is overcome [Natorp, 1911, p. 64], and in this sense, the artistic image appears as “the very mode of existence of a work taken from the side of its expressiveness, impressive energy and significance” [Rodnyanskaya, 2003].

The relationship between subject and object within the aesthetic as an interaction between the properties of empirical reality and the characteristics of the perceiving consciousness is projected onto the relationship between man and the (surrounding) world reflected in the artistic work, implicating in the text the peculiarities of the author’s consciousness. These relations entail “not only the spatial and psychological distance between subject and object (*externality*) but also their internal affinity and organic connection (*belonging*)” [Khalizev, 2000, p. 25]. A work of fiction resolves “the objective problem of aesthetics, its idea – the man of nature and the nature of man” [Kagan, 1922, p. 119]. Man appears as the centre of aesthetic vision, and in this sense, the idea of man’s place in the space of being is refracted in aesthetic consciousness.

In a work of fiction, aesthetic consciousness is revealed as a form of intellectual and spiritual activity, which, guided by value-normative criteria, is oriented towards recreating and transforming empirical reality and space.

Aesthetic consciousness is a complex organisation of sensory and thought processes implemented at the level of a literary text, of which the most important is *contemplation*, which is a form of direct contact with empirical reality; *perception, and assessment*, revealing the reaction to this reality and the level of compliance/non-compliance with social and personal moral and ethical imperatives rooted in the consciousness; and *embodiment* – the transubstantiation of these processes in a work of fiction. At the level of artistic creation, these processes are realised in the triad: *concept – idea – text*.

At the same time, aesthetic consciousness has a complex structure in which two levels closely interact: *receptive* (objective-systemic) and *poetological* (subjective-personal). The receptive level is based on the gradation of relations in the system of the *author – work – recipient*, on which the three-member scheme of the aesthetic process proposed by H.R. Jaus is projected, including *poiesis* (from Greek – to make, to produce), which correlates with the “producing consciousness”, realising the process of “creating the world as one’s own work”; *aesthesis* (from Greek – sensation, feeling), related to the perceptive consciousness, in which “the pleasure of cognitive vision and visual recognition” causes aesthetic pleasure; at this level, human perception reaches ever new heights of sublimity and intensity. Finally, the third component, *catharsis* (from the Greek – purification), represents the intersubjective phase of the aesthetic process, where the recipient directly enters the “realm of the other” and relates themselves to the other’s action [Jaus, 1982, p. 62].

The poetological level, realised directly in the process of artistic creation, includes the main components of aesthetic consciousness, which are projected onto some aspects of the content-

formal structure of the work: *thoughts* (the idea of the work); *feelings, emotions* (modes of artistry); *imagination*, which is the initial stage of the creation of an artistic image at the moment when “in the same movement of our consciousness the perception of bodily existence and a vague image of the ideal are combined” [Ortega y Gasset, 2000, p. 99], in this sense, interpreting the concept of A.P. Chudakov, an artistic image is a verbal embodiment of the artist’s mental representation of a real object, phenomenon, event, etc. [Chudakov, 1986, p. 265]; at last, *intuition* is “an immediate sense of truth as the basis for the excellence of an aesthetic judgment or artistic work, unmediated by discourse”. Artistic intuition, while being an essential factor of the creative process, reveals the criterion of truth and, as a result, the value of the work because, according to N. Lossky, it is “a special ability of direct contemplation of objects ‘in the original’, i.e. as they are in themselves, without any added ‘subjective admixtures’ of creative explications and evaluative actions. Only intuition allows us to grasp in the object of knowledge the main thing that constitutes its essence and that, as a rule, is hidden from the senses and reason” [Lossky, 1919].

The complex structure of aesthetic consciousness, connected with the specificity of perception and reflection of reality, determines its most crucial function: producing an aesthetic image of reality and in the “development” of the aesthetic ideal and its criteria.

In modern literary studies, it is common to believe that the aesthetic image finds its embodiment in the artistic image of a literary work. At the same time, there is the fact that there is no consensus in science on the relationship between the aesthetic and the artistic – which of these concepts is primary and which is derivative? Which of them is more voluminous, and which is narrower? Researchers note that the discussion of how the concepts of “aesthetic” and “artistic” should be correlated has a forty-year history in aesthetics. Nevertheless, the remark made by A.N. Iliadi in the first years of the discussion and emphasised by M.B. Glotov is still relevant, “the substitution of the concepts of aesthetic and artistic still takes place” [Glotov, 1999, p. 27].

It seems essential to us to touch upon this issue because the discussion about the relationship between the concepts of aesthetic and artistic, in fact, is the problem of correlation of aesthetic and artistic consciousnesses, which is relevant to our work.

In this discussion, we will emphasise two points of view. The first one points out that the notion of “aesthetic” is broader than “artistic” and, accordingly, primary. A.F. Losev argued that the aesthetic is broader than the artistic since it can refer to nature, society, and human personality, while the artistic refers only to the objects of human creativity – works of art. The aesthetic is the direct expressiveness of any phenomena of reality, and the artistic is a specific human embodiment of the aesthetic in this or that specific material [Losev, 1970, p. 576]. M.M. Bakhtin adhered to a similar point of view, arguing that the artistic is a form of embodiment of the aesthetic: “Aesthetic vision finds its expression in art, in particular in verbal artistic creation” [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 246]. In this sense, a parallel can be drawn between the relationship between aesthetic and artistic consciousness and the architectonic and compositional forms singled out by M. Bakhtin, “Architectonic forms, the essence of the forms of the soul and bodily value of the aesthetic man, the forms of nature... are the forms of aesthetic being in its uniqueness. The compositional forms that organise the material have a teleological, as if restless character and are subject to... evaluation: to what extent they adequately fulfil the architectonic task. The architectonic form determines the choice of the compositional form” [Bakhtin, 1990, p. 278]. Thus, according to M. Bakhtin’s concept, the artistic is secondary, derived from the aesthetic. This idea is developed by L.V. Chernets, noting that the aesthetic as an emotional reflection, primary experience, is the spiritual source of the creation of works of art (i.e. artistic). Artistic is a secondary experience, mediated (for example, by genre tradition, style, etc.) [Chernets, 2004, p. 16]. In this sense, artistic consciousness is an imaginative experience of the aesthetic; it is an “experience of experience”, giving rise to a situation in which aesthetic consciousness defines the artistic through given aesthetic norms.

At the same time, the proponents of this point of view strictly distinguish the aesthetic as an independent and self-sufficient category from the categories of cognitive, ethical, and metaphysical, which are covered by artistic consciousness. This premise gives rise to an opposite view of the problem, allowing us to assert that the artistic is broader than the aesthetic by its ability

ty to create a new vision, a new image of the world by synthesising and evaluatively transforming cognitive, ethical, and metaphysical moments. This point of view emerged in the 1920s and finds its development today. In 1922, V. Sezemanas emphasised that every artistic work contains not only aesthetic but also other non-aesthetic values (moral, cognitive, etc.), and, therefore, it is necessary to make an appropriate assessment [Sezemanas, 1922, p. 141]. In the same direction was developed the thought of M.I. Kagan, who argued that the natural (cognition) as content becomes available to human consciousness as a result of activity (in art) in the form of spatial and temporal forms, historical – in the form of mythological schemes [Kagan, 1995, p. 54]. In addition, the fact that artistic consciousness is inseparable from the process of artistic creation gives scientists a reason to include the metaphysical level in the structure of artistic consciousness, which needs to be more clearly expressed in aesthetic consciousness. Thus, it is argued that the artistic is broader than the aesthetic because artistic creativity, particularly literary creativity, as an act of realising artistic consciousness, includes the divine principle.

Such reasoning allows us to assume that artistic consciousness is primary and its type, as V. Dianova notes, is determined by the author's worldview and dictates a particular aesthetic attitude to reality, the way of its comprehension and reflection dictates the very artistic dominant that organises the poetics of the work as a whole [Dianova, 2001, p. 293].

The function of art is not limited to reflecting the real world and "explaining life". It is much deeper and more complex. While modelling a different reality, artistic consciousness reveals a contradictory, sometimes paradoxical relationship with empirical consciousness. As T. Adorno noted, a work of art becomes related to the world by the principle of contrasting with the world, thanks to which the spirit created the world [Adorno, 2004, p. 14]. Artistic consciousness, thus, is a way of understanding and perceiving reality, which reflects the need of the individual to transform the world, "to change the world for oneself and oneself for the world". In this sense, literature is "the reorganisation of the world from within, often ahead of the understanding of the purpose of such reorganisation by the reader, and in some cases by the author himself" [Schechter, 2001, p. 324]. Thus, artistic consciousness is entrusted with the critical task of forming new perceptions of reality, laying down new aesthetic values, stereotypes of thinking and behaviour, and ways of cognition of the world. In her work "On the Edge and Through the Edge", N.A. Yastrebova mentions that D. Blagoy at one time thought about A. Einstein's acknowledgement that he owed the creation of his theory of relativity to the work of Dostoevsky to a greater extent than the scientific work of physicists and mathematicians. What Dostoevsky discovered to Einstein, according to N. Yastrebova, was the ability to feel, to represent reversible structures of transformations and limit states, threshold minutes. Dostoevsky's art invested Einstein and his generation with the ability to allow the "invisible", the energies of extremes, and through their paradoxes to discover new active possibilities not only of humans but also of analogous physical beginnings [Yastrebova, 2002, p. 162].

It seems to us that both aspects of the study of the problem of the relationship between the aesthetic and the artistic are equally justified and logical in their conclusions. To put it simply, both are right. Empirical, aesthetic, and artistic consciousnesses are closely interrelated, and it is challenging to define and establish once and for all the primacy of one over the other. In A.P. Chudakov's statement, "the birth of an artistic object is the meeting of an ideal representation with an empirical object" [Chudakov, 1986, p. 265], this relationship and interdependence are apparent. On the one hand, the aesthetic image (ideal representation) is primary; on the other – the essence of empirical reality and its aesthetic perception is transferred in the analysis from the artistic object, not from the empirical one, since the aesthetic image, as well as the essence of aesthetic consciousness, can be revealed, defined, investigated, endowed with meaning, etc. only when it is embodied, materialised in the artistic work, in the artistic image.

In our opinion, the answer to the question, "is artistic consciousness determined by aesthetic consciousness, or, on the contrary, do the aesthetic views of the era originate in art and are determined by artistic consciousness?" is ambiguous and lies in the plane of dialectics and the sphere of formation of aesthetic values and the ideal of the beautiful. The birth of the aesthetic ideal is a rather complex process, connected, as it seems to us, with the accentuation in the art of this or that object of reality, turning it into an aesthetic value. "In Dutch still life", notes N. Hartmann, "appear as essential subject details of light shades and tones, which usually re-

main unnoticed in themselves... Unnoticed in ordinary life is worth being noticed. It is the beautiful itself, and only the ordinary superficial glance glides past it; the aesthetic point of view, art makes it obvious" [Hartman, 2004, p. 80]¹, in other words, artistic consciousness shapes aesthetic perception.

It is important to emphasise here that this process is historical and connected with the development of aesthetics as an independent field of knowledge. Conventionally, we can distinguish two essential periods in the history of aesthetic thought – from Antiquity to the 18th century and from the 18th century to the 20th century. These two periods correspond to two types of cultural consciousness, identified by P.A. Sorokin: the first – “ideational”, and the second – “visual” or “sensual”. “One”, notes P.A. Sorokin, “is ‘transcendental’, the other ‘empirical’ and ‘naively realistic’”. One lives in the supersensory world of Being, the other in the sensate world of Becoming. One is symbolic in its striving to depict by ‘visible signs the invisible world’, the other is ‘impressionistic’ and ‘illusionary’. One is static because the world of Being is unchangeable and remains always equal to itself, like Plato’s Idea or the believer’s God, or the philosopher’s Ultimate Reality. The other is dynamic by its very nature because its sensate world is changing incessantly” [Sorokin, 2017, p. 83].

Until the 18th century, aesthetics was regarded as the “periphery” of philosophy. In this period, aesthetic consciousness acted as a vector of cultural orientation, and the aesthetic ideal was postulated “from the outside” and “transferred” from philosophy to the sphere of Art, becoming fixed in it and legitimising normativity in artistic creation. Generally, it was a period of “material selection”, the accumulation of aesthetic knowledge based on religious or moralising principles. The situation changed in the 18th century when aesthetics “transcended” the “ideational” consciousness and stood out as an independent science. In 1735, A. Baumgarten, in “Reflections on Poetry”, for the first time introduced the word “aesthetics” into scientific usage and for the first time put forward the idea of aesthetics as a particular philosophical science, thus designating the theory of the liberal arts, inferior gnoseology, the art of thinking beautifully, the art of the analogue of reason, and defining aesthetics as the science of sensible cognition. The goal of aesthetics, according to Baumgarten, is the perfection of sensual cognition as such, such perfection being beauty. Aesthetics thus emphasises the sensual as a free, subjective perception conditioned by the laws of scientific theory. Baumgarten’s concept opened new opportunities in the study of art, expanded the range of problems of aesthetics, brought to a new level the concept of aesthetic consciousness, giving the latter a scientific and philosophical validity, contributed to its convergence with artistic consciousness and the formation of its understanding as a set of aesthetic views of the era.

The process of interaction between aesthetic and artistic consciousness as the interaction between aesthetics and literature takes place at two levels. The first level represents the transformation of the system of aesthetic-philosophical theories and characterises the state of aesthetic consciousness as a set of aesthetic views of the epoch. It is important to note that in the early 19th century, the interaction between aesthetics and literature caused a significant growth in the development of aesthetic thought, a “surge” of aesthetic consciousness and outlined the ways of forming its various modifications, which will be developed at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries. Based on the experiments of artistic consciousness embodied in the literature of the 19th century, aesthetic theories were created, the main feature of which, according to O. Krivtsov, was that “they no longer sought to embody aesthetic knowledge within the framework of universal systems with internal unity. Most of them are open concepts, free from static architectonics and not limited by a logically verified construction; theories of art that always leave an intuitively comprehensible backlash in their interpretations” [Krivtsov, 2000]. In our opinion, another feature of these concepts was their chronological distance concerning the processes that

¹ We find similar reasoning in G. Amelin, “You are walking down the street and suddenly meet someone – ah! – Renoir’s woman. But where is she, this Renoir woman? In the imagination of an artist named Renoir? But he passed away a long time ago! And this lady does not remain in the painting. Now you see what is there (in Montmartre, anywhere) in the most objective, most real way. And before Renoir, you could not see it. And now it is visible, distinguished, essentially revealed, pulled into the light of day (and will not go back into the darkness). Consciousness is, generally speaking, the experience of distinction” [Amelin, 2005, p. 63].

were taking place in literature. Here, it is meant that aesthetic manifestos, substantiating the principles of artistic movements and actually proclaiming specific trends in literature, usually appear *following* literary works that have outlined these trends (V. Hugo's lyrical collection "Odes and Ballads", in which he declares himself a Romantic poet, was published in 1826, and the Preface to the drama "Cromwell", perceived as a manifesto of French Romanticism, was in 1827; the first edition of W. Wordsworth and S.T. Coleridge's "Lyrical Ballads" is dated 1798, and the preface to them, presented as an aesthetic manifesto of English Romantics, was published in 1800; E.T.A. Hoffmann's first novella "Ritter Gluck", reflecting the writer's aesthetic views, was written in 1808, and the dialogue "The Poet and Composer" and the article "The Extraordinary Suffering of a Theater Director", where the theory of these principles is expounded, were published in 1813 and 1819, respectively; then came the collection by the Grimm brothers "Children's and Household Tales" (1812–1814) and "German Legends" (1816–1818) – and J. Grimm's scholarly work "German Mythology" – in 1835, etc. The same trend can be observed in the second half of the 19th century: É. Zola's first naturalistic novel "Thérèse Raquin" was first published in 1866, and the preface to it, substantiating the principles of Naturalism as a literary movement, was only published in 1867 in the second edition; A. Rimbaud concluded his poetic career in the mid-1870s and only in 1886, already working as a merchant in Ethiopia, read in the newspaper the "Symbolist Manifesto" published by J. Moréas. Researchers claim that Rimbaud was stunned when he learned he was considered the founder of one of the most influential aesthetic movements at the turn of the century. Similar examples, presented as a trend, not only indicate that from the beginning of the 19th century, aesthetic constants were forming in literature but also that in the 19th century, aesthetics moved beyond the realm of philosophers and became the prerogative of artists themselves – they were the ones who developed aesthetic theories, leading to a close convergence of aesthetic consciousness and literature.

The second level of interaction between aesthetic consciousness and literature is characterised by the process of "the transition of the artistic to the general cultural", involving a change in worldview stereotypes when literature, producing its own spiritual values and anti-values, turns out to be able to reorient public consciousness (in some instances, even scientific) and public psychology, to shape the mindset, tastes, and specifics of everyday culture. The prerequisite for these trends, it seems, is the process of levelling the boundaries between artistic and non-artistic realities, which began in Romantic literature. A situation has arisen when, according to N. Khrenov, "Non-artistic reality strives to obtain the status of artistic one. When the traditional boundaries and criteria of artistry are destroyed, the boundaries of art and life change. Life itself begins to be organised and perceived according to the laws of art" [Khrenov, 1994, p. 41]. An example can be found in the transition from Romanticism to a worldview that shaped a distinct model of behaviour and perception, which continued to "live" in the latter half of the 19th century. G. Flaubert vehemently protested against this, stating that the contemporary youth, who formed their ideas of the world from Romantic literature, turned out to be unviable because these ideas had nothing to do with actual reality ("Madame Bovary"). The aesthetics of Romanticism permeated everyday life, forming the "framework of salon-bourgeois customs" in the latter half of the 19th century. It also extended into the realm of science, as evidenced by the treatise "Physics as Art" by I.V. Ritter and "Philosophy of the Common Cause" by N.F. Fedorov, where political economy interacts with the mysticism of the afterlife, etc.

It is worth mentioning another cultural phenomenon, now recognised in modern science as the concept of a "universal metaphor". It refers to a cultural phenomenon or an object from the real world that, initially conceived by artistic consciousness, later transitions from literature into other spheres of activity and becomes established there. An example of this is the "cabinet of curiosities", which was initially depicted as an antique shop in Balzac's "The Wild Ass's Skin", then described as a store and an economic concept in K. Marx's "Critique of Political Economy" [Postoutenko, 2002].

The convergence of aesthetic consciousness and literature and the actualisation of the principle of possibilities that began in the Romantic era largely predetermined the development of aesthetic consciousness at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, when their interaction became so intertwined that it formed a unity. The distinction between aesthetics and literature practically disappeared, ushering in a new stage of cultural reorientation for aesthetics and art.

References

- Adorno, Th. (2004). *Aesthetic Theory*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Amelin, G. (2005). *Lectures on the Philosophy of Literature*. Retrieved from https://www.e-reading.life/bookreader.php/94501/Amelin_
- Bakhtin, M. & M. Holquist, V. Liapunov (Eds.) (1990). *Art and Answerability*. Austin: Texas University Press.
- Bychkov, V.V. (2007). *Aesthetic Consciousness. Lexicon of Nonclassics. Artistic and Aesthetic Culture of the XX Century*. Retrieved from <https://booksonline.com.ua/view.php?book=142368&page=278&ysclid=lmxcxj17b5627906192>
- Chernets, L.V. (2004). *Introduction to Literature Studies*. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-Smc1IN2qUVSqrz7OoAjgbBeRw1V7Enr/view>
- Christiansen, B. & Fedotov, G. (Transl.). (1911). *Philosophy of Art*. Saint Petersburg: Shipovnik Publishing House.
- Chudakov, A.P. (1986). *Subject World of Literature*. M.B. Khrapchenko (Ed.). *Historical Poetics: Results and Prospects of Study* (pp. 251-291). Retrieved from https://biblio.imli.ru/images/abook/teoriya/istoricheskaya_poetika_itogi_i_perspektivy_izuche.pdf
- Cohn, J. (1921). *General Aesthetics*. Moscow: State Publishing House.
- Croce, B. (1999). *Aesthetics*. S. Maltseva (Ed. and Transl. from Italian), *Anthology of Works in Philosophy* (pp. 399-450). Saint Petersburg: Pneuma.
- Dianova, V.M. (2001). *Art as modeling of the world pictures*. *Symposium*, 12, 290-294.
- Eikhenbaum, B.M. (1987). *On Literature: Works of Different Years*. Retrieved from https://imwerden.de/pdf/eichenbaum_o_literature_1987__ocr.pdf
- Glotov, M.B. (1999). *Aesthetic and artistic*. *Symposium*, 1, 27-29.
- Hartmann, N. (2014). *Aesthetics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ingarden, R. (1985). *Selected Papers in Aesthetics*. München: Philosophia Verlag.
- Jauss, H.R. & Shaw, M. (Transl.). (1982). *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kagan, M.I. (1922). *Hermann Cohen*. *Scientific News*, 2, 110-124.
- Kagan, M.I. (1995). *Two aspirations of Art (Form and Content; Pointlessness and Plot)*. *Philosophical Sciences*, 1, 47-61.
- Khalisev, V.E. (2000). *Literary Theory*. Retrieved from https://modernlib.net/books/halizev_v/teoriya_literaturi/read?ysclid=lmzv4x243w720476440
- Khrenov, N.A. (1994). *Culturological Aspect of the Artistic Process of the Twentieth Century*. A.Ya. Zis (Ed.), *Modern Art Studies. Methodological Issues* (pp. 29-50). Moscow, Science Publ.
- Krivtsov, O.A. (2000). *Aesthetics*. Retrieved from <https://reallib.org/reader?file=527866&ysclid=lmxb1v5h7y247776760>
- Losev, A. (1970). *Aesthetics*. Retrieved from <https://1092.slovaronline.com/1367-эцменука?ysclid=lmzd0ihhnc209502971>
- Losev, A. (2000). *The History of Classical Aesthetics. Sophists. Socrates. Plato*. Retrieved from https://imwerden.de/pdf/losev_istoriya_antichnoj_estetiki_tom2_ysclid=lmzcppqoa5940456074
- Lossky, N. (1919). *The Intuitive Basis of Knowledge: an Epistemological Inquiry*. London: Macmillan & Co, Limited.
- Mikhailov, A.V. (1998). *The Poetics of the Baroque: the End of the Rhetorical Era*. Retrieved from <http://17v-euro-lit.niv.ru/17v-euro-lit/articles/mihajlov-barokko.htm?ysclid=lmxasqgmhi869234064>
- Mukařovský, J. & Suino, M.E. (Ed. and transl.). (1970). *Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value as Social Facts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Natorp, P. (1911). *Philosophical propaedeutics: General introduction to philosophy and basic principles of logic, ethics and psychology*. Moscow: N.N. Klochkov Publ.
- Ortega y Gasset, H. (2000). *Aesthetics in the Tram*. Retrieved from http://rebels-library.org/files/philosophy_of_culture.pdf
- Postoutenko, K. (2003). *Sale at the Cabinet of Curiosities: The Images of Economic Totality in Balzac, Dickens, Marx and Chesterton*. *New Literary Review*, 58, 74-83.
- Rodnyanskaya, I.B. (2003). *Image*. Retrieved from <https://slovar.cc/enc/bse/2057046.html>

Sezemanas, V.E. (1922). Aesthetic Evaluation in the History of Art (Connection Between the History of Art and Aesthetics). *Thought. Journal of Philosophy Society*, 1, 117-147.

Shekhter, T.E. (2001). Dynamics of Artistic Consciousness. *Symposium*, 12, 323-326.

Sorokin, P. (2017). *Social and cultural dynamics: A study of change in major systems of art, truth, ethics, law and social relationships*. New-York: Routledge.

Spirkin, A.G. (1988). *Fundamentals of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://djvu.online/file/PSumOo9IV75Hq?ysclid=lmzuz3elnw166158673>

Yakovlev, Ye.G. (2011). *Aesthetics*. Retrieved from <https://djvu.online/file/zCcSpGOYI01Yn?ysclid=lmzvugs15p991560997>

Yastrebova, N.A. (2002). On the Edge and Through the Edge. *Trends of Art Consciousness of the XX Century*. N. Khrenov (Ed.), *Art in the Situation of Changing Cycles: Interdisciplinary Aspects of Research of Artistic Culture in Transition Processes* (pp. 161-168). Retrieved from <https://paraknig.me/view/1851066?ysclid=lmzwb4kuxt964949060>

Zolkin, A.L. (2008). *Aesthetics*. Retrieved from <https://studref.com/558283/kulturologiya/estetika>

AESTHETIC VS ARTISTIC CONSCIOUSNESS: TYPOLOGY OF AESTHETICS AND LITERATURE INTERACTION

Anna A. Stepanova. Alfred Nobel University (Ukraine)

e-mail: stepanova@duan.edu.ua

Ilona V. Dorohan. Oles Honchar Dnipro National University (Ukraine)

e-mail: ilonadorogan69@gmail.com

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/1-2

Key words: *aesthetic consciousness, empirical consciousness, artistic consciousness, aesthetic image, artistic creativity, architectonic and compositional forms, aesthetic ideal.*

The objective of the work is to study the specifics of aesthetic and artistic consciousness in their interaction in terms of literary comprehension of philosophical concepts; to highlight the levels of interaction between aesthetics and literature as a factor in the formation of aesthetic dominants of the literary trend and artistic method. The focus of the work determines the use of cultural-historical, historical-literary, philosophical and aesthetic research methods.

Aesthetic consciousness is understood as a mode of intellectual-sensory perception (and assessment) of empirical reality, which determines the type of artistic consciousness and is reflected in a work of fiction. Three levels of correlation between aesthetic consciousness and reality are distinguished: the syncretic, at which the aesthetic consciousness merges with the empirical, dissolving into reality, and the ideal of beauty corresponds to scientific ideas about the surrounding world and man; the discrete level emphasises a certain autonomy of aesthetic consciousness from empirical one, its orientation towards the expression of some ideological or ideal essence; the synthetic, representing dialectical interaction and mutual influence, giving rise to harmony and aesthetic value of the unity of content and form.

The specificity of the relationship between aesthetic and artistic consciousness is determined. The process of interaction between aesthetic and artistic consciousness as the interaction between aesthetics and literature takes place at two levels. The first level represents the transformation of the system of aesthetic-philosophical theories and characterises the state of aesthetic consciousness as a set of aesthetic views of the epoch. The second level is characterised by the process of “the transition of the artistic to the general cultural”, involving a change in worldview stereotypes when literature, producing its own spiritual values and anti-values, turns out to be able to reorient public consciousness (in some instances, even scientific) and public psychology, to shape the mindset, tastes, and specifics of everyday culture.

The findings note that the convergence of aesthetic consciousness and literature, along with the actualisation of the principle of possibilities that began in the Romantic era, largely predetermined the development of aesthetic consciousness at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, when their interaction became so intertwined that it formed a unity. The distinction between aesthetics and literature practically disappeared, ushering in a new stage of cultural reorientation for aesthetics and art.

Одержано 21.12.2022.