How to Cite:

Yang, G. (2021). Inheritance and development of national elements in contemporary Chinese, American and Russian oil paintings. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS2.1326

Inheritance and Development of National Elements in Contemporary Chinese, American and Russian Oil Paintings

Guangyu Yang

Donghua University, Shanghai, China

Abstract---When speaking of semiosis of the visual art it is worth noting that it can be considered also in the aspect of semantics, which studies relation of sign elements to the world. Semantic side of an image is related to theory of art content, meaning of creation, spirituality, in particular, the symbol theory. Together with forming the idea of painting as a source of literature data and accordingly understanding of a painting in traditional literature paradigm as source of learning the outside world. The authors of the article demonstrate solidarity of oil painting in the stylistic understanding of the integrity of the image perception through the method of knowledge. In particular, the connection between figurativeness and semeiotics, which arises in the process of painting learning on the basis of literature researching and forming of artistic taste. In the article, it is shown that development of figurativeness in art should be based on art methods, in which literature is defined. Authors clarify that this is the main difference between Chinese painting and similar cultural forms. Practical application of research may be: to form educational programs and develop in integral image of artistic development. Also, ideas if the article may be used to develop a method of intercultural analysis.

Keywords---art, artificial languages, artistic taste, China, comparative negation, general linguistics, human language, language studies, linguistic models, painting.

Introduction

Each artwork is, as we mentioned before, the integrity of content and form. The core of art work is an idea of work (what an artist wants to say, a main idea of a work of art and an artist's special attitude to it). Idea is aimed at being perceived by other person. Form answers the question: how does an author reveal a meaning of his/her work? (Castro-Tejerina, 2014). That is why the notion of form

has means of expressiveness organised in a needed way (Tucker, 2019). Content and form in their integrity embody an artistic image (Sokolov, 2010). An image has meaningful symbolic, consists of signs (Harries-Jones, 2011). Though an artistic image cannot be interpreted only as a means to convey a certain meaning because it has a purpose in itself, but along with this, it is carrier of meaning (Aragno, 2013). An image and a sign are not such strangers as it may seem (Semetsky, 2005). Since an artist cannot exist without a spectator, art images are primarily included in the space of communication (Toporišič, 2014). That is why the objective is to reveal specific of communicative relations in art and the degree of its semiotic (Leone, 2013).

Exactly semantic correlation of elements of an artwork allows interpreting it as semiotic integrity (Tønnessen et al., 2016). Artwork is organised according to the principle of sign message. The difference is that signs in work are addressed not only to conscious, but also to psyche (Joerchel, 2012). It is clearly illustrated by the artwork of M.A.Vrubel "Demon" (1890), where the central iconic sign is a human figure of athletic build. There are no traditional signs (or features from the perspective of the figurative approach) of demon appearance. Only the name of the picture shows that this is Demon and not a human only from the name. The sign of the physical discomfort of this large-scale character is its spatial constraint - the vertical of the figure that sits, extends beyond the boundary of the image field, which is emphasised, moreover, by the horizontally extended format of the canvas. The sign of the physical discomfort means, in its turn, internal discomfort. The purple colour scheme is the sign of the Demon's endless sorrow (Ferreira, 2014). So, it has been emphasised that compositional solution and colour scheme (the syntax level) are the means of expressiveness that can affect feelings of a spectator, providing nonverbal communication at the emotional level (the pragmatic level), but the communication is needed to convey a specific content, meaning, value relation (the semantic level).

Literature Review

Consequently, specific of artistic and aesthetic information is that it is related to not only cognitive, but also to semantic elements (Tønnessen, 2010). Yu.M. Lotman when characterizing literary text pay attention to the fact than the main function of a text is not so much adequate convey of meanings, as creation of new ones. He illustrates specifics of literary text comparing artistic and non-artistic photography (Machado & Romanini, 2012). If in a non-artistic photo a naked woman expresses only a naked woman and there is no meaning in denudation, in an artistic photo (or a painting) woman may express: beauty, demonic mystery, fragility, loneliness, crime (Lorusso, 2015). It can express different ages, create various cultural meanings, because it is a sign (Semetsky, 2006). In this, the scientist emphasises, it is not easy to answer the question what an author wanted to say, because art is always a mystery, it hides someone's view of the world. It is inexhaustible in semantic way, it cannot be retold (Berger, 2014).

Comparison of artistic and non-artistic photography helps to figure out the nature of aesthetic semiosis of visual art (Pérez-Álvarez, 2018). A non-artistic picture of a dog, for example, has no own value, it is just reference to an owner's beloved dog, which is his value. Photographical picture is just a sign, and this is lameness of

its existence (Sedda, 2015). In an artistic picture, on the contrary, a specific dog is of no value, expect for an owner. An aesthetic object becomes self-valuable thanks to its artistic form. This is about aesthetic perception and aesthetic semiosis (Favareau, 2009).

When distinguishing between the concepts of aesthetic and artistic, it is always stressed that artistic is characteristic of a certain semiotic activity. In this, when characterising artistic activity, it is stressed that it implies achievement of perfection of its works, that is, their aesthetic integrity (Semenenko, 2012). Not each artist can achieve this perfection and integrity of a work. That is why, speaking of aesthetic semiosis of visual art, it is important to take into account the notion of artistry that defines if a work is of art. To understand specifics of aesthetic semiosis in visual art without consideration of such category of aesthetics as artistry, in our opinion, is impossible.

Materials and Methods

In research, mostly the methods of direct comparison of traditions in different schools of visual art were used. To make such comparative study the main objective was to form the complex of conceptual apparatus. The objective of this apparatus, in its turn, is to determine a possibility to broadcast artistic meanings in the category of assessing the artistic value of a literary work (Woo, 1994; Malterud, 2001). The comparison method was based on the method of literature research, which had been determined, in its turn, by possibilities of expanded reproduction in the field of goal setting. This means that broadcasting by an image may be implemented only under the term of general category of both literature and painting image.

Results and Discussion

Artistry is complicated combination of qualities determining if fruits of creative labour belong to the field of art. For artistry, the sign of completeness and adequate embodiment of a creative plan, that "virtuosity", which is the key to the influence of the work on the reader, viewer, listener, is essential. Representations of harmony, taste, a sense of proportion, etc. are related to artistry. In other words, the notion "artistry" means formation of an artwork in accordance with norms and requirements of art as such (McCain, 2006; Wei, 2012; Li & Huan, 2019).

There are paintings, sculptures, which are refused to be artworks, which are considered to be kitsch. What is characteristic of them? These are usually images of beautiful things that exist in the world. Aesthetic pleasure here is caused by the image of the beautiful. This is one of the most primitive types of aesthetic perception. Even in its sign nature there is a minimum of what is called the signs of artistry. These are simple iconic signs. Their perception is typical for everyman (of mass culture). However, the image of the beautiful is artwork, but in this case exactly artistry distinguishes true art from false (Barone, 1995; Delgado et al., 2014).

Image of the beautiful and aesthetic of mastery should be distinguished. A person experiences the pleasure of quality, grace things. This mainly concerns form, not content. A masonry can obtain such a pleasure from art masonry, artisan – from a beautifully made thing, draftsman – from a beautifully painted plaster head. In this case, value is transferred on made thing or picture. Together with this, individuality of a creator may absent. This is still not aesthetic of artistry. An artistic picture clearly differs from any natural phenomena. This makes obvious the presence of a peculiar principle underlying the artistic activity. To analyse aesthetic semiosis in visual art, we conditionally select three levels of forming of visual messages. The necessity of such differentiation is caused by the fact that messages are formed in different ways using various types of characters.

The first level of s message relies on the principle of mimesis, that is an imitation of nature. According to the principle, an artist uses natural or inartificial codes. It is appropriate to speak of iconic signs. We interpret a message-image of artwork the same as natural phenomena. Sunset in nature and in landscape can be recognised by the same indicators. We also recognise joy or sadness on a person's face and in a portrait. The artist uses the same primitive source of information, which is nature itself, and conventions of interpretations of the world. The aesthetic effect is formed in the same way. We assess aesthetic phenomena of the world and also we are influenced by their aesthetic artificial copies. This level of an aesthetic message is available even to the least experienced viewer (Bentzen, 2005; Thorwarth et al., 2007).

The second level of a message is related to artistic form – this is the level of internal structure of artwork. This level includes how the material is organised, different elements of structure if grouped. Structure in comparison with nature objects is constructed hierarchically, and an artist is a legislator of hierarchy who highlights and leaves something. There is selection of elements and transformation of reality. An artist does not just copy nature; he/she looks for ways to impress upon a spectator its beauty, to convey own experiences, thought and feelings. Both the first and the second levels provide aesthetic effect. The difference is that exactly artistic form is able to express attitude of an author to an object and thus to consolidate and proclaim values, thereby ensuring the preservation and transmission of aesthetic experience (Hradil et al., 2003; Oda et al., 2011; Woods, 2018).

It is worth noting that art critics and spectators differently assess various works of visual art, considering some of them very artistic and, consequently, a result of good taste and other tasteless. What is the criterion of assessment? What makes cave drawings of animals, made six thousand years ago artistic, expressive, and astounding? Artistic thinking is desire for ordering, designing that is not due to any practical purpose or usefulness. This is cognition through creation. Here it is often not logic that rules, but the irrational. However, it is possible to analyse this

Artistic space is the space of artwork, totality of its properties that give it an inner unity and completeness and endow it with an aesthetic character. Encyclopaedic philosophical dictionary, edited by O.A. Ivin gave such definition of artistic space.

The notion "artistic space" in modern aesthetics plays the important role, but it was created in 20th century, though problematic that it describes has been discussed since antiquity. In the Modern history, artistic space has been equated to a space of light depicted by an artist: space of a painting or engraving, space of plastic image, space of a scene, etc. It has been understood as reflection of real, physical space. In its origin, the notion "artistic space" reaches painting, sculpture, theatre and other art forms, in which artistic narrative takes place in the physical space. Further, a content of this notion has expanded and covered those art forms, which do not take place in the physical space (literature, music, and etc.)

Artistic space is integral characteristics of an artwork. Specific solution of space problem affects all visual artefacts used by an artist and is one of the key features of artistic style. This is especially apparent in painting, in relation to which the concept of artistic space is analyzed most fully. The problem of artistic space contains not only colour, light, line of painting, its depth and granularity, but also dynamics, symbolism, relation to canon and others, O. Spengler, P.A. Florensky, J. Ortega y Gasset, M. Heidegger, M. Merleau-Ponty and others made the significant contribution to understanding the problem of artistic space.

In the book "The Decline of the West", O. Spengler stressed the importance of space not only for individual perception, but also for all art forms. The philosopher correlated the space, first of all, with the depth. He emphasised the great difference between artistic space and mathematical (geometrical) space: "In each alley we see that parallels converge on the horizon. Perspective of West painting and completely different Chinese <...> is based exactly on this fact. The experience of depth in the immeasurable fullness of its species is not subject to any numerical definition. All lyrics and music, Egyptian, Chinese, Western painting loudly contradict the assumption of a strictly mathematical structure of the experienced and seen space... "Horizon", in which and by which any historical picture gradually turns into an isolating plane, cannot be comprehended by any mathematics. Every brush stroke of landscape painter rejects the cognition theory.

P.A. Florensky wrote that all culture can be interpreted as activity on space organisation; he determined symbolic sign to the prototype through an image as the objective of art. Artistic space should be a symbol of spiritual space, true space, other reality. P.A.Florensky considered that art does not aim at reproducing reality basing on a direct perspective, as the artists of the Renaissance thought. In the opinion of the scientist, only rational, limited brain can be satisfied with external similarity. Natural or visible, space is part of integral, bigger, not visible, but known space.

In the opinion of P.A. Florensky, medieval visual art created exactly this kind of artistic space, which did not duplicate reality, but gave a deep insight into its architectonics, its material, its meaning. Art techniques, using which such artistic space was embodied, are inverted perspective and the special optical illusion giving the impression that portrait looks at a spectator from any angle. Though artists of Renaissance and Modern history considered an image according to rules of the perspective the highest art form in comparison with all other forms, the

technique of single point perspective is still one of the artistic forms, styles, languages and its superiority is not obvious. Both Pavel Florensky and Maurice Merleau-Ponty stated that this technique reflected special worldview, namely, the worldview inherent in the New History that emphasised rationality and scientific accuracy. Genealogic analysis of the perspective shows that old forms cannot be considered "the lowest" in comparison with later forms, this has consequences for both philosophy and art history. P. Shteller thinks that texts of Florensky and Merleau-Ponty make obvious the fact that studying perspective is of philosophical and even peculiarly phenomenological interest (Suda, 2017; Pan & Kadar, 2011).

Phrase "aesthetic semiosis" refers to both aesthetic and semiotics, because the notion of semiosis is one of the central in semiotics – science of signs and sign systems; semiosis is used in this to denote the process of production and functioning of signs. Semiotics as the tool of researching complicated sign systems (semiotics of culture, semiotics of painting, poetry, cinema) over last year has been developing rapidly. "Signs, – Yu.M. Lotman writes, – have actually universal meaning in the life of human collective. Street signals and words of human language, uniforms and orders, store signs and works of art – all these are signs and groups of signs, which transmit various – qualitatively and quantitatively – information."

Semiotics may be used as universal approach in many different fields of knowledge. Its objective is to research ways of information transmitting, properties of signs and sign systems (natural and artificial languages, cultural phenomena, myth, ritual), communications in nature (communication in the animal world). Semiotic approach is also used to find solutions in aesthetics. Art as a subject of aesthetics embodies results of cognitive and assessing activity and is expected to convey information; consequently, it is appropriate to speak of sign side of art, which predetermines its communicative function.

Each art form has its own sign system, speaks in own language. This makes possible and even necessary to include semiotics in the complex of scientific disciplines studying art. Semiotics provides each kind of creative activity – science, art, philosophy, with apparatus to learn their own language. Semiotic method allows considering art as process of communication and organisation of information in corresponding (aesthetic) way, which gives an opportunity to study through the prism of signs the process of creativity as the process of creation structure of artwork. Though aesthetic and semiotics has formed as independent sciences not so long ago, connection between them is old. Semiotic problematics was in ancient philosophical and aesthetic treaties, for example, Aristotle's or his predecessors. The moment linking aesthetic and semiotics is not only the basement that any manifestation of culture is due to communication, but also the fact that aesthetic is the science of perceiving by feelings and expressing by feelings.

Aesthetics as the philosophical science has self-determined a long time ago, though its own aesthetic conscious was inherent to primitive culture and history of aesthetic thought is rooted in ancient times. The term "aesthetic" (from Greece aisthetikos – sensitive) was firstly introduced by German philosopher A. Baumgarten in two-volume work "Aesthetica" published in 1760 – 1758. He

denoted with thin term the science of the lowest level of cognition – sensitive cognition, unlike the higher – logic. If logical judgements, in his understanding, rely on clear accurate representations, then "sensitive" (aesthetic) – on incomprehensible. First ones are judgements of mind; second ones are judgements of taste. Aesthetic judgements precede logical. Their object is beautiful; the object of logical judgements is true. In such way, Baumgrten has attributed all philosophy of art, the subject of which he considered also the beautiful, to aesthetic. Kant and Hegel also developed these ideas. The idea of the beautiful determines all content essence and focus of classical aesthetic. It is customary to select two ways of historic existence of aesthetic – explicit and implicit. The first one includes philosophical discipline aesthetic that has self-determined by the middle of the 18th century as relatively independent part of philosophy. Implicit aesthetic is rooted in ancient times; it is comprehension of aesthetic experience within other disciplines (philosophy, rhetoric, philology, theology and others).

Within implicit aesthetic many scientists of the past analysed art in connection with the issue of a symbol, sign, language. This interest arose in countries of ancient West (Babylon, Egypt), but these issues acquired theoretical expression in aesthetic of antiquity. Greek culture deserves the special attention because exactly it reflected upon almost all semiotic issues. Studying the essence of art ancient Greek scientists considered "mimesis", imitation as the most important category of aesthetic. The theory of mimesis was tightly linked with language problems of verbal art. Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Eleatic, Democritus, Sophists, Socrates, Plato demonstrated interest in these problems. Socrates, for example, questioned "can painting and sculpture imitating the nature express not only what we see (objects concave and convex, dark and light, hard and soft, uneven and smooth, etc.), but also something invisible – "spiritual properties"." And he answered positively: depicting eyes, face expression, gestures art should express a state of mind in all works". According to Socrates, it is possible in visual art by depicting visible symptoms or expressive manifestations.

One of the meanings of the term "mimesis" is pictures. According to modern representations, pictorial sign allows considering the issues of mimesis as the issue of semiotics. On this basis Ch. Morris stated that Hellenistic philosophy was focused on problems of semiotics. Though E.Ya. Basin disagree with this idea, he pointed that Aristoteles had knew the specialty of signs and language, which later Ch. Morris called, "expressiveness" (expression of feelings and moral qualities). Aristoteles considered the notion "sign" within rhetoric placing aesthetic affection of word in the centre. The philosopher paid the special attention to connection between philosophy, aesthetic and language studies. Also, stoics paid a lot of attention to semiotic issues and this interest was directly connected with their view on art. Stoics introduced the notion of language and non-language signs. Since there is no possibility cover antique aesthetic fully, it is worth noting that it had formulated the main issued of art related to interpretation of an image, symbol, sign and language.

Further, the issues of signs developed in the Middle Ages. In this time period, the following is very important: theory of signs by Aurelius Augustine (he systemised signs by the way of conveying a message: signs for eyes, hearing and feeling);

theory of an icon on John of Damascus (he considered the matter of nature and types of pictures, correlation of a picture and depicted object); aesthetic theory of Thomas Aquinas who emphasised that an artwork as a carnal pronounced symbol, which is characterised by harmony, symmetry, "radiance", – is a symbol of divinity, and signs, words also stem from the activities of God. Today the connection between aesthetic and semiotics are considered as application of semiotic method, which has formed within other sciences, to aesthetic that create the question about their correlation and the narrowness of the semiotic method in this union. Is there enough material in the modern science to analyse such peculiar matter as the aesthetic? The nature of interaction of aesthetic and semiotics as sciences and possibilities of semiotic method in aesthetic is the open issue.

Using semiotic approach in aesthetic may be implemented form different methodological perspectives. The main principles of semiotics and integral theory of signs and sign system was formulated in 19th century by Charles Sanders Peirce. He selected the main problems of semiotic theory of art: art as a special type of communication using signs; a role and place of pictorial sign in art; connection of signs of art with aesthetic value; semiotics and problems of the visual and expressive in art; science and art, truth and beauty, the nature of aesthetic emotions. Peirce not only selected those problems, but also found solutions. Also, he introduced the notion semiosis and divided signs into types.

Ferdinand de Saussure significantly expanded the boundaries of the science involving other humanities in the area of semiotics. Saussure building his concept on analysis of verbal language in the work "Course in General Linguistics" suggested distributing linguistic models on the process of research of other problems of humanities, because social and cultural phenomena are not just material objects or events, but carriers of meaning, the core of which is sign or phenomenon that forms these meanings. He introduced culture as secondary modelling sign system built according to laws of natural system – language.

In theoretical activity the American philosopher Ch. Morris was inspired by the idea of creation "unified science". In the work "Foundations of the theory of signs", he tried to consider "socio-humanitarian disciplines" – science, morality, policy, religion and art – from one semiotic perspective. In his early articles "Esthetics and the theory of signs", "Science, art and technology", and in sections on art, in the work "Signs, language and behaviour", issues of semiotic analysis of art was specially stressed. In these researches, the author considered briefly also issues of value character of art.

Ch.Morris wanted to make aesthetic a part of semiotics seeing the last way towards the integration of natural sciences and humanities. Semantics studies special connections between art works and their meanings, syntactics studies structural relations between elements that form aesthetic and artistic sign, pragmatics studies communicative function of art. Today in aesthetic Peirce classification of signs (iconic sign – index – symbol) is widely used, and the selection of the above levels of analysis of aesthetic objects, introduced into the aesthetics by Ch. Morris.

In Russia two basic semiotic centres interacted: in Moscow (V.V. Ivanov, V.M. Toporov, B.A. Uspenskiy) and in Tartu (Yu.M. Lotman, B.M. Gasparov and others). It is customary to speak of one Tartu–Moscow semiotic school. In the USSR semiotics was almost the only one humanitarian branch that received world recognition. Formal literature study (V.Ya. Propp, Yu.M. Tynyanov, O.M. Veselovskiy, B.M. Aihenbaum and others), then Tartu–Moscow semiotic school headed by Yu.M. Lotman always attracted attention of scientists. Roots of this research paradigm had formed much earlier.

Traditional semiotics that reaches ideas of Peirce and Saussure studies external expression, formalised sign systems. Signs and languages of culture are considered in terms of communication, that is social functioning. Along with this main line of semiotics, it is possible also to speak of another – "deeply semiotic", in the opinion of V.V. Feschenko. It is not so clearly expressed and not described in such detail as traditional, but exactly it forms the theoretical basis of artistic semiotics, which relies on anthropocentric or "human-like" approach. It formed mostly in Russian culture of the beginning of 20th century; the tradition of deep semiotics developed at the intersection of scientific and artistic experience, philosophy and doctrine of spiritual experience.

G.G. Spet was the first of Russian humanists who consciously addressed the issue of sign in philosophical and artistic context. The significance of his ideas for Russian linguistics, hermeneutics and semiotics can be equated to the role of Ferdinand de Saussure and Charles Sanders Peirce in Western tradition of language theory. G.G. Spet not only was the first in Russian literature studies who used the term "semiotics" (it meant for him "ontological doctrine of signs in general"), but also was the author of original works on sign theory, meaning and understanding. G.G. Pocheptsov characterised approach of G.G. Shpet as hermeneutic. The notion of sense, interpretation, distinction of meaning and sense are in the centre of attention of the philosopher. A. Matyushin also wrote about it: "Unique place of G. Shpet in the history of Russian culture is due to the fact that he deeply and comprehensively developed philosophy of interpretation, hermeneutics, pointed the problem of understanding as central gnoseological problem of humanities."

G.G. Shpet practically set in the preface to the "Introduction to Ethnic Psychology" the future methodology of the Y. Lotman Tartu-Moscow School. Paying significant attention to issues of aesthetics G.G. Shpet wrote the article "Theatre as art", which is the serious research of theatre semiotics. In artistic creation according to G.G. Shpet language expression is, first of all, the subjective expression. V.V. Feschenko sees difference between Shpet semiotics and Peirce and Saussure semiotics in postulating of inside space in sign structure and in expediency of semiotic process. G.G. Shpet built the concept of inner shape on the material of analysis of esthetic forms, because poetry, unlike pragmatic language (scientific or regular talking) prioritises "its own goals of self-development." In semiosis G. Shpet was most interested in the creative moment. In general, Russian pre-war semiotics may be divided into two main movements that we conditionally denote formal and cultural. V.B. Sklovskiy and other literature researches represented formal. P.O. Florenskiy, who created the religious approach in semiotics, belongs to the second movement.

In semiotic inheritance of P.A. Florenskiy, G.G. Pocheptsov selects five subject areas: doctrine of a symbol, a word in aspect of linguistics and communication, a word in magical understanding, semiotics of space and time and the area of visual semiotics. Deep semiotic researches are writings of P.O. Florenskiy in the field of art studies, in particular, "analysis of spatiality and time in artistic works", and writing on icon painting "Reverse perspective" and "Iconostasis". The very special of them is "Temple action as a synthesis of arts". It is valuable how carefully Florenskiy considered exactly visual communication, visual art (graphic arts, painting) and their differences. P.A. Florenskiy introduced in semiotics of art the notion "construction" – without which there is no artwork – distinguished the notions of construction and composition, semiotically analysed pictures from different angles and ornament seeing in it world formulas of existence.

Another philosopher who used the religious approach to semiotics was E.N. Trubetskoy. Semiotic understanding of an icon in his writings is of particular interest for our study. Addressing temple art and icons distinguishes E.N. Trubetskoy and his contemporaries. Discovering an icon to philosopher means discovering semiotics of language. Background, within which a philosopher considers Old Russian religious art, is the contradistinction of the "image of the beast." Another semiotic characteristic of an icon is influence of architecture on type of painting. E.M. Trubetskoy considered an icon only in the context of a temple, but nor as an independent message that was closed to the ideas of P.A. Florenskiy. Trubetskoy introduces the notion "architecture of icon" meaning Cathedral painting. Hence, he follows the symbolism of iconography, in which he sees the prototype of the future temple humanity. By calling an icon feast for the eyes E.M. Trubetskoy discloses colour symbolism.

- W. Kandinsky and P. Klee, whose profession was visual art, also tried to apply semiotics to painting. Kandinsky developed the concept according to which all diversity of painting can be reduced to points, lines and plane and created the system of connection between graphic and chromatic code basing on suggested by him colour symbolism. P. Klee was impressed by Chinese poetry, developed original painting alphabet drawing in small colored squares something like letters and grouping them into some lines of the scripture. After the revolution in Russian new society liked the most the formal approach in connection with the understanding of the tasks of the new art. The formal approach was associated with science at that time. It was represented by H. Wölfflin, F. Schmidt, O.G. Gabrichevsky, N.I. Zhinkin, N.M. Tarabukin, A.G. Tsires who paid attention exactly to visual arts. H. Wölfflin distinguished painting and linear styles using examples of Rembrandt painting and Durer graphic.
- F. Schmidt distinguished visual and non-visual art, defined conditional perspective considering Chinese and Japanese painting. Also, he considered in details ancient Egyptian painting. F. Schmidt interpreted art only communicatively determining it as activity on revealing images. Pocheptsov stressed that in the research of Schmidt even the smallest characteristics had semiotic significance. In 1926-1927, the collection of essays "Art of portrait" was published. There was analysis of special symbolic language of a portrait, in some cases, semiotic terminology is used. N.I. Zhinkin, N.M. Tarabukin, O.G. Gabrichevsky analysed portrait from different perspective, reviewing in this

context the notion of a personality, individuality and possibility of their picturing. N.I. Zhinkin emphasised the importance of such elements of portrait as the pose and gesture. A.G. Tsires when analysing a portrait suggested the classification of signs partially similar to the classification of Peirce. He also explored the possibility of metaphor in painting and sculpture and demonstrated narrowness of language of visual art. Disclosing complication of processes of interpretation A.G. Tsires understood special character of esthetic hermeneutics of painting work.

Semiotic researches of Tartu-Moscow school are associated with Lotman. The fact that his research subject was special status of visual language, first of all, cinema language, is very significant and important, though there were writings devoted to visual art, namely, a portrait and still life. He paid particular attention to an icon considering that semiotic approach is not externally imposed, but internally inherent in an icon more than in painting. B.A. Uspensky analysed principles of organisation of space in ancient painting, features of icon painting related to pragmatic function of an icon, semantic syntax of an icon.

Each era is characterised by own semiotic style, ways of text interpretation as a result of which composition and correlation of individual semiotic systems determine the type of culture. In antiquity the style has become a measure of artistic expressiveness. In the opinion of V.P. Bransky who stressed exactly semiotic aspect, "the style is unity of esthetic ideal and artistic method of a painter defined by this ideal, i.e. the way of coding human experiences; taste is unity of esthetic ideal and interpreting method of a spectator defined by this ideal, i.e. the way to decode artistic code. That is why from the perspective of the artistic process the style and taste are peculiar antipodes and, at the same time, they are the different sides of the same coin: style is "taste" of an artist, and taste is "style" of a spectator." It is necessary to develop the corresponding taste to understand each style, to satisfy each taste it is necessary to create the corresponding style. V.P. Bransky stressed that the art work of Renaissance style can be understood if a spectator has Renaissance taste, surrealistic artwork needs surrealistic taste. The style and the ideal are also closely related. The aesthetic ideal is the content side of the style, and the creative method is its formal side.

The notion of style is tightly linked to the notion of canon. Canonic artistic thinking, regulation of creation, canonisation of the system of artistic and expressive means and principle played an important role in many eras and movements of art where artistic symbol predominated. Canon is the system of internal artistic rules and norms dominating in art in some historical period or in some artistic movement and consolidating main structural or constructive patterns of specific art forms. Canonicity is inherent in all ancient and middleaged art. The Middle Ages made style dependent on system of conditional symbolic hierarchies of various belief systems. Renaissance contributed to appearance of the notion of style. There were style-personalities (Leonardo da Vinci, Rafael, Michelangelo, later Rembrandt). G. Burton says: "The style represents a human", and Buffon added, "Style is human". Art of New History starting from Renaissance was actively leaving canonical thinking and approaching to personal and individual type of creation. At the same time, style is manifestation of stability, domination of traditions, but not striving for

innovations and fluidity. Style arises when all system is stable and balanced. Each structural element complies with general meaning but not contradicts. Style characteristics, in the basis of which is artistic expression, convey a sense, uniqueness of phenomena of art and artistic creation. The system of expressive means is a carrier of stylistic features, but at each historical stage of development of certain stylistic features, a dialectic connection is established, which is based on the continuity of traditions and innovative searches. Style is sign of belonging to something; it characterises a thing as especial emphasising that it belongs to the general.

A.A. Pelipenko stresses that style is always the expression of one and holistic picture of the world, that is why flourishing of styles and style thinking occurred in the new European era, when a self-sufficient product appeared at the peak of development. Completeness and informational richness of the world picture in monumental easel painting and architecture of the 17th century and flourishing of huge "historical styles" were phenomena "of the same magnitude". At the same time, "ontology of the world picture was transferring from objectivistic imperativeness to subjective mental state. The process of style-formation, consequently, manifested as parallel to the process of subjectivity formation. Earlier speech took possession of a human, now a human self-determines in the space of language. Earlier, god chose a human, now a human chooses god."

From the middle of the 19th century, not "era" styles but changing movements had the leading role determining specifics of artistic fashion. The end of the 19th century brought the notion of the national style and individual style. The style in visual art has specific features or "carriers" – formal elements of composition: space, time, volume, plane, colour, line, manner of execution, etc. At the same time, all then are expressive means, but thanks to needed organization that an artist reaches intuitively they acquire a "character" of an individual style. Modern artists are characteristic of using in art different forms: Greek antiquity, Creto-Mycenean art, antique classic, exotic art of China and Japan, gothic and Renaissance,

Etruscan art and French rococo. One of the main expressive and style means in the art of modern is ornament. Gustav Klimt, Alfons Mucha, Paul Gauguin, Edward Munk, Vincent van Gogh, Amedeo Modigliani, Anri Russo, Boris Kustodiev, Konstantin Korovin, Mikhail Vrubel, Mikhail Nesterov, Konstantin Somov, Valentin Serov and other are attributed to the painters of this style. In their creations there are common traits, but at the same time they are very different. The moment of self-expression, which acts in the context of specific time and space, manifests in the style related to aesthetic sphere. Style bears the stamp of subjectivity and simultaneously absorbs endless diversity of elements of reality by being specific manifestation of ideals and tastes of a human in the products of his/her artistic activity and manifestation of ideals and tastes of an era.

Conclusion

Aesthetic function of the style is its influence on an artist and a spectator and forming of taste. Someone likes the style of Gauguin, someone prefers Mane.

Someone loves baroque, someone – modernism. Style does not only inform about belonging to an era, an artist, but also carries aesthetic information. Having a symbolic expression, style is formed in a specific cultural space – the semiosphere, directly being a participant in the process of semiosis. When studying an individual of an artist, it is necessary to consider the totality of factors: sociocultural environment and dynamics, features of mentality, ethic and aesthetic representations of an era, style and genre and stylistic connections and features of representors of different art schools. The main issue is about correlation and interinfluence of era style and individual style as pole categories. As the highest generalisation, artistic style of era consists of individual styles. In its turn, each artist in his/her art translates generalised in an individual. The peculiarity of each artist's creativity is due to his/her individuality and influence of the historically specific cultural era.

References

- Aragno, A. (2013). Phenomenology of Psychoanalytic Data. A Biosemiotic Framework. *Biosemiotics*, 6(3), 473-488.
- Barone, T. (1995). The purposes of arts-based educational research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23(2), 169-180. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355(95)91500-G
- Bentzen, S. M. (2005). Theragnostic imaging for radiation oncology: dose-painting by numbers. *The lancet oncology*, 6(2), 112-117. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(05)01737-7
- Berger, A. A. (2014). Semiotics and society. Society, 51(1), 22-26.
- Castro-Tejerina, J. (2014). "Psytizens": The co-construction of the professional identity of psychology students in the postmodern world. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 48(4), 393-417.
- Delgado, M., Ruiz, M. D., Sánchez, D., & Vila, M. A. (2014). Fuzzy quantification: a state of the art. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 242, 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2013.10.012
- Favareau, D. (2009). Excerpts from Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture. In *Essential Readings in Biosemiotics* (pp. 191-214). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Ferreira, M. I. A. (2014). Typical cyclical behavioural patterns: The case of routines, rituals and celebrations. *Biosemiotics*, 7(1), 63-72.
- Harries-Jones, P. (2011). Essential reading.
- Hradil, D., Grygar, T., Hradilová, J., & Bezdička, P. (2003). Clay and iron oxide pigments in the history of painting. *Applied clay science*, 22(5), 223-236. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-1317(03)00076-0
- Joerchel, A. C. (2012). Differentiation levels of cultural mediation within a sociocultural sphere: A re-evaluation of the concept of culture. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46(3), 303-311.
- Leone, M. (2013). The semiotics of fundamentalist authoriality. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 26(1), 227-239.
- Li, Z. X. ., & Huan, C. Y. . (2019). Chinese and North American culture: A new perspective in linguistics studies. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 3(1), 14-31. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v3n1.13

- Lorusso, A. M. (2015). Unity and Pluralism: The Theory of Jurij Lotman. In *Cultural Semiotics* (pp. 67-115). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Machado, I., & Romanini, V. (2012). Semiotics of Communication: From Semiosis of Nature to Culture. *Biosemiotics*, 5(1), 47-60.
- Malterud, K. (2001). The art and science of clinical knowledge: evidence beyond measures and numbers. *The Lancet*, 358(9279), 397-400. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05548-9
- McCain, R. (2006). Defining cultural and artistic goods. *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, 1, 147-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0676(06)01005-2
- Oda, R., Niwa, Y., Honma, A., & Hiraishi, K. (2011). An eye-like painting enhances the expectation of a good reputation. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 32(3), 166-171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.11.002
- Pan, Y., & Kadar, D. Z. (2011). Historical vs. contemporary Chinese linguistic politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1525-1539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.018
- Pérez-Álvarez, M. (2018). Psychology as a science of subject and comportment, beyond the mind and behavior. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 52(1), 25-51.
- Sedda, F. (2015). Semiotics of culture (s): Basic questions and concepts. In *International handbook of semiotics* (pp. 675-696). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Semenenko, A. (2012). Semiosphere. In *The Texture of Culture* (pp. 111-124). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Semetsky, I. (2005). From design to self-organization, or: A proper structure for a proper function. *Axiomathes*, 15(4), 575-597.
- Semetsky, I. (2006). The language of signs: Semiosis and the memories of the future. *Sophia*, 45(1), 95-116.
- Sokolov, A. V. (2010). Ontology of information. Philosophical essays. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, *37*(3), 149-171.
- Suda, I. K. (2017). The the Children Character Improvement Through Painting Activities in Art School: I Wayan Gama Painting School. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 11-21.
- Thorwarth, D., Eschmann, S. M., Paulsen, F., & Alber, M. (2007). Hypoxia dose painting by numbers: a planning study. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology**Biology*
 Physics, 68(1), 291-300. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2006.11.061
- Tønnessen, M. (2010). Steps to a semiotics of being. Biosemiotics, 3(3), 375-392.
- Tønnessen, M., Magnus, R., & Brentari, C. (2016). The biosemiotic glossary project: Umwelt. *Biosemiotics*, 9(1), 129-149.
- Toporišič, T. (2014). (Re) staging the rhetorics of space. Neohelicon, 41(1), 77-86.
- Tucker, A. (2019). Translation is Dialogue: Language in Transit. In *Translating across Sensory and Linguistic Borders* (pp. 247-268). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Wei, J. (2012). Dealing with reality: Market demands, artistic integrity, and identity work in reality television production. *Poetics*, 40(5), 444-466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2012.07.002
- Woo, W. T. (1994). The art of reforming centrally planned economies: Comparing China, Poland, and Russia. *Journal of comparative economics*, 18(3), 276-308. https://doi.org/10.1006/jcec.1994.1048

Woods, A. . (2018). American culture: A sociological perspectives. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v2n1.6