

---

## Summary

The perceptibly growing interest during recent decades on the part of scholars in various fields in the problems of the psychology of art is due to many different factors. This interest is primarily connected with trends changing the present-day world – in technogenic civilization, robotization, the creation of artificial intelligence, the growing power of the media. Moreover, it is impelled by the effort of specialists in various fields to achieve greater knowledge of the underlying heuristic aspects of human creative activity, of the main factors that promote or limit a person's creativity.

It should immediately be pointed out to the reader that the author of this book views the problems discussed here of the psychology and psychopathology of art not from the perspective of a psychologist or physician, but primarily from that of a specialist in aesthetics and the philosophy of art. He does not seek to analyze the psychograms and medical histories of specific artists or to describe the manifestations of their symptomatology. Such intentions are foreign to this author, who has worked for many decades in the field of aesthetics and the philosophy of art, because they can explain *medical* aspects, but not ones related to the *aesthetic* and *art-historical* problems that interest him the most – those of the artist's creative potential, the creative process, and the works created by the artist.

By relying on the methods of contemporary interdisciplinary research as well as on diverse sources that examine the psychology of art and the creative process among Eastern and Western peoples, this book seeks to analyze the main stages in the history of ideas about the psychology of art and to highlight the inner structure of the developments in this history and the main fields of research. It also seeks to reveal how in different countries, over the course of centuries, attitudes have changed toward the artist, his creative potential and work, the creative process, and the other fundamental problems involved in the psychology of art and the creative process and in the psychopathology of art. In its comparativist approach this monograph differs in essence from all other books published in various languages on this subject: like never before, abundant sources and facts from the great Eastern civilizations are included in a comparative analysis of the history of ideas about the psychology of art.

When we compare the processes which originally formed the psychology of art in the East and the West, we are struck that in ancient times these problems already received greater attention in Eastern civilizations. In all probability, how ideas about the psychology of art were formed was determined by how each specific civilization developed culturally because the distinctive problems that later evolved into this independent discipline first unfolded under the aegis of philosophical – and only later, aesthetic, art-historical, and psychological – thought. When analyzing the development of Eastern and Western theoretical thought from this aspect, we may note that since ancient times rationalist tendencies have been stronger in Europe than

in Asia, where – especially in India and Japan – emotionality became dominant under the influence of the sensualist tendencies rooted in the scholarly knowledge of these civilizations.

In the West, deeper scientific knowledge of the psychology of art arose only during the 19<sup>th</sup> century and especially during its final years with research into the various mechanisms of the subconscious and the early development of experimental psychology. During the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, further notable achievements were connected with the development of social and individual psychiatry and with research into experimental and clinical psychology. Today's psychology of art is divided into a multitude of different stances, camps, and groups whose supporters fiercely polemicize on practically all fundamental theoretical questions. Here, it is difficult to find even one more important problem that is not the object of discussions.

The concepts that formed the object and main problems of research into the psychology of art had difficulty breaking ground in explaining the psychological mysteries of artistic creation. For a long time, these mysteries were ignored by the thoroughly rationalized classical humanities of the West, which were dominated by the conviction that the mysteries of artistic creation are hermetic and, therefore, difficult to subject to rationalization and systematic scientific analysis. Thus, academic scholarship was itself dominated by the view that *objective knowledge of the psychology of the creative process is impossible* or, in other words, that *these problems are insoluble*.

However, scientific knowledge inexorably went forward. As it advanced, what was formerly considered mysterious and unknowable constantly revealed new and unexpected facets. Historically, the psychology of art developed under the aegis of philosophy, but it later branched into three main fields of scientific knowledge: *psychology*, *psychiatry*, and *art history*. In the first instance, it functions in a system of categories of *psychological* knowledge as part of psychological science, i.e. as the *psychology of art*. In the second, it functions in a system of *medical* knowledge as part of psychiatry and other fields of medicine, often in theories of psychopathology, as the *psychopathology of art*. In the third, it functions in a system of *art-historical* sciences in the broad sense of this term as part of a complex of art-historical disciplines, at the center of which, intensively developing and being studied as art history, lies the *psychology of art*. In the first instance, we emphasize the psychology, and in the third – the art. In this book, we focus on how the psychology of art functions in a system of *art-historical* and *aesthetic* knowledge as well as on some fundamental *historical*, *theoretical*, and *methodological* problems.

Thus, the psychology of art historically evolved as an interdisciplinary path whose tasks and object of study formed in an intermediate field in which different aspects of general psychology intersected with other disciplines: namely, philosophy (philosophical aesthetics, the philosophy of art, ethics), culturology (the history, anthropology, and psychology of culture, etc.), and art as well as literature (their history, theory, criticism). Obviously, this classification is rather conventional because the boundaries between different aspects of psychological analysis are conditional and movable.

While examining the fundamental problems of the psychology of art, this monograph devotes special attention to a comprehensive analysis of *the basic segments of the artist's creative potential*: creative activity, imagination, fantasy, diligence, intuition, powers of observation, memory, ability to generalize, empathy, ability to withdraw from the external world, personal centeredness and concentration, flexible thinking, ability to generate ideas, constant striving for perfection, experimentation, interpretation, improvisation, playfulness, curiosity, involvement, patience, faith in one's own insights and creative powers, respect for tradition, and rebellion against it.

Later, attention shifts to a discussion of the problems of a subdiscipline of the psychology of art – *the psychology of the creative process*. Its core is a system of fundamental categories: *reality – artist – creative process – work of art – perception*. The most important link that systematically organizes the totality of these categories is the *creative process*. Thus, at the center of analysis we find the various aspects of *creation as process*. Here lies *the specific nature of this new subdiscipline's object of study in comparison to other related fields that primarily study the results or products of creative work*. The main task in studying the psychology of the creative process is *the study of the dynamics of the process of creating works of art*. The scope of this study also includes these important components of the psychology of the creative process: creative activity, will, imagination, fantasy, memory, intuition, inspiration, diligence, associative and metaphorical thinking, improvisation, analysis, synthesis, and many other factors. The psychology of the creative process also encompasses the problems involved in the apprehension of works of art by viewers, listeners, readers, etc. – a field that, because of its specific approach, usually receives less attention in studies on the psychology of art.

Finally, this monograph deals with the relationship between genius and mental disorders – a problem that since Romantic times has acquired a special relevance in the psychology and *psychopathology of art*. This field of problems is directly related to substantial achievements in *clinical psychiatry* and *psychotherapy* (theoretical and practical) and especially to the data provided by *theoretical psychopathology* and *descriptive psychiatry*. This author is convinced that *the boundless devotion to creative work and overexertion typical of a personality of exceptional talent, like any irresponsible squandering and exhaustion of one's creative powers, quite naturally begets various mental disorders*. After all, the psychological, vital, and energetic resources of even those geniuses who have tremendous potential are limited. Therefore, when these resources are intemperately squandered, *what is most subtle, sensitive, and vulnerable in the human psyche inevitably begins to crack and break and leads to the destruction of the mind*. Thus, genius is not a disease, but a powerful expression of creativity that is not always related to the consistent and logical unfolding of an artist's creative potential. Here, we encounter such diverse gradations that in real life the boundary separating what we understand as “normal” from the milder forms of psychopathology that nonspecialists have difficulty noticing is often very difficult to locate.