

Delia ANDRIEȘ¹

The artistic comprehension. Interpretation and experience

Abstract: This paper aims at discussing some possible types of comprehending, i.e. interpreting and experiencing, the artworks. I'll separately approach different attitudes of interpretation, and also the particularities of the phenomenon of experience. The paper also categorizes the idea of succeeding, regarding the points of view of the author-artwork-lecturer as instances.

The study gives course to the idea that in the author-artwork-lecturer relationship, authorial assuming as a constitutive fact of the artwork is not sufficient, since the constitutive interpretation does not work in practice as it is intended to operate in terms of theory (which may be functional, following a rigorous argument). The artwork inevitably transmits, most of the time, more than the author intended to say, attention in the reception focusing on artwork's intentionality. This intentionality has a unitary meaning, independent, but based on the stake that the artist has started from (between intentional and spontaneous) wherein the creation process, depending on the functional way visual language elements are organized, and on the relationship between them in contact with the lecturer. This implies a coherence within the work (most often, but not always, due to the competence of the artist) that, once fulfilled, facilitates filling it with meaning in order to convey a specific significance (content).

Also, the paper claims that the artwork has its objectivity, meaning stability, consisting in the fact that it also holds certain intentionality. But subjectivity is manifested in the author's intentionality (in that it is indiscernible somewhere between autonomous consciousness and spontaneous consciousness), and at the level of the lecturer, that through individual steps, recovers surplus of meaning inherent to the artwork, on the assumption that this also means beyond authorial intent.

Finally, I emphasize once again that art addresses humans in a synergistically bivalent way, in conformity with its natural construction, both sensitive (empirical) and rational (cognitive), regardless to the artists priority stakes. These types of addressing can be discussed individually in the artistic discourse, but it never does manifest itself separately in the reception experience of the artwork.

Keywords: art interpretation, art experience, artworks reception, author-artwork-viewer relationship

¹ Ph.D student, National University of Arts, Bucharest

Today is often debated the situation of the gap between the aesthetic functions (between syntax and semantics), as well as the one of the divorce between art and public, caused by the limitation of the possibilities of the great public to receive with efficiency messages of art which has become too esoteric². It is a known fact that the current lecturer holds a code of perception, based on traditional values, and it is a matter-of-course that he should be outpaced from the attempts to promote new modalities of speech that however frustrates him from the inner enrichment that art provides. Such conflicts such as art and lecturer, on a reception level, appear every time when society exceeds a new stage of evolution and, along with it, the production of values³. The avant-garde reaction concerning the system becomes one of the main causes of alert and eclectic changes that comes from different art movements, which losses unavoidably communication with the public.

It is necessary to mention that in this study we consider to be important in the reception of the work of art its experience, not its understanding (more or less consistent with either the author's intention, declared or deciphered, or by any hermeneutical consensus regarding the work of art)⁴, understanding which, regarding this paper aims to discuss, does not condition the artistic experience, but it is an integral part of it, on different levels.

The discussions triggered by dividing the possibilities of reception (sensible and rational) of the artwork are known among art theory, but it need to be specified that the type of reception can't be reduced to just one of the relational possibilities between the artwork and lecturer, only at the level of the discourse of art, not in the case of the artistic experience.

Although from the perspective of receiving the work of art, nothing is exclusively conceptual or exclusively retinal, specific to a large chapter of contemporary art is conditioning the artistic experience at a comprehensive process, from where it results a kind of rational predominant relation between the artwork and lecturer (due to the expressive priority of the intentional text / discourse in the contemporary artwork)⁵. That is why it was necessary to dedicate this chapter to interpretation of the artwork, at the base of which lies in the most predominant way the rational type of work's addressing in the phenomenon of reception.

² Cornel Ailincăi, *Introducere în gramatica limbajului vizual*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2010, p. 15

³ Ibidem

⁴ C.C.E.C.A., *Arta și publicul nou*, Editura Artes, Iași, 2009 – Mihai Tarasi, *Arta și publicul*, p. 3

⁵ Ibidem

The rational reception. Interpretation

This framework of major changes in the art context involves a reorganization of the artistic vocabulary, which inevitably comes to sight to question the readings of the artwork.

If until the twentieth century, the reception of an artwork was fulfilled in terms of appreciative predicates of aesthetics, such as beautiful, sublime, magnificent, refined etc., depending so very much on the empirical reception of the content conveyed by message of the artwork, the artistic practice of the past century led to a forcing attitude of reviewing the aesthetic attitude and the reporting to the work of art, creating much confusion in terms of receiving it. This situation is due to the fact that the aesthetic relation of the lecturer with the artwork is connected to the traditional consensus regarding the artistic phenomenon, and the conceptual one crystallizes itself upon the contemporary art, after de 1970s (although a certain kind of conceptual relation is required to be recognized from the first movement of the avant-garde, initiated by Duchamp and the Dada movement, where the conceptual had to fill the void resulted from the lack of fulfilling the traditional aesthetic context). In this avant-garde ideological effect in which the discourse (text) is a priority, also the proletcultism from Russia (1918-1920) enrolls; and in the byzantine art a priority stake is placed on concept, but in a more complex way⁶.

This is where are known the discussions triggered by the sharing possibilities of receiving. Since the act of reception assumes that the perceived object is indisputable a work of art, the uncertainty of the hopefuls objects belonging to this title, has inevitably lead to a crisis in the field of reception, both in the case of the educated reader, and especially among profane public. In this case, we are talking about the act of reception in the context of a redefinition of art and of the modality to relate to it, based on reconsidering the parameters that delimitate the artwork. A fundamental theory of this is launched by Arthur Danto, through the thesis that to receive an artifact as work of art has to do with the way it is interpreted as such by a lecturer, in the context of the art world.

This type of constitutive interpretation argues that there is no artwork as such, but in relation with an interpretation, being transfigurative for the object which are turned into works of art - unlike the traditional interpretation that is explanatory and therefore dependent of the "is" of the artwork.

According to this new way of looking at things, the reception of the artwork is in an interdependent relationship with its interpretation. As a consequence of establishing this relationship, the philosophy of the

⁶ Ibidem

twentieth century has innovatively contributed to the interpretation of the artwork with an essential way of relating to a particular historical context. Following closely the development of artistic phenomenon in its postwar period, Umberto Eco published in 1962 "Open artwork", realizing, like Wittgenstein, that interpretation is relevant only in a certain context, thus its legitimacy to reformulate is practically limitless⁷. However, after almost thirty years, probably as a result of reflections that inspired all direct contact with the evolution of contemporary art, he expresses in his book from 1990, "Limits of Interpretations", a revised approach regarding indefinite opening to interpreting the artwork. Without explicitly withdrawing its thesis from "The open work", he particularly insists on "fidelity to the text", which automatically leads to imposing limits of demarche to the interpretation conducted by the receiving subject. He suggests that the interpreted text impose to its interpreters some restrictions, relying on the fact that "even the most radical deconstruction accepts that there are interpretations that are unacceptable and scandalous"⁸. Relating to Eco's theory of the three instances involved in the act of interpretation, author-artwork-lecturer, the aesthetic reception appears articulated in two opposite directions: one focused on the author's research intent, as it may be identified in the artwork, and the other, on highlighting those expressive elements of the artwork that were not expected at all by author (direction which, in turn, provides interpretation with other two variants: one, inspired by the analysis of the artwork reported to the context, another operated by the artwork approach from the perspective of a signifying system of the interpreter). In the practice of aesthetic interpretation we can distinguish three basic directions, one of which, according to Eco, always prevails, eclipsing all others:

1. The first modern theory of interpretation has phenomenological touches, being concerned with the genesis of the artwork and having as a main objective the disclosure of the "big secret" of the author on the path of intellectual intuition (Schleiermacher). Starting from the idea that the author is the authority in the genesis of the artwork, true interpretation becomes possible in this case to the extent in which the co-genius of the author and the performer is combined⁹.

2. The second stage of the modern theory of interpretation is characterized by nearly eliminating the intention of the author, asking the interpreter to regard only the artwork, reaching even total ignorance of the historical context in which the artwork was created. This alternative

⁷ D.N. Zaharia, *Estetica postmodernă I*, 2nd Edition, Iași, 2008, p. 206

⁸ Umberto Eco, *Limitele interpretării*, Editura Pontica, Constanța, 1996, p.15

⁹ D.N. Zaharia, op. cit., pp. 207-208

interpretation is rooted in the writings of Nietzsche, in which he considerably weakened the fundamentals on the thesis regarding the author autonomy¹⁰, as well as theories of semiotics inspiration, that of the structuralism and deconstructionism. This emphasis put on the intention of the artwork in the 60s-70s has made it possible for the interpreter to claim a previously unimaginable freedom, when it was strictly subjected to the author's intention. The evolution of pragmatic aesthetic theories of interpretation led to an uncontrolled explosion of interpretation and, in many cases, to interpretations in which the meaning either no longer keeps any connection with the artwork, or is completely absent. This strategy finds in part the structuralist method, which has the particularity of focusing the interpretation approach on the artwork, ignoring almost completely the author and his intentions. Following Derrida's thesis in Europe and Hills Miller's in America, it has been cultivated such a permissive attitude, so that no interpretation, no matter how fancy, is not considered illegal.

In extreme opposition lies R. Stecker's¹¹ rough and pure intentionalism, which allowed only one meaning for each artwork, namely that defined by the interpretation seen by the author himself. However, intentionality is not limited to the mentally project of the artist because, though what he is proposing to undertake is an important form of intentionality, both perception and belief can act as forms of intentionality. Intentionality also works as an indicator of well targeted relations from the spirit to the world. So we should not imagine the existence of mental representations that constitutes a kind of prototype of the artwork to be performed, as Benedetti Croce¹² thought, but rather a "intentional" genesis, in the sense of a "genetic-engineering"¹³ practice, that involves mastering inherent capacities in a creative way (in painting, for example, the author's intentionality approach involves the development of a project by the artist, adapting the means to a pursued purpose, capitalizing accidents that occur during its evolution, and so on).

3. A third type of interpretation which has gained ground currently requires a moderate version of intentionalism, called hypothetical intentionalism¹⁴, a term that suggests that one can not know for sure whether what is received coincides with the emotional intention of the author, but it although remains in an area where the author's intention

¹⁰ Ibidem;

¹¹ Ibidem;

¹² Benedetto Croce, *Breviar de estetică*, Editura Științifică, București, 1978, apud D.N. Zaharia, *Estetica postmoderna I*, 2nd Edition, Iași, 2008, p. 209

¹³ Schaeffer's verbal expression, took from D.N. Zaharia, *Estetica postmoderna I*, 2nd Edition, Iași, 2008, p. 209

¹⁴ Name given by Levison, took from D.N. Zaharia, *op. cit.*, p. 209

retains a decisive spot. The reason for which this attitude gained ground lies in the fact that it has the advantage of being in compliance with the decontextualization and recontextualization phenomena which play an important role in the artistic creation and the contemporary aesthetics of reception, as well as appropriationism procedures, quotation, disarticulation and recombining¹⁵ etc. The English aesthetician Michael Baxandall asserts with pertinence that “figuring out the intention is not telling what is going in the mind of the painter, but to build an analysis likely to shed light on the means available to him and his pursued goals”¹⁶. In painting, for example, the term of intentions does not apply to one that is painting the canvas, but to the canvas itself, assuming a causal analysis applied to the artwork considered as a product of an intentional act, analysis which consist with selecting a number of susceptible factors in which to explain why the artwork present itself in a way and not in another¹⁷. Provided that any conscious effort to identify factors stops, eventually, unable to distinguish between intentional and unintended, Baxadall leaves the last words to the “common visual experience” that each of the receiving subjects mobilizes it his own way. In this context has arisen the concept of unconscious intentionality, which covers intentional and voluntary behaviors with personal meaning, but which that does not base on a clear conscience of this sense. Maurice Merleau-Ponty performed in a similar manner the distinction between spontaneous conscience and reflexive conscience¹⁸, between whose poles extends and develops the homogeneous space of artistic intentionality.

This latter type of interpretation is the approach which we will use in this analysis, based on the idea that the meaning of the artwork (the intentionality of the artwork) is an impartial one, through the coherence which is implied to be inherent (in the case of a successful artwork), which precisely because it symbolizes, has potential for broader meanings than those intended by its author. Hence, the surplus of meaning is recovered by the lecturer, through the subjectivity of “mobilizing of common visual experience”¹⁹, either from the first contact with the artwork, or in time, but always keeping the impartial benchmark that does not exceed the intentionality of the artwork.

¹⁵ Watch the examples from D.N. Zaharia, op. cit., pp. 209-210

¹⁶ Michael Baxandall, *Formes de l'intention*, Editions Jacqueline, Nimes, 1991, p. 179

¹⁷ D.N. Zaharia, op. cit., p. 210

¹⁸ Spontaneous consciousness - self-consciousness that forms naturally in contact to another or to the object; Reflexive consciousness - consciousness through which we truly individualize as autonomous consciousness

¹⁹ Approached in the frame of the discussion mentioned above

We will discuss these concepts in more detail in the following, analyzing individual the instances of author-artwork-lecturer and the relationship between them.

1. Regarding the author, although the intention remains impossible to understand, as we previously saw, even when we have the opportunity to know it, it does not become a methodological norm of interpretation on the grounds that the artwork is from its principle more than just the author's intent. Moreover, its value is even higher, the significances it suggests are more numerous and far from the meaning intended by the author. In fact, a proposal can not be recognized as a work of art, as long as it doesn't tell us anything other than what the author claims, because in the later case we find ourselves in the plan of unequivocal message communication - of science or of everyday language²⁰.

2. The level of the artwork should be the focus of most our attention, as it provides much of what it is needed to be known in order to be interpreted. Eco denies the legitimacy of those interpretations that "say" more than the artwork permits, without postulating, however, that a work of art corresponds to one single variant of interpretation. Formulated in this way, the thesis appears to be one at least questionable, if we follow the specific phenomenon of contemporary art of involving the receiver in the act of creation till his indistinction of the author. In this case, the author remains steadfast in the discussion, because part of the artwork is allowing the lecturer to co-participate, this meaning being formed by the intersection of the artistic object itself and the involvement of the public upon it, as an artistically assumed fact of the author.

Although contemporary art does not have, at the level of the author's intention, the homogeneity that theoretical generalizations require, such as conceptual and stylistic consistency²¹, the artwork can always be identified by a specific intention, which functions independently from the author's will, intersecting or not with it, and which may be analyzed in terms of coherence. For example, the artistic specific of Duchamp's Fountain does not stand in the co-participation of the lecturer to the artwork's meaning, through the interpretation of the urinal as a work of art, but in the artist's intentionality to propose as art the combination of an object- the urinal- and the possible of reactions from the public. Therefore, Duchamp's artistic proposal resides not just in the urinal, but also in the reaction of the audience and the urinal, which together give rise to an artistic postmodern criterion: originality, in the sense of novelty. Regarding the intentionality of the artwork, it denotes possession of a certain kind of aesthetic coherence, based on the relational tension between the ensemble of the artwork (the

²⁰ D.N. Zaharia, *op.cit.*, p. 213

²¹ Umberto Eco, *Limitele interpretării*, Editura Pontica, Constanța, 1996, p. 19

object - not incidentally chosen by the artist, non-holder of aesthetic predicates, and the author's act of artistically assuming) and the traditional archive to which the artistic practice has been reported till then, received because of this coherence, which at a first sight is much harder to decipher. We can deduce that if the interpretation is inseparable from the artwork, it is no less inseparable from the artist, to the extent that the work is his creation. Therefore possible interpretations can not be infinite because they are limited to the situation of the artist in the world, hence the conclusion that there is indeed interpretative truth and a stability of the artwork²².

Explanatory interpretations (as opposed to the constitutive ones, discussed above) deal with works of art as signs, symbols or expressions of a hidden reality. Since the artwork is related to states of this reality, the interpreter must possess a certain code (psychological, semiotic, culturographic or otherwise). Rochlitz pertinently draws attention on the fact that the artist produces a system of signs which first point to one another, forming a whole coherent ensemble in which the artist admits the translation of the experience he wishes to symbolize²³. In other words, in the terminology of Mihai Tărăși²⁴, in a succeeded artwork, there is coherence between the structural elements among themselves, and between them and the relational ones, coherence which facilitates filling of the artwork with meaning. The artist can not foresee all potentialities, interpretations or possible applications of the scheme that it produced: "to know how to produce an aesthetic coherence and to know how to translate it in terms of theory or interpretation, these are two separate skills"²⁵. This partial discrepancy between the creator's intention and the interpretations that the artwork reveals, appears with maximum evidence regarding artistic symbols, whose semantics is sedentary in time, in close connection with the life experience of a particular human community. Even if the artist can demonstrate a well-defined purpose that makes use of the symbol, this symbol will work without any information about the author's intention. This is, in fact, what distinguishes the painted artwork of a simple pictorial illustration of a practical guide, or a literary of a newsletter²⁶. In another

²² D.N. Zaharia, op. cit., p. 218

²³ Reiner Rochlitz, *Subversion et subvention, Art contemporain et argumentation esthetique*, Gallimard, Paris, 1994, apud D.N. Zaharia, *Estetica postmodernă I*, 2nd Edition, Iași, 2008, pp. 218-219

²⁴ Mihai Tărăși, *Sens și expresie în arta contemporană*, Editura Artes, Iași, 2006, watch chapter I.2., p. 36 - regarding the directions of addressing structural and relational, as well as chapter I.3., p. 80 - About meaning

²⁵ Reiner Rochlitz, *Subversion et subvention, Art contemporain et argumentation esthetique*, Gallimard, Paris, 1994, p. 100

²⁶ D.N. Zaharia, op. cit., p. 219

chapter we will discuss these differences, the distinction between signalization and symbolization, as well as the distinction between communicational function of art and that of document.

The creator of the artistic symbol can not control its possible interpretations, because this doesn't signifies directly and unequivocally - otherwise its significance could be transmitted without resorting to this medium which is the artwork. What constitutes the work of art is not the signification as such, but that "significant aesthetic coherence" made by the artist and opened to main regenerative interpretations²⁷. Paul Ricoeur (1913-1998) said about symbols (applies to works of art in general) that "they say more than they say"²⁸, therefore successful artworks incites to interpretation even in borderline cases where authors (or artists like Warhol or minimal artists) have developed them as transparent and discouraging for a possible interpreter. This type of interpretation is known as constructive or reconstructive, focusing on elements involved in the work's aspiration to aesthetic success²⁹.

3. P. Francastel believes that "there is no fair vision, nor accurate reading or signification, independent of the existence of a group capable of interpreting the artwork"³⁰. Finally, the third instance constituted by the lecturer, which enables reception and the interpretation of the artwork, complementing its communication function, is the one which contemporary art imposes a high level of competence in the reception approach, understanding and interpreting the artwork, often on a higher level than that of the contemporary artist. When we talk about interpreting the artwork, we are dealing with a type of relational addressing³¹, due to the possible recovery by the lecturer of discursive meaning of the artwork (the message), terms usually used in rationalizing in a hermeneutical way the existing elements in the artwork. Because the aesthetics and concept are not attributes of art, but of men (as well as beauty and ugliness), and their operationalization is mainly present in the experience³², implicit in the reception, one of the reader's attributes is that he completes, most of the time, by his own experience, the lacking zones caused by the author's ideas' reductivity. In other words, he recovers, as we mentioned in the previous point, either the lack or the surplus of meaning of the work, without exceeding its interpretation parameters, if we find ourselves in the case of

²⁷ Ibidem, p. 220

²⁸ Paul Ricoeur, *De l'interprétation*, Edition Le Seuil, Paris, 1965, p. 76

²⁹ D.N. Zaharia, op.cit., p. 222

³⁰ P. Francastel, *Figura și locul*, Editura Univers, București, 1971, p. 11

³¹ Watch Mihai Tarasi, *Sens și expresie în arta contemporană*, Editura Artes, Iasi, 2006, chapter I.2., p. 36 - regarding the directions of addressing structural and relational

³² Ibidem

successful reception. He constitutes a dialog partner able to project their personality more active and effective over the artwork, extracting its suggestive elements, but subjected to artistic initiation, his chances to receive the artwork more accurately increases significantly, because “who enjoys a more vivid conscience of the reasons, enjoys fuller and deeper”³³. Therefore, developing a method of study and of interpretation of expression visual forms should start from the knowledge of the principles, methods and procedures that make up the contemporary methodology of arts³⁴.

Adopting the view that knowing the laws of art is useful to receipting it in a more complex way, we deduce that the more alienated the lecturer is from the knowledge of art, the more skeptical and inflexible he becomes, always willing of mechanical decoded recipes, without any involvement, fact that would lead to the instauration of a new dogmatism about things. Therefore, the lecturer should contribute in the act of interpretation with his own judgment, based on a cultivated aesthetic sensibility that is not necessary unless he wants that the chances of success in interpretation become higher.

*The aesthetic perception (empirical/ retinal/ sensitive). Experience*³⁵

It is required to note that the act of reception is accomplished automatically at the contact between the lecturer and the artwork, regardless of its training and competence, but the quality and the complexity of the reception experience are often directly proportional to the visual education of the lecturer and with his art elevation degree.

In the framework of sensible perception, it is required to raise in discussion a fundamental human quality: visual perception, feature that influences to conditioning our way to relate to the surrounding reality. This means that the way in which man reports visually to the objective reality relies in determining relations caused by the direct action of objects and phenomena upon the sense organs (in the framework of discussion, sight). This causal relationship is enrolled into the mechanisms of human visual apparatus, also corresponding to the inherent structure of human construction that works automatically, regardless of reason or emotion, often causing their reaction. So, in terms of perception, there is a code situated in the common structures of all men, which functions as a

³³ Tudor Vianu, *Estetica*, Editura pentru Literatură, București, 1978, p. 38

³⁴ Cornel Ailincăi, *Introducere în gramatica limbajului vizual*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2010, p. 25

³⁵ Result of human interaction with the objective world, reflected into consciousness, intentional infliction of a phenomenon in order to study its phases of development; www.dexonline.ro

perceptual predisposition that comes in contact with stimuli, certain emotional states and associative reactions³⁶.

If this faculty is not a native “gift”, collective unconscious, it certainly has become a “given” accumulated over time³⁷, as a mark of progress. To illustrate, we take the well-known case of simultaneous contrast, which Johannes Itten³⁸ (1888-1967) had theorized experimenting the phenomenon of colors for years with his students at the Bauhaus University of Zurich. Although physics gauges do not record any difference, the human eye perceives a certain quantity of neutral gray juxtaposed on yellow, as violet (its complementary)³⁹. This is due to the natural human need to achieve harmony inscribed in him, by equivalence on the outside. If human was created harmonic, his way of seeing is, in turn, harmonic, and therefore his perception availability tends to harmonize what it sees. Deciphering a visual form of the harmonic code was done for artistic representations, and assumed, from authorial perspective, the use of the communication acts in a retinal way, in highlighting the support of an ordering network line⁴⁰.

Rudolf Arnheim speaks about tensions and directions⁴¹ in a dynamic of a framework, which is triggered when an element is inserted in an attempt to regain equilibrium. In the receiving device of the lecturer, the perceptual phenomenon happens due to non-compliance of inherent harmonics needs, which causes imbalance, the sensation of restlessness. These events resulted in the author-artwork-lecturer relationship, in two types of incarnation of the conveyed content: a harmonic structure, corresponding to human immanent structure, and one extra-harmonic, or intentionally used by artists stakes to produce a particular type status, or accidentally, that state being as well received, no matter what the artist's stake. By virtue of this fact, we note that although a big part of contemporary art launches artistic productions with conceptual stake, the visual apparatus of humans receives automatically the visual organization of the artwork's framework, this being an important element in artistic perception at the experience level, even if the artist does not assume it as

³⁶ Mihai Tarasi, op. cit., p. 44

³⁷ Idem, p. 42

³⁸ The results were published in 1961, in the volume *The Art of Color: The Subjective Experience and Objective Rationale of Color*, (original title: *Kunst der Farbe: Studienausgabe* by Johannes Itten, Otto Maier Verlag, Ravensburg, 1961 and 1973)

³⁹ We can find other examples of the chromatic functioning of human visual perception in Liviu Lazarescu, *Culoarea in arta*, Editura Polirom, Iasi, 2009

⁴⁰ Watch Mihai Tarasi, *Sens si expresie in arta contemporana*, Editura Artes, Iasi, 2006, p. 49, the example from Charles Bouleaux, *Geometria secreta a pictorilor*, Editura Meridiane, Bucuresti, 1979

⁴¹ Rudolf Arnheim, *Arta si perceptia vizuala*, Editura Meridiane, Bucuresti, 1979, p. 19

expressive priority in his artistic approach. Therefore, what does the lecturer receives, at an experience level, is the coherent ensemble between visual elements and message layout of the artwork, whose succeeding facilitates the emergence of a sense/meaning of the artwork, able to properly target communicated content⁴².

The reception experience of an artwork, although it is firmly rooted in the way our visual apparatus makes us, does not exclusively imply that determination. In the act of reception, there is also a number of personal factors involved, highly subjective, pertain to each individual how to get connected to the world around, but also rational, by the human tendency to always explain what he sees, amounting to an important size to the reception act. At the level of phenomenon experiencing, the retinal reception, emotional and rational, happens in a synergetic way, their delineation being possible only in a theoretical discussion.

References:

- Ailincăi, Cornel. 2010. *Introducere în gramatica limbajului vizual*, Iași: Editura Polirom
- Arnheim, Rudolf. 1979. *Arta și percepția vizuală*, București: Editura Meridiane
- Baxandall, Michael. 1991. *Formes de l'intention*. Nimes: Editions Jacqueline C.C.E.C.A. 2009. *Arta și publicul nou*. Iasi: Editura Artes
- Croce, Benedetto. 1978. *Breviar de estetică*. Bucuresti: Editura Științifică
- Eco, Umberto. 1996. *Limitele interpretării*. Constanta:Editura Pontica
- Francastel, Pierre.1971. *Figura și locul*. București: Editura Univers
- Lăzărescu, Liviu. 2009. *Culoarea în artă*. Iasi: Editura Polirom
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1965. *De l'interprétation*. Paris: Edition de Seuil
- Rochlitz, Reiner. 1994. *Subversion et subvention, Art contemporain et argumentation esthetique*. Paris: Edition Gallimard
- Tarasi, Mihai. 2006. *Sens și expresie în arta contemporană*. Iasi: Editura Artes
- Vianu, Tudor. 1978. *Estetica*. Iasi: Editura pentru Literatura
- Zaharia, D.N. 2008. *Estetica postmodernă I*. (ediția a II-a). Iasi: Editura Dosoftei
- www.dexonline.ro

⁴² Not to confuse the communicational content with the message (discourse) of the artwork, which is, in its turn, a vehicle of the communicated content