INFORMATION TO USERS

1326389

Politowicz, Zak

ANALYSIS AND METAPHOR SEARCH STRATEGY CONCERNING VISUAL
WORKS OF ART

The University of Arizona   M.A.   1985

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __√__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____

2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____

3. Photographs with dark background _____

4. Illustrations are poor copy __√__

5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____

6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____

7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages _____

8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____

9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____

10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____

11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.

12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.

13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.

14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____

15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____

16. Other_____

_____

_____

University
Microfilms
International

ANALYSIS AND METAPHOR SEARCH STRATEGY

CONCERNING VISUAL WORKS OF ART

by

Zak Politowicz

.

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF ART

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
WITH A MAJOR IN ART EDUCATION

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 8 5

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

        This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfill-
ment of requirements for an advanced degree at The Univer-
sity of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library
to be made available to borrowers under Library rules.

        Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable
without special permission, provided that accurate acknow-
ledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for
extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript
in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major
department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his
or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the
interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however,
permission must be obtained from the author.

                      SIGNED: _____

                    APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

_____   _____
        DR. VINCENT LANIER   Date
        Professor of Art

DEDICATIONS

This thesis is fondly dedicated to:

Dr. Warren Anderson whose courses in "Environmental Aesthetics" and "Art and Society" have helped to identify the visual metaphors that surround us.

Dr. Joanna Freuh, for exposing the verbal metaphors that prevail in the subtexts of art literature and other writings exemplified in her course "Feminist Art Criticism".

Sunyata Peniel, my daughter, who has always used metaphor without even knowing about it.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes an analysis and metaphor search strategy for critical talk about art used in discipline-based art education. The conceptual investigation here proposes a new and difficult approach to be used with sophisticated adults because untutored students at the secondary level are unfamiliar with critical talk about art and other related disciplines which bear on a visual work of art. The proposed sequential model for discussing and interpreting a visual work of art is founded on theories in the literature and on the assumption that metaphor can extend and thus enhance the meaning of a visual work of art for the viewer.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

One way to talk about art is metaphorically. A visual work of art, like a metaphor, is understood through the relations of parts within the whole. Unfortunately, there is not enough work on metaphor in the visual arts to fully examine this way of looking or to ground this thesis in the visual arts context alone. Therefore, writings from literature, psychology, philosophy, and linguistics will have to be used to expand certain points in this study.

Although this thesis is based on a dissertation by Feinstein (1979), it is a new approach to the examination of using metaphor with visual works of art. It seeks first to incorporate metaphor as an interpretive tool within the frame of a simple and generalized approach to critical talk about art. Secondly, it stresses its role as a comprehensive tool within art education. Lastly, metaphor is not involved here in the sense of the discipline of language nor literature, but in the visual arts context.

Furthermore, one goal of this conceptual investigation is to set up a model to bring out the characteristics of a visual work of art and to interpret it metaphorically. It is to be used with sophisticated adults presupposing that they can understand novelty, vividness, what it is to relate

1

things to each other, what is the result of the interaction
of different ideas, and what are the design elements in a
visual work of art.

This study will be theoretical, in that it does not
use experiments, statistics, or proofs. The proposed Analy-
sis and Metaphor Search Strategy (or AMSS from here on) for
critical talk about art has not been tested to check its
effectiveness for teaching or learning. It is not known
whether AMSS can help students understand and talk about art
better than other discussion formats but it certainly can be
used along with them. It does, however, bring into the fore-
ground certain considerations on the topic of metaphor as an
idea that language expresses and as it correlates with a
visual work of art, which will be exemplified later.

Finally, AMSS as it refers to Discipline-based Art
Education (or DBAE from here on) will also be used as a cri-
tical analysis of visual works of art. It goes beyond Fein-
stein's (1980) metaphor search strategy which does not con-
sider the formal aspect of critical art talk. It is a form
of guided discovery in that analytical questions are used
to facilitate metaphorical and non-metaphorical interpreta-
tions. In this way it can be an integral part of DBAE which
wants to show people how to know about art and to be able to
describe aesthetic properties such as vividness,

completeness, and intrinsicness (which is the exclusion of means and is confined to a state of mind, not the object) in visual phenomena. Similarly, AMSS, through its open and cognitive questioning and metaphorical interpretation, wants to produce an aesthetic response (Broudy, 1972, says this has four aspects: formal, technical, sensuous, expressive, and that the responce is incomplete unless it is interpreted.) from students. The procedure proposed here is directed towards an adult audience but further study might reveal how the process could be used with younger learners. Critical talk about art in the classroom situation is not so well studied that we can afford to ignore any possibly helpful body of concepts. Any methodology that might help to make talk about specific works of art more insightful can be of significance.

Discipline-based Art Education

A fine art education is one that is "discipline-based" (Greer, 1984). This means that art education, if it is to be a study in its own right, requires a sequential curriculum in which ideas and procedures are defined and questions point to understanding. This also means that studio art, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics are incorporated. (Aesthetics is concerned not so much with the

nature of art, because this is unanswerable, but with what
kind of idea it is, or what are its features. Appreciation
and criticism are also considered because without interpre-
tation, the aesthetic response is incomplete.) Teaching art,
therefore, shall have real worth.

According to discipline-based art education, the
offspring of aesthetic education, concepts and procedures
are put forth in an orderly way, for example, from simple
to complex, and thus can result in a keen understanding of
art for the viewer. Also the concepts that a student learns
in aesthetics (such as Bullough's psychic distance, and
Lipp's theory of empathy), art history, art criticism, and
in the studio can be seen and assessed by the understanding
that an aspiring student exhibits. DBAE provides a curricu-
lum that reveals the workings of art as a study. This new
approach to teaching art seeks to evoke in people an under-
standing of art and an awakening to aesthetic elements every
where.

Eisner's contribution (1972, 1982) and Feldman's
position with respect to art criticism (1967, 1981) have
helped to develop the view that art education should be
discipline-based. Broudy (1972, 1983), Lanier (1983), and
Smith (1971, 1983) have explored the role of aesthetics in
art. Herein, and as part of DBAE, aesthetic education is in

ways of knowing works of art through concepts in aesthetics
that help form the ability to have meaningful aesthetic ex-
periences of art works. It is not a vain attempt to define
art, the undefinable, but cradle it in some conditions to be
able to understand it.

By studying works of art, people can acquire the
content of art but this is not the end result of disciplined
study. The goal is the ability to generalize among stimuli
because this can help the person to make sense of their ex-
periences within different "value domains" (Broudy, 1984),
or references. This means that an aesthetic domain can be
related to, for instance, a political one and thereby define
an area where politics and art can be pondered.

DBAE teaches that art is made from different mate-
rials and that it can reveal some basic human quality. Here,
skills, processes, and ideas are the content of the visual
work of art and are a tool to understanding art. To further
develope these ideas, historical and cultural knowledge is
essential. This means that biographical, stylistic, and sym-
bolic aspects of a work of art have to become familiar. Se-
rious students of art can then propose what a visual work of
art means and defend their judgement about it. Finally, and
perhaps most important, is that a visual work of art can
have multiple meanings. This observation can lead to aesthe-
tic insights and therefore provide aesthetic education.

Studying art and its aesthetic capacity are two aspects of discipline-based art education. Building skills, perceiving art in different ways, and putting art in historical and social references is a third aspect. A written outline or curriculum to teach art in an orderly manner is a fourth. The fifth is that "ideas and skills from aesthetics, art history, art criticism, and studio practice are taught concurrently, they interrelate to reinforce one another"(Greer, 1984:216) and to form a comprehensive view. Finally, "the attention to systematic instruction with time requirements and attention to outcome are the sixth and seventh distinguishing features of instruction within a discipline-based art program" (Greer, 1984:217).

DBAE has information and procedures that can be tested and for which teachers are responsible. What students obtain from this study become expressive of what they learned. Art "when taught as interconnected disciplines, can bring about a coherent understanding of diverse expressive forms that delineate imagination" (Greer, 1984: 218).

With regard to discipline-based features, everything taught is referenced to art. Understanding art through the discipline-based approach stems from a progressive build up of knowledge from simple to complex. In this

way art education will have very much to do with art. Furthermore, teaching disciplune-based art is solidly anchored in written criteria that begins at the untutored level and seeks to end where people can adequately express what they know about a work of art, what it means, support their views, and give it aesthetic content. Lanier (1984) suggests eight criteria for selecting such content:

1. Identify art content that will best present the knowledge and skills calculated to enhance our negotiation of objects we perceive aesthetically.

2. Examine aesthetic responses to all visual phenomena, in the light of its formal, sensuous, expressive, and technical properties.

3. Content should be centered on artifacts well within the cultural milieu of the learners because they may not understand it if it is outside their experiential basis.

4. Involve the use of content from the literature of aesthetics, by asking questions such as: Why paint portraits? What are some responses to art? How and why does aesthetic experience take place? What are relationships between design elements? Why should we have a detached yet absorbed attitude in an objects perceptual qualities?

5. Structure the content of art curriculum so that it moves from the familiar to the unfamiliar, or from simple to

complex, arrange some basic pattern of art production, and prepare an art critical dialog perhaps using Broudy's aesthetic scanning, use a social aspect so that the content may involve social phenomena, and finally, use the time sequence of art historians.

6. Deal with the contemporary arts whenever possible because it is what is affecting our lives now.

7. Art curriculum should employ as models for study an adequate number of forms of art other than drawings, paintings, and sculptures, such as, cinema, happenings, and ads.

8. Select material for curriculum content relevant to the largest portion of the learner group because the norm for all is set by the majority.

Lanier's principles for curriculum are not obligatory because he admits that perhaps no curriculum can match the ability of a dedicated and inspired instructor who desires to share what he/she has. Lanier also says that this marks a fine teacher and maybe more vital to the learning process than any guideline or principle.

Metaphor and Art Education

To make a metaphor, relate two ideas to each other in an anamolous way, such as, the empty space (of a whole canvas) is shocking - Bonnard, Malevolich, and Rauschenberg. To understand metaphor, juggle its ideas and try to perceive

the relationships among them. For example, what is it about the void that is shocking? Is it the unseen, the not understood that is feared? In this way the reader/viewer can expand his/her capacity in learning and communicating.

Ortony (1975) talks about three different ways that metaphor may help learning: (1) The compactness of metaphor takes parts of experience and transfers them from well known to less well known contexts as exemplified later in reference to the Statue of Liberty. (2) Vividness provides more durable learning because the imagery is more concrete or vivid thereby bringing coherence to discourse. (3) The inexpressibility aspect states that certain features of experience are not incorporated in language and that metaphor provides the meanings that are not part of it.

Another distinction of metaphor that can be educationally applicable is its shock value. A live metaphor is novel. It makes an association where none has ever been made before. Thus, it is not unlike what artists do, who reach into something common, stir about, and extract the profound. The novel or surprise element rings with a truth that sounds out the essence of that which it asserts. For example, Cezanne said that the essence of art is realization, that is physical realization of an idea about nature.

Educationally it is unwise to use metaphors that can confuse the students because they may not have the experiential basis to relate to the transfer of metaphorical components. Oddly, metaphor is greatly used as a method of explaining. To change the anomaly, the student must change from a mode of understanding where the relations between that which signifies and that which is signified in a metaphor are extracted. This means that anological thinking and knowledge of certain areas that the metaphor expresses are essential. In this case, metaphor becomes a learning tool because it deals with finding relationships among perceptually different objects, and discovering the extent to which they can be related conceptually. Perception/conception is on a relative basis says Sticht (1979).

Petrie (1979) writes that although metaphor can produce new knowledge from old, it is not easy for the untutored to do so. However, education has always fostered situations in which people can develope classifying and relating abilities. These are essential to understand metaphor as they are to any study. Hence, it is pragmatic to use metaphor to its utmost capacity, that is, lend light to that which is otherwise difficult to express, such as aesthetics or peculiar relationships in interpretation.

DBAE holds aesthetic education, which deals with questions on perception, and appreciation of objects, in high regard. Greer (1984:214) says aesthetics deals with perception, understanding, and appreciation of things that stir and satisfy us in ways that cannot be considered literally only. Metaphor is a mode of conceiving/perceiving the non-literal. In a visual work of art the non-literal is implied. Metaphor can be used to interpret this. In this way it can relate to DBAE since it deals with critical talk about art. Moreover, metaphor depends upon an association among encoders (or literal mental representations) from many disciplines. This enables the educated person to understand and appreciate their experiences within different contexts or "value domains"(Broudy, 1984) that mark a person's life (Greer, 1984).

Aesthetic education in art is basically concerned with studio production, art criticism, and art history. But it is also concerned with juxtaposing contexts, seeing the function of art in culture as it transmits values, attitudes, and cultural meanings, and understanding the interaction of design elements. Putting what is seen into exact words is impossible because pictures cannot be equated with words. Nevertheless, words are used to communicate experience and art education requires that its ideas be

thus expressed although responding to art does not always have to be verbal. Herein metaphor becomes invaluable for expressing odd contexts by analogy among the unlike things. It can give form to associations that otherwise cannot be experienced.

Hamblen (1984) said that questioning is an important part of effective teaching but it needs to be paired with an orderly and meaningful content. Together, questions and subject matter can help make the model proposed herein, as it refers to talk about art, an intgral part of DBAE. The questions in AMSS will help the viewer interact with art or other objects by establishing ideas that come about as part of critical talk about art.

In a visual work of art the verbal metaphor is implied, but the literal composition, tenor, or vehicle which carries the crux of the meaning is not. The composition is seen and the metaphor is implied. What they have in common is what Richards called a "ground".

To find the metaphor in a visual work of art is often the job of the investigator of art works or the art critic who already supplies metaphors as descriptors or as synopses of a work of art for audiences. A professional's remark or review about a work is based on the work and on personal experience. This is fine for those who accept it, but an art work can be said to ask"what do I mean to you".

Discussion or talk about visual phenomena is effective when it promotes shared information and, at best, aesthetic understanding. To say what and how one thinks about a work in an art discussion has been the subject of much literature. However, little of this literature has made explicit use of the metaphor as a hypothesis for the visual work in informed talk about art. Thus, it has not extended our ability to form even greater meaning. The model proposed herein, establishes a foundation in which knowledge is shared, objects are understood aesthetically and thus forms greater meaning. It does so by serving to bring out the characteristics of a visual work of art and by interpreting them.

In terms of interpretation, a category of formal art criticism, forming metaphor may be just another step. But, in terms of understanding how and what it does it can be very valuable. For example, Petrie (1979:441) says that metaphor provides the opportunity to transfer learning from what is well known to what is less well known. Educationally this provides an essential platform to build other ideas or simply to facilitate a way to economically interpret something, such as a visual work of art, in order to be better and more easily familiar with it. It also provides a way to know old things in new ways.

Metaphor can supply the viewer with a fairly comfortable handle with which they can feel that they understand the work. A short metaphorical phrase, although not as detailed or perhaps as accurate as a lengthy critical exposition on the work, can provide the viewer with an economical amount of information. They then are free to consider and better recall the next work if it is also seen through a label.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Three factors structured the review of the litera-
ture: (a) the importance of language in talking about art,
(b) that verbal language largely shapes what and how we per-
ceive, that is, a gestalt is formed when understanding is
through knowing how to use a verbal symbol syatem, (c) the
need for an analysis and metaphor search strategy which is
based on introspection (questions in analogy, analysis, and
imagination), on the principle that talk about the visual
work of art has to correspond to what is present in the
work (referential adequacy, Pepper, 1945 and Ecker, 1967),
and on an interpretation which would help recall and under-
stand visual works of art.

The notion of metaphor as an aid to discussing vi-
sual art is a recent one (Feinstein, 1982. Clements, 1982.
Foss, 1984). Before this we had other ways of looking at
art such as Lanier's screens (1968), Feldman's criteria for
informed talk about art (1970), Broudy's aesthetic scanning
(1972), and other systems as vehicles for understanding and
appreciating the visual arts. These are excellent procedures
in art criticism but they do not attend to the effect lan-
guage has on shaping perception which is a rhythmic and not
a static process (Johnson, 1980:76).

15

The proper use of language is an essential and indispensable tool for discussing concepts in art. It is dependent on vocabulary and context. When it effects what we see and then do, precision needs to be used when choosing descriptive words about a visual work of art. As a metaphorical idea, it makes an analogy and thus breeches the unfamiliar with the familiar. It is based on concensus and relations among things to form logic and meaning. In art education, which takes characteristics and relates them to each other and other things, we then might discover meaning.

With this in mind, a system for looking and talking about art, like AMSS, serves to identify visual properties, the interaction of design elements, interpretive contexts, and thus make meaning more available to us. But, we have been better conditioned in the verbal symbol system than in looking at visual works of art which deal with a visual symbol system. It is not surprising that we should be more familiar with words than with looking at, for example, abstract art which is often unfamiliar and uncomfortable for many. Lanier (1968), Feldman (1970), and others have attempted to help the viewer to approach and analyze a work of art. Langer (1957), Feinstein (1980), and others have taken the position that once the data has been coded, that is, abstracted and symbolized, then it can be known metaphorically.

Meaning

It is in the nature of thought to abstract and symbolize experience so that we may understand (Langer, 1957). According to Langer (1957) and Arnheim (1969), when we understand the techtonics of something, we know its features, qualities, and patterns. To grasp these essentials is to have abstracted or extracted. When we relate the common attributes of two different things by either similarity, relation, the result of interaction, or novelty (Pavio, 1979:152), we can form a metaphorical leap in understanding objects. Metaphor, then, can be said to be the heart of looking that is based on introspection.

In a visual work of art, the properties, principles of design, purposes for doing the work, artistic means, and varied perceptions are the catalysts that can bring about a metaphor of the work. They can also bring about a narrative that need not be bound to an individual's actual experience, but perhaps to a world view as interpreted by the individual.

What consequences occur when perception is self centered? That is to say, a meaning depends on the meaning one is conditioned to. We are ignorant because we identify ourselves and reality with our own condition (Polanyi, 1975: 126), or "man is the measure of all things"- Protagoras. Petrie (1979) explains that we start with what we already

know to learn something new. He says that much learning is being able to experience in terms of contexts of understanding. Piaget adds that during assimilation we learn by changing experiences to fit our concepts and modes of understanding. In other words, we rationalize either in terms of truly knowing something like processing metaphor or we project. However, Piaget continues, during accomodation we learn by changing our concepts and modes of understanding to fit our experience (Petrie, 1979:440). That is, we can be open .

This does not suggest that we can get out of ourselves to understand without bias. Luckman (1966) states that knowledge is metaphoric of individual psychology, cognition, and socialization patterns. He adds that social patterns set the contour and categories within which knowledge occurs. Hamblen (1982) supports this by saying that a theorist's area of focus is subject to social values. A similar position is taken by Carr (1961) who adds that theory making is a selective process because parameters are preselected, predesigned, and allow an area of study to be understood in a particular bias. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:206) write that the structuring of experience involves the application of general concepts that have a basis in our experience and in the understanding we achieve as members of a culture. It seems that we cannot escape bias.

If nature is raw material to be translated we cannot
translate it well for these reasons: The composition of any-
thing is seen in parts. We see in parallax. Emotion can in-
fluence perception, and everyone's interpretation is differ-
ent. Hence our understanding is partial and biased. But,
without concepts there is no cognition, which is both meta-
phorical and non-metaphorical. Hamblen (1982) writes that
cognition involves the forming of categories and a hierarchy
of meaning whereby metaphoric transfer allows for the build-
ing of multiple reference systems and the subsuming of new
knowledge within pre-existing categories. However, without
the act of pure sensation, when the physical act of appre-
hension is the basis of mental operation, meaning cannot be-
gin (Johnson, 1980:199-200). In addition, to understand ab-
stract concepts, such as art, we need experience and many
metaphors (Lakoff/Johnson, 1980:145) or concepts because
from many points of view together comes a fuller representa-
tion.

Turner (1978) says that meaning comes from analogy
and associations come from sensory sources. Both are influ-
enced by culture. But, the foundation of all interpretation
and thought is the correlation of signs or images with their
meanings; of symbols with concepts that show a concensus be-
tween names and things; and of patterns of symbols that are
assigned to certain analogues in the learner's experience
(Langer, 1974: 77-78).

Robert Frost said that every thought is a feat of association. Because one idea, through some kinship, links with another, we can bridge the unfamiliar by the familiar. That is, we operate within stimulus generalization which is responding to other stimuli that resemble the original conditioning stimuli (see Hartley's association theory). Because of this and because of the reciprocity between knowledge and convention we can read symbols. As a result, language (visual and verbal) is used to asses experience and is a repository of conventions (Goodman, 1968).

Metaphor can be such a repository because it is a linguistic idea which is, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), basically either ontological, structural, or orientational. This will be explained later. It is also a figure of thought in which one thing is likened to another different thing by being spoken of as if it were that other. It is symbolic of an explicit analogy. "It is a technique of reasoning resting on two kinds of connectives between the phenomena of similarity and contiguity" (Turner, 1974:290). It is like memory which is not a tape recording but a combination of what happened and how it fits into our perceptions. It is the evidence of abstract understanding and the power of the mind to use symbols (Langer, 1957). Its origin is in the nature of perception or way of seeing.

In any case, metaphors come from physical and cultural experience (Lakoff/Johnson, 1980:195). That is, we look at things in terms of our understanding and in terms of what people say about them. We structure our experience in terms of multi-dimensional gestalts (Lakoff/Johnson, 1980:202) or many contexts. When we overlay concepts/percepts, this establishes a correspondence between the old and the new and makes our experience coherent since it is seldom direct. In a visual work of art there are many levels of meaning, such as formal, historical, psychological, and metaphorical. These ideas can overlap and interrelate. The historical aspect of a work of art, for example, does not exclude the beliefs and values of the people that surround the work at the time of its creation. The formal aspect of a work is always present too and it, like the other aspects, may jockey for dominance in theme or content. Because of the many ways of understanding, a work can be known as a totality when they are brought together.

Factors in Viewing Art

Paintings and other works of art are not ordered in the way that verbal metaphorical comments are. They are a model for ideal formal wholeness and simultaneaity (Johnson, 1980:108). This means that they can be understood all at once. They do not make comparisons. Verbal metaphors do.

They also do not often make assertions because they cannot be taken as literally as a verbal phrase which has a more definitive meaning. However, in the handwriting of the artist, they depict a world view. This is shown as experience, that is, as an expressive force in perception that is a surrogate of reality, while seeming to reveal it too (Schiff, 1978:109). The essence of an artist's vision is what is expressed through formal elements (Johnson, 1980:178). Because of the novelty of images, the artist/poet is the inventor of visual language. Perhaps this is why, according to Beittel (1977), art cannot be taught, but must be learned all at once. That is, its essence cannot be explained totally by others, hence it must be personally experienced.

Painting as artifice is a pattern of associations that have a rhythmic and pictorial overtone (Johnson, 1980: 227). As artifice, it illustrates the transforming nature of the imagination to change the dead natural world into a wondrous, artificial, and two-dimensional world of art (Johnson, 1980:27). In the Gestalt view, a painting expresses the functional similarity of analogous forms commonly shared among viewers (Arnheim, 1949). In other words, what is recognized in the symbols of art may be a cultural convention. Clemmer and Leitner (1984) write that paintings show a logical structure that is understood through metaphors of

emotion. This means the viewer can tell one work from another by affective impact. Finally, and as it is used in AMSS, feelings and structures together form the symbol or visual work of art whose "meaning is a function of patterns or linkages, that is, meaning lies in logic where one deals with relations" (Langer, 1974:52-53).

When perceiving and expressing viewpoints on art, we must understand the manufactured object in terms of artistic qualities (Anderson, 1981b). This is exactly what a verbal metaphor has to do when refering to visual objects. It has to refer to the work. This important aspect has also been incorporated within the body of the forms of critical talk to be examined here, and it is within the proposed model for analysis and metaphor search.

Discussion of factors viewing art suggest that there is no one way to look at artistic expression. Unlike literature, it is a whole other way of experiencing. This different way is made more familiar by interpretation. Metaphor is one tool that can transform any object into something else, something for understanding, something for discussion. Advertisers know this well. For instance, the phrase "invest in fine art" associated with a picture of a Mercedes suggests that the two go together. How synonymous the product is with the caption, or for that matter, the real visual

work of art with an interpretation, is at the heart of metaphorical insight. Such a concern is also at the heart of AMSS and other forms of talk about art.

Talk about Art

Talking about art has often been referred to as "art appreciation, aesthetic education, and picture study" (Jones, 1974), and so on. These processes all have elements of studying works of art for their formal qualities. As Feldman says about art criticism, that it is just"talk about art" (1970:348). In order to talk about art metaphorically, a method, like AMSS, is required.

The need for critical talk about art in the classroom has been a heavily discussed subject but the extent of its application is barely known. Wilson's (1966) study of structure and sequence in art talk tried to change student's perception of paintings by language and experiences that directed them to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate paintings. For example, how did Braque depict time and space in "Nude Descending Staircase"? Wilson found that activities other than studio need to be developed, such as, language and perceptual ideas that people already have.

Gall (1984) has shown that classroom recitation questions are often leading, asked quickly, and often elicit

rote learned answers. In metaphorical thinking, if the meta-
phoric answer is a cliche, it does not expand the meaning of
the content. In AMSS the questions are introspective and
seek to compare abstractions to form leaping associations.

Metaphor combines language and perception by means
of reason and imagination (Feinstein, 1982) often into a
profound analogy. It can offer significant insights and it
is often used in art criticism and in art history as yet an-
other aspect in understanding and appreciating art. It may
be just another step in interpreting visual works of art,
but it needs to be understood for what it is, especially in
education, a perceptual model or a trap that focuses on
biased features.

Forms of Art Talk

This study summarizes and discusses four art rela-
ted discussion formats from art education. The systems were
studied with regard to their capacity for using metaphor in
discussing visual works of art, questioning method, and
symbolizing or abstracting capability.

First are Lanier's (1968) nine screens. They ask the
viewer to question him/herself about what they are looking
at and how they are perceiving. They provide the viewer
with a way of taking apart an experience associated with a
visual phenomenon, such as, a painting, so that it can be

conceptualized. It builds an awareness that can be talked
about categorically. The screens are: (a) what other people
say about art in general and one art work in particular, (b)
the art work's setting, (c) how the viewer has learned to
look, that is, cultural influences, (d) the viewer's know-
ledge of design, (e) symbolism, (f) associational influen-
ces, (g) history of the work, (h) personal judgement of the
work, (i) and how the viewer's life relates to the work.
These screens filter everyones's perception differently.
They may also appear in a different order than is listed and
this element separates it from Feldman's and Hamblen's sys-
tem which depends on a sequence that starts from looking and
ends with an informed opinion.

The second and best known system for discussion
about art is by Feldman (1970). It is separated into four
sequential levels but when combined, may critically identify
a work of art. By beginning with description we make a vi-
sual inventory. Following is analysis which is also a de-
scription but only of the relationships among visual ele-
ments, that is, the principles by which they function. In-
terpretation is the meaning that the elements and their re-
lationships have, that is, the form that is the shape of the
content or subject matter (Shahn, 1957). Ending with evalu-
ation, and withheld until the above levels have been consi-
dered, the viewer is required to make a judgement on the
merit of the work based on the above levels.

The third scheme is Anderson's (1983), who especially looks at the manufactured environment. Anderson separates the experience of looking at a visual work of art into basic areas that a viewer needs to consider to be able to perceive the whole. This is a prescription and not a matter of asking questions in order to arrive at an understanding. He has four parts in his method for talking about art. By function, he means the durability and efficiency of an object regardless of its form or emotional content. Form is how the object looks in terms of engineering (quantitativeness) and art (qualitativeness). Proportion is something else that can account for an object's form. Content has to do with the interpretation of the intended or unintended meanings in the relationship of the object with its surroundings. Content makes use of ambience, moods and values. The last issue is style. It is the sum of an object's visual qualities which have connotations of a special time, place, form, or brand.

The fourth writer, Hamblen (1984) utilizes Bloom's taxonomy which divided the cognitive domain into a hierarchy of six learning levels: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. She takes these and relates them to Feldman's four levels. This relationship becomes a basis for making a sequence of art criticism questions within the taxonomy. The questions are found on the

basic thought processes of each level, on certain art rela-
ted words and relevance to the object. Hamblen, has also in-
tegrated Bloom's cognitive and affective domains (receiving,
responding, valuing, organization, and characterization) by
combining questions requiring attitudinal answers dependent
on logic and language.

These processes do not depend on metaphor to further
segment the perceptual process or to expand their ability to
understand a visual work of art in yet another way. But, the
fact that these systems do sequentially breakup the experi-
ence of looking at a visual work of art by considering dis-
tinct areas; the totality of a picture can be known in a
more vivid way than by just looking without considering. In
this way, looking at a visual work of art may develope mean-
ing which can be defended.

Problems with Art Talk

Metaphor is not used by these forms of art critical
talk. If it were, as it could, it would be part of inter-
pretation. As an interpretive tool it can compact yet ex-
pand information, make it more vivid, and express the other-
wise inexpressible. These aspects have been discussed ear-
lier but what needs to be said here is that metaphor might
play an important role in talk about visual art. This will
be further explained when it is used with Figure 2.

Moreover, it is not easy to form metaphors about a visual work of art nor is it always easy to understand them. This means that care needs to be used in making them and that the audience they are made for need also to be considered because their experiential basis is not universal.

The above discussion systems deal with a variety of qualities when talking about art. However, talking can destroy art discussion when the talk is incompetent or inappropriate for the level of the viewer (Eisner, 1976:5). Ecker (1967) believes that the inability to talk articulately about an aesthetic object may be because of the lack of an appropriate vocabulary and skill in using it during art talk. How can there be serious talk if the terms are unknown? Therefore, a guide is essential in securing qualitative art discussions.

The viewer and the viewed make up half of the balance on the scale of informed talk about art. The other half is language, the great molder of behavior. "Art educators should note that attempts to refine and organize have succeeded in technical fields through the careful narrowing of the descriptive range of concepts and terms into the words and syntax of specialization (Dobbs, 1971:32). He then says, art education needs to specialize because it needs concensus on the meanings of its commonly used words; it is

difficult to talk about art or aesthetics because they each
have physical and mental aspects. Research in art education
also calls for a clear technical vocabulary. Dobbs also be-
lieves that art and aesthetics have intangible qualities,
hence a verbal metaphor would help interpret it.

Rhode (1974) reviewed textbooks in twelve different
fields to make an inventory of particular terms in each sub-
ject. The sciences have more of these than art, but art has
more than literature. Out of 4066 unique terms in art, 2741
are unique to art alone. There seems to be plenty of words
to help make art tangible. In fact, Dobbs (1971), White and
Bell (1977) say that a vocabulary is important for increas-
ing understanding; for appreciation and communication of
ideas (Rowell, 1983); and assisting in the recall of infor-
mation (Walton, 1972).

There seems to be little vocabulary instruction with
studio processes and rarely are specific explanations of
procedures or examples of terms provided. Rowell (1983),
White and Bell (1977) say that new terms, such as contour,
chiaroscuro, and staging, should be introduced with visual
examples that describe the ideas behind the words. A techni-
cal vocabulary allows for precision in the study and discus-
sion of complex topics. Furthermore, Cushenbury (1981) wrote
that vocabulary can be linked positively to intelligence and

reading comprehension. However, Humes (1976b) stated that most of the valid information on vocabulary development is in research. Little of it is applied in schools (Cronnell/Humes, 1973:3).

Brown (1981) said that direct teaching of vocabulary is more effective than learning it incidentally; that the type of and purpose for vocabulary is confused; that there is a tendency to choose words that are of little use to students; and that there is a trend to use commercially prepared materials which test rather than explain terms.

Rowell (1983) classified terms for expressive, formal, and technical qualities, and for their physical and cultural influences on the work. Humes (1976a) has classified terms for color, medium, criticism, style, technique, and tools. Anderson (1965) listed and defined one-hundred-ten terms for categories like: design elements, art forms, historical references, materials, tools, and techniques. His words appear throughout his plans for learning about art, and he encourages their use. He also points out that although many terms are complex, simple words aimed at a child are usually inacurate and curtail verbal literacy.

Importance of Context

The proper use of metaphor, in the visual arts, must rely on a sophisticated art vocabulary and heavily on interpretation and analysis, which are two aspects of art critical talk. This will insure a firm basis within the work or as Ecker (1967) says, it would be "referentially adequate". To a large extent, metaphor does this by abstracting features from two different entities and relating that about which something is novelly said (topic) to that which says the novel thing (tenor). Similarly, any form of critical talk starts by identifying what is there and how they relate to themselves and to other things; then a hypothesis can be made about the findings.

Both of these processes use abstraction to form meaning and order and are largly achieved through verbal mediation. Miller and Rohr (1980) say that abstracting can involve the use of verbal cues to analyze and generalize signals that the individual perceives from the environment. Langer (1957:93), Klix and Metzler (1981) add that concepts are coded in feature structures resulting from classification processes in perception. Finally, Langer (1957) says that language is prerequisite for abstract thought. It transforms the image after the primary elements of the image are established and understood.

Whether cue, feature, primary element, or however
the abstraction is termed, it remains isolated like a word
unless it has life in context. For example, art is often
perceived more politically as a tool of the state in the
U.S.S.R. than it is in the U.S. which may often think of it
more in economic terms. Culture often determines its reality
or meaning. But, it is under constant pressure to alter that
meaning when handled by individuals. The arts and other
areas that deal with the subconscious which are on the edge
of articulation, force a tremendous pressure on verbal lan-
guage to concretize the immaterial, that it can break down
as a means of communication (Perry, 1984:22). As a result,
an artist often has to point to referred areas, and speak
metaphorically, when literalness will not do.

Language Affects Behavior

Langer (1974:52-53) writes that any item that is to
have meaning must be employed as a sign or symbol which can
either be discursive or non-discursive. Thus language re-
structures perception because the reader is asked to combine,
relate, and fuse elements together which are explicitly se-
parate in nature, thereby reorganizing nature (Johnson, 1980:
31). It seems that perception involves penetration, in that
it is the organizing structure of description (Johnson:103),
and is dominated by language and convention. In other words,
perception involves making sense of the environment.

Kuhnert (1982) says that concepts play a role in the content and processing of experience because language and reality are tightly related. That is, they have cultural/ historical components. For example: until Shakespeare's time, "girl" used to mean "boy". Gender terms are socially determined and influence observation and interpretation of gender related behaviors (Richardson/Damron, 1981). In other words, language influences behavior (Whorf, 1956). We need only look at statements of belief, paradox, truth conditions, propositions, conditional clauses, directives, rigid desig- nators, interogatives, sex, possible worlds, gestalt, verbal conditioning, music, math, choreographic scores, road signs, and the visual arts to know that language is used to tell us what to do. It gives access to cognitive operations, and language habits (Langer, 1957). Code (1980) supports this when she says language and knowledge influence each other as do language and culture.

Frueh (1984) and other feminist scholars have exa- mined how the categories of speech, prediction, concept fa- voritism, and judgement are often determined by sex oriented metaphors. It is argued that male and female language users position themselves differently toward the outside world and shape their language accordingly. We can understand this, for instance, in art history where the language is often

patriarchal as in "Fathers of Art" or"Masters of Art"; or
militaristic when artists destroy previous styles by subver-
sion and revolution; or derides women when the male produces
the "baby" (product of art or creation) or is pregnant with
meaning. Women are negatively seen as Eve, Jezebel, Cleo-
patra, Femme Fetale, Vagina Dentata, Harpy, Amazon, Sex, and
so on (Frueh, 1984). It is important to be aware of falla-
cies such as these, because when teaching art, for instance,
it is erroneous to cloud a picture by covert ideas such as
repetitive metaphors in the subtext (actions of one person
to another) which inform a reader's relationship to art.

Regarding metaphor as it effects behavior, it can be
highly functional. It can make associations where literal-
ness has fallen behind. By means of similarity, relation,
and the result of anomalous interactions of known objects
(Pavio, 1979), an observer can make the unknown more readily
understood. For example: The Statue of Liberty is now refer-
ed to as "the Lady". It can be reasoned, but perhaps not by
a feminist, that the term "lady" has connotations of wealth,
grace, refinement, esteem, education, leadership, and world-
ly position. It can be imagined that these associations fit
neatly with a certain bronze sculpture off Manhatten. This
little word has compacted a lot of meaning in a little space
yet it has also expanded a meaning by making the notion of

what a particular tonnage of green metal is, quite clear to a nation of a quarter billion people. Metaphor then, is often very practical, highly expressive, and sets up certain connotations that are often blindly accepted. When teaching, this has to be understood.

Ruskin said that a visible symbol cannot be para-phrased (Johnson, 1980:85), because words and pictures are not equatable.Hence, a picture is worth no number of words. Metaphor, then, is the best idea we have to span the meaning among disparate things because ordinary language loses power as it loses verbal accuracy (Johnson, 1980:86).

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), when we talk about ideas they are either metaphorical or concrete (non-metaphorical). The metaphorical type is basically an orien-tational form, an ontological form, or a structural form.

The orientational type provides a non-literal sense of direction to the meaning of terms. It is a linear struc-ture where more, good, control, and rational are equated with verticality or up. For example: acquisitions fell, mu-seum attendence rose, art is an up, Dali is high.

The ontological form substitutes material for imma-terial characteristics. It reveals projections as in words and the mind are containers; the mind is fragile or it is a machine; and energy is a thing. These are shown in such

phrases as: "words are hollow, clear your head, Klee is
sharp, van Gogh was delicate, yet he burst with vitality".
In a painting of shoes by van Gogh, the phrase "van Gogh's
shoes are mystical" shows that an otherworld quality is pro-
jected on to ordinary shoes because they seem to have an ex-
tra life of their own.

As a structuring form, metaphor handles one type of
experience as if it were another kind of activity. This is a
way of conceptualizing because metaphorical concepts are
based on complex experiential gestalts (Lakoff/Johnson,
1980:201). That is, metaphors are structured in terms of
other concepts that are concrete, and are in our sensical
repertiore. Typically, understanding as seeing becomes "I
see what you mean". Art as time becomes "life is short, art
is long", (Hippocrates. Aphrounis, I.). Art as evaluation
becomes "art is the last judgement",(Proust). Photographing
animals as marksmanship becomes "shooting wildlife". Being
absorbed in a painting becomes "swallowed by the work". The
formal use of elements and principles of design becomes the
"language of art".

We do not always know exactly what something means
in a visual work of art so we can discuss it by speaking of
it in comparison, as if it were something like what we do
know. Similarly, we can discuss a visual work of art by

another figurative comparison that suggests that what we are talking about is seen in relation to some standard that reflects an orientation. For example, Goldberg said "I will bet that you have had it up to here with metaphor". This suggests a kind of equalizing that relates the non-literal metaphor 'here is up' to the literalness of up. Finally, by saying something is something else when it really could not be is a way of making a figurative comparison. That is "art is life" is only a way of saying that with out imagination, civilization cannot be.

Problems with Metaphor

Metaphor reveals only part of the picture. It may overlap or be inconsistent with other metaphors. For example: art has no intrinsic value contrasts with art has social significance because one speaks of art as aesthetic, the other refers to it the way that a scientist might look at an artifact.

Metaphor by itself misses the mark. It cannot be understood aside from its experiential basis. "Good is up" has a different experiential basis than "joy is up" because we experience 'up' in many different ways. This means that because concepts are understood in relation to experience, we have to experience something in a certain way before metaphor can help us understand it. "Understanding is a matter

of an individual's experiential history as well as his/her cultural heritage (Lakoff/Johnson, 1980:206). That is, concept before percept.

The formula for metaphoric structure, "A is B", does not show how concepts are linked in experience. However, a gestalt does. It singles out the pattern by which we can understand a certain experience or function. This says that the concept of, say, the emotion of joy, may encompass part of the concept of up. The two bocome linked in a mutual physical experience in addition to the metaphors on the subject that a culture provides.

Since concepts exist within our experience (Lakoff/ Johnson, 1980:206), and experience is such a complex flux, we have to consider many metaphors, based on experience and cultural heritage, to understand different aspects of the same concept or gestalt. Being receptive to metaphors that are inconsistent with the metaphor in focus is a necessary attitude for a larger understanding. "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy", said Hamlet (Shakespeare, act I, scene V). In this way, a metaphor can be understood for what it is, a model for a point of view or a trap if some part is mistaken for a key feature of the theory it represents. Therefore, to surpass the limits of metaphor, we need to have many

metaphors or concepts to understand different parts of the same idea or ground. For example, if architecture is frozen music, (Goethe), what are the ideas in architecture that share a commonness with frozen music? In any case, we will always be influenced by the metaphors we dig from the well because they are structures by which we file experience.

The Verbal linked to the Visual

Aside from the conditioning factors of language, such as projection, orientation, and analogy, people who read very well know that visual stimuli are easier to recall when verbal labelling strategy is used (Hicks, 1980). Similarly, form recognition is better when it is paired with meaningful verbal symbols (such as the word tri-angle with a picture of a pyramid) than with non-sense syllables (such as, ar-ed-iz-fo-wah with a picture of a pyramid) or when it is simply observed (Nagae, 1978). It has also been shown that visual stimuli are recalled better with the use of meaningful associations than just by rehearsing (Johnson, 1975). If we want to be more familiar with our images, we need to take care in the words we make to describe them.

The figurative use of language is understood sooner than the literal use (Kemper, 1981). Later, Kuhlman (1982) has shown that a positive correlation exists between the level of visualization and the ability to construct

analogies and metaphors. The greater the ability to visualize, the greater the ability to form analogies. This evidence implies that a meaningful, figurative, and linguistic idea, such as metaphor, can be an aid to understanding and recalling visual works better than if they were viewed only literally. It also suggests that a lively imagination is necessary to form leaps of association and this is also basic to understanding metaphor.

If words are things or images then it is not surprising that Stopher, Kirsner (1981) and Joseph (1982) have shown that pictures and words (or sentences) are recalled equally well. But, constructing metaphor, for defining or comprehending art, requires perceptual learning in the structural features of stimuli, remembering experiences and ideas associated with the stimulus, and the ability to manipulate or organize the information contained within the stimulus events (Kuhlman, 1982). In addition, Ruskin said that by training the eye in composition, we become more receptive to how things relate to each other (Johnson, 1980: 83). With this in mind we can bring together the two abilities in a strategy for talking about art and developing metaphors that are "referentially adequate" (Ecker, 1967) to Figure 2 for example. This means that it will be based on the image referenced to. But, Ruskin also said that a

visible symbol can not be paraphrased (Johnson, 1980:85). He meant that if words are used to describe visual images, then the exposition is to restrain affective associations so that the pure facts are not clouded. Hopefully, that will not happen when the model for using metaphor in interpreting paintings is developed.

PARALLEL POSITIONS REGARDING
THE USE OF METAPHOR AND SOME CRITICISMS

C. Day Lewis said that metaphor is the earliest scientific method (Shibles, 1972). In other words, when we, as anological animals, know something, it is through metaphor. Although much has been said about metaphor and its use, nothing has been said about how to discover and formulate it in visual works of art until Feinstein (1980) adapted a method.

Feinstein's view of the use of metaphor in interpreting visual works of art is a metaphor search strategy that she bases on Rico's (1976)"clustering". "Clustering" requires that the viewer verbalize feelings that are stimulated by the visual work of art (see Figure 1a and 1b). Draw a circle around the first word elicited that is the initial pervasive quality of the work. Then radiate spokes from it to words that are associated with it. These words are verbalized visual qualities that have constant reference to the image. Eventually a pattern emerges and from the clusters of words a verbal approximation of the visual image, such as a metaphor, can be generated (Feinstein, 1980:94) by using a word from a cluster, such as weal-deal in Figure 1b, and equalizing it to the first word or initial pervasive quality of the image. We then have a 'weal-deal is truth'.

Feinstein's approach is a novel and fairly successful process of interpreting visual works of art based on the idea that art is metaphoric. Langer (1957) and others who see that a visual symbol construct, twice removed from reality, is a way of knowing, naming, describing, and is metaphoric. Feinstein's approach is systematic and seems to do the job. But, her strategy ignores certain basic areas of interpretation, such as formal analysis, historical/cultural contexts, and evaluation. This neglect cannot expand interpretation by makung it more meaningful. It is often difficult to find meaning in things, but Langer (1957) points out that it is in the scheme of things, for mankind to make meaning using literal and non-literal kinds of thinking.

Feinstein's plan scans the visual work quickly, as has been explained with'clustering', thereby she claims to eliminate analytical thinking which deals with literal description, analysis, and preference (1984:77-83). How can that be? When she lists feelings, these are the result or extension of perception, that is, the emotive interpretation of description and analysis. She also leaves out relationships that can be understood causally and/or metaphorically. To ignore analysis is to ignore comparison, the ground floor of metaphor, and the basis of thinking (I.A.Richards, 1960). When considering or explaining how something is related to something else, the recognition of common form, paradigm, or comparison is often a way of doing so.

Feinstein (1980) has shown that metaphoric thinking can be fostered by a non-linear search strategy as it regards interpreting visual works of art. Her study is still unique even though it does not overtly include the consideration of analysis, technique, style, context, and evaluation. She feels this would detract from apprehending the work more directly because the propositional left brain does not deal with wholes. Neither does she present her strategy in a larger way such that a viewer can open a package of steps to make a big leap of association, and not have questions about the meaning of the work. She is not developing a criticsm of a visual work of art, but a tool to find metaphor in one. The purpose of this thesis is to form a guide for critical talk about art within a metaphor search. This will help the viewer understand the motivations behind the metaphor, critically consider the work of art, and make the metaphor "referentially adequate" (Pepper, 1945). It will further facilitate art appreciation, especially for the untutored in talk about art. The SWRL curriculum by Greer, curriculum proposals by Lanier, Chapman, and others have a similar position, that is, that a sequential format with which to ease and expand the students understanding is basic to the development of the teaching of art as a discipline. As a matter of fact, this is also central to DBAE.

There are other related positions regarding the use
of metaphor in interpreting visual works of art. For exam-
ple, Foss (1984) enumerates several assumptions about art.
Art as entertainment, wealth, antiquty, volume, technique,
knowledge, and as superlative are a few of these. She claims
these metaphors have helped to condition perception about
art for centuries. They focus on a certain point of view,
but they may also hide other aspects of a concept that is
inconsistent with it. For instance, art as superlative shows
us the idea of a masterpiece; that it is an example of su-
preme excellence and separate from common experience. Sud-
denly, this metaphor does not sound right, but this is ty-
pical once the metaphor is fully exposed.

Clements (1982) claims to reveal metaphors in art
education. Love, law, nature, teachable skills, inborn ta-
lent, problem solving activity, creativity, religion, and
play (28-31) are some topics considered. Concepts such as
these need to be made clear because they simplify and ro-
manticize broad ideas to a dangerous level. For example, the
making of art as play suggests a certain amount of intuition
and spontaneity, but to call it 'play' is misleading because
it is also disciplined hard work. It is a kind of work that
uses analysis and is honed to such a degree that it appears
to be magic, effortless, a force of its own, and as if it

were mere child's play. Similarly, art as religion has had

Ruskin, Pater, and others as converts, but it is also a

stray notion. Religion has been a patron and still a theme

of much art now as it has ever since art began. Artist's may

work religiously and viewers may have religious experiences

when confronting visual works of art, but to say that we

worship art is inappropriate.

Scientists cannot be rid of metaphors anymore than

the rest of us. Metaphors name and describe emotion and re-

ality as no other aspect of language can because language

is strained when it is used to explain certain abstract

constructs. For example, the language of time acquires a

spatial metaphor because we have come to 'see time pass' or

to put ourselves 'on time'. Another popular misconception is

'sunset and sunrise'. The sun does not do that, but the earth

does. In art circles too, we speak metonymously about a

painting as if it were the painter. For example, "McGrew

is light dancing". It has become convenient to talk 'as if',

that is, to treat the model as the reality. To treat meta-

phor as a substitute for logical examination is eroneous

because it puts the viewer in an egocentric role, as if

everything revolves around them.

McLuhan says that metaphors are scouts, extensions

of our senses as are media and the only reliable guide to

what is worthy of being known (Levinson, 1981:180).

Metaphorical terms such as "iron curtain," "domino theory,"
"population bomb,""juicy scandal," "spaceship earth," "melting
pot," "carry the ball," "red tape," "strike out," and "food
chain" (MacDonald, 1983) bring us the world through a model
complete with an entire set of beliefs, values, and tech-
niques (Eckstein, 1983). According to I.A. Richards, the
comparative mind is inclined to think figuratively using
models to explain the unknown in terms of the known. How-
ever, sometimes a problem developes if we forget that what
we are perceiving is through a particular way of perceiving,
that is, we forget or mistake the model for the reality. For
example, when looking at a McGrew watercolor of a Sonoran
landscape, the receptive and knowledgeable viewer is told by
the painting how to look, but the composition that is expe-
rienced by the undisciplined viewer usually reflects an
attitude or way of perceiving that has little bearing on the
work, such as an unsupported psychological report.

Each discipline has a general and widely held meta-
phor that is often replaced when a better one comes along.
For example, art education used to be under Lowenfeld's um-
brella of "creativity," but now its banner could be DBAE.
History is filled by metaphoric models and traps and the
greatest problem to understanding metaphors is the lack of
indicators (MacDonald, 1983). Indicators are contextual

references and cultural experiences with the analogy. For
example, in 'art is power', what is it that makes art and
power have something in common? What does a society contri-
bute to the understanding of the comparison? Being familiar
with indicators gets easier to do after the age of four (Or-
tony/Vosniadou, 1983). However, the recognition of concepts
relating different categories often remains difficult to
grasp at any age. Nevertheless, art education typically pro-
vides the situation in which classifying, relating, and
other analytical procedures are necessary and through which
contexts from other disciplines and experiences must also be
examined and cross referenced. In this way knowledge and un-
derstanding are built.

Sometimes understanding metaphor is a 'Eureka'. At
other times it is the result of labored scrutiny. Rico (1976)
offers her "clustering strategy" as aid to deciphering the
meaning of verbal metaphors. Feinstein (1980) adapts this by
substituting the visual for the verbal. In other words, she
tries to discover a verbal metaphor for a visual work of art.
However, she ignores that a culture or context can change
perception towards certain non-literal comparisons just as
certainly as word knowledge is essential to grasp meaning in
the first place (Readence, 1982). For example, history has
shown us how the artist as a person has been perceived in
different times and places. In ancient Egypt, the artist,

because of his recording ability, was highly valued by the pharoahs. In nineteenth century Europe, the artist was often a romantic and frail dandy (see S. Langer. Illness as Metaphor). Therefore, MacDonald (1983) writes that an analytical and orderly approach may provide the ability to recognize and understand one of the important building blocks of language, as context, and thus the implications of metaphor.

The Literal and the Non-literal

Langer's (1957) position regarding metaphor or right brain non-literal processes is that it is balanced by a different skill or mode of cognition which are left brain analytical processes and deal with propositional communication. She says that the two hemispheres informed integration with each other is necessary for complex symbolic activity. She draws a distinction between the metaphoric whole that the right brain handles and the analyzed parts that the left brain sequentially deals with at the expense of the whole. These bear directly on art processes because making, viewing, and discussing art requires the inter-related skill of both right and left brain activities, which is the full range of cognition. In interpreting a visual work of art, we need to combine presentational and analytic skills to form meaning.

When Feinstein deals only with intuitive aspects in her plan, she ignores Dewey's (1958:32) idea of the function of criticism as the education of perception of works of art. This suggests art's literal as well as non-literal meanings. We clearly understand a great deal without using analysis. For example, understanding feelings, or that paint can be applied to surfaces by fingers as well as by brush is done with little reflection or consideration. However, we would be upset if this was the attitude of a scientist, a psychiatrist, or an art critic. Moreover, when Feinstein (1980:18) says that art is often taught analytically at the expense of gestalt, she means that the study of visual works of art has been dryly dissected and that intuition and a more direct perception is ignored. She has therefore swung to the other extreme in her clustering adaptation at the expense of propositions. She looks non-literally at an advertisement as a picture and ignores that it is still an ad that deals with cause/effect, audience, time dependence, literalness, and other contexts. In fact, symbolic activity is not dichotomous but an integration of action, process, and product of both analytic and non-analytic skills (Feinstein, 1980:19).

Arnheim (1969a) and Langer (1957) conceive of knowledge as the formation of concepts or abstractions. Arnheim (1969a:160) adds that the development of the percept/concept proceeds from the general to the particular through a

gradual process of percept differentiation. For instance,
the idea of linearity is further developed by experience,
that is, by generalization into individual lines. This sug-
gests that perception, a constructive process, is of wholes
first and then of parts (Wertheimer, 1925).

Feinstein stops with intuition rather than with
links between cause/effect because conception begins with
the comprehension of the big picture (Langer, 1976:266).
However, the links or associations are also vital in inter-
pretation. According to Hartley's association theory (1779:
in Fantino/Logan, 1979), we see what we have learned to see
as a result of the association of ideas (or Stimulus-Res-
ponce psychology: see Thorndike, E. L. reprinted in Dennis,
1948) which come from experience via sensations and reflec-
tions. As we reflect, we associate previous and current
ideas or S-R through such principles as similarity, con-
trast, and contiguity (Feinstein, 1980:34). In other words,
meaning is the product of learning. What have we learned if
we are not interested in the forces around us, and the pro-
ducts of learning which are the links? We would have learned
to deny full perception of the evocative properties in a
form, which is the main content of vision, or the impact of
visual forces (Arnheim, 1969:430) such as contrast, tension,
direction, and balance. Without a chance to think analyti-
cally about what is seen, we deny ourselves the chance to

respond to visual forms in the light of the characteristics found in the viewer and in the form, says Eisner (1972:29). The more we see, the more there is to see.

According to Langer (1976:90) inherent in our mental system is the tendency to organize the sensory field into groups of sense data to perceive forms rather than flux. Form detectors, she continues, are influenced by and respond to relational factors, such as: distinction, similarity, proximity, congruence, and relevance that exist in the internal and external world. We promptly and unconsciously abstract a form to conceive the experience as a whole, as a thing. This is why a metaphor search strategy, such as 'clustering', appears to be partially effective in deciphering visual metaphors. In addition, metaphor, a heuristic symbol, asks more than it answers, and it is subject to many interpretations. Therefore, making a metaphor bears on knowing its cousins, denotation and connotation to know how a word is used in a given situation. This is what 'clustering' does not overtly focus on. To extend meaning, it needs to analyze relational factors because metaphor is a process of connecting qualitative relationships which Lanier's screens adeptly address by utilizing formal analysis and social contexts.

Langer says that the nature of fine art is non-literal and through symbolization, knowledge is given form, the organized container for an intimate process of discovery.

Discovery calls for the interaction of analytic and non-analytic skills. In a visual work of art, experiences and feelings are objectified, frozen for a moment, to be looked at in a one to many kind of correspondence. A visual work of art evokes many associations. Its import is intuited at first. It is a metaphor for a gestalt. The artist translated feeling from the raw material of nature into a perceivable quality.

To interpret the visual work of art, we have to reverse the process cognitively. This means, that to get and process literal relationships, such as tension, and planar arrangements, analytic skills are necessary. As content is examined, the visual facts become more rich, prominent, intense, clear, cohesive, and self sufficient (Johnson, 1980: 98). To be conscious of degrees of perception alters the perceptual process by introducing will and control (Johnson, 1980:94). By avoiding the emotional personal self, we avoid the tendency to read what is in us rather than absorb the objective self into what is seen. Perception then, imperfect because of parallax, is the process of organizing the structure of description. As in interpretation, it carries a peculiar revelation. It involves penetration because it is always of something and in the case of visual works of art, it is, at least in part, of the composition of the formal elements. In fact, painting, according to Ruskin and Proust, is

a model for the perceptual process (Johnson, 1980:176), that
is restructured by language. Perception is not pure impres-
sion or direct experience which is awareness of the moment
and is without judgement. But it is twice removed from re-
ality and can become a facade of abstraction and judgement.

To understand the essence of a thing is to use figu-
rative and or propositional skills, then pure sensation,
which is to be conscious of the present, will be better un-
derstood. By grasping the sensation we live in the concrete
because meaning is within sensation. In addition, when we
can understand the whole picture, we understand all its re-
latioships. But, emotional influence of perception needs to
be reckoned with. It can taint, project, suggest, or inten-
sify interpretations that are appropriate sometimes, but not
when the viewer/reader is herded into a particular view,
perhaps through subtexts which aim to prevent them from ma-
king their own assessment. In a complex symbolic activity
such as interpretation, both the presentational and the pro-
positional skills are necessary to use if a visual work of
art is to be an educational tool for understanding the
struggle of the artist's vision.

A MODEL FOR USING METAPHOR IN INTERPRETING PAINTINGS

Analysis and metaphor search strategy, the procedure proposed here, is specifically made for interpreting visual works of art. Like Feinstein's, it is also based on Rico's formulation for discovering metaphor by grouping emotional effects on the viewer with visual qualities under the guidance of an intuited descriptive word that seems to say it all about the image in question. That is, this word should be the dominant impression. AMSS is based on these writers because there is no one else who has pioneered the area of developing metaphor especially with a visual work of art. This is to say that Feinstein adapted Rico's tool for making metaphor in literature to making it about a visual work of art.

By using metaphor, the viewer can make analogies that are not possible in any other way and thereby gain insight into a world which can never be directly experienced. This is probably metaphors greatest asset. The viewer can also gain a concise and accurate model of what it is they want to know about a visual work of art. Its economy makes it easier to recal than a critical essay which may be more precise.

More important than the end result of metaphor
search is the means. This is to say that the model, that
this paper developes, is more important than the metaphor
it seeks to create because the metaphor usually acts as a
skin while the criteria leading to it are the bones. It is
these bones, like a critical essay, that really bare more
weight on the visual work of art than any single metaphor
can. In this case we learn more from the process than the
product which often obscures more than it reveals and which
is usually soon replaced by one that is more fitting for
someone else.

The model here approaches the visual work of art
from many ways of seeing and this is not known when we only
have the metaphor. In this later sense, this model is like
the one in Feinstein's dissertation. It differs greatly,
however, because Feinstein does not consider any result of
analytical reasoning. Her approach, as seen in Figure 1b,
hovers in an intuitive realm. As it refers to an art educa-
tion setting, Feinstein's model does not adequately inter-
pret a work of art in that it hangs a label on it. Therefore,
the analysis and metaphor search strategy proposed here is
better although the total process is difficult. It lays a
perceptual foundation before the actual work of constructing
a metaphor takes place. The point has been made that a

metaphor cannot fully describe or interpret by itself, a
complex thing such as a visual work of art. A foundation is
essential for a fuller understanding because metaphor does
not always make things easier or clearer to understand, as
has been shown. Besides, the metaphor itself will be better
understood when it is known how it has been discovered. In
this way, through a system of looking and a metaphorical
phrase, a visual work of art is understood in yet another
way.

This study will expand and modify Feinstein's pro-
cess, based on the assumption that to make a metaphor firmly
grounded in a visual work of art, much has to be known about
the work in order to make the most fitting metaphorical in-
terpretation possible. This means that more than just im-
pressions and qualities, which Feinstein uses in her model,
need to be associated. Formal relations and contexts need to
be considered also. Moreover, an analytic process has to be
used to discover relatioships among visual qualities be-
cause these may suggest forces that bear on the work's mean-
ing. Neither Feinstein nor Rico deal overtly with analysis.
They only present an easy method for discovering adjectives
which can develope into metaphors. However, with Feinstein,
who is concerned with the physical image, relational factors
are not enough of a context if one does not also consider

what people say about the work, how the viewer's life relates to it, cultural influences, associational influences, history, setting of the work, and personal judgement (Lanier, 1968).

Feinstein's method, although brief, is presented so that nearly any untutored viewer can approach it regardless of whether they understand formal arrangements, which is one of the most important aspects of a visual work of art. This is practical when securing a foothold is all that is wanted, but to get someplace, movement is required. This refers to contact with context because without it there is no adequate interpretation.

Finally, Feinstein's model is not developed to talk about art. In art education, a format is essential because a sequential procedure can provide for a more coherent understanding. A viewer should be able to pick up a model, read instruction A, proceed to step B, come out with C, and not have questions such as the points already mentioned and others.

Students at the elementary and secondary levels are unfamiliar with critical talk about art. The following model, as it refers to a visual work of art (Figure 2) is aimed at sophisticated adults. It will benefit them during art criticism processes by increasing awareness. It deals with facts to form tone and meaning. This model is submitted for the

purpose of expanding Feinstein's model of a metaphor search strategy. But, we must remember that the responses should be considered as a partial selection of the possible solutions.

A. <u>The first items are questions as they refer to Figure 2</u>:

1. What is the physical setting of the work, that is, gallery, school, museum, out of doors, etc.?

2. What is the style or vision of the work, that is, the historical period, ideology, symbolism, and cultural influences?

3. Is the image of the work realistic, abstract, or non-objective?

4. Does the title of the work, although often arbitrary, help the search for metaphors? How does it color it?

5. What is the form or pattern that is the over-all visual equivalent of a feeling or idea? Circle the word or phrase that shows this.

6. List at least several qualities found in the work as they refer to question 2.

7. List several feelings, impressions, associations, or ideas about the work as they refer to question 2.

8. Briefly, ascribe a few characteristics to passages or describe the relationships among properties. This can be shown by the use of adjectives such as harmonious, unbalanced, delicate, violent, restful, harsh, etc.

9. Group the above associations around the chosen word
   that best describes the dominant impression of the work
   and that becomes the apex for all other impressions.

10. Construct a metaphor from the above associations that is
    "referentially adequate" and that is a verbal equation.
    For example,'nudity is art', shows that nudity is a way
    of seeing and nakedness is being without clothes writes
    Kenneth Clark. The naked body, he continues, has to be
    seen as an object to become a nude or art form (Berger,
    1972:53-54). In addition, the oddity of the comparison
    between unlike things in an anological statement pro-
    vides for a novel leap in association between the sig-
    nifier and the signified.

B. <u>The next items are the answers as they refer to Figure 2</u>:

1.   This painting was exhibited at a modest gallery that
did not add nor detract from the power in the work. The
painting is twice as big as a door, so it seems that it
makes its own setting. That is, there is no problem being
caught within the work like a movie-goer who gets swept by
an exciting scene on the wide screen.

2.   The style of this work takes its place generally in
the expressionist vein. It is contemporary and perhaps sym-
bolic in that it hints at a world we have never directly
known. This largely green acrylic painting is a cartoon-

like perception or science-fiction in charater, of a human-
like condition that we can view from the outside looking in.
What is it about a society that is so interested in the for-
bidding night side of things? Is it that we can see our-
selves in the things we see, which is why we know them?

3.   The image is mainly of two distorted or mannered
figures of human form which puts the painting solidly in the
style of realism. But, remove the figures and the work be-
comes non-objective. This split also adds to the idea that
two recognizable creatures inhabit an inhospitable world
that is not this world. That is, we look in on where the
players are no place.

4.   The title of this work was not completely ignored
because upon completing the above questions, it revealed
that it too can be admitted to the list of associations for
consideration in finding a fitting metaphor for this work.
"Paris Green Night" might as well read 'sky blue orange'
except that paris green is an insecticide in the bright
green pigment of arsenic trioxide and copper acetate. This,
then, contributes to the over-all synthesis of qualities and
ideas that focus on a certain interpretation, say, intoxica-
ting madness.

5.   The pattern in this image is one of a balance of
opposites, where hard lines oppose soft, male is unlike fe-
male, foreground vs background, dot against dash, here nor
there, solid and vague, hot and cold, bright and dark.

6.   The ten qualities are: two human-like figures, dab/ drip textures, large canvas, remote, cool green, calligraphic, symbolic, bright, dark, depth.

7.   Several emotional responses to the work are: jazzy, unreality, menacing, inhospitable, separateness, macabre, spooky, madness, tension, compelling.

8.   Several charateristics among properties are: tension, penetration, balance, violence, luminosity, delicacy, juxtaposition, floatation, verticality, spatiality.

9.   The associations that group about 'intoxicating madness' are: anxiety, tension,poetry, violence, nervous, spooky, explosion, excitement, dream, alive, menace, glow, vibration, mystery, inhospitality, cool yet hot, unreality, floatation, cartoon-like spectres, depth, dance, dark, debris, looking in from without.

10.   In developing the metaphor as an interpretation for the work, we have these phases: Madness is just beyond us yet in sight. The spooky loons dance is a jittery dream. The strange figures mad dance is a jangled and inhospitable world. Madness is nude, explosive, spooky, controled, mysterious, and not us. The mad dance is debris and tension. Beautiful madness zags beyond place and time. The mystery of madness is there. Madness is explosive tension. Mad is dream life. Finally, mad is scribble, drip, zag, and dob.

SUMMARY

Interpretation is seldom easy. We never know if the shoe fits until we have worn it for a while. Fortunately, we have other shoes. Finding meaning is often the product of scrutiny, patience, experience, and many trails. Categories and associations can overlap. Clues can uncover other clues. Questions become arrows to answers. Slowly, the way is cleared of thoughts and feelings. The summit is our dominant impression. From there we can see where to go in the jangled forest of context and association below. However, beware of the sign ahead. It says: To understand the referent through analogy or metaphor is to understand nothing necessarily about its meaning (Lakoff/Johnson, 1980:208), because metaphors cannot be taken literally. Analysis has to help metaphor and analogy by putting it in a larger context. Metaphor by itself may be a trap. In analogy and metaphor, parts are linked to form something we do not know enough about. Hence, analysis and metaphor together may form the big picture.

Analysis and metaphor search strategy helps interpretation by identifying formal, symbolic, historical, and social contexts first. Then it formulates short

descriptions of the visual work of art through impressions
and pervasive qualities as they refer to the above items.
Finally, it encapsulates a partial interpretation with a
metaphor.

Feinstein (1980) wanted to eliminate left brain
activity in so far as it effected the use of reason. She
merely formed metaphors about a visual work of art by first
verbally clustering feelings and qualities as they exempli-
fied the work. She never stressed that a metaphor is never
definitive, that is, that it is only a model. Reasons were
never given for the choices of feelings and qualities. The
expressions were never linked to the work verbally as a re-
sult of formal consideration. After all, the formal
arrangement is one of the most important aspects of art.

Metaphor can certainly be discovered by grouping
feelings of value, organization, and characterization with
visual qualities such as saturation, direction, and balance.
But, how relevant would it be without the use of effective
thinking. Thinking and feeling happen together says Krath-
wohl et al (1964). They make up the whole person. If they
are separated, there is imbalance.

It has been the aim of this paper to make AMSS an
integral part of DBAE as it can be used with forms of cri-
tical art talk, particularly in the area of interpretation,

and with sensitivity to aesthetic qualities. The cognitive questioning in AMSS establishes it as an introspective activity that focuses on many aspects of critical talk about art and aesthetics.

In terms of art education, Feinstein's model falls short. AMSS expands and modifies it by setting the tone that brings out the adjectives that describe qualities and then can develope into metaphors. It integrates feeling and thinking processes, that are typical in art talk, to present a larger basis from which metaphor can be developed. It provides statements about the causes that contribute to a visual work of art. Through a guided discovery, such as AMSS, a viewer can learn about a work of art.

This paper stresses that it is difficult to form metaphor. Context and the experiential basis of the audience are essential to keep in mind. But, more than this is that metaphor, although very practicle, is very dangerous because the model can be mistaken for the reality, or that it can obscure somethings as it seems to reveal others. Sensitivity in this is essential in teaching. Therefore, several metaphors or ways of seeing are better than one and this is also something that AMSS establishes.

When Broudy (1972:43) formed the theory for aesthetic scanning, he was talking about developing the viewer's openness to expressiveness through metaphor. This is done by giving form to sensory content and thus bringing meaning and value before imaginative perception. Similarly, through Amss, we can see, things that we are prepared to see, which is one foundation of art critical talk. The questions are genetic in that they deal with specific conditions about a visual work of art, interpret them metaphorically, and work to produce an aesthetic response from the viewer.

APPENDIX A

Figure 1a.
Zak Politowicz. (1982). Weal Deal. Charcoal on paper. 24
inches high by 18 inches wide. Possession of Mr. and Mrs.
E. J. Petruff. Tucson, Arizona. Reproduced with their
permission.

"Spill and Find"(Feinstein, 1980)

Cluster no. 1:

circular
closed-in
Rose

tilting
pushing
assertive
opposites
unstable

futile
predictable

(Striking Quality,
1st word)

TRUTH

hard
soft
44

insurance
uneasy
tense
mistrust
gamble
weal-deal

frustrated
deflowered
coarse
trapped
determined

Cluster no. 2, regrouped:

opposites

circular

TRUTH
        Rose

        deflowered
        weal-deal

mistrust
trapped
insurance
determined
44

Some words are easily associated. The words de-
riving from the first word, which is the initial pervasive
quality of the drawing, can become a metaphor for the work.
Hence, by seeing qualities and drawing associations among
them, we can make meaning. Some possible metaphors are:
The gun is insurance. A 44 is truth. A weal-deal is truth.
A Rose is not a rose.

Figure 1b.

Figure 2.

Andrew Polk. Paris Green Night. Acrylic on Canvas. 70 in-
ches high by 80 inches wide. Estate of the artist. (1980).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, W. H. (1965). <u>Art learning situations for elementary education</u>. Belmont, Ca. Wadsworth.

Anderson, W. H. (1981b). Varying styles of visualizing: A basis for art awareness. <u>School Arts</u>, 80(8), 64-69.

Anderson, W. H. (1983, July). Environmental aesthetics: The form, style, and content of our everyday man-made surroundings. Paper presented at the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, Los Angeles.

Arnheim, R. (1949). The gestalt theory of expression. <u>Psychological Review</u>, 156-71.

Arnheim, R. (1969a). <u>Art and Visual Perception</u>. California: University of California Press.

Arnheim, R. (1969b). <u>Visual Thinking</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Beittel, K. R. (1977). Perceptions of the artist about the affective domain, in Berman, L. M. and Roderick, J. A. (Eds.). <u>Feeling, Valuing, and the Art of Growing: Insights into the Affective</u>. (1977 yearbook). Washington, D. C. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Berger, J. (1972). <u>Ways of Seeing</u>. New York: Penguin Books.

Berger, P. and Luckman, T. (1966). <u>The Social Construction of Reality: a Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge</u>. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Broudy, H. S. (1972). <u>Enlightened Cherishing</u>. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Broudy, H. S. (1983). A common curriculum in aesthetics
        and fine arts. Eighty-second yearbook of the
        National Society for the Study of Education.
        Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of
        Education.

Brown, R. W. (1958). Words and Things. New York: Free Press.

Brown, R. (1981). Vocabulary development in the classroom.
        Evansville, IN: Evansville University School of
        Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.
        ED 200 310).

Bruner, J. (1973). Beyond the Information Given. New York:
        Norton.

Campbel, K. (1976). Metaphysics. Encino, CA: Dickenson
        Publishing Co. Inc.

Carr, E. H. (1961). What is History. New York: Vintage.

Clements, R. D. (1982). Metaphors in art education. Art
        Education, 35, (5), 28-31.

Clemmer, E. J. and Leitner, A. (1984). The affect recog-
        nition of abstract art: Language and Aesthetics.
        Visual Arts Research, 10, (2), 58-66.

Code, L. (1980). Language and Knowledge. Word. 31, (3),
        245-258.

Cronnell, B. and Humes, A. (1977). Tryout of vocabulary
        Development exercises. Los Alamitos, CA: SWRL (
        ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 172 144).

Cushenbury, D. C. (1981). Building vocabulary in every
        content area. Des Moines, IA: Paper for Ninth
        Plains Regional Conference of International Read-
        ing Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction
        Service No. ED 208 358).

Damron, E. and Richardson, J. G. (1981). Gender descrip-
        tive language and scientific reporting. Perceptual
        and Motor Skills. 53, 483-489.

Dennis, W. (1948). Readings in the History of Psychology. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts.

Dewey, J. (1958). Art as Experience. New York: Capricorn.

Dobbs, S. M. (1971). The problem of communication in art education. Studies in Art Education, 12(2), 28-33.

Ecker, D. W. (1967). Justifying aesthetic judgements. Art Education, 20(5), 5-8.

Eckstein, M. A. (1983). The comparative mind. Comparative Educational Review, 27(3), 311-22.

Eisner, E. W. (1972). Educating Artistic Vision. New York: Macmillan Co.

Eisner, E. W. (1976). The mythology of art education. Studies in Art Education, 12(3), 7-15.

Eisner, E. W. (1982). Cognition and curriculum: A basis for deciding what to teach. New York: Longman.

Fantino, E. and Logan, C. (1979). The Experimental Analysis Of Behavior. San Francisco, CA: Freeman Press.

Feinstein, H. (1980). A college curriculum integrating Langer's theory of symbolization and aspects of hemispheric processes. 1979 Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 1980.

Feinstein, H. (1982). Meaning and visual metaphor. Studies in Art Education. 23(2), 45-57.

Feinstein, H. (1984). The metaphoric interpretation of paintings: Effects of the clustering strategy and relaxed attention exercises. Studies in Art Education. 25(2), 77-83.

Feldman, E. B. (1967). Art as Image and Idea. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Feldman, E. B. (1970). Becoming Human Through Art. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Feldman, E.B. (1981). Varieties of Visual Experience. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fisher, H. (1977). From object to image to object. Journal of Psychological Research, 6(2), 105-143.

Foss, S. K. (1984). Metaphors in treasures of Tutankhamen: implications for aesthetic education. Art Education. January.

Frueh, J. (1984). The Dangerous Sex: Art Language and Male Power. Unpublished.

Gall, M. (1984). Synthesis of Research on Teacher's questioning. Educational Leadership, 42(3), 40-47.

Goodman, J. (1968). Languages of Art: an approach to a theory of symbols. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs Merril.

Greer, W. D. (1984). Discipline-based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study. Studies in Art Education. 25(4),212-218.

Hamblen, K. A. and Jones, B. J. (1982). Art theory as sociological metaphor. Visual Arts Research. No. 16.

Hamblen, K. A. (1984). An art criticism questioning strategy within the framework of Bloom's taxonomy. Studies in Art Education, 25(1), 41-50.

Henri, R. (1960). The Art Spirit. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co.

Hicks, C. (1980). ITPA (Illinois Test of Psychlinguistic Abilities) visual sequential memory task. British Journal of Educational Psychology. 50(1), 16-25.

Humes, A. (1976a). A Design for Vocabulary Development Program. Los Alamitos, CA: SWRL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 376).

Humes, A. (1976b). Requirements for vocabulary development instruction. Los Alamitos, CA: SWRL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 172 142).

Johanson, Bo S. (1975). Encoding strategy and retroactive interference in short term memory. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology. 16(4), 319-322.

Johnson, L. M. (1980). The Metaphor of Painting. AnnArbor Michigan: University Microfilms Research Press.

Jones, R. (1974). Aesthetic Education, its Historical Precedents. Art Education, vol. 27 #9.

Joseph, C. A. (1982). Effects on free recall and recognition of transforming visually presented words and pictures into trace or imagery forms. Journal of General Psychology. January, 21-26.

Kemper, S. (1981). Comprehension and interpretation of proverbs. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research. 10(2), 179-198.

Kepes, G. (1966).(Ed.) Sign, Image, Symbol. New York: George Braziller Inc.

Klix, F. and Metzler, P. (1981). Relationships between picture coding and concept representation in human memory. Zeitschrift fur Psychologie mit Zeitschrift fur angewandte Psychologie. 189(2), 135-165.

Kuhlman, M. M. (1982). Metaphor as a function of feature detection and stimulus generalization. Visual Arts Research. No. 16.

Kuhnert, W. (1982). The role of concepts in the constitution and processing of experience. Linguistische Berichte. December. 41-49.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. Chicago, ILL: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980b). Structures of the human conceptual system. Cognitive Science. Vol. 4, 195-208.

Langer, S. K. (1957). Problems of Art. New York: Scribners.

Langer, S. K. (1974 and 1976). Philosophy in a New Key. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press.

Lanier, V. (1968). Talking about art: An experimental course in high school art appreciation. Studies in Art Education. 9(3), 32-44.

Lanier, V. (1983). The Visual Arts and the Elementary Child. New York: Teachers College.

Lanier, V. (1984). Eight guidelines for selecting art curriculum content. Studies in Art Education. 25(4), 232-237.

Levinson, P. (1981). McLuhan and Rationality. Journal of Communication. 3(3), 179-188.

Loux, M. J. (Ed.) (1979). The Possible and the Actual. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.

MacDonald, A. and MacDonald, G. (1983). Teaching metaphor in a secondary language. Exercise Exchange. 28(2), 7-11.

Miller, M. and Rohr, M. E. (1980). Verbal mediation for perceptual deficits in learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 13(6), 319-321.

Mourant, J. A. (1963). Formal Logic. London: Collier-MacMillan Ltd.

Nagae, S. (1978). The effect of phonetic symbolism labeling on shape recognotion and memory. Japanese Journal of Psychology. 48(6), 329-336. Psychological Abstract 10364 (1979:1040). See also 7720 p. 765.

Ortony, A. (Ed.)(1979). Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortony, A. and Vosniadou, S. (1983). The literal and metaphorical: Anomalous distinction in young children. Child Development. 54(1), 154-161.

Osgood, C. K. and Richards, I. A. (1960). Meaning of Meaning. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Pavio, A. (1979. Psychological Processes in the comprehension of metaphor. In Metaphor and Thought. 150-171.

Pepper, S. (1945). The Basis of Criticism in the Arts.
    Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Perry, L. R. (1984). The arts: Judgement and Language.
    Journal of Aesthetic Education. 18(1), 21-33/

Petrie, H. G. (1979). Metaphor and learning. Metaphor and
    Thought. 438-461.

Polanyi, M. (1975). Meaning. Chicago: University of Chicago
    Press.

Rader, M. (Ed.)(1952). A Modern Book of Esthetics. New York:
    Henry Holt.

Readence, J. E. (1983). Word knowledge and metaphor inter-
    pretation. Research in the Teaching of English.
    17(4), 349-358.

Rico, G. (1976). Metaphor, cognition, and clustering. in
    S. Carmean and B. Groves (Eds). The eighth Western
    Symposium on Learning: Creative Thinking. Western
    Washington State College. 1977. See also Rico, G.
    (1983). Writing the Natural Way: using right brain
    techniques to release your expressive power. Los
    Angeles, CA: J. P. Tarcher Publishing.

Rhode, M. (1974). Compilation of the technical lexicon.
    Technical Note 2/74/19. Los Alamitos, CA: SWRL.
    (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173 752).

Rowell, E. H. (1983). Developing reading skills through
    the study of great art. In J. E. Cowen (Ed.),
    Teaching Reading Through the Arts (pp.59-61),
    Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Sacks, S. (Ed.) (1979). On Metaphor. Chicago: University of
    Chicago Press.

Savchenko, A. N. (1980). Speech and mental imagery. Vaprosy
    Yazykoznaniya. 29(2), 21-32.

Schiff, R. (1978), Art and life: a metaphoric relationship.
    In S. Sacks (Ed.) On Metaphor. Chicago: University
    of Chicago Press.

Shah, I. (1981). Learning How to Learn. New York: Harper-Row.

Shahn, B. (1957). The Shape of Content. New York: Random House.

Shibles, W. (1972). Essays on Metaphor, Whitewater, WI: the Language Press.

Silverman, R. H. (1982). Learning about Art: A Practical Approach. Newport Beach, CA: Roman Arts.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). Verbal Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, R. A. (Ed.)(1971). Aesthetics and Problems of Education. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Smith, R. A. (1983, Spring). The purpose and place of the arts in education. Viewpoints, pp. 1-5.

Sticht, T. G. (1979). Educational uses of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.). Metaphor and Thought. pp. 474-485.

Stopher, K. and Kirsner, K. (1981). Long term memory for pictures and sentences. Memory and Cognition. 9(1), 34-40.

Tolstoy, L. (1898). What is Art. London: Oxford University Press. Translated by Aylmer Maude, 1962.

Turner, V. (1974). Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Turner, V. and Turner, E. (1978). Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture. New York: Columbia University Press.

Valle, R. S. and von Eckartsberg, R. (1981). The metaphors of Consciousness. New York: Plenum Press.

Walton, E. (1972). For the elementary teacher: Design is a verb. School Arts, 71(6), 8-9.

Wertheimer, M. (1925). Drei abhandlunger zur gestalt theo-
    rie. Originally published 1925. In W. Dellis (Ed.
    and transl.). A Source Book Of Gestalt Psychology.
    New York: Humanities Press. 1950.

White, R. N. and Bell, M. L. (1971). The effect of instruc-
    tion in art vocabulary upon projects in art.
    Southern Journal of Educational Research, 12(1),
    21-30.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). Language Thought and Reality. Boston:
    The Technological Press of MIT.

Wilson, B. G. (1966). An experimental study, designed to
    alter fifth and sixth grade students' perception of
    paintings. Studies in Art Education. 8(1), 33-42.