ONDŘEJ KRÁTKÝ[1]

PERCEPTION, LENGTH OF ITS DURATION, EVALUATION: VARIOUS AUTHORS, RELATED OBSERVATIONS

Absrtact

The recipient perceives text always successively and linearly. The reader's perception of the text most often lasts for the same duration that the text fulfills the expectations that the recipient has of it. The author, aware of this fact, builds (in proportion to his goals, aims, or preferences) the text in order to either (more or less) meaningfully fulfill the expectations the recipient has of the text according to the author's knowledge, estimation, or presumptions or, on the contrary, to (more or less) intentionally violate these expectations. While the fulfillment of expectations results in a certain «comforting» impression on the recipient, its violation causes an arousal in the recipient. Violation of expectations does not have to have only a negative effect — it can also have communicative value. Thus, it can be said that a) the author incorporates stimuli into the text that lead

[1] *Ondřej Krátký* received his Ph. D. at the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts, West Bohemia Univeristy (Pilsen, Czech Republic). He authored his widely known monogpaph «An Oriental Internationale: Milestones of the Shia Awakening in the 20th century» (Brno: Vaclav Klemm Publishing House, 2013). During the recent years, he has continuously published articles tackling mostly Western and Near Eastern culture, history and geopolitics. In this context he has also turned interested in aesthetic and hermeneutical aspects of text perception to which this article is devoted.

to the violation of the recipient's expectations and does so with communicatively-functional intent (including the artistic and aesthetic) and b) if an arousal is a consequence of violating the recipient's expectations, then, if the relevant author's plan (artistic, aesthetic, other) lies in a (multilayer, sequential, compositional, etc.) series of violations of the recipient's expectations, the experience (aesthetic, other) induced by it is caused, amongst other things, by a series of arousals (that are induced by relevant violations).

Key words
Readinng, perception, text, expectations.

I. Linearity of text perception

Text perception takes place on the part of the recipient (temporally) linearly by shifting from one perception («episode» or «event») to the next. In various examples of text «absorption», it begins with perceiving the whole and then shifts to perception of individual parts (e.g. in images, statues). In other cases, on the contrary, the recipient shifts away from parts of the whole or absorbs the text in an otherwise successive sequence of individual perceptions (a book, film) or the text is «looser» and is thus absorbed via a series of various perceptions from various perspectives (an exhibition) or during various «opportunities» or «events» (becoming acquainted with someone's personality, etc.).

The fact of the linear character of text perception (i.e. from the inception of the text to its «comprehension» or the achievement of other saturation by the given text) is a phenomenon that the recipient of the text — within the framework of each relevant text paradigm — quite «naturally» fulfills. Thus («linearly») the recipient gradually gains a sequence of perceptions until the moment the text is somehow «replete» (including situations when the reader feels the necessity to interrupt or end his perception).

In this context, it is the recipient's «exposing himself» to the sequence of perceptions or his «confrontation» with them that is essential for perception: the recipient of the text in some

cases naturally «enters» into this confrontation (within a certain type of paradigm), in other cases (within another type of paradigm) «enforces» or creates this «exposure to perceptions» himself. For instance when a) he is «confronted» by a book, he *reads* — i.e. by moving his eyes he shifts from one graphic representation of a sound, which refers to a meaning (= phonemes, or letters, words, etc.), to the other; if b) he is confronted by an image, he *looks at it* — i.e. by taking various perspectives, he uses his eyes to shift from the whole to the individual elements and from them back to the whole if need be, etc.; c) if he is confronted with music or film, he («only») *listens* or («only») *watches* — the perceptions are moving, changing, and progress «on their own», i.e. they provide the reader with a change in the sequence of individual «moments» (or «events») of perception and; d) if he is confronted by an individual, an exhibition, or another «looser» text, he uses *various points of view* which *he himself actively fosters and co-creates them* in the effort to comprehend

— *he circles the issue, looks inside, tests reactions to stimuli*; in short, he seeks out (or himself creates, even sub-consciously) various opportunities and methods of «viewpoints».

In principle, it can be stated that a) the more «static» the text (a painting, sculpture, or in part a book), the higher the «physical» activity of the recipient that is developed for its examination; if, on the contrary, the text is b) «dynamic» (a film, music, performance, etc.), the «activity» of the recipient is lower — this is because the paradigm of the text itself provides for a change in perceptions (or: such a change is a «consequence» of the nature of such a paradigm). If we are dealing with a text that, in terms of the character of the change in perceptions, can in a certain manner be labeled c) «mixed» or «more loosely defined» (or with a «looser» or less obvious paradigm or a «non-existent» intent on the part of the author, etc. — e.g. a «personality» mentioned previously, an expo located in various pavilions, natural scenery, etc.), the recipient

creates as many diverse «activities» or points of view he sees necessary in order to comprehend the text (or at all evaluate whether it is worth becoming interested in or not).

II. Proportion and balance of text elements

At the very least, it is legitimate to assume that the authors of creative (or «artistic») texts compose them with some goal. Most commonly, that goal is the effort or necessity (artistic, aesthetic, etc.) to communicate a certain message. This is also the reason that artistic texts can in retrospect appropriately function as an assessment of how well this message was communicated. Images (or, even more exactly, paintings) are especially appropriate, as they are capable of accommodating a large (or «multilayered») amount of «easily» palatable forms of text that can in retrospect be used to «evaluate» the degree of how successfully these images are «presented» (colors, shapes, compositions, contrast, highlighting, abstraction, caricature, deep meaning, perfection of craft, etc.). This is perhaps why they are a kind of a synonym for art as such.

Art theoretician Ernst Gombrich used the example of images to identify one of the basic prerequisites for textual information to have even a chance of being communicated to the recipient in the required form. He summarized this finding by stating that «*all attention must take place against a background of inattention*»; see Gombrich: 1982, *The Image and the Eye*, p. 15. The meaning of this statement can also be understood in the following manner: In order for a text (that is intended to be the principal one) to even *defend that* precisely *it* (in the whole author's composition) should be such a principal one, its «accentuation» must clearly contrast with the *con*text (that is in some way blurred and thus does not attract attention).

If we apply this precept more broadly (and relate it with examples from everyday life), we find that it is a statement that has more general validity — in regard to perception, the «dual» (or «binary») contrast of «*attention*» vs. «*inattention*» is

practically «ever-present». Examples may relate not only to the perception of images (= background vs. the «primary» subject matter; blurred contours vs. clear meaning, etc.), but also to such relatively «plain» yet illustrative contrasts like a) «*blank paper on a table in a room*» (= we basically perceive everything as one whole, the paper does not attract our attention, everything is in its own way a mere «background», and nothing attracts any smaller or larger degree of attention) vs. b) «*paper with a message lying on the table in the same room*» (= «for some reason» we have the tendency to perceive the message on the paper more than anything else, or: we hardly perceive anything else at all).

Similarly contrastive are the day-to-day «banalities», which most probably «prompted» the creation of certain «obvious» denominations (e.g. the clearly demarcated «Sun» or «Moon» on the background of a relatively amorphous, changing and «variable» sky, etc.) or even (the more recent) linguistic taxonomy (movement or change on a background of statics or stability as the basis for «contrast» of *verbs* vs. *nouns*, etc.). Based on the same principle, basically any other text that is considered to be the primary one by the recipient in the given configuration (on the background of the «peripheral» context) comes into the foreground (of attention).

If we concede that communication is a certain «exchange» of a) the author's *intent* and b) the recipient's *perception of such intent*, American linguist Paul Grice's concept of communication theory can be seen as a similar finding to the one Gombrich reached in the field of art theory. Similarly to Gombrich and despite the differences in the two disciplines, Grice also considered the *meaningfulness* and *efficiency* of communication to be an important criterion. In his concept, however, Grice drew from a theoretical assumption of «communicative cooperation». This represents a certain ideal state in which the participants of communication enter into the communication act equipped with both a) an ideal volume of information and b) an ideal will

to communicate (and perceive) them, while doing so in such a way that allows for the communication goal to be achieved in the most effective manner, i.e. for the information to be transferred and rendered in such a form that allows for the highest degree of its understanding.

Using this basis, Grice defines both the resulting a) «ideal» of maximally effective communication which occurs while applying so-called «communication principles» (which are: *brevity, clarity, relevance,* and *truthfulness*) and b) the events that take place when the given principles are violated. Grice calls such events *implicatures* (see Grice, Paul, 1975, *Logic and conversation*, *In Cole, P.; Morgan, J. Syntax and semantics. 3: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press*, p. 41–58). Given deviations from the «ideal» state (i.e. from principles of cooperative communication) take place both in the form of a) «common», minor deviations from the «ideal» in terms of common, i.e. *actual* (and thus any other than basically non-existent *ideal*) communication and in the form of b) stronger but nonetheless (and most usually) conscious, guided, or otherwise «sophisticated» deviations that are (in correct contextual use) highly functional for specific communication goals (lying, sarcasm, irony, parody, etc.).

Where, however, is the parallel with Gombrich's observation? One arises if we generalize the idea of the «distortion» of the norm dealt with by Grice's implicatures: While the *communicational cooperativeness* is a variant in which the ideal text takes the foreground and all that is unnecessary remains context, *implicatures* are an eventuality in which something that would in a «normal» case (that is in preserving the norm) be context or only a mere theoretical possibility (absent in the text and thus not attracting attention as it is not used, activated, or «manifested» by the author) has for some reason made its way to the foreground (= i.e. become text). While the former eventuality is an example of preserving a certain «general» (but theoretical) norm, the latter case

represents a certain form of its violation (a variation of it, a distancing from it, a definition of itself against it, its alternative, etc.).

There is, however, another parallel here: knowing that Gombrich applied his observations to art, it is quite opportune to further observe that it is *art itself* that is based on a similar type of distortion. In other words: *The controlled oscillation between how much to preserve the norm (s) on one hand and how much to violate the norm (s) of all types is present in most artistic genres.* Another question may also be asked: *Is such a design particular only to art, or do actions done in its spirit take place during any more or less conscious manipulation with the recipient for which text is the medium?* Posing the question this way is all the more justifiable if we admit that this «manipulative» distortion fulfills its communicativ e purpose (or the author's communicational intent) at least *altogether equally* (or *even more effectively*) as it is fulfilled by a text (in other events) that fully respects «Gricean» principles (or at least coming close to upholding it).

If we reinterpret Grice's principles (during the theoretical and ideal application of which the potential of communicative cooperation is fulfilled to its maximum) using Gombrich's observation (s), it can be stated that a) an accurately sufficient (or: *just the right* etc.) volume (brevity) of b) distinct contours (clarity), which c) creates sense, refers to something that is known or otherwise enriches via its information (relevance) and is d) communicated in a non-deformed shape and content (truthfulness) on a e) background that does not attract the recipient's attention more than necessary. The final point is purely Gombrichian only ostensibly — the (author's) background, i.e. the blurring of (the recipient's) attention is only another form of the author's adherence to principles of *brevity, relevance, clarity,* and *truthfulness*: namely *because the author is* communicatively cooperative, he chooses either larger (center of attention) or smaller (blurring, reduced attention —

background) «dosages» in the individual sections of the compositions he creates. However, the *spirit* of communication principles still remains the same — it is only realized on a «Gombrichian» axis created by the main points of the author's thoughts relating to the recipient's attention, i.e. a) *highlighting the important* and b) *placing the unimportant in the background* or even c) *omitting what can be inferred* (the obvious, known, clear, or otherwise stemming from the context).

It is plain to see that the mechanical expression of Grice's «ideal» communicatively cooperative approach in the field of interpretative expression would be, for instance, a *completely perfect* photograph or a *(hyper) realistic* painting. The desire (will / longing / intent / goal / etc.) to avoid such «forced» imitations of reality is precisely the moment (or *impulse*) when (or along with which) an «artistic» entrance takes place. This, however, does not mean that upon its arrival Grice would begin to lose legitimacy or Gombrich would begin to prevail — on the contrary: Art is «only» a controlled series of deviations from the norm, and as such it always counts on the norm as something that it *stands apart from but is grounded in* at the same time. It perhaps relativizes the norm, but in essence refers to it at least through one of its elements. In a similar sense: If art is a (larger or smaller) series of deviations from the norm, it is nothing more than — in the Gricean sense of the term — «only» a (larger or smaller) series of implicatures (just as is any other text that violates Grice's principles in any other sense). If such a text contains anything «more» or something is (not) highlighted in it a different way than it «should» be, this may be the fault of a) a simple error (intentional or other violation of communication principles) or b) a different purpose of communication (distortion of shape or content — a caricature or other parody; change in sequence, frequency, color, etc. — art; placed in the background or missing — a riddle or a «fill-in» exercise; etc.); in these cases, the text also properly fulfills its communication purpose.

Gombrich and Grice agree in a certain and more general approach via which they view a text, an author's intent, or communication — specifically in a certain «subconscious conviction» that it is possible, necessary, or desirable to achieve a certain balance between a) the primary (expressive) message («text») and b) a supporting (non-violating) supplement («context»). This does not necessarily have to be a «mere» contrast of *content* vs. *form:* if the aim is to demonstrate skill in the craft, the content is usually placed in the «arrière-plan» or the creative personality of the author «steps into the background». If, on the other hand, the goal is to create a strong message, the form may be seemingly «ordinary», «conformist» or in any other way «normal» — this (thanks to its «non-violating nature») allows the content to stand out all the more (e.g. paintings by René Magritte). Some kinds of applied art as well as certain «mixed» disciplines also function on similar grounds, in which a very simple form or one seemingly «imperfect in craft» («primitive», somehow «uncouth» etc.) is «tolerated» (or, more exactly: required), granted that the content is very strong (caricatures or drawn jokes). On the contrary, Grice's maxims are appropriate in places where the key effort is to adhere to the norm and be extremely «textually» effective. As such, their main significance primarily lies in being a certain theoretical «ideal» that practical implementations of text only come close to greater or lesser degrees.

III. Length of text perception

In their deliberations on text, Gombrich and Grice largely work off the assumption that the recipient will always perceive text in its whole extent (i.e. from beginning to end or as a set of all individual perceptions). In order for text to be truly «perceived till the end», the recipient must, however, have the will to shift fluently and without disruption from one perception to another. In order for the recipient to realize how much of such a will he is «prompted to generate» over the course

of perceiving each relevant text, gradual evaluation is key to the recipient who — in a certain way and intensity — during his perception of the text carries out such evaluation. The result of such evaluation is either his will to shift to the next perception or, on the contrary, his desire to interrupt or prematurely end the perception of the relevant text.

If we are to label something an «interruption» or «termination» of a text (ahead of its time), it is *prematurity* that is the main defining characteristic of such an occurrence. By its simple definition, such prematurity will take place a) before the point that is objectively assumable, understood, or interpreted as the end of the text b) after the recipient absorbs a certain volume of perceptions c) as well as in place of the recipient's shift to the next perception.

Both Gombrich and Grice touch on the topic, but only partially or via that which stems implicitly from their arguments. Gombrich does so using the example of the canvas, on which a («baroque») signature not corresponding in style is placed adjacent to a Mondrian-esque pattern (see Gombrich: 1998, *Sense of Order*, p. 237). Based upon this, Gombrich finds that the shift from a temperate «geometric» style à la Mondrian to an ostentatiously conceived signature is not pleasant to the «eye» and therefore the whole composition is perceived as disharmonious and violating. This way, using a seemingly small example, Gombrich says much about a wider principle that, in its predeterminative quality, refers to significantly more: from order on a desk, fashion, art, and architecture to any other activity the essence of which is a) the author's plan, which more or less takes into consideration b) the recipient's perception — i.e. the principle that the impression of harmony is in its essence the result of a series of pleasant (and pleasantly intertwined) perceptive impressions.

Grice partially expressed his opinion on the topic (of finiteness or the dis/continuity of text) by defining a) the primary conversational principles in terms of the cooperative

communicational approach as b) variations that may motivate individuals to (primarily *functionally*) violate such principles — and as such to continue to violate them, in fact, in a communicationally cooperative sense. Grice, however, did not further elaborate on the variation that occurs during a violation of communication principles that proves to be in some way *dysfunctional* — this is every violation during which the decline or loss of the recipient's attention or his participation in communication as such occurs.

IV. Expectancy violation theory

In order to understand how the recipient's assessment takes place, what occurs during it, and what the conditions are for its outcomes, it can help to consider the standpoint of (*non*) *expectancy* or *expectancy violation theory* connected with its role in communication. This theory was elaborated upon by Judee Burgoon from 1976 to 1978 during an experiment researching the various reactions of recipients to various methods of fulfilling/not fulfilling expectations that they had in terms of the respect of their personal space on the part of another individual (or another participant in the experiment).

While Grice perceives the norm (on which he develops «his» implicatures that represent a certain «typologizing» of the individual methods of violating principles of cooperation) as something «objective» (either theoretical, ideal, or abstract), Burgoon's research deals with the subjective level considerably more. This is naturally due to the fact that her experiments follow specific reactions to each individual case of the violation of the recipient's expectations, the context of such violations, and so forth.

In relation to this idea, the following can be considered important conclusions made by Burgoon:

— the reminder that «*Based on both experience with the normative behaviors in society and knowledge of the unique proxemic patterns of those with whom we interact, we develop*

expectations (of what spatial relationship will be established with those individuals under any given circumstance.) " (quot. Burgoon: 1976, p. 135). I believe this can be viably interpreted by stating that the outcomes of hitherto perceived texts (or perceptions) create the expectations of the texts (or perceptions) that will follow them. Furthermore, b) her observation is important that if expectations are violated, each such violated expectation (i.e. conflict with a certain *personal* or subjectively *assumed* or *anticipated* norm) causes an *arousal* to occur in the recipient. Also important is a certain c) «clarification» that the given arousals (or the violations of expectations that stimulate them) *are not necessarily negative* (as the term *expectancy violation* might suggest) and *thus may have a positive effect on the recipient.* In this, Burgoon indirectly corresponds both with Grice (whose *implicatures* describe the situation in which expectancy violation results in the effectiveness of the message) and Gombrich. If some — fully functional, «verified», and elsehow effective — «art» is based on the author's conscious distortion of what would otherwise by «only» an empty reproduction or replication, its functionality arises thanks to the author's awareness of the fact that, in terms of the recipient, there is for some reason at least a «paved path» — if not a direct demand — for each *type, series, configuration or sequence of unexpectedness* that the author's artistic work will offer in its resulting form. Such a type of anticipation commonly functions in caricatures or, for example, advertisement spots (which, in fact, are a kind of instant, contractual, consumer, or entertainment distortions that are built on unexpectedness /and in which unexpectedness is actually expected/). The «demand» for welcomed unexpectedness closely and somewhat serendipitously intersected with the origin of cubists; in contrast to this, Van Gogh's paintings found their recipient belatedly or «cultivated» this recipient thanks to the interventions of critics.

Nevertheless, Burgoon did not carry out her research in the

field of aesthetics or art, but rather drew from her experiment that traced reactions in connection to the (non-) violation of personal space. The variable in the experiment was based on changing «authors» (who, based on the most objectively defined general criteria, were deliberately chosen for their varying degree of attractiveness) of the initial «text». According to Burgoon's instructions, the authors (called «initiators» by Burgoon) would draw closer to the «recipient», ending at either a larger or shorter distance (than was expected according to the criteria of the experiment). The reaction of the recipient to the (non-) violation of personal space by an (un) attractive «initiator» (i.e. the author) thus developed the individual forms of the recipient's perception of (dis) liking this (un) expected violation of personal space that was dependent on initial variables.

By dividing the «reality» of the given experiment into individual main elements for the needs of her research, Burgoon very successfully defined several basic (and mutually «complementary» or structural) entities that are crucial for researching communication in terms of expectancy violation. In my opinion, this division (aside from several examples in the previous and following paragraphs, see Burgoon: 1976, p. 132–136 or Burgoon: 1978, p. 130–131) is highly representative and accurate and possesses more general legitimacy and is therefore valuable for further work on the topic.

The author of the text (e.g. in terms of the artistic paradigm) can thus be identified with what Burgoon calls the *initiator*; the recipient can be identified with her term *reactant*. She sees (or describes) the norm as a *social norm*, a subjective deviation that nevertheless does not exceed its framework as an *idiosyncracy*. She uses the term *deviation* to label any deviation from expectancy or «other than what we expect» — expectancy violation is labeled as *any recognizable deviation*.

The element that she calls *evaluation* or *communication outcome* in her «dissection» of reality (for the purpose of the

given experiment) is also valuable. According to Burgoon, communication outcomes are «*the behaviors and evaluations of the reactant in response to the initiator's choice of distance. Such things as com- prehension, attitude change, trust, self-disclosure, attraction, and evaluations of the initiator's credibility would be typical outcomes of interest. An outcome could be considered the response to a single action by the initiator or the cumulative response of the reactant to the initiator's distance patterns over the course of a conversation*» (quot. Burgoon: 1978, p. 130–131).

V. Shifting from one perception to the other

In Burgoon's research, the last two terms mentioned above provide a terminological «grasp» or «operationalization» of the final moment of each experiment. What they label in the given experiment is nevertheless in reality «only» one of «several» moments of interaction in terms of *when* (or «*before*») the recipient («reactant») decides to continue to perceive the text, interrupt this perception, or completely terminate it. Burgoon's experiment ends — naturally according to plan — in this phase. It is, however, unquestionable that such «evaluating» (and thus «deciding») moments are continually present in communication as a certain «connector» between the «termination» of one perception and the «beginning» of another. It can be assumed that overcoming them is one of the key criteria that on one hand allows the author to successfully «present» his text in its complete form; on the other hand, it allows the recipient to saturate himself with the same text in roughly the same extent as was intended by the author.

In other words: Burgoon's research experiment ends at the same moment that the certain «principal» communication outcome occurs — i.e. the one which, for the purpose of the given experiment, is its primary goal. This, however, happens for a wholly logical reason, as the whole experiment is evaluated based on this given moment. Nonetheless, even during the experiment and permanently, «particular» communication

outcomes occurred in the same way they occur while any texts in any communicational interaction are perceived — obviously, such communication outcomes were not reflected in the experiment (as mentioning, observing or reflecting them was actually not the goal). Naturally, the simple fact that the recipients have gone through such communication outcomes is proof that, during the process (until «culmination» in the form of a final, «official» communication outcome), they never achieved *evaluation* of such a nature that would deter them from continuing or disconcert them to such a degree that they would (at least temporarily) interrupt their perception of the text.

I understand a *communication outcome* as a moment that a) is on one hand an outcome of all existing text perceptions in a certain paradigm (perhaps also including the fact that a certain emphasis is placed here on final or especially strong perceptions as these are fundamental to the recipient's further decision making). At the same time, however, I see (each individual) communication outcome (i.e. the recipient's impression «at the end» of each event of perception) as b) the recipient's indicator of whether or not he will continue on in the text or decide otherwise. A communication outcome is thus actually both c) the current state compared to existing expectations and d) a stepping stone (or reference point) for «jumping» to the next perception (or comparing the given new perception with a set of perceptions from the existing text).

If we depict the course of communication with regard to this notion's subject of interest roughly like this (in which A — author of the text, R — recipient of the text):

...then each «individual» communication outcome (or «critical point», milestone, dividing line, etc.) «between» two perceptions can (in a «reduced» or «condensed» form) basically be equal to the state at the end of the given scheme — during which time everything (as a certain new «basic» position of each additional text element) is repeated in terms of the whole text on the same *general principle* (i.e. in the same scheme) onward.

Beginning	Middle	End
A Introduction, establishment of a paradigm and norm (common or "own")	Effort to adhere to what was "advised" with the help of an introduction	Based on antecedents, gradually increasing "obligation" to finish the text
-----------------------	---------------------- TEXT ----------------	------------------
R Becomes acquainted, opportunity to decide . whether the offered paradigm and norm are acceptable	Checks if the author's adherence to the norm, i.e. the recipient's expectations gained thanks to antecedents, the balance of the text, etc.	Lets the author produce text until it fulfills his expectations; otherwise interrupts or ends perception

In terms of *specific realization*, it does not naturally matter if we are speaking about a *note in the listener's hearing that follows the note (s) before it* (while both of course are linked to a series of previous notes and are parts of the whole recording or interpretation), a *word in the text* following the previous word (s), *a colored surface, shape* or *pattern* that the eye fixes upon after leaving the surface (s), shape (s), or pattern (s) before it, and so forth (for an example of specific scientific research carried out on a similar topic, see e.g. Loui, P., & Wessel, D. L. (2007). *Harmonic Expectation and Affect in Western Music: Effects of Attention and Training.* Perception and Psychophysics*, 69 (7)*, p. 1084–1092).

Note: As text progresses, under normal circumstances the spectrum of varieties for the selection of each additional element of the given text decreases — this is naturally under the assumption that (in terms of «communicative cooperation») the text will fulfill expectations until it is finished in such a form

that it will continue to raise (or maintain) the recipient's desire or will to follow through until the end. In other words: The constant diminishing of the «reservoir» for the selection of each additional, usable element (also selected by the author) is also a certain indicator (symptom, etc.) that the text is nearing its end; at the same time, by reducing the spectrum (and if everything goes «well» and according to the «author's intent»), the recipient of such a text comes closer to his saturation. He begins to sense the imminent end or integrates this feeling into a set of expectations that he has of the text / author or those that arise during the process.

VI. Evaluation: «Only» a glance at the past, or the basis for a standpoint on the future?

With (or *for the purposes of*) Burgoon's experiment, the *communication outcome* serves primarily to *look back* at a previous text (or at the recipient's «impression» of it). Its complete meaning in terms of common communication, however, mainly accounts for a *look into the future*. Where else would an otherwise crucial, i.e. «practical» significance of any evaluations be directed? Or: For what other reason should probes of the past be carried out than to prepare a certain standpoint on something that is to come (and not an evaluation of the past *in a purposeless manner*, *just because*, and so forth)? In such a light, any phase of interaction that can be labeled a «communication output» realizes its *meaning in the moment new expectations are created* — this being done based on the degree to which expectations hitherto have been (un)fulfilled in «confrontation» with standards («the norm») of a paradigm in which the text was situated in terms of each relevant communication output (while such expectations are naturally always a mix of standards that are the recipient's «own» or «determined» by a certain «general» norm and degree of familiarity with the author / his «idiosyncracies» / just as standards «evoked» by the text being absorbed at the moment,

etc.).

For these reasons, it is my assumption that evaluation in «looking back» is not as important as the «position», «standpoint», «judgment», «evaluation», «impression», or «feeling» that such evaluation establishes; backward evaluation would «only» be looking back and recapitulating without any pragmatic effect. During text perception, however, we make continual decisions on what our each and next step will be, i.e. whether we will listen (i.e. whether we allow the text to flow and the author to «act»), interrupt with a question or our own otherwise motivated intrusion (in which we replace the author's creation of text with our own), or bring about an end to the text (i.e. we leave it or otherwise «limit» the author in further text creation, etc.). Thus, each current impression that is evoked always by the amount of text that has been perceived until each given moment and conveyed by *looking back* is much more important than a mere «looking back» on its own. The given «impression» (which is a look back only formally) is thus here primarily to allow us to take a pragmatic stance on a) each additional element of the text, b) each *additional* text, or c) the author of the text (or his *personality* — with everything that can be expected of it).

One observation linked to the elementary need of the feeling of security can serve as an argument in favor of this statement. This observation deals not only with evaluation or elimination of a danger, but anything that is *unwelcome, potentially threatening,* or simply otherwise *unpredictable in a disturbing manner*, etc. Polish anthropologist Bronisław Malinowski observed that in order to minimize or eliminate the disturbing effect of unknown, unpredictable situations, (magical) ritual played a crucial role among the native civilizations that he studied. Lévi-Strauss (1963: *Structural Anthropology*, p. 14) cites Malinowski illustratively by using a passage in which the Polish anthropologist argues that (magical) ritual is reserved for «all important activities and

88

projects, over the *course of which man has no control»* (cited in: *The Sexual Life of Savages in North- western Melanesia*; for more on the topic see Malinowsky's *Magic, Science and Religion*, or: *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*).

It cannot be ruled out that one of the reasons for the effectiveness of ritual is that its strictly set course offers not only an atmosphere of exceptionalness or holiness but also possesses the calming effect of predictability, the impression of which lasts long after the ritual is over. The meaning of magical ritual thus may be to shroud the unpredictable into a complex of acts that precede it, thus quantitatively minimizing the «unpredictable» part compared to the (larger) whole that arises.

The strong borders of ritual (and strongly ingrained rules in general) convene with the wider concept of social institutions, the social significance of which Malinowski sees in the *predictability* of the paradigms they guarantee or offer that allow for the functionality of the system, trust in it, the certainty that stems from it, the opportunity to make meaningful plans, etc. Trust in order and the certainty that stems from it to a certain degree depends on the «impression» of predictability, which a given institution is able to arouse. For these reasons, the «demand» for the minimization of unwelcome unpredictabilities gave rise to social institutions or became one of the primary objectives that such institutions accomplish.

VII. Controlled expectancy violation as the author's creative process

If we summarize this in the spirit and context of the aforementioned, it is possible to state that a) evaluation finds its main sense against *following*, not *passed* text. The feeling induced by existing text serves to identify *subjective* future expectations and in the long term perhaps for the construction of certain *objective* norms. The resulting view into the future (i.e. «expectations» from the following text or its author)

to a certain degree corresponds to how positive or negative the certain resulting «impression» from the existing text (i.e. its «evaluation») is.

Future text is always more or less (un) predictable. Expectations of it that stem from the evaluation of its (multiple) existing antecedents can thus oscillate somewhere between (4) main alternatives; these can be — if we take into consideration (*the non-/violation of*) *expectations* as one of the main criteria for viewing the matter — «defined» approximately in variations of the phrase *(un) welcomed (un) predictability*.

If (from the recipient's perspective) we view text in such a way and the recipient, based on existing «perception inputs», is able to estimate its character or another stimulus causing him to make an assumption, we see that this «phrase» covers a whole spectrum of variations.

Welcomed predictability is any type of «ritual» — from the use of («consensual» /or «spontaneously agreed upon»/) natural language, an every- Sunday afternoon cup of coffee with apple pie or a classical music concert by a «reliable» artist to the guarantee of school education for children or the retirement insurance system; *unwelcomed predictability* is then anything from the vision of a boring stay with lazy, prudish, and overcautious grandparents to the demoralizing effect of long-lasting solitary confinement, as well as the prospect of a tedious voyage through a well -known, unattractive environment or a feeling of monotonousness induced by even such plain stimuli as repeated unappealing patterns (on clothes, buildings, various utensils etc.) that the recipient encounters throughout the day. *Unwelcomed unpredictability* can take the form of morning traffic chaos, a cacophonic composition, social changes, or war. On the other hand, *welcomed unpredictability* can be nuances as well as longer sequences of a jazz concert (and primarily its improvised sections), small «entertaining», «refreshing», or otherwise «moderate» deviations in theatrical, recital, craft (applied art), or culinary work (e.g. various methods of preparing a dish based

on an otherwise identical recipe, etc.), advertisement spots or slogans, logo designs, or various sorts of wordplay such as, for example, spoonerisms. These could also be whole works that, based on proportionally «balanced» deviations or a complete series of them («deviations that radiate purposefulness or have an internal order), give rise to a wholly new artistic genre (fauvism, cubism, dada, etc.).

The way the recipient perceives the text does not always necessarily intersect with the author's interest: That which one recipient sees as unwelcomed unpredictability (insecurity, gamble, risk, danger, etc.) can be perceived by another for its unpredictability as welcomed (chaos offering opportunity, adventure, etc.). Nevertheless, I base this thought on certain established «norms», collective preferences, and long-term experience (mainly of the Western cultural circle).

Possible types of reactions of recipients to the non-fulfillment of their expectations bring additional and more general questions on the nature of the texts: Is the interruption of the author's text by a question a wholly new text (just created by the author of such a question), or is it an integral part («supplement») of the utterance of the original author? Is the termination of communication (including physical departure from it) a consequence of the existing text or an attempt to limit what the recipient evaluated as the strong probability of a series of unwelcomed successions of additional text elements, i.e. those he would very likely be exposed to if he remains in communication? Is «punishment» (meant in principle as any type of punishment — i.e. including physical punishment or incarceration) *revenge for what has been committed hitherto* or primarily *prevention for the future*, i.e. the effort to prevent the author by any means from continuing on in a certain «action» in his following text?

Similarly, there is a paradox here of a certain «ultimate» point of view. This point of view is to a certain degree dependent on the degree and nature of subjective nuances.

Depending on these nuances, we can, for instance, ask each recipient: *If we go to an exhibition of post -modernists, are we expecting the unexpected* (i.e. we do not know the post-modernists in detail but we have the feeling that their work will violate what we would normally expect «from the paintings») or *are we expecting the expected* (i.e. we are going there because we expect a certain type of distortion from the work on display because we know post-modernist art)?

In other words: If an artist whose style is known for violating expectations (for example a caricaturist or an experimental singer) suddenly performs a «normal» performance (i.e. it is in the «norm» but by doing so he violates the expectations that he has often induced), he shifts the discussion roughly to the level of the aforementioned «paradox». The paradox is, of course, only ostensible, mostly because art is by principle a permanent (and more or less consciously experimental) «deliberate» oscillation between a subjective and objective approach to the (objective or subjective) norm in the sense of it being upheld or violated. This is done with the goal of invoking a certain aesthetically agitated «mobilization» or «dynamization» that often culminates between refusal and acceptance, agitation and satisfaction, and leads into a more long-term feeling of what is to come — this, in the ideal case, most probably means somewhere between welcomed predictability and welcomed unpredictability.

In order to better understand this «aesthetic arousal», we can return to a certain conclusion drawn by Burgoon when she stated that *expectancy violation* (i.e. an «episode» of perception that is in contrast to expectations evoked by existing inputs — i.e. directly by a relevant *specific text* and *general experience* hitherto) creates *arousal*. If we agree with this, we can furthermore assume that if *multiple such violations* take place in one text, the consequence must be a *series of arousals*.

If such a «law» (or the fact that expectancy violation is accompanied by arousal) is of a more general character, the

recipient is exposed to its «effect» not only in the case of «unwelcomed unpredictable» texts (in which the resulting «feeling» or «impression» would be *negative*) but also unpredictable texts of a «more welcomed» character (e.g. artistic or otherwise «intentionally manipulative» — advertisements, propaganda, poetry, etc.), i.e. texts in which the «impression», «feeling», or «experience» is (usually) *positive* — and not uncommonly even given the label of «aesthetic».

In such a case, the relevant (artistic) text can be perceived as a certain «structure» or «platform» that bears stimuli (or «possesses» them) that, via the succession in which they are perceived, cause a series of arousals comprised of individual «episodes» of violation of the recipient's expectations. If we concede that such violations do not necessarily have to function negatively and the author (artist) has built such violations in his text with the goal of making an aesthetic impression on the recipient, we would argue that aesthetics is (at least to a certain degree) based on *controlled sequencing of such expectancy violations*, the combinations, succession, or configuration of which evoke the required (aesthetic) experience. In other words — the aesthetic experience is (to a certain degree) a consequence of the recipient's perception of stimuli configured by the author to cause (in the required manner) a series of (controlled) violations of the recipient's expectations.

Thus the recipient is exposed to a series of wholly specific «slips», turns, and «detours» away from the predictable to the unexpected that evoke stimuli (arousals) of a diverse manner, sequence, and intensity. Nonetheless, they are generated in such a quality and quantity that their «overall combination» (i.e. the final «communicative result») is powerful enough not only to make the recipient continue to perceive the text — but for him to become «absorbed» and his experience to be strengthened even more. In a certain way, this is another element through which something (surprisingly but acceptably) unexpected takes place.

The (author's) will toward a rational game with the (recipient's) irrational dispositions that activates in the recipient all types of dimensions of (not only) artistic and euphoric exaltation is one of the main stimuli of the author's creative intent. The same will is the author's primary «strategic doctrine», which he keeps in mind over the whole course of creating his text. In addition, it is quite probably and primarily in this way that a considerable portion of the essence, impressiveness, and captivating magic of an aesthetic experience is born (or «encoded» into the text) — and that to differing degrees of intensity, urgency, or efficacy materializes each time the text is «perceived in full» and thus understood, enjoyed, or otherwise fully «experienced».

References

Bell, C. (1992). *Ritual theory, ritual practice.* N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Bell, C. (1997). *Ritual: Perspectives and dimensions.* N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Burgoon, J. K. (1978). A communication model of personal space violation: Explication and an initial test // Human communication research. Vol. 4. No. 2.

Burgoon, J.K., Jones, S.B. (1976). Toward a theory of personal space expectations and their violations // Human communication research, Vol. 2. No. 2.

Gombrich, E. (1979). *The Sense of Order. a Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art.* Oxford: Phaidon.

Gombrich, E. (1982). The Image and the Eye. Further Studies in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation. Oxford: Phaidon.

Grice, H.P. (1989). Studies in the way of words. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Grice, H.P. (1991). The conception of value. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Grice, H.P. () Presupposition and conversational implicature // *Cole, P., ed.* Radical pragmatics. N.Y.: Ac. Press. P. 183 — 198.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning. Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K., Hasan, R. (1991). Language, context and text: aspects of language in a socio-semiotic perspective. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Levi-Strauss, A. (1977). Structural anthropology. London: Allen Lane.

Loui, P., Wessel, D.L. (2007). Harmonic Expectation and Affect in Western Music: Effects of Attention and Training. Perception and Psychophysics, 69 (7). P. 1084 — 1092.

Malinowski, B. (1922) Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London: Routledge.

Malinowski, B. (1926). Myth in primitive psychology. London: Paulette Pub. Co.

Malinowski, B. (1962.) Sex, culture and myth. New York: Harcourt Brace.

ОНДРЕЙ КРАТКИ[1]

ВОСПРИЯТИЕ, МЕРА ЕГО ДЛИТЕЛЬНОСТИ И ОЦЕНКА: РАЗЛИЧНЫЕ АВТОРЫ, СООТНОСИМЫЕ НАБЛЮДЕНИЯ

Абстракт

Реципиент всегда воспринимает текст постепенно и линеарно. Читательское восприятие текста чаще всего длится столько, сколько обещают ожидания, которые читатель имеет на его счет. Автор, отдавая себе отчет в этом факте, выстраивает текст (соответственно своим намерениям, целям или предпочтениям) таким образом, чтобы либо (в большей или меньшей степени) преднамеренно выполнить ожидания реципиента соответственно своему знанию, оценке, предположениями, или, напротив, чтобы (в большей или меньшей степени) целенаправленно нарушить эти ожидания. В то

---

[1] *Ондрей Кратки* получил степень доктора философии от факультета философии и искусств Университета Западной Богемии (Пльзень, Чешская республика). Он является автором известной монографии «An Oriental Internationale: Milestones of the Shia Awakening in the 20th century» (Brno. Vaclav Klemm Publishing House, 2013), посвященной кросс-культурным проблемам взаимоотношений восточной и западной культур. В последнее время последовательно опубликовал ряд стате по проблематике кросс-культурных и геополитических отношений Европы и Ближнего Востока. В этом контексте проявил интерес также к эстетической и герменевтической проблематике восприятия текста, чему посвящена настоящая статья.

время, как исполнение ожиданий дает результат в виде «комфортного» воображения реципиента, нарушение ожиданий вызывает пробуждение реципиента. Нарушение ожиданий не должно иметь только негативный эффект — оно также может иметь коммуникативную ценность. Следовательно, можно утверждать что а) автор включает в текст стимулы, которые ведут к нарушению ожиданий читателя, и делает это с коммуникативно-функциональным намерением (включая художественное и эстетическое) и б) если пробуждение представляет собой следствие нарушения читательских ожиданий, то, если соответствующий авторский план (художественный, эстетический, другой) заключается в серии (многослойной, последовательной, композиционной и т.д.)) нарушений читательских ожиданий, то опыт (эстетический и другой), вызванный ей, обусловлен в числе других факторов, серией пробуждений (который вызван соответствующими нарушениями).

Ключевые слова
Чтение, восприятие, ожидания.