Functioning of Language in Creative process of art production

Yashaswini Jayadevaiah
Dept of HSS (Fine Arts), Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur (IITK),
ysh.wini@gmail.com, Mob No: + 91 81053388301

Tanvi Jain
Dept of HSS (Fine Arts), Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur (IITK),
tanvi.jain500@gmail.com, Mob No:+ 919953114058

Abstract: In the present globalised world where mobility and communication have seen exceptional development and reach, previously alienated components of societies and cultural ethnicities are aligning parallel to each other. This has enforced communication and interactions that are unprecedented in scale and degree creating a need to reach larger population/groups marked by stark politico-social and cultural difference. This metamorphosis of multi socio-cultural value systems has posed a typical challenge for Art practitioners. They need to be sensitive, considerate about different and often conflicting cultural conceptions, as they are expected to conceptualise and articulate their art to reach a larger audience. Art lacks effective articulation in comparison to other disciplines which consider language (directly or indirectly) as a means to communicate with the viewers.

This paper observes that Art though communicates, it's ability is being limited as it does not operate as effectively as language. This happens as, language being, a system of communication, is been highly effective in enabling preciseness to the info to be communicated. Paper further digs into understanding the role of language at cognition level and locates it as a catalyst which transforms cognition into artwork. By this, the paper suggests to look into centuries held belief, on the communicative ability of art and its self-sufficiency as a language.

In this regard, the paper seeks to understand the relationship between art and language and examines the functioning of the language in the creative process of art production. We will be looking into language and art from their functional perspectives; firstly, language and art as an external communication tool and secondly, language (linguistic / sign) and image (visual imagery) interaction at cognition (internal) levels. In conclusion, we observe that language and art are different entities, though they do transgress respective boundaries. We also observe that, though interdependency between them is indicative; a majority of the time it is the art which exhibits such dependency on language and is very crucial for art production as well as communication.

Key Words: Art and language, creative process and language, communication and art, art production process, art, language

In the present globalised world where mobility and communication have seen exceptional development and reach, previously alienated components of societies and cultural ethnicities are aligning parallel to each other. This has enforced mutual interactions that are unprecedented in scale and degree. Everything that was local is

becoming global and global becoming local enhancing the need to reach out to larger population or groups marked by stark politico-social and cultural difference. This metamorphosis of multi socio-cultural systems has posed a typical challenge for artists. They need to be sensitive and considerate about the different and often conflicting cultural conceptions and at the same time are expected to conceptualise and articulate their art to reach a larger audience pool with marked and glaring differences and affinities. Many art forms based on the audio or audio-visual components like literature, singing, picture films etc. (in which produced artefact imbibes significant language component) are been able to break down the socio-political and cultural barriers. Whereas, visual arts have not been able to achieve this goal largely because of ultimate abstractism and hyped individualism which allowed art to disassociate itself from its communicative purpose.

This paper intends to dwell on looking for answers and believes that art's detachment from communicative intentions can prove detrimental curbing its ability to reach to the larger population. Along with paper questions the rigorously held credence of self-sufficiency and superiority of the visual depiction over and above language in the field by many artists and art critics. Thereby intend to understand the relationship between art and language and examine the belief held for centuries a in the communicative ability of art and its self-sufficiency as a language. To understand this, we will look into the language and art relationship from two perspectives;

1. Language and art as an external communication tool
2. Language (linguistic / sign) as catalytic and transformative of cognition (internal) into an artwork (artefact)

Initially, we look briefly into how communication and language are related - are they the same or do they differ? Followed by a discussion on conception and perception of the language and communication among scholars from the field of visual art, aesthetics and linguists. Do these conceptual similarities or and differences exhibit any influence on the research area under study? As the definition of language varies from individual to individual and between fields under enquiry, we are considering the definitions from the field of Linguistic which is the discipline that scientifically studies the language and its structure.

Communication and language: Communication is a process of conveying a message which involves two or more participants sharing information (cognitive, affective and behavioural) in a reciprocal process of coding and decoding of the message through a specific medium. Whereas, Language is "a system of communication-based upon words and the combination of words into sentences. Communication by means of language may be referred to as linguistic Communication. Other components like laughing, smiling, shrieking, and so on – are types of non-linguistic communication." (Eifring H). This definition indicates that language is one kind of communication but all kinds of communication are not necessarily language. It also recognises the existence of non-linguistic communication which is different from language. For example, dogs, bees etc. can communicate but don't have the ability to process and produce language like a human being.

Scholar Lois Bloom defines language as "a code whereby ideas about the world are expressed through a conventional system of arbitrary signals for communication"

(Eubanks). Nelson Goodman, who worked extensively on the nature and function of symbol systems in music, dance, the literary arts, and the visual arts, to establish a philosophical basis for considering non-verbal representational systems defines language as "a symbol system that conveys complex ideas" (Eubanks). As one can observe these two definitions of language share common elements: signals or symbols with conventional meanings; a code or system that organizes the set of symbols; and the language which is an arbitrary set of conventionally agreed-upon symbols (sounds or hand shapes/movements) that is productive (can be rearranged in infinite combinations). This concept of language is backed by Chomsky (Noam) who while describing different components of language identifies generative grammar as an essential component of sentence formation as well as evaluation of a sentence. According to him, the generative grammar includes syntactic, phonological and semantic components which are commonly shared by the population speaking the same language. He also identifies that to speak (to communicate using language) is not just the mere repetition of the same words, which have struck the ear, but to utter (respond) others to their purpose and suitable to them.

1. Language and art as an external communication tool

Art has always been assumed to have communication as its purpose. As Leo Tolstoy ((Tolstoy) identifies art "as an intentional activity by which the artist expresses his experience (a human condition) with the sole aim to communicate it to the viewer". Emphasizing communication as one of the basic purposes of every artistic activity and acknowledges that language and art share one similar purpose, that is to communicate. In Tolstoy's view, art acts in a similar manner as speech (Language) transmits the thoughts and experiences of men. But the difference between the two is, in speech man transmits his thoughts to another by words and in Art, they transmit their feelings through the produced artefact (artwork). Thus the phrases like 'language of Art' or 'Art is a Visual Language' are used.

Many scholars engaged in this endeavour opinioned that art is more superior than language as a medium of communication for its universal acceptance; some supported language as more acceptable amongst the same language-speaking community than art and some explored the intersections and dependencies. However, researcher Richard Wollheim (Wollheim) in his effort to develop a theory to explain the link between language and art objects (artefacts) observes that "art objects communicativeness depends on the extent of the artists wish and willingness to allow his art creation to communicate" making it subjective to each artist and artwork. Thereby identifying the possibility that an artist might create artwork without an intention to communicate with viewers and in which case, the artwork will not possess (intentionally) any message to communicate.

Whereas, McLuhan (McLuhan) in his attempt to explain a philosophical base for postmodern art proposes Medium as Message against the established belief of content as a message. According to him, it is the medium that shapes and controls the scale and form of human association and action.

Considering all these viewpoints, we would like to draw that artworks do possess messages (intentional or unintentional) either through its content or through its medium of execution that can get communicated depending on the communicative

intentions of the artists and viewer. As we understand that artworks do communicate; we need to look into how do they communicate and does this communication is similar to language.

From the Pre-historic period to now, human beings use images or any visual representations besides text or speech to communicate. Even the Egyptian hieroglyphs are the derivations from images. Still, we use images, diagrams, drawings to illustrate a theoretical fact or to represent an unknown fact where images help to deliver a logical hypothesis based on evidence or scientific imagination. As E. H. Gombrich (Gombrich) while discussing the origin of symbolism and past human artefacts notes that "if we want to understand the story of art we may do well to remember once in a while that pictures and letters are really blood-relations."

On the other hand, the present century philosophers who have interested themselves in aesthetics often speak of art as if it is supposed to be considered a language. What is hard to find is any systematic attempt to make clear what it would be for art to be a language. Many scholars and philosophers differ in their opinion on the relationship between language and art.

Nelson Goodman (Goodman), an American Philosopher is one among the initial scholars to focus on the relationship between art and language. He opinioned that language and art as linked both words and images are symbols. He (Goodman) "approach art semantically without having to specify something resembling an artistic grammar. Goodman's thesis is that artworks are characters within symbol systems" (Gerwen). Charles Morris, (Morris) for example, has argued that aesthetic discourse is part of the subject matter of semiotics[1].

John Dewey (Dewey) recognises artworks as the language of art. According to him "Because objects of art are expressive, they are a language. Rather they are many languages. Each art has its medium, and that medium is especially fitted for one kind of communication. Each medium says something that cannot be uttered as well or as completely in any other tongue." He also declares that each artist speaks his language, and there are intimations to the effect that works of art, taken individually, are rather like languages.

Collingwood (Collingwood)claims not just that art is a language but that art and language are identical. In his 'The Principles of Art' his arguments are ingenious and impressive, but his conclusion: that art, being the act of expressing emotion, is identical with language, depends on a set of very special definitions which seem so inappropriate to accept. For example, in his view, English, French, and German are not languages, but the by-products of language. There are aestheticians such as Suzanne Langer and Albert Hofstadter who believe that art and language, both involve concepts such as symbol, truth, validity and have some vital underlying connection. Gombrich offers his theory, which begins with the hypothesis that art is a language. Parallel to these, the works of Richard Rudner (Rudner) indicates the

---

[1] There are three primary forms of discourse (the scientific, the aesthetic, and the technological), and that all other forms are secondary, that is, are a function of these primary form. The theory of discourse is thus one development of the general theory of signs (technically called semiotic). Please see 'Science, Art and Technology' by Morris for further details.

radical obstacles that must be overcome by a theory in which "iconic signs" are crucial to consider art as a language.

However, Roland Barthes (Barthes) work answer the concern of whether art communication is similar to linguistic communication to an extent. Barthes identifies the linguistic nature of the image and demonstrates the same with an example of an advertisement as advertisements are intentionally designed to communicate the preconceived message or set of messages to its viewer. He identifies the message in an image at three levels and opinions that though the first two level of the message can be stripped and understood the third meaning (obtrusive) is something which is not possible to describe through language either in oral or written form.

However, Barthes explanation cannot apply to all forms and styles of visual artworks as they might not imbibe any component and explicit intention to communicate. Even if we consider communicativeness as one of the purposes of art, still Barthes classification doesn't hold good for most of the artworks. As Barthes discusses and identifies syntactic and semantic components in the images, it is very difficult to equalise advertisement images to artworks. John O'Nolan (John) while explaining the difference between art and design identifies how the message in art, interpreted by its audiences. According to him as an artist sets out to convey a viewpoint or emotion, it is not to say that the viewpoint or emotion has a single meaning as art connects with people in different ways because it's interpreted differently and not understood in the same way as its creator perceived while creating it. Raising a question; if art has a language then doesn't it should be grasped and understood in the same way as intended by its creator or composer than to interpret it in different possible ways.

We now know that many philosophers and individuals associated with art field have different standpoints about the relationship of art and language. In the below section we try looking into this concern from two different positions. The first position where we examine the possibility of art to communicate everything a language (spoken, written and sign) can communicate and secondly can language (spoken, written and sign) communicate everything an artwork intended to communicate. Ideally, if art is a language, this is not just a probability but has to be a fact as statements in one language are translatable into many other with bare minimum errors.

W. J. T. Mitchell (Mitchell) on the relation of visual representation to language and language to visual representation notes that there always exists a potential for the shift 'from word to image' and 'image to word', even in the sparest, unadorned forms of writing and speech. To him, 'natural' visual experience of the world, quite apart from the viewing of images, is much like a language. As the recognition of what visual images represent, even the recognition that something is an image, seems possible only for language-using animals.

Though Mitchell strikes to mark the similarities between an image and language Salim Kemal and Ivan Gaskell (Kemal and Haskell)doesn't seem to agree on the same. As to Kemal and Gaskell, knowledge and understanding of cultural context is an essential and a basic requirement to understand what a particular artwork of a specific artist intends to communicate. Therefore, it is neither readily readable nor comprehendible in comparison to language. On this basis, one can argue that the field of oral and written language exhibits same constraints as it's also culture-specific and

one needs to learn and expertise in the language of specific community or culture to understand and to converse in that particular language making it culture specific. However, cultural specificity of language though exists, it doesn't inhibit individuals' ability to acquire a new language and thereby understand it. Many bilingual and multilingual people operate in the real world without understanding much about the culture of society and community whose language they are speaking. It is possible as principles and norms in each language are the resultant factor of biological possibilities (of human beings) making language rules highly pre-defined and prefixed (Chomsky, Mukherji and Patnaik). As Chomsky (Chomsky, Mukherji and Patnaik) states 'language is acquired and is resultant of synchronisation of many biological systems like the cognitive system, performance system, sensory-motor system, articulatory, perceptual systems etc.'. It invariably varies from individual to individual influencing their ability to acquire, master and use the language when exposed to a similar external environment with language stimuli.

His theory of Innateness of language was further extended to sign language by Laura – Ann Petitto (Petitto) who explains how both verbal and non-verbal (linguistic and sign) language is acquired. According to her, "language is a tacit knowledge of the finite set of possible grammars that it could assume and will be acquired by the baby when it listens to the patterns present in the specific language sample to which she is being exposed & chooses from her innate set of possible grammars the grammar she is hearing". It makes us wonder whether such a possibility exists when it comes to art.

As we are considering the possibility of art to fulfil the same roles as language, let us look into the vice versa that is, through language can an individual communicate everything an artwork intended to communicate. For this, we are reviewing writings from art historians and critics entrusted with the responsibility to communicate in writing (language) about art and artworks.

Among them, one can broadly identify three viewpoints. The first viewpoint is observable when Rosen Stanley (Rosen) differentiates Art and language (about art criticism) and opinions that one should not reduce art to the writing (language) level as it reduces the thought and experience and coherence between both. Support for her view is observable in the writing of Michael Baxandall (Baxandall) as he recognises the distinctiveness of art objects and describes them as having a visual interest which is not straightforwardly grasped in descriptive language, enforcing difference between art and language.

In the same lines Andrew Harrison (Harrison) notes the peculiarity of visual quality of art objects and argues that art objects have a specific visual character that remains even after language has articulated all that it can. It highlights the point that the art object communicates such feelings or cognitions which cannot be communicated by language thereby differentiating both.

Secondly, researchers like Richard Wollheim (Wollheim) tries to develop a theory to explain the link between language and art object. This second category of art historians and critics are of the opinion that it is possible but not true in every instance as certain criterions ruled it. Carl R Hausman R (Hausman) successfully identifies a component which seems to exhibit similarity between art and language. Hausman states that the works of art are the result of creativity and are constituted of newly

produced meanings making it inevitable to use metaphor while communicating the art history of that specific art. It strikes a similarity with language characteristic wherein, the composer or user of the language is capable of aligning a grammatically correct sentence every time he speaks or responds to a speech. However, at the same time, it raises a concern that, if each artwork derives new meaning/message can all this be grasped by the viewer in the same way and with the same depth as conceived by the artist.

Thirdly, a band of art historians and critics who view language and art as interdependent entities which cannot communicate what they are intended to communicate in the absence of other. Richard Shiff (Shiff) views, that "object and language don't exist independent of each other as pure entities"; raising questions on whether they are dependent? Are they same? Are they replaceable by each other? Can we say art is equal to language making art a language?

On the same lines, Catherine Lord and Bemardete A Jose (Lord and Jose) contend that language and the visuals inevitably interpenetrate as language use alone (independently) cannot constitute the art object. By this, they do point out that art and language are different entities, however, are dependent on each other to enhance the effectiveness of the artwork and its communication.

To sum up the above discussion I would like to mention the points raised by Mary Mothersill (Mothersill) while analysing Gombrich's theory which hypothesises 'art as language'. She acknowledges the fact that there are similarities between art and language. Nonetheless, that doesn't mean there is no difference. The importance one attaches to these differences will determine one's decision about whether art is a language or is not. She summarises the stark difference as follows:

Nothing can be asserted or denied in the language of art. A picture is at best analogous to a predicate. It can "convey information" on one and only one topic, namely how things look, and can do this only as a supplement to some ordinary language.

No one can learn the language of art unless he knows an ordinary language and unless, also, he is familiar with a set of conventions that prescribe conditions under which a picture considered as representing or looking like something.

However, Dr Anna M. Kindler (Kindler) argues that art, especially as it functions within societies today, hardly lends itself to the metaphor of a "language of communication" – quite the opposite, it seems to be one of the least understood endeavours of a very minimal perceived relevance to the society – despite what artists and art educators would wish for it to be.

With the emergence of consideration art medium itself as message (against to the traditional belief of content as message) and the consideration of the process of art making (like Johan Pollack's works) as art against centuries held conception that identifies the final outcome or product (produced at the end of art making process) as artwork added further complications. Considering these three points, we would like to note the following. Firstly, if the artist doesn't intend to communicate anything through his/her artwork, then there is no role of language or any other means of communication in the art (External). Secondly, if the medium is the message; the content of an artwork becomes subservient to medium, and a medium can be anything

from paper to an electronic gadget, and it is not a language. In such conditions where art adopts different mediums (of art execution) to convey the message it may or may not consider language. If language is used as content, then language assumes the role of subservient content to medium. Finally, if the process of making artwork is art, each artist's process of making artwork is unique and innate to selves. Because of which, the message communicated is not readily understood and if understood it's not reciprocated in the same manner. It is against to the shared principal (in language) of a finite set of possible grammars that can be readily acquired, developed and adopted.

All the above-stated studies and viewpoints do indicate that art and language both have a similar purpose 'to communicate' and are interdependent to a certain extent. However, equalising both and considering art as a language seems exponentially difficult.

2. Language (linguistic / sign) as catalytic and transformative of cognition

Above we discussed language in its traditional accounts where language is "the formal and expressive medium that is [used] to describe mental representations" (Li and Gleitman), that is, it is an output system—a way to communicate our ideas, which can be converted to language, but are themselves independent of it. Contrasting sharply with this conception of language is a view that language is "potentially catalytic and transformative of cognition" (Bowerman and Choi). A clear understanding of this viewpoint would further open up possible similarities and differences between language and art.

To understand it in details this paper will discuss few studies from interdisciplinary fields are considered, which will help us in unravelling the neural basis of the visual imagery, language as well as the interaction between them and the resulting transformations (art).

The use of language is not just a matter of communicative convenience; rather, language reflects and facilitates our most pervasive, open-ended manifestations of cognitive flexibility (Lupyan, Rakison and McClelland). The basic function of language is fast, flexible production and reconstruction of a practically unlimited range of selectively sculpted mental representations. No other behaviour system in nature matches this potential for flexible representation (Deak). By the learned associations between words and their referents, words participate in the creation of categories they denote, and function on-line to selectively shape the perceptual representations that underlie our conceptual knowledge (Lupyan, Rakison and McClelland). Rather than just being simply a system for communicating to others; one's pre-existing conceptual representations' verbal labels participate in constructing and modulating these representations. In addition to changing representations in our interlocutors, language changes representations in our own brains. Experimental studies conducted by Bernard Mazoyer et al. (Mazoyer, Mazoyer and Mazard), Neil Cohn et al. (Cohn, Paczynski and Ray) and Giancarla Unser-Schutz (Schutz) further reinforces this stand. These studies indicate the relationship between language and mental image, visual perception. They also indicate the role played by language in directing mental imagery and visual perception.

Bernard Mazoyer et al. (Mazoyer, Mazoyer and Mazard) in their study focuses on the two modes of mental representations used by humans; mental visual imagery and

language and states that they are not exclusive from each other. The importance of mental imagery in human cognition comes in part from the interactions between mental image and language.

Neil Cohn et al. (Cohn, Paczynski and Ray) study based on narrative sequences supports it further. The study opinions as syntax differentiate coherent sentences from scrambled word strings, the comprehension of sequential images also uses a cognitive system to distinguish coherent narrative sequences from random strings of images. This study was conducted to examine the contributions of narrative structure (language narrations) and semantic relatedness to processing sequential images. They compared four types of comic strips: (1) Normal sequences with both structure and meaning (in which the panels were related to a common semantic theme, and had narrative structure), (2) Semantic only sequences (in which the panels were related to a common semantic theme, but had no narrative structure), (3) Structural only sequences (narrative structure but no semantic relatedness), and (4) Scrambled sequences of randomly-ordered panels.

The experiment results indicated longest reaction time for panels in Scrambled sequences, intermediate in both Structural Only and Semantic Only sequences, and fastest in Normal sequences (both structure semantic and drawing). The second experiment under the study which measured ERPs[2] (Event-related potential) to these four types of panels across the whole sequence indicates the following. The semantic processing of upcoming panels was highest when narrative structure and semantic relatedness are combined and were intermediate when it was in Semantic Only sequences and was lowest when panels were in both the Scrambled and Structural Only sequences. It does indicate that linguistic and imagery with linguistic was grasped, understood and articulated efficiently than only image-based understanding. However, linguistic-based narratives are (comparatively) readily understood in comparison to images only.

Giancarla Unser-Schutz (Schutz) in their study uses Manag comic in which they make a distinction between linguistic text (language) and visual language. In which linguistic text (as it mediates, visual structures) assumes a position of the second element in comparison the to visuals. The researcher argues that these texts, on the one hand, offers artist to visually code the data regarding relevance and readers to visual decode thereby offering a space of dynamic interpretation where readers will be able to ignore or read visuals as per their needs. This study establishes human beings preference towards language as a tool to understand the artistic expression.

Gary Lupyan's (Lupyan, Rakison and McClelland) study offers us an explanation for the above-discussed research scenarios. In his study researcher observes the role of language in differentiating and labelling the categories in human cognition. Experiment exposed healthy human subjects to verbal-interference that impede their ability to categorise as it requires isolating particular dimensions. This limitation in the ability to categories is observable among the aphasic patients with absent

---

[2] ERP is a measured brain response which is stimulated by a specific sensory, cognitive, or motor event. Technically it is a stereotyped electrophysiological response to a stimulus. This process is used to study the brain by a non-invasive means and to evaluate brain functioning.

linguistic ability. It does prove the importance of language to facilitate individual cognitive abilities.

Susan Schaller (Schaller and OLIVER) in her book, Man without Words elucidates a case study of a profoundly deaf Mexican immigrant who grew up in a house with hearing-impaired parents who could not teach him sign language. It serves as the best example of thought without symbols and life without language (linguistic and sign). It depicts what human thought would be like without language. Schaller when working as a sign interpreter, met an immigrant, a deaf and was unable to use sign language, in one of her classes for 'Reading skills' conducted for deaf students. As he did not know Mexican sign language, he started copying whatever she was communicating to him (sign language). He was not even able to recognise that she was communicating with him and he is expected to reply to her. He was just surviving in part by simply copying those around him, but he had no idea what language was. Though he observed people's lips and mouth movement he was unaware that they were making a sound, unaware that there was sound, trying to figure out what was happening from the movements of the mouths. Her every effort to communicate with him went in vain until a day when he realised that each object has a sign associated to it which proved to be a breakthrough for him to acquire sign language and to communicate with people. Though visual clues were present around the trainee and he was able to perceive them; he was not able to differentiate between them or label them in the absence of language acquisition. Thereby indicating the different roles of visual and language and how in the absence of language visual perception might not hold much of meaning and affects individual cognition, emotions and behaviour.

While on the other had Helder Bertolo (Bertolo) in the paper titled Visual imagery without visual perception? Shows that it is possible to have visual imagery without visual perception using visual activation in dreams and its relation with EEG's spectral components, showing that congenitally blind have visual contents in their dreams and can draw them. This study supports the hypothesis that it is possible to have visual imagery without visual experience.

These two studies indicate that human being can communicate without visual experience but not without linguistic experience or exposure. However, this doesn't mean to indicate that verbal and visual never interact with each other or neither to state that they don't reinforce each other. Few neurological and cognition related studies had shown that mental images generated from verbal description elicit activations in both visual and language cortices. Interestingly, the study shows that language areas are more likely to address a representation when language is the only source of information than when imagery and language used in conjunction. The study demonstrates modulation of the activity in these areas by the mental imagery task. Overall, these findings provide a neural substrate to the dual coding theory developed by Paivio. They also indicate the level of grasping and connecting (at the individual level) varies depending on the input type (language, image or both).

Mazoyer Bernard et al. (Mazoyer, Mazoyer and Mazard) consider mental visual imagery and language as two main types of representation used by humans and opinions that these two modes of mental representations are not exclusive from each as there will be interactions between mental image and language. Their research

results showed that the mental images generated from verbal description elicit activations in both visual and language cortices. However, language areas are more likely to address a representation when language is the only source of information than when imagery and language used in conjunction. Though language and imagery influence each other, this study points out the difference between art and language making them different identities.

Michael Tlauka et al. (Tlauka, Keage and Clark) investigated the brain neural activity aroused by the processing of previously learned map information and its influence on the modality in which the spatial parameters of the maps learnt originally. Participants learned a map by either viewing it directly or by reading an equivalent verbal description. Following learning, the participants' ability to use their spatial knowledge tested in a spatial orientation task. Results from this study indicate that visuospatial (e.g., looking at a map) and verbally (e.g., reading a description of a map) acquired spatial memories are similar as visual imagery will be playing a role when acquiring spatial details verbally.

Marcel Adam Just et al. (Just, Newman and Keller) opinions that, types of thinking (particularly) language comprehension, entail the use of mental imagery. For example, understanding a text on architecture or automobile design seems impossible without mental imagery. The study showed that the sentence imagery manipulation affected the activation in regions (those get activated in other mental imagery tasks) of the high-imagery condition, suggesting a common neural substrate for language-evoked imagery that is independent of the input modality.

Ability to constitute a structure has long been established as a central feature of human language. Furthering this Neil Cohn et al. (Cohn, Ray and Holcomb) indicates this through an experimental study that opinions, similar to how syntax organises words in sentences, a narrative grammar organises sequential images into hierarchic constituents. They showed that the brain draws upon this constituent structure to comprehend word-less visual narratives. Their study's findings provide evidence that viewers use a narrative structure to comprehend visual sequences and that the brain engages similar neurocognitive mechanisms to build a structure across multiple domains and not just in language.

All these studies discussed above clearly indicates that visual cognition is different from linguistic cognition. However, Visual cognition needs support from linguistic cognition starting from Perception to external execution without which visual cognition stays just as an image. Sequencing of visual imagery also happens with the help of linguistic cognition.

Considering the above discussion, we derive that linguistic cognition provides a required storyline (if we can call it like that) along sequence to externalise cognition related to an artistic execution resulting in an artefact (a book, a dance performance, poetry, a musical recital etc.). Therefore, we think that language not just externalises the cognition but transforms the 'cognition of an artist' (art) to artwork (artefact) and facilitates the viewer's internalisation of an artefact/artwork through providing a narrative to what we perceive and internalise.

3. Conclusion

Considering the above discussion, we are concluding that language and art are clearly and definitely different entities. Though they seem to share similar roles and serve the similar purpose, they have clearly defined set of differentiated roles and status. Though interdependency between them is indicative majority of the time, it is the art which exhibits such dependency on language than language has such requirements. We cannot assimilate language and art (visual) as one and the same. The above-discussed studies and scholarly papers provide clear roles for both language and art where language along being an external communication tool assumes the role of catalyst for cognition formation. Whereas, art though acts as a communication tool (within a limit) assumes the role of an externalising tool to transform the artist's cognition into an artefact. Which is similar across all the art forms including literature, singing and music which are considered as art though are observably linguistic. Hence art though is a communication tool; is not a language.

However, the idea of art as a language appeared to be useful and fit within a certain range of pedagogical contexts. Since in those contexts, it is understood to be a figure of speech. The full-scale discussions of art as a language, either while serving communication purpose (external) or while facilitating cognition (internal) is highly incomprehensible and concludes against the same. However, it doesn't mean to say that language doesn't share certain similarities in both internal (visual imagery) and external (art) paradigm. It may on occasion be helpful to think of art as a language as it communicates and aid in perceiving and reinforcing learning. But on the other hand, to be taken factually, it indicates that there is no direct bearing on art or on language as those concepts are ordinarily understood.

Reference

1. Barthes, Roland. "Rhetoric of Images." Barthes, Roland. *Image Music Text*. London: Fontana Press, 1977.
2. Baxandall, Michael. "The language of art criticism,." Kemal, S and I Gaskell. *The Language of Art History.* Cambridge, London: Cambridge university press, 1991.
3. Bertolo, Helder. "Visual imagery without visual perception." *Psicologica* 26 (2005): 173-188.
4. Bowerman, M and S Choi. "Shaping meanings for language: Universal and language-specific in the acquisition of Semantic categories." Bowerman, M and S C Levinson. *Language acquisition and conceptual development*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 475-511.
5. Chomsky, N, et al. *The architecture of language*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000.
6. Cohn, Neil, et al. "(Pea)nuts and bolts of visual narrative: Structure and meaning in sequential image comprehension." *Cognitive Psychology* 65 (2012): 1-38.
7. —. "The grammar of visual narrative: Neural evidence for constituent structure in sequential image comprehension." *Neuropsychologia* 64 (2014): 63-70.
8. Collingwood, Robin George. *The Principles of Art*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938.
9. Danto, Arthus C. "The End of Art: A Philosophical Defense." *History and Theory* 37.4 (1998): 127-143.
10. Deak, Gedeon O. "The Development of Cognitive Flexibility and Language Abilities." Kail, R. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*. Vol. 31. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc, 2003. 271-327.
11. Dewey, John. *Art as Experience*. Perigee Books, Penguin, 1934, 2005.
12. Eifring H, Theil R. "https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/ikos/EXFAC03-AAS/h05/larestoff/linguistics/Chapter%201.(H05).pdf." 2014. 2017.
13. Eubanks, Paula K. "Art Is a Visual Language." *Visual Arts Research* 23.1 (1997): 31-35. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20715892.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A044c2d5f8a54d3c2e016206283 9a781e>.
14. Gerwen, Rob van. *Art and Experience*. Vol. 14. Utrecht: Utrecht University, 1996. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.452.7429&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
15. Gombrich, Ernst Hans Josef. *The Story of Art: With 370 Illustrations*. 4. London: Phaidon Press, 1950.

16. Goodman, Nelson. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968.
17. Harrison, Andrew. "A minimal syntax for the pictorial: the pictorial and the linguistic – analogies and dis analogies." Kemal, S and I Gaskell. *The language of art history*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 213-239.
18. Hausman, Carl R. "Figurative language in Art." Kemal, Salim and Ivan Gaskell. *The Language of Art History*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 101-128.
19. Herberg. *Art as Language - Wittgenstein, Meaning and Aesthetic Theory*. Ithaca, London: Cprnell University Press, 1995.
20. Hospers, John. "The Croce-Collingwood Theory of Art." *Royal Institute of Philosophy Journal* 31 (1956): 291-308.
21. John, O'Nolan. *The difference between art and design*. 09 2009. <http://www.webdesignerdepot.com/2009/09/the-difference-between-art-and-design/>.
22. Just, Marcel Adam, et al. "Imagery in sentence comprehension: an fMRI study." *NeuroImage* 21 (2004): 112-124.
23. Kemal, S and I Haskell. "Art history and language: some issues,." Kemal, S and I Gaskell. *The Language of Art History*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge university press, 1991.
24. Kindler, Anna M. "Art as a Language for Communication and Critical Awareness (or not?) - and some reflection on the relevancy of this question to art education." n.d. *CiteSeerX*.
25. Khatchadourian, Haig. "The Expression Theory of Art: A Critical Evaluation." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 23.3 (1965): 335-352.
26. Li, P and L Gleitman. "Turning the tables: language and spatial reasoning." *Cognition* 83.3 (2002): 265-294.
27. Lord, Catherine and Bernardete A Jose. "Baxandall and Goodman." Kemal, Salim and Ivan Gaskell. *The Language of Art History*. Cambridge. London: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 76-100.
28. Lupyan, Gary, David H Rakison and James L McClelland. "Language is not Just for Talking." *Psychological Science* 18.12 (2007): 1077.
29. Lupyan, Gary. "The Label Feedback Hypothesis: Linguistic Influence on Visual Processing." *The Label Feedback Hypothesis: Linguistic Influence on Visual Processing*. Pittsburg: Carnegie Mellon University, 2007.
30. Mazoyer, Bernard, et al. "Neural bases of image and language interactions." *International Journal of Psychology* 37.4 (2002): 204-208.
31. McLuhan, Marshall. *The Medium is the Message: Understanding Media - The Extensions of Man*. McGraw-Hill publication, 1964.
32. Mitchell, W. J. T. "What do Pictures "Really " Want?" *October* 77.Summer (1996): 71-82.
33. Morris, Charles W. "Science, Art and Technology." *The Kenyon Review* 1.4 (1939): 409-423. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4332109.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A34d7522efde3d5856432ef6acc1d 98cc>.
34. Mothersill, Mary. "Is Art a Language?" *The Journal of Philosophy* 62.20 (1965): 559 -572.
35. Nelson, Robert S and Richard Shiff. *Critical Terms for Art History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
36. Noam, Chomsky. *Current issues in linguistic theory*. Hague: Mouton, 1967.
37. Petitto, Laura – Ann. "How the brain begets language. ." Gilvray, James Ma. *The Cambridge companion to Chomsky*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
38. Rosen, Stanley. "Writing and Painting: The Soul As Hermeneut." Kemal, S and I Gaskell. *The Language of Art History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
39. Rudner, Richard. "Pm Semiotic Aesthetics." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 10.1 (1951): 67-77.
40. Schaller, Susan and SACKS OLIVER. *A Man Without Words*. 2. California: University of California Press, 2012.
41. Schutz, Giancarla Unser. "Language as the visual: Exploring the intersection of linguistic and visual language in manga." *Image & Narrative* 12.1 (2011): 167-188.
42. Shiff, Richard. "Cezanne's Physicality: the politics of touch ." Kemal, Salim and Ivan Gaskell. *The Language of Art History*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 129-180.
43. Tlauka, Michael, H Keage and C R Clark. "Viewing a Map Versus Reading a Description of a Map: Modality-Specific Encoding of Spatial Information." *Cognitive Science* 29 (2005): 39-50.
44. Tolstoy, Leo. *What is art?* . New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1904.
45. Wollheim, Richard. "Correspondence, projective properties and expression in the art." Kemal, S and I Gaskell. *The Language of Art History*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge university press, 1991.