

---

*HISTORY OF SCIENCE*  
*ИСТОРИЯ НАУКИ*

---

## Psycho-aesthetic Concept of A.V. Bakushinsky and Periodization of Human Ontogenesis

**Nikolay E. Veraksa**

Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3752-7319>, e-mail: neveraksa@gmail.com

**Larisa F. Bayanova**

Federal Scientific Center of Psychological and Multidisciplinary Research, Moscow, Russia  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7410-9127>, e-mail: balan7@yandex.ru

**Evgeniya O. Shishova**

Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia;  
Federal Scientific Center of Psychological and Multidisciplinary Research, Kazan, Russia  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4903-9021>, e-mail: Evgeniya.Shishova@kpfu.ru

Interest in the work of A.V. Bakushinsky stems from the significance of his psycho-aesthetic concept for contemporary developmental psychology. This concept outlines the stages of mental development associated with a child's perceptual capabilities within the context of global fine art. The article presents an argument supporting A.V. Bakushinsky's commitment to the cultural-historical approach in evaluating ontogenesis. A.V. Bakushinsky illustrates the parallels between the means of global fine art and the use of artistic symbols by children in their visual activities, following the developmental patterns of the child's psyche. The article also offers a comparative analysis of the approaches taken by A.V. Bakushinsky and A.V. Zaporozhets. They assess the evolution of perception. The similarities and differences in the conclusions of A.V. Bakushinsky and O.M. Dyachenko regarding the formation of images as symbolic means in ontogenesis are examined. A.V. Bakushinsky's ideas hold practical significance for elucidating the perception of the diversity of information, which the scientist called the "multiplicity of the world." The findings of this study can be used by specialists in the design and evaluation of a developmental educational environment.

**Keywords:** cultural-historical psychology; psycho-aesthetic concept; the formation of a child's perception; symbolic function; means of world art; periodization of human ontogenesis.

**For citation:** Veraksa N.E., Bayanova L.F., Shishova E.O. Psycho-Aesthetic Concept of A.V. Bakushinsky and Periodization of Human Ontogenesis. *Kul'turno-istoricheskaya psikhologiya = Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 2024. Vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 103–111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2024200412>

# Психоэстетическая концепция А.В. Бакушинского и периодизация онтогенеза

## Н.Е. Веракса

Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова  
(ФГБОУ ВО «МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3752-7319>, e-mail: neveraksa@gmail.com

## Л.Ф. Баянова

Федеральный научный центр психологических и междисциплинарных исследований,  
г. Москва, Российская Федерация  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7410-9127>, e-mail: balan7@yandex.ru

## Е.О. Шишова

Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет (ФГАОУ ВО «КФУ»),  
г. Казань, Российская Федерация;  
Федеральный научный центр психологических и междисциплинарных исследований,  
Казанский филиал, г. Казань, Российская Федерация  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4903-9021>, e-mail: Evgeniya.Shishova@kpfu.ru

Интерес к творчеству А.В. Бакушинского обусловлен значением его психоэстетической концепции для современной психологии развития. В данной концепции показаны этапы становления психических средств, связанные с возможностями восприятия ребенка в контексте мирового изобразительного искусства. В статье приводится аргументация в пользу приверженности взглядов А.В. Бакушинского культурно-историческому подходу Л.С. Выготского в оценке онтогенеза. Параллели средств мирового изобразительного искусства и использования детьми художественных символов в изобразительной деятельности показаны им в логике закономерностей развития психики ребенка. В статье предложен сравнительный анализ подходов А.В. Бакушинского и А.В. Запорожца в оценке развития восприятия. Выявлены сходства и различия в выводах А.В. Бакушинского и О.М. Дьяченко относительно становления образа как символического средства в онтогенезе. А.В. Бакушинский обратил внимание на то, что в живописи есть чередование изобразительных стилей; в общих чертах это чередование сводится к смене хаотичного упорядоченным, гротескного умеренно-спокойным. Такую смену изобразительных стилей он обнаружил и в детских рисунках в разные периоды детства. Обнаружено чередование циклов восприятия, когда ребенок то стремится к структурированию познаваемой им множественности мира, то принимает его хаотичным. А.В. Бакушинский сравнил это чередование сменяемостью стилей в живописи, когда экспрессионизм вытесняется импрессионизмом, барокко — классицизмом. Идеи А.В. Бакушинского имеют сегодня прикладное значение для объяснения восприятия многообразия информации, названного ученым «множественностью мира». Результаты исследования могут быть использованы специалистами в проектировании и оценке развивающей образовательной среды.

**Ключевые слова:** культурно-историческая психология, психоэстетическая концепция, становление восприятия ребенка, символическая функция, средства мирового искусства, периодизация онтогенеза.

**Для цитаты:** Веракса Н.Е., Баянова Л.Ф., Шишова Е.О. Психоэстетическая концепция А.В. Бакушинского и периодизация онтогенеза // Культурно-историческая психология. 2024. Том 20. № 4. С. 103–111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2024200412>

## Introduction

In our opinion, by addressing the history of psychology, we not so much resist oblivion, but rather seek a new opportunity to solve methodological problems of psychology. In this context, the psychological ideas of Anatoly Bakushinsky appear to be more than just undeservedly forgotten, but to be unfairly ignored, despite their resource of explaining, from a new perspective, the

development of mental tools in ontogenesis through the prism of artistic techniques of world art. This idea is extremely relevant for developmental psychology and modern educational practices, as we are still unclear about the instrumental effects of the influence digitalization has on the child development. Bakushinsky focused his analysis of the psyche formation on the assessment of the world art techniques that a child is able to use as its mental tools.

Anatoly Bakushinsky is known as an art critic, organizer of folk crafts and teacher, actively engaged in the theory and practice of aesthetic education. At the State Academy of Artistic Sciences, created in 1922, he headed the Physical-Psychological Department. In those years, in the humanitarian circles, art history and psychology conducted active communication demonstrating real collaboration (Zhdan, 1998). The famous scientists Lev Vygotsky, Aleksei Losev, Nikolay Zhinkin and Moses Rubinstein took part in the Seminarium held by the aforementioned Physical-Psychological Department. Analyzing the work of Bakushinsky, Natalia Poleva identifies three areas of his art criticism: definition of the periods and phases of mental development, psychology of artistic perception and methods of artistic education (Poleva, 1999). During the years of collaboration with the State Academy of Artistic Sciences, Bakushinsky wrote a number of works devoted to the analysis of children's creativity (Bakushinsky, 1923; Bakushinsky, 1924; Bakushinsky, 1925). Psychology is undoubtedly interested in the most important aspect of Bakushinsky's work, in his research of the child's psyche development in interaction with fine arts, which the scientist himself directly described in the following way: "I'm establishing parallelisms in the typical development of a person, individual and generic, as well as in the character and features of the artistic form conditioned by this development, individual and generic" (Bakushinsky, 1925, p. 3). In our opinion, these parallels are much broader and more multifaceted, representing the author's systemic vision, covering both the features of the child's cognitive sphere and the resource of its use of symbolic means of art.

Anatoly Bakushinsky's fundamental work "Artistic Education. An Experiment in Research Based on Spatial Arts," published almost a hundred years ago in 1925, is an example of a cultural-historical interpretation of ontogenesis (Bakushinsky, 1925). This work provides a generalized understanding of the development of mental tools in childhood, the result of Bakushinsky's years of experience in the psychological analysis of children's drawings. As an artist, he described his study of child psychology as follows: "I study the development of the child's psyche, the ways in which it perceives the world, its creative expression, and, as a function of these factors, the artistic form in its evolution" (ibid., p. 5). At the same time, Bakushinsky openly admitted that he was a supporter of the biogenetic theory, according to which ontogenesis repeats phylogenesis. However, a thorough analysis of his research results proves that his psycho-aesthetic theory is a vivid expression of the cultural-historical understanding of ontogenesis. Having studied the formation of artistic means in world art, Bakushinsky introduced an original interpretation of the instrumental component of the child's psyche. His psycho-aesthetic theory shows that at each stage of their development, children, due

to the cognitive capabilities of their perception process, are able to use certain artistic means of world culture. As a nod to the biogenetic law, is the part of his theory where Bakushinsky describes parallels between the individual and the generic aspects. For example, according to the artist, motor-tactile perception, characteristic of early childhood, is inherent in the generic and ancient culture, using such artistic means as primary ornament, stereotype, composition made up of several objects, complex frieze and color. Perceiving an object, a young child explores it with its hands, thus synthesizing a generalized image. According to Bakushinsky, artistic techniques of impressionism would be accessible to the child's perception at later stages, since light, in his opinion, required more advanced cognitive capabilities than motor-tactile perception.

Our analysis of Bakushinsky's psycho-aesthetic theory shows that the author considered the means, the instrument of psyche, to be the determining source in the child development. Bakushinsky's theory focuses precisely on the instruments in explaining ontogenesis, which emphasizes his commitment to the ideas of the cultural-historical approach. It is no coincidence that Alexei Leontiev, discussing Vygotsky's work, noted that the creator of the cultural-historical theory initially called it first 'instrumental', then 'cultural', then 'historical' (Leontiev, p. 41).

Bakushinsky gave the following definitions of his psycho-aesthetic theory: "ways of perceiving the world," "artistic content," "artistic form" and "design of the world." He wrote directly that for him the functional connection between the ways of perceiving the world and its creative design with artistic form and artistic content in art was becoming increasingly clear (Bakushinsky, 1925, p. 125).

The conceptual nature of Bakushinsky's views lies in the fact that he found ground for explaining the entire ontogenesis, not a separate fragment of development, relying on the means as an instrument of the psyche. "The individual creative evolution of a child and a cultural or low-cultural adult", — he wrote, "is an organic series with typical similar phases, their duration depending on age and the level of their general development. However, neither age nor cultural level essentially change either the nature of the phases or their sequence" (ibid.).

An additional and very interesting argument in favor of Bakushinsky's commitment to the cultural-historical conception is his description of the internal dynamics of ontogenesis. As we know, for Lev Vygotsky, the internal movement of development was the presence of crises. One recalls his classic metaphor that if crises were not discovered empirically, they would have to be invented theoretically (Vygotsky, 1984).

Bakushinsky also explained development by objective internal processes immanent to the psyche, in particular, by a special rhythm. In one period of its development, the child's perception accepted the spontaneity

and chaos of the world; while in the next period, it strove to structure and organize the perceived space. This tendency, according to which the psyche alternately put the world of its existence in order, while later allowed for the emancipation and chaos of this world, according to Bakushinsky, represented a special rhythm of the dialogue between the child and the world. Then, the logic of the regulation development in ontogenesis was seen in a new way, when, for example, the arbitrariness of a primary school student was replaced by adolescent love of freedom.

When Vygotsky assessed the evolution of children's drawings, he also distinguished periods, in which the rhythm of alternation, indicated by Bakushinsky, was visible. Thus, Vygotsky distinguished four periods of children's drawing development: the first stage was "scribbles", the second stage was "diagrams and lines", the third one was the stage of a plausible drawing, and the fourth was the stage of a plastic image, where there was perspective and light (Vygotsky, 1997, pp. 63–64). In general, Vygotsky noted the special value of drawing in the development of mental resources and imagination. "The main trend of the child's evolution is that the role of vision in mastering the world begins to increase, from a subordinate position it passes into a dominant one and the motor-tactile apparatus of the whole child's behavior is subordinated to the visual one" (Vygotsky, 1991, p. 72). Vygotsky presented the formation of children's drawing means as a "struggle of two opposing attitudes" (ibid.). This is the similarity of Vygotsky and Bakushinsky's views on the formation of ontogenesis of means not as a linear, but as a dialectical process.

If the unity of the world is perceived through contemplation, multiplicity requires emotions and will: "rationalism" collides with "romanticism", "impressionism" with "expressionism". Thus, Bakushinsky saw the functional interaction of man and the world as an alternation of "...the law and the norm of a human over the superhuman, over the shapeless mass of impressions" (ibid., p. 102). This attribute of the rhythm of unity and multiplicity, noticed by Bakushinsky in the evolution of world art, where expressionism with its brightness of a variety of colors is replaced by impressionism, where light organizes the unity of the world through perspective, was used by Bakushinsky to interpret the alternating ways of the child's world perception (Bayanova, 2009).

Bakushinsky's idea about the rational perception of the world by adults is very timely and interesting, it is about the complex diversity that reigns around destroying unity, so a special effort is required to maintain this unity of the world. He wrote about the crisis of modern culture, when the world disintegrated in individual consciousness, atomized to become multiple again (Bayanova, 2009). "The modern highly developed personality, rooted in the tradition of post-Renaissance culture," he wrote, "loses all ground. Alien, hostile forces of titanic extrapersonal tension in the area of material and spiri-

tual processes that build up modern life in its orientation toward the future, split and break up the personality with a mass of internal growing contradictions. The personality becomes increasingly powerless in its desire to grasp the unity of the world through a creative act" (ibid., p. 133). Many modern-day scientists, working in the field of philosophy, psychology and pedagogy, write about the information space, eclecticism and diversity, which requires special efforts from a person in the perception and selection of knowledge. The perception of information today is one of the complex humanitarian problems, its emergence was anticipated by Bakushinsky. The diversity and expanding volume of information increasingly complicate the possibility of its structuring and selection, probably giving rise to difficulties in the dialogue of a person with the perceived world.

### **Child's perception development: From touch to contemplation**

For Bakushinsky, perception was a cognitive process that determined development. He identified several stages formed by the patterns of interaction, developed within each stage, between the cognitive capabilities of perception and the tools, used by the child in learning about the world.

In Bakushinsky theory, the first stage in the development of perception is the period of the motor-visual installation (from birth to the age of three). The author calls this stage pre-pictorial, the phase of a disjointed scheme. The turning point here is the age of four months, at which time the primary chaos of the external world for the child is replaced by images of specific things. Muscular-cutaneous sensations are supplemented by visual ones, and this process allows the creation of an image of a thing with its constant properties. At this stage, the child, according to Bakushinsky, is an "egocentrist", since "the world exists only for him/her" (Bakushinsky, 1925, p. 18).

Among Russian psychologists, who studied the development of the perception process in ontogenesis, Alexander Zaporozhets is the most well-known. He argued that a child's perception is connected with its sensory learning and acquisition of sensory standards developed by society — the color spectrum, the system of geometric figures, the generally accepted scale of musical sounds, etc. "Such standards," wrote Zaporozhets, "become operational units of perception, mediate the child's perceptual actions, just as its practical activity is mediated by a tool, and its mental activity by a word" (Zaporozhets, 1986, p. 113). Zaporozhets, like Bakushinsky, associated the creation of an object image with child's physical interactions with a thing, when "simulation" and "modeling" of those material and ideal objects with which the child acts occurred, which led to the creation of adequate ideas or concepts about these objects (Zaporozhets, 1986). Perception, according to Zaporozhets,

was functionally connected with specific orienting-exploratory, perceptual actions.

In line with these ideas, Bakushinsky pointed out that at the earliest stages of the perception development, a child used ornament and believed that this was nothing more than “mastering a surface with the help of rhythmic movement on it” (Bakushinsky, 1925, p. 59). The idea of the connection between the movement and the creation of an image in early childhood is quite implicit today, presented in various methods of teaching fine arts to children.

The second stage in the development of perception, identified by Bakushinsky, was the period of the visual-motor integration/ ‘eye-hand coordination (from three to five or six years). The author called this period the phase of the scheme and semi-scheme. At this age, the child’s egocentrism was overcome, “... in the process of active cognition of the world, in the dynamic experience of the results of this cognition, it forgets about itself. All its cognition is directed at external objects – things, later – at their interrelation, even later – at their qualitative and quantitative changes” (Bakushinsky, 1925, pp. 18–19).

Zaporozhets noted a qualitative change in the child’s perception as early as from the second year of life. Thus, taking into account the results of his experimental studies, he wrote: “At this genetic stage... the images of perception lose the globality and fragmentation that were characteristic of the previous stage, at the same time acquiring a clearer and more adequate structural organization of the perceived object. So, for example, in the area of form perception, a general contour configuration gradually begins to stand out, which, firstly, distinguishes one object from another, and secondly, determines some possibilities of their spatial interaction (approaching, overlapping, grasping one object by another, etc.)” (Zaporozhets, 1986, p. 115).

Bakushinsky noticed that between the ages of 3 and 6, “two-dimensional spatial representations” were formed, owing to them the child developed the ability to comprehend in visual perception “...the textural richness of matte surfaces, the shine of roughness, the smoothness of the perceived surface” (Bakushinsky, 1925, p. 22).

Referring to the research by a number of authors, Zaporozhets noted a qualitative change in the perception of a child at the age of 3–7 years, the age range corresponding to preschool childhood, when children “...develop complex types of visual analysis and synthesis, the ability to dismember a visible object into parts and then combine them into a single whole, before such operations are implemented in practice. Accordingly, perceptual images of form acquire new content. In addition to further clarification of the object’s contour, its structure, spatial features and relationships of its constituent parts begin to stand out, the things to which the child previously paid almost no attention” (Zaporozhets, 1986, p. 115).

The third stage of perception development, described in Bakushinsky’s psychoaesthetic theory, is the period of visual attitude (from 10–12 to 14–15-year olds). Pointing to the distinctive features of this stage, Bakushinsky called it the phase of individual image, expression of relations. In general, it is noteworthy that Bakushinsky believed that the development of a child’s perception was structured in such a way that the visual element displaced the motor element in him/her. At the age of 15–16 to 19–20, the perception of a young man became the same as that of an adult. Rationalism of perception suppressed impressionism and expressionism, characteristic of the perception of the previous stages.

Following Bakushinsky, Zaporozhets pointed to qualitative changes in the nature of perception, as reflected in his generalizations based on experimental studies: “The available experimental data suggest that at this stage the externally orienting-exploratory action turns into an ideal action, into the movement of attention across the field of perception. Some features of ‘ideal’ perceptual actions are highlighted by the studies dealing with the perception of a stabilized image” (Zaporozhets, 1986, p. 118). Characterizing the later stages of the perception development, Zaporozhets, pointed out that “...children acquire the ability to quickly, without any external orienting-exploratory movements, recognize certain properties of objects, distinguish them from each other, discover connections and relationships between them, etc.” (Zaporozhets, 1986, pp. 117–118).

For Zaporozhets, the ontogenesis of perception depended on the nature of practical activities. It may seem that according to Bakushinsky, perception developed spontaneously. However, this is not entirely true. Here, we rather discuss the similarities in the assessment of perception in the conclusions made by Zaporozhets and Bakushinsky. However, the paths leading to these conclusions were different. Thus, Bakushinsky formulated his conclusions mainly on the basis of his observations and analysis of children’s drawings, while Zaporozhets – on experimental studies (Dubovis, Khomenko, 1996).

### **Mental means as a product of transposition of art symbols**

Olga Dyachenko considered culture to be a source of instrumental amplification of the child’s imagination. Dyachenko pointed out that the process of mastering the means “... can occur through interaction with the objects of universal culture that are created by the power of imagination, as well as through the development of the symbolic function in various types of children’s activities that they master with the help of an adult who conveys to them the forms and methods of ‘signifying’ reality” (Dyachenko, 1988, p. 59). The similarity of Bakushinsky and Dyachenko’s views in the assessment of instrumental means is manifested in the fact that both authors considered these means to be developing in on-

togenesis. Thus, Dyachenko proposed her periodization of imagination, in which the logic of development was associated with extra-subjective markers in the same way as Bakushinsky believed it to be. This periodization suggested three stages of development. Describing the imagination of 2.5 to 3-year-old children, Dyachenko noted that at the first stage, their imagination was connected from the very beginning with the use of symbols (Dyachenko, 1988, p. 55).

When generating the idea of an imaginary product, a specific feature of using an image was constructing it by the action of “objectification”. Separate impressions from reality were completed to make a certain objective whole, occupying a central position in this whole. For example, while finishing the drawings of indefinite images, children turn a square into a house, a television, a doghouse, etc. (Dyachenko, 1988, p. 56).

At the third stage, for 6–7-year-olds, the possibilities of choosing these techniques were directly related to their learning characteristics, primarily to the way they mastered the culture of play and the elements of artistic creativity during their preschool childhood (ibid., p. 57). Examining Dyachenko’s picture of the imagination means evolution, we clearly see how the symbols, used by children in their preschool childhood, undergo transformations. These changes are not spontaneous, but are related to children’s cognitive capabilities and an inseparable connection between the child and the culture that provides them with a resource of instrumental means.

A comparative analysis of the child’s processes of perception and imagination development theories, proposed by the Russian psychologists Alexander Zaporozhets and Olga Dyachenko, and the psychoaesthetic concept of Anatoly Bakushinsky allows us to see how much the child’s psyche is instrumentally determined by the cultural and historical context. Bakushinsky offered a

new perspective on assessing ontogenesis, on its being determined by external circumstances represented by culture. With attention to the history of psychology in university education noticeably fading, we should emphasize the importance of interest in texts written in the historical past, which is not at all an excessive and idle activity (Zhdan, 2021). Lev Vygotsky said it very well: “Modernity is too stingy about harvesting ideas. Everyone somehow seems to be too confident about knowing everything” (Vygotsky, 2017, p. 47). Bakushinsky’s psychoaesthetic concept essentially offers one of the versions of assessing ontogenesis, where the formation of perception and methods of designing perceived images occur in a certain sequence. The holistic picture of the psychoaesthetic concept is presented through the relationship between the stages of ontogenetic development and the techniques of world fine arts (Table 1).

Bakushinsky’s psychoaesthetic theory is based on the interrelationship between the modes of perception, the stages of world art, artistic techniques and conceptualization of the world (Bayanova, 2009). According to this theory, ontogenesis is determined by the instrumental capabilities of the psyche, formed in the process of perception. It is the interrelationship between this basic function at the origins of cognition with cultural images that underlies the argumentation of Bakushinsky’s psychoaesthetic theory.

Several bases can be distinguished in determining ontogenesis. Firstly, the causes of development can be internal. If we recall the well-known periodizations of mental development, most of them explain the source of development based on internal factors. Thus, according to Z. Freud, the stages of development are determined by sexual energy and its localization in the body. The development of intelligence, according to J. Piaget, is determined by biological maturation, which is also related

Table 1

**Psychoaesthetic concept of ontogenesis (according to Bakushinsky)**

Stages of “general mental development”	Means of perceiving the world	Stages of world art (“artistic content”)	Basic pictorial techniques (“artistic form”)	Trends in the design of the world
Childhood	Motor-tactile attitudes	Tribal culture - Antiquity	<b>Primitivism</b> ( <i>Primary ornament, stereotype</i> ). <b>Expressionism</b> ( <i>Contrasting colors, sharp lines, rough brushstrokes, deformation of objects, composition of several objects, complex frieze, color</i> )	Unity of the world
Adolescence	Visual-motor attitudes	Barbarian culture	<b>Impressionism</b> ( <i>Use of light, chiaroscuro, absence of sharp lines, thin brushstrokes</i> )	Plurality of the world
Youth age	Visual attitudes	Medieval culture	<b>Baroque</b> ( <i>Contrast, dynamism of images, combination of reality and illusion, expression, grandeur of images</i> )	Unity of the world
Adulthood	Thinking	New time	<b>Classicism</b> ( <i>Moderation, harmony, academicism, romanticism</i> )	Plurality of the world

to internal determination. P. Blonsky's periodization is known to use the fact of the appearance and change of teeth as an objective criterion.

Secondly, the interaction of the child and the environment is defined as the source of development. This approach is a fundamental thesis of the cultural-historical theory, in which the social situation of development, as a specific system of relations between the child and the surrounding world, determines the emergence of new psychological formations. In the psychosocial theory, proposed by E. Erikson, the formation of personality is determined by its conflict with the environment. In the process of ontogenesis, under optimal environmental conditions, the personality acquires hope, will, purpose, confidence, loyalty, love, care and wisdom. Finally, the third circumstance, explaining the source of ontogenetic development, is external factors independent of the child. It was the external factors, by which the periods of development are determined, that Bakushinsky explored in his psychoaesthetic theory. In connection with the analysis of Bakushinsky's psychoaesthetic conception, the ideas of organizing children's educational space, which have been developed in recent years, are seen in a new way, highlighting an important place given to the special formation of the subject environment. Here, we take into account the educational environment as a component of the socio-cultural environment, which is a complex system including the integrity of specially organized psychological and pedagogical conditions for the development of the individual.

The ideas of the cultural-historical conception about the importance of environment in the development of the child's psyche, are further developed with the aim of creating a space for children's self-realization (Veraksa, 2018). Undoubtedly, the subject-spatial environment is a necessary condition for the child development. This idea is supported by the postulates of the cultural-historical theory. The importance of instrumental amplification through the interiorization of cultural instruments — the means of world art, is also highlighted by Bakushinsky. However, the spatial environment, being a necessary condition for development, remains an insufficient basis for it. It is the space of children's self-realization, as a necessary condition for their development in ontogenesis, that allows us to

shift the focus of psychology from the sphere of the necessary to the sphere of the possible (Ivanchenko, 2011). In the context of creating a subject-developing environment and a space for children's self-realization, the views of Anatoly Bakushinsky enable us to understand ontogenesis in a new way.

## Conclusions

1. The views of Anatoly Bakushinsky represent a systemic theory of psychoaesthetic evolution based on the parallelism in the stages of the ways we perceive the world and the stages of world art development, its artistic content and artistic form. Bakushinsky presented the interaction of man and culture in terms of ontogeny.

2. Bakushinsky's psychoaesthetic theory consists not only in identifying parallels between autonomous systems (the individual development of a child and the formation of art), but also in revealing the possibilities of mastering the means of art as tools of the psyche. In cultural-historical psychology, one of the key points in arguing the cultural determination of mental development is precisely the process of mediation formation.

3. The child's knowledge of the world is based on the process of perception. The methods of perception are associated with the techniques of fine arts, where expressionism is replaced by impressionism; the contrast and dynamism of images are replaced by moderation and harmony. The alternation of techniques of fine arts, used in the perception of the objective world, is projected onto the structuring of this world, where order is replaced by chaos.

4. Bakushinsky was the first to demonstrate the possibility of analyzing ontogenesis through external markers, quite clearly presented in fine arts. Each stage of ontogenesis initiates the use of certain tools, appropriated by the child and based on the capabilities of its cognitive sphere.

5. A comparative analysis of the views of Lev Vygotsky, Alexander Zaporozhets and Olga Dyachenko in the context of Bakushinsky's psychoaesthetic concept reflects the unity of the methodological approach to the assessment of mental means in ontogenesis.

## References

1. Bakushinskii A.V. O zadachakh i metodakh khudozhestvennogo vospitaniya [On the tasks and methods of artistic education]. *Iskusstvo v trudovoi shkole = Art in labor school*, 1923, pp. 3–12. (In Russ.).
2. Bakushinskii A.V. Khudozhestvennoe vospitanie [Artistic education]. *Opyt issledovaniya na materiale prostranstvennykh iskusstv* [Research experience on the material of spatial arts]. Moscow: Novaya Moskva, 1925. 240 p. (In Russ.).

## Литература

1. Бакушинский А.В. О задачах и методах художественного воспитания // Искусство в трудовой школе. 1923. С. 3–12.
2. Бакушинский А.В. Художественное воспитание // Опыт исследования на материале пространственных искусств. М.: Новая Москва, 1925. 240 с.
3. Бакушинский А.В. Художественное творчество и воспитание. М.: Культура и просвещение, 1924. 304 с.

3. Bakushinskii A.V. Khudozhestvennoe tvorchestvo i vospitanie [Artistic creativity and education]. Moscow: Kul'tura i prosveshchenie, 1924. 304 p. (In Russ.).
4. Bayanova L. F. Problema vzaimodeistviya sub'ekta i kul'tury v otechestvennoi psikhologii XX veka: dis. ... d-ra psikhol. Nauk [The problem of interaction between the subject and culture in domestic psychology of the 20th century. Dr. Sci. (Psychology) diss.]. Moscow, 2009. 307 p. (In Russ.).
5. Butenko N.V. Khudozhestvenno-esteticheskoe razvitiye detei doshkol'nogo vozrasta: metodika, tekhnologiya, praktika: monografiya [Artistic and aesthetic development of preschool children: methodology, technology, practice: monograph]. Moscow: Pero, 2016. 200 p. (In Russ.).
6. Veraksa N.E. Detskoe razvitiye: dve paradigmy [Child development: two paradigms]. *Kul'turno-istoricheskaya psikhologiya = Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 2018. Vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 102–108. DOI:10.17759/chp.2018140211 (In Russ.).
7. Vygotskii L.S. Oрудie i znak v razvitiye rebenka [Tool and sign in the development of the child]. *Sobranie sochinenii [Collected works]*. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1984. Vol. 6, pp. 5–90. (In Russ.).
8. Vygotskii L.S. Zapisnye knizhki L.S. Vygotskogo: izbrannoe [L.S. Vygotsky's notebooks: a selection]. Zavershneva E. (eds.). Moscow: Kanon+, 2017. 606 p. (In Russ.).
9. Vygotskii L.S. Problema vozrasta [The problem of age]. *Sobranie sochinenii [Collected works]*. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1984. Vol. 4. (In Russ.).
10. Vygotskii L. S. Voobrazhenie i tvorchestvo v detskom vozraste [Imagination and creativity in childhood]. Saint Petersburg: Soyuz, 1997. 96 p. (In Russ.).
11. Dubovis D.N., Khomenko K.E. Voprosy psikhologii khudozhestvennogo vospriyatiya v trudakh A.V. Zaporozhtsa: Khrestomatiya po psikhologii khudozhestvennogo tvorchestva [Issues of psychology of artistic perception in the works of A.V. Zaporozhets: a textbook on the psychology of artistic creativity]. Moscow: Magistr, 1996. pp. 174–182. (In Russ.).
12. D'yachenko O.M. Ob osnovnykh napravleniyakh razvitiya voobrazheniya doshkol'nika [On the main directions of development of a preschooler's imagination]. *Voprosy psikhologii (Questions of Psychology)*, 1988, no. 6, pp. 52–59. (In Russ.).
13. Zhdan A.N. Sodruzhestvo iskusstvoznaniya i psikhologii. Opyt sovmestnoi raboty v GAKhN [Commonwealth of Art History and Psychology. Experience of working together at the State Academy of Artistic Sciences]. *Voprosy iskusstvoznaniya [Issues in Art History]*, 1998, no. 1, pp. 295–302. (In Russ.).
14. Zhdan A.N. Mesto istorii psikhologii v sovremennom psikhologicheskom obrazovanii. In Shabolts A.V. (ed.), *Anan'evskie chteniya-2021: Proceedings of the international scientific conference* (Saint Petersburg, October 19–22, 2021). Saint Petersburg: Skifiya-print, 2021, pp. 38–39. (In Russ.).
15. Zaporozhets A.V. Osnovnye problemy ontogeneza psikhiki. Razvitiye vospriyatiya i deyatelnost'. K voprosu o genezise, funktsii i strukture emotsional'nykh protsessov u rebenka [The main problems of the ontogenesis of the psyche. Development of perception and activity. On the question of the genesis, function and structure of emotional processes in a child]. *Izbrannyye psikhologicheskie trudy [Selected psychological works]*. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1986. (In Russ.).
16. Ivanchenko G.V., Leont'ev D.A., Plotnikova A.V. Ideya potentsiala v naukakh o cheloveke: ot chelovecheskogo potentsiala k lichnostnomu. [The idea of potential in the human sciences: from human potential to personal]. *Lichnostnyi potentsial: struktura i diagnostika [Personal potential: structure and diagnostics]*. Moscow: Smysl. (In Russ.).
4. Баянова Л. Ф. Проблема взаимодействия субъекта и культуры в отечественной психологии XX века: дис. ... д-ра психол. наук. М., 2009. 307 с.
5. Бутенко Н.В. Художественно-эстетическое развитие детей дошкольного возраста: методика, технология, практика: монография. М.: Перо, 2016. 200 с.
6. Веракса Н.Е. Детское развитие: две парадигмы // *Культурно-историческая психология*. 2018. Том 14. № 2. С. 102–108. DOI:10.17759/chp.2018140211
7. Выготский Л.С. Орудие и знак в развитии ребенка // Л.С. Выготский. Собрание сочинений: в 6 т. Т. 6. М.: Педагогика, 1984. С. 5–90.
8. Выготский Л.С. Записные книжки Л.С. Выготского: избранное / Под общ. ред. Е. Завершневой и Р. ван дер Веера. М.: Канон+, 2017. 606 с.
9. Выготский Л.С. Проблема возраста // Л.С. Выготский. Собрание сочинений: в 6 т. Т. 4. М.: Педагогика, 1984.
10. Выготский Л. С. Воображение и творчество в детском возрасте. СПб.: Союз, 1997. 96 с.
11. Дубовис Д.Н., Хоменко К.Е. Вопросы психологии художественного восприятия в трудах А.В. Запорожца: Хрестоматия по психологии художественного творчества / Ред. А.Л. Гройсман. М.: Магистр, 1996. С. 174–182.
12. Дьяченко О.М. Об основных направлениях развития воображения дошкольника // *Вопросы психологии*. 1988. № 6. С. 52–59.
13. Ждан А. Н. Содружество искусствознания и психологии. Опыт совместной работы в ГАХН // *Вопросы искусствознания*. 1998. № 1. С. 295–302.
14. Ждан А.Н. Место истории психологии в современном психологическом образовании // *Ананьевские чтения-2021: Материалы международной научной конференции, Санкт-Петербург, 19–22 октября 2021 г.* / Под общ. ред. А.В. Шабольтас; отв. ред. В.И. Прусаков. СПб.: Скифия-принт. С. 38–39.
15. Запорожец А.В. Основные проблемы онтогенеза психики. Развитие восприятия и деятельность. К вопросу о генезисе, функции и структуре эмоциональных процессов у ребенка // *Избранные психологические труды: в 2 т. Т. 1* / А.В. Запорожец; под. ред. В.В. Давыдова, В.П. Зинченко. М.: Педагогика, 1986.
16. Иванченко Г. В., Леонтьев Д.А., Плотникова А.В. Идея потенциала в науках о человеке: от человеческого потенциала к личностному. Личностный потенциал: структура и диагностика / Под ред. Д.А. Леонтьева. М.: Смысл, 2011. С. 42–58.
17. Леонтьев А. А. Л. С. Выготский. М.: Просвещение, 1990. 158 с.
18. Леонтьев А.Н. Деятельность, сознание, личность: учеб. пособие. М.: Изд-во политической литературы, 1975. 303 с.
19. Полева Н.С. Сравнительно-исторический анализ научной школы Государственной академии художественных наук: дис. канд. психол. наук. М., 1999. 178 с.



17. Leont'ev A.A. L.S. Vygotskiĭ. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1990. 158 p. (In Russ.).

18. Leont'ev A.N. Deyatel'nost', soznanie, lichnost': ucheb. posobie [Activity, consciousness, personality]. Moscow: Izd-vo politicheskoi literatury, 1975. 303 p. (In Russ.).

19. Poleva N.S. Sravnitel'no-istoricheskii analiz nauchnoi shkoly Gosudarstvennoi akademii khudozhestvennykh nauk: dis. kand. psikhol. nauk. [Comparative historical analysis of the scientific school of the State Academy of Artistic Sciences. Ph. D. (Psychology) Thesis]. Moscow, 1999. 178 p. (In Russ.).

#### **Information about the authors**

*Nikolay E. Veraksa*, Dr. Sci. in Psychology, Professor, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3752-7319>, e-mail: neveraksa@gmail.com

*Larisa F. Bayanova*, Dr. Sci. in Psychology, Associate Professor, Senior Researcher at the Laboratory of Childhood Psychology and Digital Socialization, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7410-9127>, e-mail: balan7@yandex.ru

*Evgeniya O. Shishova*, PhD in Education, Docent, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Institute of Psychology and Education, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; Senior Researcher, Federal Scientific Center of Psychological and Multidisciplinary Research, Kazan, Russia, ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4903-9021>, e-mail: Evgeniya.Shishova@kpfu.ru

#### **Информация об авторах**

*Веракса Николай Евгеньевич*, доктор психологических наук, профессор, профессор факультета психологии кафедры психологии образования и педагогики, Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова (ФГБОУ ВО «МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3752-7319>, e-mail: neveraksa@gmail.com

*Баянова Лариса Фаритовна*, доктор психологических наук, доцент, старший научный сотрудник лаборатории детства и цифровой социализации, Федеральный научный центр психологических и междисциплинарных исследований, г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7410-9127>, e-mail: balan7@yandex.ru

*Шিশова Евгения Олеговна*, кандидат педагогических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры педагогической психологии Института психологии и образования, Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет (ФГАОУ ВО «КФУ»), г. Казань, Российская Федерация; старший научный сотрудник, Федеральный научный центр психологических и междисциплинарных исследований, г. Казань, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4903-9021>, e-mail: Evgeniya.Shishova@kpfu.ru

Получена 01.03.2024

Принята в печать 10.12.2024

Received 01.03.2024

Accepted 10.12.2024