

Chapter 12

Continuing the Dialogue: Advancing Conceptions of Emotions, *Perezhivanie* and Subjectivity for the Study of Human Development

Marilyn Fleer, Fernando González Rey and Nikolai Veresov

Abstract This final chapter brings together the outcomes of a dynamic dialogue on the concepts of emotions, *perezhivanie* and subjectivity. In drawing upon the content of the three sections in this book, the editors theorise the relations between the concepts introduced, building new theoretical insights, but also explicitly introducing methodological challenges yet to be faced by the cultural-historical community as they engage in research which draws upon these concepts. This chapter notes the controversies, the challenges, and the elaborations of Vygotsky's original theory by advancing his legacy through a dialogue on the concepts of emotions, *perezhivanie* and subjectivity. This chapter does not resolve these, but rather opens up the dialogue, as has been the tradition in our cultural-historical community. In identifying emerging gaps in contemporary discussions of emotions, *perezhivanie* and subjectivity, this chapter contributes to furthering scholarship in our understandings of these concepts for the study of human development.

12.1 Introduction

The concepts of *perezhivanie*, emotions and subjective sense and configuration were discussed in the three sections of this book. As editors we sought to examine the theory and the methodological dimensions of these concepts, not as a complete *conceptual product*, but rather as concepts still in the process of development. The concepts of *perezhivanie*, emotions and subjective sense and configuration were

M. Fleer (✉) · N. Veresov (✉)
Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
e-mail: marilyn.fleer@monash.edu

N. Veresov
e-mail: nikolai.veresov@monash.edu

F. González Rey (✉)
University of Brasília, Brasília, Brazil
e-mail: gonzalez_rey49@hotmail.com

discussed in unique but related ways. In keeping with our original framing for this book, in this final chapter we enter into a dynamic dialogue about these concepts. We analyse concepts and ask questions to each other, so that together we can show the theoretical power of these concepts, and contribute in new ways to scholarship in cultural-historical theory.

In our theoretical analysis of the concepts of perezhivanie, emotions and subjective sense and configuration, we frame our dialogue in relation to the content of the three sections. However, we also move back and forth across the content of the sections, so that a more dynamic and relational understanding of the concepts of perezhivanie, emotions and subjective sense and configuration can be realised.

We begin this dialogue in relation to the first section: perezhivanie; followed by the second section on emotions; and finally we discuss subjective sense and configuration. In the final section of this chapter, we conclude the book by offering insights into the controversies, challenges and contexts which surround the recent interest in these concepts. Together, we seek to build and contribute to new theoretical understandings and through this, show the methodological power of the concepts of emotions, perezhivanie and subjectivity.

12.2 Perezhivanie in Focus: Methodological Challenges and Empirical Implications

Nikolai The first section of this book reflects the current state of the art of scholarship in the concept of perezhivanie. Perezhivanie nowadays as a concept of cultural-historical theory *is* of interest to researchers. Even simple Google search of the concept of perezhivanie indicates hundreds of sources available showing a huge variety of understandings and interpretations. The three chapters on perezhivanie presented in this book not only reflect this interest and diversity in conceptualising this concept, but respond to this current state of affairs through foregrounding the challenges and implications in unique ways. With all my respect to post-modernist conception of multiple truth, I do not think that such a variety of understandings and interpretation is something we should be celebrating, but rather it is something we should be seeking to understand. The recent special issue of *Mind, Culture an Activity* (Volume 4, 2016) on the concept of perezhivanie also shows this diversity, and seeks to try and understand the complexity of this concept. I strongly believe that theoretical concepts have definite theoretical contents, at least when we speak on the concepts of cultural-historical theory of Vygotsky. The section on perezhivanie in this book does seek (1) to clarify the content and (2) to show possible ways of how to use this concept as an analytical tool for analysis. The section gives us a theoretical lens to study the process of development of human mind in its complexity.

From my point of view, two methodological distinctions are important and which have also been discussed in Veresov and Fleer (2016). The first is a distinction between *perezhivanie* as a psychological phenomenon (P1) and *perezhivanie* as a theoretical concept (P2). This is not a distinction of two meanings only, this is a distinction of two levels of analysis—phenomenological and theoretical. When we study the content of children’s *perezhivanie* as a phenomenon (for example, presented in children’s drawings or imaginary play) it might bring a lot of data of how concrete social environments influence a child’s mind, and how a particular child interprets and relates to certain situation. *Perezhivanie* as a concept has no phenomenological content, it is a part of the theory and its content is therefore completely theoretical. Using this concept as an analytic tool, a researcher might discover how social environments influence the whole course of child development; but what are the developmental outcomes of these social influences and how are they refracted through child’s *perezhivanie*? In other words, *perezhivanie* is a concept that can be used to study the process of development as the sociocultural genesis of the human mind.

The second important distinction is in advancing the theoretical endeavour of this concept. I am sure it does not make any sense to repeat what Vygotsky said about *perezhivanie* in different periods of his work, as everyone who is interested can easily find appropriate quotations in the *Collected works* and the *Vygotsky Reader*. Chapter 2 brings together these interpretations, and Chap. 3 gives this historical reading of the development of Vygotsky’s thinking. The challenge is to find new ways of advancing the understanding of the content of this concept, yet to do this in line with Vygotsky’s thinking and theoretical framework. I introduce a concept of dramatic (critical) *perezhivanie* because of several reasons. First, dramatic *perezhivanie* is related to the contradictory nature of human development. There is no development without contradictions, and higher mental functions “can be most fully developed in the form of drama” (Vygotsky 1989, p. 59); dramas, dramatic events being refracted through dramatic *perezhivanie*, do not only affect the child, but can create turning points in a whole course of child development. The famous example by Vygotsky of three children from one family demonstrates such dramatic *perezhivanie*, where social drama in the family affected the children’s developmental trajectories in different ways. This is also touched on by Veresov and Fleer (2016) in the special issue of *Mind, Culture, and Activity* on the concept of *perezhivanie*. Second, dramatic *perezhivanie* is related to development in such a way that it is a theoretical tool for the analysis of development and qualitative reorganisation of the whole system of higher mental function. Dramatic *perezhivanie* brings changes to the whole system of the child’s mental functions. The unique architecture and hierarchy of higher mental functions of human beings is the result of the unique dramatic interpsychological collisions that have happened in their lives and of the process of that human overcoming them. There is no development without qualitative reorganisation, there is no reorganisation of the system of higher mental functions without social drama refracted through the prism of dramatic *perezhivanie*. I think this is absolutely in line with Vygotsky’s words of dynamics of personality as drama. In other words, dramatic *perezhivanie*

is a theoretical tool for analysis of complex process of sociocultural genesis of human mind in two key dialectical aspects (1) contradictions and (2) qualitative reorganisation. This is a contribution to advancing the concept of perezhevaniye. But there are some contradictions in Vygotsky's writing over time, as I have alluded to already.

Would you agree that concepts developed in the last period of his life follow from the key principles of the cultural-historical theory developed in late 20s and beginning of 1930s, the period some researchers identify as an "instrumental" period?

Fernando No, I disagree with this. I considered that his works during that period were not only instrumental, but also had a strong behavioural orientation. As I have defended elsewhere (González Rey 2011, 2014, 2016), in the last period of his work, Vygotsky followed some of his foundational ideas from "The psychology of Art" and from some of his first works on defectology, which permitted him to overcome the idea of social determinism of the psyche as a process from the outside to the inside, and to emphasise the emotions, the imagination and the creative character of the individual.

Is it possible to consider perezhivaniye as a concept in transition in Vygotsky's thought? What are the consequences for the study of this concept?

Nikolai Yes, but what does it mean "the concept in transition"? For some people it might be understood as "concept in development", but not every transition is a developmental transition. For others this might mean simply an "undeveloped concept" which means that the concept was introduced by Vygotsky in a general way but remains undeveloped in terms of its theoretical content and relationships with other concepts and principles of the cultural-historical theory.

Fernando Can we consider that Vygotsky introduced the definition of perezhivaniye in the Psychology of Art, and do we see a more advanced definition of the concept in "The crisis at age seven"?

What are the implication of the concept in those moments when the concept was introduced for advancing a new approach about emotions and motivation?

Nikolai I do not think so. These two works of Vygotsky belong to different stages of his scientific biography and reflect different theoretical positions. Psychology of Art (written before 1925) reflects the theoretical position of Vygotsky's early period, that was far from the cultural-historical theory which appeared in 1928–1932. "The crisis of age seven" is based on one of Vygotsky's last lecture of 1933/34. In that text Vygotsky speaks on perezhivaniye as a concept which allows for the study of the role of the social environment on the child's development. In short, there are two meanings of the word perezhivaniye in Vygotsky's texts—perezhivaniye as a psychological phenomenon (P1) and as a concept

(P2) (see Chap. 3). In Crisis of age seven Vygotsky uses P1 and P2 and this creates difficulties in understanding, but in the Psychology of Art, Vygotsky uses perezhivanie only as P1. In 1925 Vygotsky did not have a concept of perezhivanie, in 1934 he had this concept. I see this as a process of conceptualisation of perezhivanie.

Marilyn Consequently, we can see that there is disagreement between whether or not Vygotsky originally conceptualised perezhivanie as a concept or as a phenomenon in his earliest work—The psychology of Art. But this is only an issue of disagreement if you separate out perezhivanie into a concept and into a phenomenon. A holistic conception would suggest that they must always be considered together to have theoretical power. One of the important theoretical points that emerge throughout this book, is how a holistic conception of perezhivanie has methodologically supported the empirical chapters to foreground development through their case studies. Indeed, this holistic conception, that is characteristic of cultural-historical theory generally, is strongly featured in Sect. 12.2, where emotions and imagination are dialectically theorised and empirically discussed.

We now turn to a discussion of emotions and imagination.

12.3 Emotions and Imagination

Fernando What is the relevance of Vygotsky's turning point in relation to the definition of emotions between 1932 and 1934 for advancing his legacy of the study of psychological functions?

Marilyn In the second section of the book, it is possible to see how contemporary researchers have drawn upon both the early foundational theorisation of emotions by Vygotsky in the Psychology of Art (Vygotsky 1971) and from the Teaching about Emotions (Vygotsky 1999), where new directions for the study of emotions moved from a reductionist research methodology and methods to realising emotional imagination. One of the key points that Vygotsky made in relation to the genesis, function and structure of emotions was that emotions could not be simply reduced to physiological responses and behaviours, such as “bodily changes” as we might see on a child's face—a smiling action when happy or a flight response when frightened. But rather, it became increasingly important for Vygotsky to study emotions as part of a child's activity, and not as a series of descriptions of behaviours exhibited by a child as a result of some experimental condition.

In the Psychology of Art, Vygotsky draws attention to the emotional nature of responding to a piece of visual art, or the collective response that is felt in theatre between the audience and the actors. This early work laid an important foundation

for later scholars by moving attention from the physiological response to the cultural construction and societal power of emotions in shaping and being shaped by social activity. The concept of an emotional attitude emerged to explain how children responded to a particular task, discipline area, or even to others, such as their teacher.

We see across a variety of Vygotsky's texts that he worried about intellectualism (e.g. Bozhovich 1977; Vygotsky 1966), and saw an important place for the study of emotions in the ontogenesis of human psyche (Vygotsky 1998). Vygotsky recognised that changes in the emotional–motivational dimensions of a child's personality were key indicators of a child's development (Vygotsky 1998). Some of these ideas can be seen in text on the Emotions in Teaching (Vygotsky 1999), where he considered the pedagogical relations between exhibiting raw emotions and the child's realisation of these emotions as particular feeling states. In those that followed (e.g. Bozhovich 2004; Zaporozhets 2002), Vygotsky's original conception of emotions was further theorised to show how emotions were experienced socially and culturally at an interpsychological level through stories and fairytales (e.g. El'Koninova 2002; Flear, this volume; March and Flear, this volume). Over time, children emotionally empathised with the hero and lived through the emotions of the characters in the storyline, where they could anticipate, and experience the emotions at the intrapsychological level. That is, children experienced the ideal form of emotions in stories and role play through a form of *emotional imagination*. A form of emotional self-regulation became evident through emotional imagination (Flear, this volume; March, this volume). Zaporozhets (2002) captures this idea well:

There are grounds to believe that in forming mental activity, which is necessary for the emergence of an ability to anticipate the results of other people's actions as well as to emotionally anticipate one's own actions, a fundamental role is played by a figurative, image-bearing means of dramatised verbal description and a graphic depict of forthcoming events, a kind of stimulation of their meaning and significance for the child himself (sic) or the people whose fate touches him. These expressive means, this *language of feelings* has a social origin. Its most perfected forms are represented in art which is, in the apt worlds of Vygotsky (1968), an "instrument of society," by means of which society draws the most intimate and personal aspect of our being into the circle of social life (p. 58).

Fernando Is emotional imagination signaling a new comprehension of intellectual functions?

Marilyn Yes, *emotional imagination* signals a new comprehension of intellectual functions. The writings of Vygotsky addressed the Cinderella phenomenon first noted by N.N. Lange back in 1914 (cited in Zaporozhets 2002), who found that emotions as an area of cultural-historical study had received less attention when compared with her older sisters, thinking and will. The focus on intellectual functions dominated research, and in many Western contexts, continues to be researched without reference to emotions. This was also acknowledged by Bozhovich (1977) when she said,

Vygotsky himself was apparently not satisfied with the intellectualism implicit in the theory of consciousness and personality that capped the second stage of his investigations and was troubled by the fact that the postulates at which he arrived from his study of cognitive mental processes were not a sufficient basis for an analysis of the higher systemic structures that determine human personality. Hence, he devoted the entire last period of his life to a theoretical development of the problem of affect, its relationship to intellectual processes and to the problem of the transition from elementary emotions to the higher feeling characteristic of man (sic) (p. 15).

It is possible to see how emotions shape and are shaped by intellectual functions; and intellectual functions shape and are shaped by emotions. What is interesting to note is how in recent studies emotions have become central for understanding executive functions, where emotion regulation and the study of imagination are becoming increasingly important (Bodrova et al. 2011).

Nikolai What do you think about perezhivanie as an emotional experience as some researchers define it? Would you agree that reducing perezhivanie to emotional aspect is an example of simplifying the cultural-historical theory? What might be arguments to “protect” the concept and the phenomenon of perezhivanie from such a simplification?

Marilyn There is an abundance of research which assumes and even defines perezhivanie as an emotional experience. This point is also picked up in the special issue of *Mind, Culture, and Activity* on the concept of perezhivanie. This work is important for capturing and theorising emotions in research. It has a place in the literature, because it makes an important contribution to understanding one dimension of perezhivanie that has been traditionally lacking in studies in many Western countries where scholars have focused primarily on cognition. But as is shown in the first section of the book, and discussed above, perezhivanie is both a concept and a phenomenon. Perezhivanie as an emotional experience is part of this narrative. In using this definition, it could be argued that it lacks the explanatory power needed to deeply inform understandings. However, it must also be considered that (1) Understanding difficult concepts, such as perezhivanie, is a developmental process in its own right for those using the concept in their research; (2) Concepts that were not fully developed by Vygotsky, provide opportunities for contemporary scholars to theorise and sharpen these complex concepts in relation to contemporary problems; and as argued by Chaiklin (2011), (3) concepts come from practice, and therefore it is through research that practice informs theory, and this gives the possibility for greater insights into the concept of perezhivanie.

Marilyn In your view, how do we as a scholarly community develop Vygotsky’s original concepts? Is this best done by research or through theoretical analysis? Should we stay with the original readings of concepts or should concepts, like the definition of individual words, change in relation to the contexts or practices which are being informed by or are informing these concepts?

Nikolai Your question requires extended answer, but as I do not have enough space for detailed discussion, I would suggest to leave this to another book. However, I can present some brief considerations that highlight some aspects to show its complexity.

The problem with cultural-historical theory is that by now there is no one single book or a paper presenting the whole theory in a form of a system of interrelated concepts, laws and principles clarifying their theoretical contents related to most important dialectical aspects of the process of sociocultural genesis of human mind. On the other hand, in the literature I see the tendency of “advancing” or “developing” separate concepts without paying attention to their place within the whole theory and their theoretical relations with other concepts. Taken from the theory, separated from the theory, the concept becomes theoretically empty and therefore useless as a theoretical analytical tool. So, my position is—theoretical concepts are not “toys” to play with by changing their contents whatever you like, they are not words with different meanings, they are deep and powerful tools with definite and strong theoretical content (as shown in Sect. 12.1).

Another side of the problem is that concepts of cultural-historical theory as theoretical tools of analysis of the process of development of higher mental functions reflect dialectical nature and the character of the process of development; they are focused on the discovery of the dialectics of developmental process including quantitative changes, qualitative reorganisations and contradictions. To put this in a simple way, they reflect the complexity of dialectics of development. Fundamental dialectical categories and principles stand behind concepts of cultural-historical theory.

Marilyn I would also argue that through these original writings of Vygotsky, through their use in empirical studies, and through extended theorisation, we can find gaps, as well as the need for new concepts. Consequently, in the third section of the book there are chapters which explicitly draw upon and use new cultural-historical concepts. Specifically, the concepts of subjective sense and subjective configuration were introduced to support the methodological advancement of studying human relations in the course of a child’s or person’s development.

We now turn to a dialogue surrounding these unique concepts introduced and developed by Fernando Gozalez Rey.

12.4 Subjective Sense and Subjective Configuration

Marilyn Fernando why did you introduce the relational concept of subjective sense and subjective configuration into the literature? How do they relate to Vygotsky’s concepts in the Collected Works?

Fernando I think that the concepts of subjective sense and subjective configuration have more to do with the definitions of sense and perezhivanie

which are related to the last period of his work, between 1932 and 1934. Before I became theoretically conscious of the relevance of sense and *perezhivanie*, I introduced the concept of psychological configuration of personality as an alternative to define the psychological unit of personality within the cultural-historical legacy, following Bozhovich's tradition in her research on personality (González Rey 1995). I attempted to advance a new avenue for the study of personality, overcoming the constraints I perceived in regards to the concept of psychological formation of personality as it was defined by Bozhovich and her collaborators. I remembered that during my doctoral study, two psychological formations were studied in depth in Bozhovich's laboratory, moral ideals (Chudnovsky 1966; Dukat 1965 and self-evaluation (Slavina 1966; Neimark 1966). These concepts were very interesting because they permitted a new comprehension of motive as a formation of personality. Moral ideals were studied by their content, and also by their structure, which was defined by the way in which the argumentation on moral ideals was conducted, overcoming the methodological focus on the stimuli and answers, and on the observation of behaviour. The structure of ideals was a first step in considering the quality of their expression as an element of the effectiveness of moral regulation. However, the consideration of only moral content in the study of ideals continued to be the core of moral ideals. The definition of psychological formation had to do with Bozhovich's understanding of the "orientations of personality" that she splits into three types, collective, individual and praxeological. These orientations represented the hierarchy of motives of personality, and only three kinds of motives were emphasised over others, since the ideological values at that time exerted a great influence on what were viewed as the more important motives of personality. I became familiar with Vygotsky's concepts of *perezhivanie* and the "social situation of development" in my time as a doctoral student in the laboratory headed by Bozhovich, the only Soviet psychologist that continued with this part of Vygotsky's legacy. I used both concepts to advance the topic of the development of personality (Gonzalez Rey 1995).

Unlike Bozhovich and her team, with the concept of psychological configuration of personality I attempted to advance a concept capable of integrating different psychological elements from different spheres of life into one concept, aiming to capture the real cultural and social diversity of one historical individual existence. However, configured within this unity, I still defined different psychological elements as they were traditionally defined by psychology. These included interests, needs, conflict and goals that exist in different spheres of life and I integrated them as relevant contents of psychological configurations no matter in what field they appear. When I perceived theoretically how promissory the concept of sense could be in overcoming the traditional taxonomy of concepts that characterise

psychology, I understood that senses could be used to embody diverse symbolical social productions as they are felt and lived by individuals, which could open a radical new way of understanding individuals and social psychological productions.

As was advanced in third section of this book, in Soviet psychology the concept of the word “sense”, as it was defined by Vygotsky, was completely overlooked, and the concepts of sense and of *perezhivanie* were only discussed by Vygotsky at the very end of his work, without having time to advance the psychological systems toward which he seemed to be moving in that last period.

The basic differences between subjective sense and subjective configurations, on one hand, and the Vygotsky’s concepts of sense and *perezhivanie*, on the other hand, are as follows:

- Unlike sense and *perezhivanie*, as defined by Vygotsky, subjective senses and subjective configurations represent symbolic-emotional units, in which emotions acquire a symbolic character and symbolic processes are also emotional ones. These units I defined as subjective, due to their generative character that is beyond the external objective conditions and that also characterises human experiences. Subjectivity is a new quality of human phenomena, whether social or individual, representing a production within the social and cultural networks, historically located, that characterize human life.
- Subjectivity is not only an individual phenomena; social life is also subjectively configured. Each social institution or scenario is configured by subjective senses that embody other social productions. For example, the discourse of gender as symbolic social production is singularly configured in different ways into the subjective configurations of families that share the same social context. The concepts of sense and *perezhivanie*, as defined by Vygotsky, also referred to individuals.
- The interweaving of subjective senses and subjective configurations expresses the dialectic of self-regulatory and generative movements given by the subjective configurations, which is a source of subjective senses relatively independent of the external objective course of one experience, but at the same time, during this lived experience, new subjective senses emerge through which the subjective configuration can be modified themselves.
- Subjective senses and subjective configurations result from lived experiences, but as new symbolical-emotional productions based on these lived experiences, representing new imagined moments regarding them, that represent new human creations.

Nevertheless, the ensemble of concepts in our proposal on subjectivity in the third section of this book follows the Vygotsky legacy, embodying in the comprehension of the different psychological functions and processes the “full vitality of life” that, according to Vygotsky, remained separated from thinking in the traditional approaches to the study of thinking. This “full vitality of life” could only be integrated within the psychological function through the symbolical-emotional character of the ongoing movement of an embodied subject.

- Marilyn* The concept of sense is said to be controversial. Do you agree?
- Fernando* Yes, in my opinion it was controversial because Vygotsky advanced the concept in a different way to how it was treated by linguistics, and because, at the same time, Leontiev introduced his concept of personal sense after Vygotsky, completely omitting Vygotsky's definition, which created confusion in relation to its definition. Taken together, all these facts, along with the lack of development of the concept in Vygotsky's work, make it possible to state the controversial character of the concept of sense.
- Marilyn* What did Vygotsky not have time to write that speaks to the focus of this book? What might be missing or only partially developed?
- Fernando* In my opinion the advances in this book on the concepts of *perezhivanie*, emotions and subjectivity, represent one step forward in the ensemble of these concepts within one psychological system oriented toward an integrative representation of human psychological functioning. Not only did Vygotsky not have time to develop this representation, but in my opinion Vygotsky did not yet have the theoretical devices to advance on this system. However, this book shows different advances on the legacy of Vygotsky, each of which represents a way to keep that legacy alive. I think that every intellectual development may imply "undeveloped concepts", which represent a new level of thinking, but which are in process throughout the time before achieving their complete maturity. That is, in my opinion, what occurs with Vygotsky's definitions of sense and *perezhivanie*. The great merit of these concepts was not their preciseness as concepts, but their opening of new avenues for the development of the cultural-historical approach.
- Nikolai* This question that is in need of clarification is: what do we mean by "sense as a concept"? Concepts of sense in Vygotsky are different from the concept of "personal sense" in Leontiev. In my understanding there is a point of methodological difference of Vygotsky and Leontiev here. Leontiev did not accept Vygotsky's idea of *perezhivanie* as a unit of personality and environment saying that not *perezhivanie*, but an activity is the unity (Leontiev 2005). From this Leontiev developed the principle of the unity of consciousness and activity and *perezhivanie* was excluded from Leontiev's system of concepts. In last stages of his work, he introduced personal sense as a concept, but still within the principle of the unity of consciousness and activity. The point of methodological difference here is that Vygotsky tried to apply a logic of units (*edinitisa*) in analysis of complex unities (*edinstvo*). As I see this it is a dialectical approach to study complex living wholes by appropriate units. Leontiev's methodological approach was different—this was the logic of unities where the structure of consciousness coincides with the structure of external object-oriented activity (*Tatigkeit*) of an individual

due to the principle of the unity of consciousness and activity. So, *perezhivanie* in Vygotsky and the personal sense in Leontiev belong to two different methodological approaches. Both are part of the ongoing narrative that opens up when scholars come into dialogue.

12.5 Conclusion—The Relations Between Concepts

This chapter has specifically sought to generate a narrative surrounding existing concepts that are currently in debate (i.e. special issue on *perezhivanie* in *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 4, 2016), concepts which Western science has generally ignored (Sect. 12.2), and new concepts needed for the study of human development (Sect. 12.3).

Concepts in cultural-historical theory are interrelated and connected to each other. They are analytical tools for the study of the sociocultural genesis of mind. The dialectics and complexity of these concepts afford further discussion, theorisation and use in practice. Concepts are “heavy” tools that enrich research and support researchers with building understandings, which in turn allow for new insights. Concepts are never complete. Societal conditions, the corresponding new needs and changing motives, are always in a state of change. Historical periods show how concepts require reinterpretation, redevelopment, and retheorisation for supporting the new societal conditions, motives and needs. This book has touched on each of these dimensions. In bringing together the concepts of *perzhivanie*, emotions and subjectivity, we found that:

- each concept gives meaning to the other;
- these concepts are dialectical in their form and relations;
- concepts should always be conceptualised as part of a system of concepts which are drawn upon for specific research purposes; and
- societal needs and motives change over time, and these new conditions demand new interpretations, development and theorisation of concepts.

Consequently it is not surprising that controversies in the use of Vygotskian concepts have emerged in relation to:

- the translation of terms;
- when concepts were conceived; and
- the need for growing the concepts to support contemporary questions, needs and contexts.

This book shows this diversity. Further, new concepts, such as subjective sense and subjective configuration, were introduced and used by researchers in the context of Vygotsky’s cultural-historical theory, in order to enrich research, and through this to grow cultural-historical theory. Having a section in the book that grows theory through the introduction of new cultural-historical concepts, signals

the dynamic nature of this theory, and highlights the relevance of the historical and cultural dimensions of Vygotsky's original theory.

Solving problems and theorising findings in ways that are in keeping with the principles of Vygotsky's methodology, were central to the how authors used and discussed concepts in the various chapters of the book. In this chapter we entered into a dialogue within and across concepts in ways that gave context to the concepts. Emotions, *perezhivanie* and subjectivity were brought together in this book to advance Vygotsky's legacy and to give more clarity and context to those concepts that have in recent times generated a great deal of interest.

References

- Bodrova, E., Leong, D. J., & Akhutina, T. V. (2011). When everything new is well-forgotten old: Vygotsky/Luria insights in the development of executive functions. In R. M. Lerner, J. V. Lerner, E. P. Bowers, S. Lewin-Bizan, S. Gestsdottir & J. B. Urban (Eds.), *Thriving in childhood and adolescence: The role of self-regulation processes. New directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 133, 11–28.
- Bozhovich, L. I. (1977). The concept of the cultural-historical development of the mind and its prospects. Russian text by *Voprosy psikhologii*. Moscow: "Pedagogika" Publishers.
- Bozhovich, L. I. (2004). L.S. Vygotsky's historical and cultural theory and its significance for contemporary studies of the psychology of personality. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 42(4), 20–34.
- Chaiklin, S. (2011). The role of *practice* in cultural-historical science. In M. Kontopodis, C. Wulf, & B. Fichtner (Eds.), *Children, development and education, international perspectives on early childhood education and development* (Vol. 3, pp. 227–246). Springer Science+Business Media B.V. doi:[10.1007/978-94-007-0243-1_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0243-1_14).
- Chudnovsky, V. E. (1966). *Ekspperimentalnoe vyyavlenie preobladaiushix motivov povedeniya y detei* [Experimental expression of children's dominant motives of behavior]. XVIII Meshdunarodnii Psikhologuiskii Kongress [XVIII International Congress of Psychology], Moscow.
- Dukat, L. Y (1965). *Psikhologuiskii analiz sodershaniya, strukturi i funktsii nrastvennii idealov* [Psychological analysis of contents, structure and functions of moral ideal]. Dissertatsiya kandidata psikhologuiskis nauk. Moscow: Institute General and Pedagogical Psychology.
- El'Koninova, L. I. (2002). Fairy-tale semantics in the play of preschoolers. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 39(4), 66–87.
- González Rey, F. (1995). *Comunicacion, personalidad y desenvolvimiento* [Communication, personality and development]. Havana: Pueblo y Educación.
- González Rey, F. (2011). A re-examination of defining moments in Vygotsky's work and their implications for his continuing legacy. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 18, 257–275. doi:[10.1080/10749030903338517](https://doi.org/10.1080/10749030903338517).
- González Rey, F. (2014). Advancing further the history of soviet psychology: Moving forward from dominant representations in western and soviet psychology. *History of Psychology*, 17(1), 60–78.
- González Rey, F. (2016). Vygotsky's concept of *perezhivanie* in the psychology of art and at the final moment of his work: Advancing his legacy. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*. doi:[10.1080/10749039.2016.1186196](https://doi.org/10.1080/10749039.2016.1186196).
- Lange, N. N. (1914). *Psikhologia*. Moscow (cited in Zaporozhets, A.V. 2003).

- Leontiev, A. A. (1984). The productive career of Aleksei Nikolaevich Leontiev. *Soviet Psychology*, 13, 6–56.
- Leontiev, A. A. (1992). Ecce Homo: Methodological problems of the activity theoretical approach. *Multidisciplinary Newsletter for Activity Theory*, 11(12), 41–44.
- Leontiev, A. N. (2005). Study of the environment in the pedological works of LS Vygotsky: A critical study. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 43(4), 8–28.
- Neimark, M. (1966). *Study of personality orientation in the adolescent*. Eighteenth psychology congress, Moscow.
- Slavina, L. S. (1966). *Deti c affektivnym Povedenie* [Children with affective behavior]. Moscow: Prosvechenie.
- Veresov, N. & Fleer, M. (2016). Perezhivanie as a theoretical concept for researching young children's development. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 23(4), 325–335. doi:10.1080/10749039.2016.1186198.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1966). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. *Voprosy psikhologii*, 12(6), 62–76.
- Vygotsky, L. (1968). *Psihologia iskusstva* [Psychology of art]. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publishers.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1971). *The psychology of art*. Cambridge: MIT Press. (Original work published 1925).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1983). Genezis Vishih psykjichskih funktsii [Genesis of higher psychological functions]. In A. M. Matuschkin (Ed.), *Istoriya Pazvitiya Vishixpsikjicheskixfunkzii* [History of development of higher psychological Functions]. L. S. Vygotsky, Selected works (Vol. 3, pp. 133–163). Moscow, Russia: Pedagogica.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1989). Concrete human psychology. *Soviet Psychology*, 27(2), 53–77.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1994). The problem of environment. In R. Van Der Veer & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *The Vygotsky reader* (pp. 338–354). United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). The history of higher psychological functions. In R. Rieber (Ed.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–260). New York, NY: Plenum
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1998). Child Psychology. In L. S. Vygotsky (Ed.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky* (Vol. 5, English trans: M. J. Hall; R. W. Rieber, Ed.). New York: Kluwer Academic and Plenum Publishers.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1999). The teaching about emotions: Historical–psychological studies. In *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky* (Vol. 6, pp. 69–235). New York: Plenum Press.
- Yasnitsky, A. (2012). Revisionist revolution in Vygotskian science: Toward cultural-historical gestalt psychology. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 50(4), 3–15. doi:10.2753/RPO1061-0405500400.
- Zaporozhets, A. V. (2002). Toward the question of the genesis, function, and structure of emotional processes in the child. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 40(2), 45–66.
- Zavershneva, E. (2010). The Vygotsky's familiar archive: New findings. Notebooks, notes and scientific journals of L. S. Vygotsky (1912–1934). *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 48(1), 34–65.
- Zavershneva, E. (2016). “El camino a la libertad”: Vygotski en 1932. [The path to freedom: Vygotsky in 1932] In A. Yasnitsky & R. Van der Veer (Eds.), *Vygotsky revisitado: una historia crítica de su contexto y legado* [Revisionist revolution in Vygotsky studies: The state of art]. España: Miño y Dávila Editores.

Author Biographies

Professor Marilyn Fleer holds the Foundation Chair of Early Childhood Education at Monash University, Australia, and is the immediate past President of the International Society for Cultural

Activity Research (ISCAR). Her research interests focus on early years learning and development, with special attention on pedagogy, play, culture, science and design and technology.

Professor Fernando González Rey is full professor of the Faculty of Education and Health Sciences of the University Centre of Brasília, Brazil, and senior associate professor of the Faculty of Education of the University of Brasília. He is also coordinator of the research group “Subjectivity in health and in education” at the University of Brasília. He obtained his Ph.D qualification at the Institute of General and Pedagogic Psychology of Moscow. He also obtained the title of Doctor in Science from the Institute of Psychology of the Sciences Academy of Moscow. Full professor of the Faculty of Psychology of the University of Havana (1973-1999). Dean of this Faculty (1987-1991). Vice rector of the University of Havana (1991-1995) Awarded the Inter-American Prize of Psychology in 1991. His research interests focus on education and psychology from a cultural-historical approach in three specific fields: (1) the development of the theoretical topic of subjectivity and the epistemological and methodological issues related to this study; (2) Learning as a subjective development process; and (3) Health and subjectivity: beyond the pathologization of life. Key publications are: González Rey, F. (2016). Advancing the topics of social reality, culture, and subjectivity from a cultural-historical standpoint: Moments, paths, and contradictions. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 36, p. 175–189; González Rey, F. (2016). Vygotsky's Concept of *perezhivane* in the beginning and at the Final Moment of His Work: Advancing His Legacy. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 17, p. 1–10; González Rey, F. (2016). A new path for the discussion of Social Representations: advancing the topic of subjectivity from a cultural-historical standpoint. *Theory & Psychology*, 3, p. 1–19. González Rey, F. (2013). *O pensamento de Vygotsky: contradições, desdobramento e desenvolvimento* (Vygotsky's thought: contradictions, unfolds and development). São Paulo: Hucitec; González Rey, F. (2011). *Saúde e subjetividade: superando a clínica da patologia*. (Health and subjectivity: overcoming the clinic of the pathology). São Paulo: Cortez.

Dr. Nikolai Veresov is an Associate Professor of the Faculty of Education at Monash University, Australia. He has experience as a daycare centre and kindergarten teacher (1987–1991) and secondary school teacher (1982–1987). He got his first PhD degree in Moscow in 1990 and started his academic career in Murmansk (Russia) as a senior lecturer (1991–1993) and the Head of Department of Early Childhood (1993–1997). The second PhD was obtained in University of Oulu (Finland) in 1998. From 1999 to 2011 he was affiliated to Kajaani Teacher Training Department (Finland) as a Senior Researcher and the Scientific Director of the international projects. His areas of interest are development in early years, cultural-historical theory and research methodology.