

UDC 141.31:7.035(4)

K. V. Bataeva
*Doctor of Philosophic Sciences, Docent,
Professor of Department of Sociology of
Kharkov Humanitarian University
“People Ukrainian Academy”*

SOCIAL VISUALISTICS IN POSTMODERN PHILOSOPHY CONTEXT

Introduction. Postmodern society appears its peculiarities most intensively in phenomena of visualization and mediation that produce “hybrid” phenomenon of media-visibility. According to N. Mirzoeff, “the disjunctured and fragmented culture that we call postmodernism is best imagined and understood visually, just as the nineteenth century was classically represented in the newspaper and the novel” [12, p. 3–4]. Media-visibility has become a subject of inter-disciplinary project called Social Visualistics with its goal to study peculiarities of visual content functioning in postmodern culture. To determine specific features of Social Visualistics, the paper considers the tasks of positioning this project among other visual philosophic disciplines and carries out conceptualization of media-visibility and the Social Visual as the subject of Social Visualistics.

In humanitarian disciplines, there are the following basic directions in studies of visual phenomena which are conceptually close to each other – Cultural Studies, Visual Culture and Visual Studies. Cultural Studies were started in Great Britain in 1950-th by R. Hoggart, R. Williams, and S. Hall. Specific features of Cultural Studies can be noticed in the main interest to such cultural phenomena as art, cinema, gender practices, TV, etc. Four decades later (in the 1990-th), another direction called Visual Culture appeared in the USA. This direction studies visual aspects of culture in sociological context. The most known scientists of this discipline are N. Bryson, M. Jay, C. Jenks, M. Sturken, and L. Cartwright. In the second half of the 1990-th, a new theoretical trend originated called Visual Studies. It is represented by J. Berger, M. Dikovitskaya, J. Elkins, T. Mitchell, N. Mirzoeff. J. Elkins states that “In 1995 W.J.T. Mitchell used “Visual Studies” as a name for the confluence of art history, cultural studies and literary theory, each of them in the way of what Mitchell calls the “pictorial turn” [6, p. 4–5].

Although Visual Studies differ from Visual Culture, it is yet possible to try correlating these concepts (especially if visual culture is considered as a separate term rather than the title of research trend). First, it is possible to discover a common subject of analysis for these disciplines. According to N. Mirzoeff, a researcher in Visual Culture focuses on phenomenon of “visual event” treated as mobile and unfixed process of interaction between a visual artifact and a spectacular, between visible and an observer by means of visual technology (where the term «visual technology» is understood extremely widely as any mean of video-information transferring – “from oil painting to television and the Internet” [12, p. 3]). In Visual Studies, “visual events” are the main subject of analysis as well. They can be viewed in historic-cultural universum. Second, it is possible to assume that Visual Culture and Visual Studies relate to each other as content and methodological aspects of the same conceptual situation. Visual Culture is the *topic* for theoretic analysis whilst Visual Studies are concrete-practical *interpretation method* for visual culture content. Third, it is also possible to equate these concepts as this has been done by, for example, M. Dikovitskaya in her determination of the term “visual culture”: “Visual culture, also known as visual studies, is a new field for the study of the cultural construction of the visual in arts, media, and everyday life”

[5, p. 1]. In Visual Studies, researchers are interested just in *practices*, – visual practices realized in everyday life and have such properties as producibility, repeatability, fluidity and instability. These practices are *effects* of scopic regimes set in concrete cultural situation and, at the same time, they reproduce existing codes of visibility.

Keeping in mind *practical-applicative* connotation of the concept of “visual studies”, let us design a concept that combines concrete-practical and abstract-theoretical senses. V. Rozin, for instance, proposed a term *visuology* for a discipline dealing with analytics of visual phenomena. To our opinion, definition of this term proposed by him is slightly diffuse: “visuology is theory on visual: visual perception, thinking, activity, culture, “visual” in different areas of human practices (in arts, in design, in mass communications, etc.)” [1, p. 217]. Analyzing the structure of this concept (which becomes obvious for its writing as visuo-logy using hyphen), it is possible to notice its mainly theoretical (logical) sense charge. To our mind, it is more correct to use the term “visualistics” (similarly to linguistics) that harmonically combines theoretical and practical aspects of studies. The concept “visualistics” is too general since there are many visual disciplines in its stuff as “visual culture”, “visual studies”, “visual anthropology”, etc. Meanwhile, the concept of Social Visualistics has a more particular transposition. Social Visualistics is a discipline that deals with studying theoretical aspects of social construction of visibility (social types of visual perception), analytics of socio-cultural regimes of vision, and carrying out practical investigations of visual practices met in mass-media and everyday life. It is worth stressing that the term “visualistics” has recently (at the end of the 1990-th) established itself in the sphere of info-communications where a new direction called “computational visualistics” that studies computer images arose [18, p. 74]. Taking into consideration the fact that the term “visualistics” has been already exploited in the context of studying computer images and taking into account that Social Visualistics has interest not only in objective but also in virtual visibility, it is reasonable to consider the term “visualistics” as integral title for theoretic-application project that studies different forms of social visibility as media-visibility, cyber-visibility and so on.

Social Visualistics Peculiarities. Social Visualistics is in relation of *crossing* with other visual philosophic disciplines. Essential attention in it is paid to concrete-applied studies of everyday visual facts (actually, this is just Visual Studies). Social Visualistics has interest to social peculiarities of visual phenomenon functioning (which is the subject of Visual Culture). However, Social Visualistics can be hardly considered as hybrid effect of visual discipline interaction or a new mix of various visual approaches since it has several specific characteristics.

In opposite to Visual Studies and Visual Culture that deal with studying different cultural phenomena (photography, cinema, painting, architecture, mass culture), Social Visualistics concentrates on analytics of a narrower subject group – *social phenomena* of media-visibility observed in public sphere of individuals’ interaction (TV, Internet, press). One might argue that Visual Studies also have the goal of studying cultural phenomena in social (and

sometimes sociological) aspect. For example, A. Usmanova in the paper with specific title “Between art science and sociology: towards subject and method of visual studies” states that “critical analysis of image as social objects is what constitutes viewpoint of Visual Studies” [21, p. 10–20]. Thus, Visual Studies investigate the influence of sociality on forming art images and, vice versa, the impact of art on sociality reproducing; they have interest in social aspects of art functioning. However, in any case, “visual researchers” focuses on a *certain* variety of images, in the first order, art images (mass, screen, elite, popular, cinematographic, painting, theater, and other art images). Concerning Social Visualistics, its theoretic scope involves, again, a certain group of visual phenomena that arise and exist in the sphere of social-interpersonal communication. Then, socio-cultural meaning becomes not a separate aspect but the main content of these phenomena. The same subject area includes various forms of visuality – visuality of human everyday life, visuality of cybercommunication, TV visuality, billboard, magazine, newspaper visualities, etc. It is possible to state that the subject field of Social Visualistics is wider since it involves not only art but also other types of visuality as non-art, publicism, documental, TV-serial, advertisement, everyday visualities.

In contrast to visual sociology that has the main interest in applied aspects of studying visual appearances of social life, Social Visualistics enters the level of philosophic generalizations developing just *theory* of visuality (e. g., theory of media-image, theory of cybervisuality and so on). Thus, Social Visualistics is a wider project since, alongside with concrete-research activity, it carries out philosophic understanding of events/changes that take place in the sphere of social visual. It is worth stressing that, according to opinion of A. Usmanova, Visual Studies also deal with reception of philosophic concepts: “Visual Studies concern studying cinema, TV, mass culture from viewpoint of modern philosophic and social theories” [22]. However, whilst Visual Studies deal with *applying* the philosophic theories in the process of performing applied studies of visual phenomena, Social Visualistics pays basic attention to creation of philosophic theory of image, visuality, visual communication. Meta-theory of visual phenomena becomes in it not accompanying effect (and not only analytic approach), but the main task.

Let us also compare Social Visualistics to Visual Anthropology where the latter separated from social and cultural anthropology after World War II and instituted in 70-th of the previous century [14, p. 10]. The title Visual Anthropology was proposed by M. Mead in 60-th of the XX-th century. According to S. Pink, “Visual anthropology is about the visual and about visual communication, even if this is reasserted in terms of a relationship between visual and other elements of experience, practice, material culture, fieldwork and representation. Rather, as I have suggested in the preceding chapters, my aim is to re-situate visual anthropology’s” [14, p. 131].

Similarly to Social Visualistics, Visual Anthropology exploits two plans of analysis – theoretic and applied (ethnological and ethnographic) [14, p. 87]. However, theory and practice of Visual Anthropology are accomplished at the level of *micro*-communication, i. e. level of everyday life of individuals that belong to different cultures. Meanwhile, Social Visualistics analyzes not only micro- but also macro-interactions in visual universum: it studies objective structures of visual present in public socio-sphere as well as their influence on everyday visual practices of humans. Social Visualistics, on the contrary, concerns how micro-level of visual communication structures social macro-order.

In Visual Anthropology, culturological vector of social analysis is intensified. Ye. Aleksandrov states that the

ultimate goal of visual anthropology is *dialogue of cultures*: “Visual Anthropology is complex (scientific, creative, organization and information-technological) activity intended on obtaining and using audio-visual information about unknown sides of society life in social practices with the goal of accomplishing cultures’ dialogue” [1]. Visual anthropology researchers deal with investigating such *unique* aspects of sociality as family photos, home objects, visual representations of cinema and fashion, visuality of urban area. Concerning Social Visualistics, it, in the first order, is interested in functioning non-unique, typical (typological) forms of visuality represented at mass level in public social sphere and in mass-media. If Visual Anthropology is a discipline with prevailing applied aspect of socio/ethno-cultural analytics that has describing character, Social Visualistics is *theoretic*-applied project intended on extracting general dependences in studied phenomena.

It is also possible to mark one more discrepancy between the compared disciplines. Whilst Visual Anthropology actively practices video-documenting of cultural phenomena (producing of ethnographic films and photo-sessions can be regarded as “brand label” of this discipline) [16, p. 1345–1351; 14]; while Visual Sociology pays basic attention to producing photos and to “videography” [9] of social problems, Social Visualistics prefers not creation of novel video-artifacts, but analytics and interpretation of already existing visual facts publicly presented and circulated by mass-media.

Social Visualistics has points of conceptual contact with relatively new philosophic project called Media Philosophy that appeared in the 90-th of the previous century. Media Philosophy studies peculiarities of functioning media in two aspects. Firstly, it is interested in auto-process of media-communication self-development (the process of media-communication changes as self-reserved system or, using terminology of N. Luhmann, autopoietic self-producing of media). Secondly, Media Philosophy studies anthropologic aspect of media functioning, i. e., the impact of media-communication on self-feeling and behavior of media-subject (i. e., a human existing in media-sociality sphere) and, vice versa, the inverse influence of subject activity on the media process. Media Philosophy investigates how a modern human thinks and acts by *means* of media, inside media; how *he/she* sees by “eyes” of media (more exactly, objectives and cameras); how *he/she* is seen by objectives of “vision machines” (the term of P. Virilio); how his/her world view changes *under pressure* of media.

Since there are different forms of media that have certain specific features of functioning and influencing humans, the style of media-subject existence inside concrete type of mediality should differ. M. McLuhan described unique structures of life experience for a human being in three different systems of mediality – oral-audial, writing-press and audio-visual (electronic) systems of media – where a specific style of environment framing, specific way of vision, hearing and thinking are formed [11]. Homo Telematic (i. e., an inhabitant of “electronic village”) understands and feels surrounding world in absolutely another manner, pays attention to such aspects of life which absolutely do not touch humans of oral culture and vice versa. Different ways of existence-in-different-media become the main question of media philosophy that studies different forms of mentality. Similarly to M. McLuhan, R. Debray marks three main media-spheres to be investigated by Media Philosophy (or Mediology in terminology of R. Debray): “historically, every mediasphere is specific to time and place, and our tables (see appendix) distinguish between three primary types: the logosphere, when writing functions as the central means of diffusion under the constraints and through the channels of orality; the

graphosphere, when printed text imposes its rationality on the whole of the symbolic milieu; the videosphere, with its devitalization of the book via audiovisual media" [4, p. 26]. In contrast to Media Philosophy that is interested in various forms of media-practices, Social Visualistics studies only one type of mediality, namely "videosphere", visual facts represented in media-sphere and character of their perception by humans. Social Visualistics attempts to answer what is the nature of media-visibility and its some moduses; how does a human act in videosphere; how video-mediality can transform or strengthen his/her habitual attitudes.

Therefore, Social Visualistics is the inter-disciplinary project developing at the edge of social philosophy, philosophy of culture, visual anthropology, visual culture, visual studies and media philosophy. This project involves abstract-philosophic and practical research levels of analysis. Its subject is phenomenon of the Social Visual. The Social Visual are visual facts constructed and perceived in the sphere of inter-person interaction at micro-level and in the sphere of structural mass-media communication at macro-level as well as in the context of inter-action of macro-structures and micro-actions of persons.

Consider the essence of the term "visual" which is the part of the concept of "social visual". The term "visual" has some sense aspects. On one hand, it can be treated as analogue of the term "visible". On the other hand, this term includes additional connotations. If the term "visible" presumes the ability to view some phenomena by means of physical (or mental) eyes, the term "visual", alongside with the abovementioned sense, also presumes the sense of techno-mediatedness of viewing act (visual is that can be seen not only by eyes but also by means of different apparatus). Besides, "visual" includes that can be seen in imagination using reflexive techniques (recalling what really happened or submerging to fantasies or dreams).

The essence of "social visual" has communicative overtones: the Social Visual means that this can be viewed/seen in the sphere of communication of individuals. Accordingly, the Social Visual should have parameters of publicity. Seen by a particular person in his/her private space that will never be public and noticed by others is *individual* (but not social) visual. The Social Visual can exist not only in real but also in virtual sociality (this relates to interactions between actors divided by space and time) that can be observed by means of mental reflexive oculars. The Social Visual has processual and contextual character: it is formed in certain circumstances reflecting moods and cultural peculiarities of an epoch.

Socio-cultural Modifications of the Social Visual. The Social Visual gets different properties depending upon character of cultural sociality formed in concrete historical context. Thus, Social Visualistics deals not only with studying modern forms of social life visualization, but also with analysis of cultural-historical modifications of the Social Visual. Let us consider the most general peculiarities of historic-cultural forms of visibility, namely, visibility of Antiquity, Middle Ages, Renaissance, Modern and Postmodern.

Antique visual paradigm is most brightly represented in concepts of *intelligible seeing of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus*. It is possible to state that platonic and neoplatonic traditions of *intelligible seeing* are united by tendency of contemplating non-material, intelligible realities confirmed not by corporeal, but by reflexive eyes. Both *Plato and Plotinus* were absolutely sure that visual practices of *intelligible seeing* of Godness can be accessible to those who performs ascetic life, fights against low-grade passions and tries to perfect his soul preparing it to visual contact with the Godness.

Meanwhile, it is possible to find certain differences between these philosophic traditions. If for *Plato and Aris-*

totle the absolute goal of human life is contemplation and intelligible seeing of eidetic realities, *Plotinus* considers that the highest value is not objective-visible perception of *form (eidos)* of Good, but being inside of the One, ecstatic submerging in its lightness. If *Plato* and *Aristotle* tend to contemplating only one substance (*Good* for *Plato* and *Intelligence (nous)* for *Aristotle*), *Plotinus* considers several substances (*The One, the Intellect, the Soul*) where each of them presumes specific conditions of viewing and incorporates different abilities of human soul.

Middle Ages and *Renaissance* created absolutely different models of visual practices: theologically oriented in the first case and esthetically oriented in the second. *If in Medieval illuminationism* of *Saint Augustine, Hugh of Saint Victor* and *Saint Bonaventure* one concerns enlightening of human spirit by Divine Light that allows to spiritually see the God, *Renaissance visionerism* considers an opportunity of meditating subjective apparitions living in soul of an artist. Vision of soul 'wraith' (not accepted by medieval thinkers and considered as ambiguous and unsafe for soul) is considered in Renaissance epoch as feature of genius.

Spiritual seeing of God can be reached, according to medieval thinkers, only as the result of fighting against passions. On the contrary, *Renaissance visionerism* assumes that viewing of soul wraiths might have sensitive character. If in medieval illuminationism the existence of God is visibly confirmed where Light can be seen by soul eyes, Renaissance visionerism deals with contemplating subjective, illusory phenomena that have not ontological but psychological nature.

Peculiarity of Renaissance visual paradigm appears itself in an idea of art perspectivism that relates to a concept of monopolar vision of Contemplator that perceives surrounding world from only one and uniquely correct viewpoint. This idea has been later articulated in Cartesian philosophic system. As M. Jay says, "totally hegemonic visual model of the modern era, that which we can identify with Renaissance notions of perspective in the visual arts and Cartesian ideas of subjective rationality in philosophy. For convenience, it can be called Cartesian perspectivalism" [8, p. 4].

The perspectivalism, according to J. Crary, has led to phenomenon of monocularity of worldview since the practice of art perspective forming presumes the act of monocular seeing (whilst binocular viewing inevitably results in deformation effect and spatial shifting in visual object perception). The monocularity of visual practices of Renaissance has formed specific manner of visual perception with the main intention of homogeneous, unitary, centric (coming from the same center and leading to the same viewpoint) perception of reality: "Monocularity, like perspective and geometrical optics, was one of the Renaissance codes through which a visual world is constructed according to systematized constants, and from which any inconsistencies and irregularities are banished to insure the formation of a homogeneous, unified, and fully legible space" [3, p. 33].

In Modern epoch, the visual paradigm was developing more intensively than earlier. If in antique, medieval and renaissance philosophy the visual concepts could be found only in the works of some thinkers, in Modern epoch almost each philosopher (G. Berkeley, F. Bacon, R. Descartes, T. Hobbes, G. Leibniz, J. Locke, N. Malebranche, B. Spinoza) tried to propose his own version of the vision theory. Peculiarity of Modern visual paradigm can be seen in preferable attention to problems of physical vision, to means of its technical imperfection (by "vision pipes" and lenses). If in the previous epochs the God Light was the absolute goal of visual attempts and this Light illuminated intelligible eyes of believers, in Modern epoch the term "light" is, in

the first order, associated with thinking abilities (intellect) of humans able to pass through darkness of delusions and ignorance. In this context, "Light" transforms into metaphor used alongside with other metaphoric means as "oculars of proofs" or "geometry of vision".

In *German classical philosophy*, the topic of vision occupies some peripheral positions. However, it has its own peculiarity that influenced further historic-cultural development of the visual paradigm. German thinkers *G. W. F. Hegel, I. Kant, J. G. Fichte and F. W. J von Schelling* proposed dialectic analytics of the logic essence of the main visual concepts as light, contemplation, visibility, and vision. For visual paradigms of predeceasing epochs, such analytics was atypical: philosophers of Antiquity, Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Modern epochs that dealt with visual topic were mainly interested in understanding the conditions for high quality and correct vision and studying the ontological, ontical and spiritual backgrounds for illumination and enlightening of human soul. Concerning German classical philosophers, they studied logical characteristics of visual concepts and tried to analyze transcendental-subjective bases of human contemplation activity intended on mental copies (phenomena) observed in consciousness of subjects rather than really existing objects.

The iconic turn that started in Modern epoch and reached special intensity in Postmodern epoch is trans-subject motion towards world represented in paintings, images, icons, bodies. Whilst in Modern phase of iconic turn there is preserved and supported distance between subject and object, between Observer and observed world, in Postmodern there is a removed division of a viewer and world in gaze event that re-unites things and eyes. Transgressive motion of gaze outside human corpus combines with practice of videophilia (amorousness into images) and videomania (submerging into images), social voyeurism (mass desire to see not only that is on the surface but also that is hidden) and social exhibitionism (mass desire to "display him/herself" and to "collect and store" gazes of other people). If visual interest of pre-Modern thinkers was focused on transcendence realm, the mental gaze of Modern and Postmodern thinkers directs on immanence and visible surface of real things.

The presence of considerable differences in ways of vision, in visual preferences typical for different cultural-historic epochs confirms the thesis about cultural relativism [7, p. 267] of visual practices. Each epoch differs from others by specific visual interest, mode of vision impacted not only by cultural codes and habitus of humans, but also by context of visual practices.

Media-visibility as Modern Form of the Social Visual. Studying the peculiarities of social forms of visibility for previous epochs is one of the main tasks of Social Visualistics. By solving this task, it is possible to more deeply understand specific features of one modern form of visibility, namely, media-visibility. Depending upon meaning put into the concepts "media" and "visibility", let us distinguish some senses in the concept of media-visibility.

Classical definition of the concept "visibility" was proposed by H. Foster in Introduction to the book "Vision and Visibility" where he tried to distinguish visibility from vision: "vision suggests sight as a physical operation, and visibility sight as a social fact... the difference between the terms signals a difference within the visual – between the mechanism of sight and its historical techniques, between the datum of vision and its discursive determinations – a difference, many differences, among how we see, how we are able, allowed, or made to see" [20]. Visibility is formed in concrete social context where a human performs vision practices. According to N. Bryson, character of vision is formed under influence of social discourse, mental and language practices of behavior employed in concrete socio-

cultural situation. Any deviations from the discourse line of worldview, "falling-out" from the visual mainstream of concrete epoch stigmatizes as hallucinatory, defective, incorrect experience: "vision is socialized, and thereafter deviation from this social construction of visual reality can be measured and named, variously, as hallucination, misrecognition, or "visual disturbance". Between the subject and the world is inserted the entire sum of discourses which make up visibility, that cultural construct, and make visibility different from vision, the notion of unmediated visual experience" [2, p. 91–92].

Media-visibility can be understood as a specific form of video-information representation by means of mass-media. Depending upon meaning of the concept "media", there are certain senses in the concept of media-visibility. Let us consider the main meanings of "media". Literally (from Latin *medium*) this term means "something average, placed inside or occupying intermediate position" [17: p. 10]. However, in Media Philosophy, a more actual meaning of this term is another, – not as "mediator", but as "medium" where humans exist, as artificial space of communication where interpersonal exchange of symbolic information becomes possible. "Media are no more technical mediators transferring something that is absent in them but they appear as engrossing and catchall medium, i. e. reality of experience and consciousness" [17, p. 10].

Combining the aforementioned meanings of "media" with the concept of "visibility", it is possible to get two senses of the term media-visibility. In the first sense, if one keeps in mind *mediatory* sense of the term media, then media-visibility means a special scope of creating visual products by mass communication technologies as TV, Internet, press, etc. These products are visual images, video-content translated on mass (but not individual) level by apparatus-technological means. Let us underline importance of two sense aspects in the given definition of media-visibility: massness and technologicness of video-translation. Concerning the first aspect (massness), it might, at the first glance, arise some conceptual doubts. According to opinions of *many* theoreticians, "the term media might relate to any means (both mass and individual, both replicated and unique) of transferring visual information: body, face, gests, paints, cloth, paper, gypsum, wood as well as printing press, TV, Internet. Concerning is all this media, there are two positions. One of them, according to M. McLuhan, understands media as "human self-extension"; i. e., any form of perception is already medial since it is mediated by sensing organs. Another position assumes that media are instances that presume distancing from sense-body experience, for example, language, writing and all technical and cultural means of communication" [17, p. 12]. Accepting possibility of extended meaning of media as any mean of visual embodiment of some content, we prefer 'narrower' interpreting of this term. According to it, not any but only "mass oriented" forms of message translation can be denoted by this term. Respectively, media-visibility can be defined as visual messages translated at mass level by means of technologies that V. Flusser called "visual media" (photo-camera, video-camera, monitor of TV or computer, video-recorder).

It can be noticed that the second sense of *mediatory* concept of media-visibility, namely, technologicness, inevitably accompanies massness aspect since mass character of translating both verbal and visual information can be provided only by technological (apparatus) means. According to N. Luhmann, meaning of *technologicness/apparatusness* is the main in defining the concept of mass-media: "all society organizations that use technical means for transferring messages have to be covered by the term mass-media. In the first order, we mean books, journals, newspapers manufactured at printing press; but there are also the results of some pho-

to and electronic copying, in particular, in the case if mass products are manufactured for receivers not determined yet. Message dissemination in broadcasting is also encapsulated by this term if messages are available to everybody. ... *Only machine manufacturing* of some products as communication carrier – but not writing itself – has led to separation of special system of mass-media” [10, p. 9].

Consider the second, *medial*, definition of “media-visibility” that becomes the result of conjugating the concept of “visibility” and the concept of “media” in the meaning “habitat medium” of humans. In this context, media-visibility means: process of manufacturing media images and other visual messages as well as their perception by media-auditorium; unique vision scopes that are formed in modern mediated/electronic society; ontological condition of self-understanding of modern human who observes his/her technologized reflections/displays in media sphere; situation of creation and reproducing specific habitus or predisposition to specific style of everyday behavior and thinking at mass level by means of visual content. Media-visibility in this context shows itself not as external object that could be viewed disinterestedly but as situation into which modern human is submerged, as common space where “spectacle of society” takes place (J.-L. Nancy). Media-visibility as “habitat medium” has multilayer structure and multivector mode of self-motion acting simultaneously at the level of mass media, the level of everyday communication, and the level of latent construction of new cultural samples. “Mediality [*media-visibility* in the context of our study] does not reduce to apparatus, to communicants, to social conditions of their appearance. Mediality is epiphenomenon of all components” [17, p. 19]. In a similar manner R. Debray defines “mediations”: “in the word “mediology”, “medio” says not media nor medium but mediations, namely the dynamic combination of intermediary procedures and bodies that interpose themselves between a producing of signs and a producing of events. These intermediates are allied with “hybrids” (Bruno Latour’s term), mediations at once technological, cultural and social” [4, p. 17].

What definition of media-visibility, *mediatory* or *medial*, has to be preferred? To our opinion, each definition has certain advantages. The first one is simpler for operating while analyzing modern state of media-sphere. The second definition provides deeper and dense understanding of the processes taking place in modern society. In Social Visualistics, both concepts of media-visibility are used. On one hand, it analyzes structure and content of media-visibility in the first meaning (visibility massively reproduced by modern communication technologies). On the other hand, Social Visualistics studies peculiarities of visual existence of modern humans in the scope of hyper-reality (the second meaning of media-visibility).

Conclusions. The paper presents conceptual bases of Social Visualistics that aims on theoretical analysis and practical studies of visual media-content the subject of which is media-visibility as sub-type of the Social Visual. Differences of Social Visualistics from Visual Studies, Visual Anthropology, Visual Sociology, and Media Philosophy are demonstrated. Social Visualistics studies only one modus of mediality, namely, videosphere or visual events presented in media-space as well as character of their perception by humans.

Social Visualistics investigates phenomenon of the Social Visual. The Social Visual is visual facts constructed and perceived in interaction sphere at micro-level (interpersonal communication), macro-level (structural mass-media communication), and in the context of interaction of (macro) structures and (micro)actions of humans.

The Social Visual has communicative nature, it is formed in the context of interpersonal interaction. Perception

of media-visibility is accompanied by interpreting its meanings that is spontaneously performed by social actors. Interpretations of media-visibility meanings also have communicative character: they appear in situations of vision (in the process of visual communication) and keep actuality only for short periods of time (time of vision). Communicative media-image produces multiple interpretations that is caused by multiplicity of its meanings. Depending upon what social context media-visibility is perceived and what aspects a social actor pays attention to, different variants of understanding its meanings appear.

Social Visualistics studies not only modern forms of the Social Visual (media-visibility, cyber-visibility) but also models of visual worldview typical for Antique, Medieval, Renaissance, and Modern epochs. Studies of genesis and development of visual concepts of the past might assist better understanding of modern moduses of the Social Visual. In the modern society, the Social Visual appears itself in the modus of media-visibility that gets different characteristics depending on what sphere it appears in.

References

1. Aleksandrov E. Opyt rassmotreniia teoreticheskikh i metodologicheskikh problem vizualnoi antropologii [Experience of considering theoretical and methodological problems of visual anthropology]. – Moscow: Penaty, 2003. – URL: http://visant.etnos.ru/library/maket_book_alex.pdf.
2. Bryson N. ‘The Gaze in the Expanded Field’ in: Vision and Visuality; [Edited by Hal Foster]. – Seattle : Bay Press, 1988. – P. 87–108.
3. Crary J. ‘Modernizing vision’ in: Vision and Visuality [Edited by Hal Foster]. – Seattle : Bay Press, 1988. – P. 29–44.
4. Debray R. Media manifestos: on the technological transmission of cultural forms; [transl. by E. Rauth]. – London ; New York : Verso, 1996.
5. Dikovitskaya M. Visual Culture: The Study of the Visual after the Cultural Turn. – Massachusetts : MIT Press, 2005.
6. Elkins J. Visual Studies. A Skeptical Introduction. – New York : Routledge, 2003.
7. Jay M. ‘Cultural relativism and the visual turn’. Journal of Visual Culture. – 2002. – № 1 (3). – P. 267–278.
8. Jay M. ‘Scopic regimes of Modernity’ in: Vision and Visuality [Edited by Hal Foster]. – Seattle : Bay Press, 1988. – P. 3–23.
9. Knoblauch H. ‘Videography. Focused Ethnography and Video Analysis?’ In: H. Knoblauch et al. (Eds.) Video-analysis: methodology and methods. Qualitative Audiovisual Data Analysis in Sociology. – Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2006. – P. 69–84.
10. Luhmann N. Obshchestvo obshchestva [Society of society]. Volume II. Media kommunikatsiya [Media communication]. [translated by A. Gluhov, O. Niciforov]. – Moscow : Logos, 2005.
11. McLuhan M. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. – New York : McGraw-Hill, 1964.
12. Mirzoeff N. An Introduction to Visual Culture. – New York : Routledge, 1999.
13. Nakamura L. Digitizing Race. Visual Cultures of the Internet. Minneapolis. – London : University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
14. Pink S. The Future of Visual Anthropology: Engaging the Senses. – London ; New York : Routledge, 2006.
15. Rozin V. Vizualnaya kultura i vospriyatye. Kak chelovek vidit i ponimayet mir [Visual culture and perception. How a person sees and understands world]. – Moscow : URSS, 1996.
16. Ruby, J. Visual Anthropology. In Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology, David 1996. Vol. 4: 1345–1351.

17. Savchuk V. 'Mediafilosofia: formirovanie discipliny' ['Mediaphilosophy: discipline forming'] in: Mediafilosofiya. Osnovnye problemy i poniatia. [Media-philosophy. Main problems and concepts] [Edited by Savchuk V.]. – St. Petersburg : Izdatelstvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo filosofskogo obshchestva [Editorial Board of St.-Petersburg Philosophic Society], 2008. – P. 7–39.

18. Schirra Jörg R.J. 'A New Theme for Educating New Engineers: Computational visualistics' in Global Journal of Engineering Education, 2000. – Vol. 4. – № 1.

19. Sturken M. Practices of Looking: An Introduction in Visual Culture. – Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press, 2001.

20. Vision and Visuality [Edited by Hal Foster]. Seattle: Bay Press, 1988.

21. Usmanova A. 'Mezhdru iskusstvoznaniem i sotsiologii: k voprosu o predmete i metode vizualnyh issledovaniy' ['Between Art science and Sociology: towards the question on subject and method of visual studies'] in: Visualnie aspekty kultury [Visual Aspects of Culture]. Izhevsk: Udmurtskiy gosudarstvenniy universitet [Udmurt State University], 2006: 10–20. URL: <http://www.google.com.ua/Fbelintellectuals>.

22. Usmanova A. Visualnie issledovaniia kak issledovatel'skaia paradigma: Konspekt lektsiy dlia studentov [Visual studies as research paradigm: Conspectus of lectures for students]. 2011. URL: <http://viscult.ehu.lt/article.php?id=108>.

Summary

Bataeva K. V. Social Visualistics in Postmodern philosophy context. – Article.

The main purposes of this paper are to conceptualize peculiarities of social visualistics as inter-disciplinary theoretic-applied project and to determine its differences from other visual philosophic and cultural disciplines. Social visualistics' object is "Social Visual", i. e., visual facts constructed in concrete social-historic context that reflect habitus and cultural preferences of concrete epoch. Peculiarities of the Social Visual in Antique, Medieval, Renaissance, Modern and Postmodern epochs are considered. Basic sense aspects of media-visibility as postmodern modus of the Social Visual are discussed. Media-visibility is considered from two analytical viewpoints: on one hand,

media-visibility includes visual facts created and reproduced by mass communication technologies, and, on the other hand, media-visibility is a specific scope of visualized existence of modern humans in the context of mediated hyper-reality.

Key words: Social Visualistics, the Social Visual, media-visibility, media communication.

Анотація

Батаєва К. В. Соціальна візуалістика в контексті постмодерної філософії. – Стаття.

У статті концептуалізовано особливості соціальної візуалістики як міждисциплінарного теоретико-прикладного проекту, а також виявлено її відмінності від інших філософських і культурологічних візуальних дисциплін. Об'єктом соціальної візуалістики є «соціальне візуальне» або візуальні факти, що конструюються в конкретному соціально-історичному контексті, у яких відображається габітус і культурні переваги конкретної доби. Розглянуто специфічні особливості «соціального візуального» за умов Античності, Середньовіччя, Ренесансу, Модерну й Постмодерну. Виявлено змістові аспекти медіа-візуальності як постмодерністського модусу соціального візуального.

Ключові слова: соціальна візуалістика, соціальне візуальне, медіа-візуальність, медіа-комунікація.

Аннотация

Батаева Е. В. Социальная визуалистика в контексте постмодернистской философии. – Статья.

В статье концептуализированы особенности социальной визуалистики как междисциплинарного теоретико-прикладного проекта, а также выявлены ее отличия от других философских и культурологических визуальных дисциплин. Объектом социальной визуалистики является «социальное визуальное» или визуальные факты, конструируемые в конкретном социально-историческом контексте, в которых отражаются габитус и культурные предпочтения конкретной эпохи. Рассмотрены специфические особенности «социального визуального» в эпохи Античности, Средневековья, Ренессанса, Модерна и Постмодерна. Выявлены содержательные аспекты медиа-визуальности как постмодернистского модуса социального визуального.

Ключевые слова: социальная визуалистика, социальное визуальное, медиа-визуальность, медиа-коммуникация.