



УДК 7.01 : 130

Artemenko A., Artemenko Ya.

National University of Pharmacy

PRINCIPLES OF VISUAL REPRESENTATION OF DYNAMIC OBJECTS

Artemenko A., Artemenko Ya. Principles of visual representation of dynamic objects. The article is dedicated to the problem of visual anthropology as methodological system. The authors analyze the problem of morphogenesis of anthropological and social phenomena. In the article is noted that the procedure of imaging provides opportunities for construction and legitimization of social reality models. Visual anthropology as methodological system solves several problems: first, the problem of morphogenesis of anthropological and social phenomena; second, the issue of group and personal identity legitimization. Visualization of social space turns into a problem of representation of meta-objects meanings with more subtle forms of manifestation. The authors point out that problem of visualization at the same time actualizes the challenges of observation and description. The concept of objectivity is examined in the article. This concept reflects the structure of the sign, the functional and physical nature of social objects.

Keywords: anthropology, visualization, social philosophy, Actor-Net Theory, frame.

Артеменко А. П. Артеменко Я. І. Принципи візуальної репрезентації динамічних об'єктів. Стаття присвячена розгляду методологічних принципів візуальної антропології. Автори аналізують проблему морфогенезу антропологічних і соціальних феноменів. У статті наголошується, що розкриті в процедурі візуалізації значення і смисли надають можливості для конструювання і легітимізації певних моделей соціальної реальності.

Візуальна антропологія представлена як методологічна система, яка вирішує декілька задач: по-перше, проблему морфогенезу антропологічних та соціальних феноменів; по-друге, легітимізації

групових та персональних моделей ідентичності. Візуалізація соціального простору є проблемою вираження великих смислових об'єктів, але з більш тонкими формами прояву. Автори відзначають, що вирішення проблеми візуалізації одночасно стикається з завданнями і «спостереження», і «опису». У статті аналізується концепт «об'єктність», який відображає структури знакової, функціональної та фізичної природи соціальних об'єктів.

Ключові слова: антропологія, візуалізація, соціальна філософія, акторно-мережева теорія, фрейм

Артеменко А. П. Артеменко Я. И. Принципы визуальной репрезентации динамических объектов. Статья посвящена рассмотрению методологических принципов визуальной антропологии. Авторы анализируют проблему морфогенеза антропологических и социальных феноменов. В статье отмечается, что вскрытые в процедуре визуализации значения и смыслы предоставляют возможности для конструирования и легитимации определенных моделей социальной реальности.

Визуальная антропология представлена как методологическая система. Она решает несколько задач: во-первых, проблемы морфогенеза антропологических и социальных феноменов; во-вторых, легитимации групповых и персональных моделей идентичности.

Визуализация социального пространства является проблемой выражения больших смысловых объектов, но с более тонкими формами проявления. Авторы отмечают, что решение проблемы визуализации одновременно сталкивается с задачами и «наблюдения», и «описания». В статье анализируется концепт «объектность», который отражает структуры знаковой, функциональной и физической природы социальных объектов.

Ключевые слова: антропология, визуализация, социальная философия, акторно-сетевая теория, фрейм.

Visual anthropology as an independent area appeared in the last quarter of the twentieth century. It was a result of a multidisciplinary study of interaction between human and society, social groups and cultural regions. Visualization became the first-string topic in social philosophy, philosophy of culture, sociology, history and cultural studies. Researchers developed sophisticated imaging techniques of social, cultural and psychological objects. It was not mere application of spatial metaphors to description of object been observed. Visual anthropology studies established new methodology of description and explanation of human being which is most complicated and challenging object.

Considering versatility of visual anthropological methods we can expect them to solve several tasks. First of all it is a question of anthropological and social phenomena morphogenesis. The point is that traditional explanative schemes based primarily on mechanical, economic or political notions reveal just a certain tendency or “slice” or social reality while

visualistic approach tries to grasp human world volume and dynamically.

And the second important aspect of visualization is its ability to legitimize the model of social/cultural identity.

The scope of visual anthropology issues is determined by the complexity of social or personal life phenomena. The meaning of a thing, gesture or expression is not isolated or excluded out of existential horizon. All of them refer to meanings of more complex objects with more subtle and divaricate manifestations. So, we should observe and determine the system of a complex and variable geometry.

Variable geometry is a pre-condition of any social order existing as combination of elements and rooting in movable relationships [1: 231]. This is not only a problem of a context. At the same time we face the problem of observation and description governed by some settings.

This is not a new issue for philosophy or philosophy of science, but now this issue is actively discussed by sociologists and social psychologists. Since the times of Plato, reality of event is being constructed by its description. The representation of some fact implied its rational manifestation and description. This act had the content of *giving somebody an opportunity to see*. Plato understood *conceivable* and *perceptible* as identical concepts. In *Theaetetus* and *Fileb* conceivable reality was represented as a perceptible one, because you can not have thought of a thing that does not exist, or differs from what you feel [7: 222]. As an example of this approach, Plato called a thing *an instrument of time*. Any single thing has perceptible obviousness. That's why any single moment of time got a static visual form, and time turns into a range of these indivisible points. Changes of things show us the passing of time. So time becomes visible and thinkable. Moreover, the moment of visual impression gets complex internal dimension that contains different historical references [2: 112]. Plato's method is applicable for description of complex non-discrete visual objects disposed in discrete temporality.

The process of observation could be represented as a process of composition of visual images. It is the process of both naming and creating prospects. Defining the object we fix it in a concept. Then, concept is being filled with some sense depending on a context. The context of a concept outlines the prospects of meaning transformations. We can say that observation is an ability to select objects and combine their projections. Furthermore it is a cognitive act of structuring the image by observer.

It's important to note that the process of visualization in itself can be marked as social practice. It depicts human reality as being in a framework of social order and order of descriptive language, and vice versa — it creates new social order enriching interpretative discourse that exists. This idea is the one of the central point in philosophy of late XIX — XX centuries, and

the firsts who undertook such kind of interpretation were K. Marx and M. Weber. The next steps in development of idea were made by K. Mannheim's and P. Ricoeur's (ideology and utopia theory), J. Habermas, J. Derrida and S. Benhabib (understanding of representative practices as forms of social behavior), M. Foucault, R. Barthes and L. Marin (conception of controlled production of discourse) and, finally, E. Goffman with his Frame analysis.

According to M. Heidegger, things show themselves making their understanding possible. Heidegger's methodology, being understood instrumentally, reduces visualization to social (value, semantic or functional) attribution of represented object. Visualization provides a correlation between physical *topos* as a spatio-temporal anchor point of a thing, on the one hand, and functional and information networks as fields where it works, on the other. Through the surface of visualized object it is possible to see the shine of remarkable meanings of metanarratives. Imaging mechanisms allow an individual to domesticate wild forces of alien meanings, discover expressive potential of ordinary objects and transform them into significant existential or social event. In this peremptory manner a three-color dress turns into a symbol of revolution, sweat on a forehead of cinematic character becomes a sign of honest labor (R. Barthes), and even casual viewer of advertisement appears to be a loyal participant of capitalist distribution (J. Elkins).

Nonetheless, descriptions of reality are not directly connected with reality of events they are considered to refer. So, the problem of signification unfolds as an issue of correspondence between social and image ontology. Thus, visual studies raises a number of questions relating to the problem of social phenomena morphogenesis, their specific ontology rooted in the structures of causality, distinction and classification.

T. Lukman remarked that social reality constitutes itself as a collective arena of subjective social interactions in the long chain of intersubjective processes. Considering this approach, we suppose that understanding of certain social relations is possible only when material object becomes a tool of making social interaction visible. A similar point of view was represented by G. Simmel's works. Later Simmel's idea of thing as an instrument of social space design was combined with M. Heidegger's concept of ontic reality and has been described in the works of J. Law, K. Knorr-Cetina.

These authors are convinced that it's impossible to analyze an object excluding it out of its environment. Environment creates an aggregate set of relationships, which defines the space and functionality of a thing. Authors of Actor-Network Theory developed a new concept for explanation of ontic reality: *objectivity*. New concept was developed to describe non-discrete ontology of social being.

Thing generates and detects the object as *dynamically stable* form of interaction between physical and non-physical spaces. Object remains the

same, as long as it saves its place in a stable network of connections with other things. When system of relations surrounding thing loses any component, it causes morphogenesis and brakes ontological “outline” of anthropological/social phenomenon. Any single gap in ontic horizon leads to disappearance of the whole semantic universe. Object as a dynamic spatial formation exists in regime of permanent references which are valid only in certain contextual projection. When one changes his visual angle, ignores some components of picture or “invents” the new ones, integrity and density of environment gets disorder and an object is lost. Stability of system surrounding object depends on stability of “inner” and “outer” semantic connections. However, the nature of relationships is determined by agreement of network actors. This is the principle of contingency that was not articulated by authors of Actor-Network Theory, but it can be clearly seen as logical outcome of their works.

Objectivity includes not only corporeal beings, but also processes, relations and their interpretative projections as well. M. Heidegger argued that things reveal themselves only in the space of existential relationships. Visual object “collects” realities into complex cosmos of “everything that matters”. Furthermore, object is viewed as actual convention, which exceeds descriptive means of Euclidean geometry. Spatiality and continuity of objects can get transformations when conditions are changed. Objectivity appears to be a stable form of symbolic, semantic and functional system of social interaction [1 : 121]. Thus thing becomes a manifestation of communicative network. M. Mamardashvili demonstrates this with the help of following example: corkscrew represents a system of cultural, social and material relations [6 : 73–74]. Corkscrew objectifies the practice of liquids bottling and a culture of their consumption. Thing makes possible visualization of non-obvious cultural relations. Cultural tradition, which is seen throughout this single object, designs live picture of social identity. Usage of a corkscrew refers to certain mode of living that is to be interpreted in accordance with series of stories and histories.

Thus we came to conclusion that mechanisms of visualization reveal and transform objects of everyday reality into significant events. Due to this, we defined visualization as a process that determines principles and criteria for social identification. Mastering things, detecting significant markings in words and gestures, reading meanings out of corporal dispositions and practicing verbal or behavior models, we deal with visual forms. The order of interpretative discourse makes vision work as descriptive and *pre*-scriptive practice. We grasp an object as being framed by everyday life details. But it is possible to observe the reverse order of things: situational interpretative frame creates new forms of social disposition and rearranges semantic network and functional order.

Література:

1. Артеменко А. П. Топологія Я в мережевих структурах соціуму / А. П. Артеменко. — Харків: Цифрова друкарня №1, 2013. — 344 с.
2. Артеменко Я. И. Онтология импрессионального «места» / Я. И. Артеменко // Философские перипетии. Вестник ХНУ. — Харьков, 2002. — № 561. — С. 110–113.
3. Вахштайн В. На краю привычного мира: события и их фреймы / В. Вахштайн // Социологическое обозрение. — Т. 10. — 2011. — №3, — С. 79–94.
4. Гофман И. Закрепление форм деятельности / И. Гофман // Социология вещей: сборник статей / под ред. В. Вахштайна. — М.: Издательский дом «Территория будущего», 2006. — С. 54–117. — (Серия «Университетская библиотека Александра Погорельского»).
5. Ло Дж. Объекты и пространства / Дж. Ло // Социология вещей: сборник статей / под ред. В. Вахштайна. — М.: Издательский дом «Территория будущего», 2006. — С. 223–244.
6. Мамардашвили М. Кантианские вариации / М. Мамардашвили. — М.: «Аграф», 1997. — 320 с.
7. Платон. Тезет / Платон // Собр. соч. в 4 т. — М.: Мысль, 1994. — Т. 2. — С. 192–274.
8. Усманова А. Р. Насилие как культурная метафора: вместо введения / А. Р. Усманова // Визуальное (как) насилие. Сборник научных трудов / отв. ред. А. Р. Усманова. — Вильнюс: ЕГУ, 2007. — С. 5–37.
9. Хайдеггер М. Бытие и время / М. Хайдеггер; [пер. с нем. В. Бибихин]. — М.: Издательство Ad Marginem, 1997. — 452 с.