

Fee-Alexandra Haase

Visual Culture as “Cultural Visualization”.

Cross-Cultural Studies on Meanings of Visuality as the Non-Visual Conditions of Esthetics in Language as Cultural Memory

Author: Dr. Fee-Alexandra Haase
F.a.haase@gmx.de
Address: Home:
Dr. Fee-Alexandra Haase
email F.A.Haase@gmx.de
Am Sportplatz 2 D-18573 Ramin Germany

-Abstract-

Visual culture starts in linguistics. Visuality is received differently in various cultures. We will select several concepts of linguistic representations of different languages for visuality in order to discuss their differences. Based upon the various concepts we will claim that visuality is a highly differentiated concept. We will trace back the concepts behind visuality differentiating between the visual as sensual experience of sight, the metaphysical un-sensual visuality, and visuality as employed in the arts (rhetoric, poetry, visual arts). We postulate that actually any research regarding visuality has to start with the examination of its categories and terms that are employed to communicate it. This is the communicable and realistic approach towards the visual examining its conditions of realization in language. Furthermore, the conditions of communicating visuality are determined by the words used and their meanings. Non-visual conditions here place the field of "visual culture" in the light of non-visual aspects: The communicability of the visual depends on non-visual means; in other words: any visual impression can only be communicated through a means, another image, a written text, or as less authentic tool through recordings appealing to other senses. The means here employed are non-visual in the physiological meaning of a living organism's faculty to receive visual impressions from the world outside. This is the point where our research starts tracing back categories of the visual and their meanings in different cultures in order to support our introductory statements and to examine the varieties of the visual. Cultural Visualisation here has two meanings: It is the historical process preserving memory in visual form and also the actual visual form of writing.

Ink sf iw.i rx.kwi dwAw

Mine is yesterday, I know tomorrow

Egyptian Book of the Dead, Chapter 17

1. Introduction: State of Research and the Question “What is Visual?”

“What is Visual?”, Cultural Memory, and Visual Culture

Two recently popularized concepts are the entrance into our research, *cultural memory* and *visual culture*, and we will demonstrate that the linguistic setting of meanings determines both of them. As a term cultural memory was first introduced by the German Egyptologists Jan and Aleida Assmann. Cornelius Holtorf wrote: “Cultural Memory is a concept introduced to the archaeological disciplines by Jan Assmann (1988a; 1988b; 1992: espec. 22). Assmann defines cultural memory as the “outer dimension of human memory” (1992: 19), embracing two different concepts: “memory culture” (Erinnerungskultur) and “reference to the past” (Vergangenheitsbezug). Memory culture is the way a society ensures cultural continuity by preserving, with the help of cultural mnemonics, its collective knowledge from one generation to the next, rendering it possible for later generations to reconstruct their cultural identity. References to the past, on the other hand, reassure the members of a society of their collective identity and supply them with an awareness of their unity and singularity in time and space—i.e. an historical consciousness—by creating a shared past.” (Cornelius Holtorf). Lepore and Ludwig mentioned about the problem of the study of meanings in linguistics in foreign languages: “The crucial point is that appeal to meaning as entities fails to provide us with an understanding of any expression of a language except insofar as we pick it out with an expression we understand which we tacitly recognize to be a translation of the term whose meaning we want to illuminate by the appeal to assigning to it a meaning. The meaning drops out as irrelevant: the work is done, and can only be done, by matching terms already understood with terms they translate.” (Lepore; Ludwig). Natahrius stated that “the role of visual perception in media literacy is paramount in understanding the shift from a linear perceptual process (literacy) to a holistic perceptual process (visuality) by which almost all information is now transmitted through the visual forms of mass media: television, film, and the Internet The media-literate individual must be educated in the processes of visual perception and how the media use the visual channels to transmit, and often distort, information. The media-literate person understands the meaning of the primary axiom of visual communication-The more we know the more we see-as well as the next most important axiom: What is not seen is as important as what is seen.” (Natahrius 238). Kjeldsen asserts that also the ancient rhetoric is “a visual discipline, an art imbued with visuality and discusses the importance of ancient rhetoric as a general art of persuasion. Analysis of views of author Gorgias on the importance of visuality in ancient rhetoric.” (Kjeldsen 133). According to Mirzoeff, visuality has become a “keyword for the field of visual culture. However, while many assume that it is a postmodern theoretical term, the word was coined by the Scottish historian Thomas Carlyle in his lectures On Heroes (1841).” From here “the contradictory source of the resonance of 'visuality' as a keyword for visual culture as both a mode of representing imperial culture and a means of resisting it by means of reverse appropriation.” (Mirzoeff 53).

Science Encyclopedia wrote: “The emergence of an idea called visual culture surely implies the emergence of a set of urgent problems for which the idea should enable some kind of answers. At a certain moment in the late twentieth century, a new consideration of the role of the visual, of perception, of images, and of the technologies and

subjectivities that are embroiled in these relations became an urgent matter for scholars.” (*Science Encyclopedia*). Also from other perspectives the idea of primacy of language for visibility was emphasized. Armstrong wrote that the “idea that iconic visible gesture had something to do with the origin of language, particularly speech, is a frequent element in speculation about this phenomenon and appears early in its history. Socrates hypothesizes about the origins of Greek words in Plato's satirical dialogue, *Cratylus*, and his speculation includes a possible role for sound based iconicity as well as for the visual gestures employed by the deaf.” (Armstrong 289).

The semiotic assumption was negated by Van Oort who argued that “the problem of representation stands at the center of the debate concerning the legitimacy of cognitivism as a research strategy for the humanities. Yet, curiously, very few commentators in this debate see representation to be a problem at all. Questions about the anthropological origin and function of representation tend to be regarded as at best supplemental, and at worst simply irrelevant, to the synchronic question of the causal mechanisms involved in the production of representation in the brain.” (Van Oort). According to Game and Metcalfe, “in *Camera Lucida*, Barthes makes a distinction between a semiological approach and a phenomenological approach to the sign. While semiotic theory has usually focused on signs that work through mediation and representation, in this article we investigate the possibility of a sign that is immediate, experienced as a presence. This is not a sign of, or even the impossibility of a sign of; rather, it is a sign that just is, without an elsewhere to refer or defer to.” (Game, Metcalfe 493). Boye and Harder in the abstract of the paper *Encoded Secundariness: A Usage-based Theory of Grammaticalization and Grammatical Status* mentioned that “by describing how grammatical items develop out of lexical sources, grammaticalization research has shown that an absolute distinction between lexicon and grammar cannot be maintained. In this respect grammaticalization research constitutes a challenge to mainstream generative linguistics (as acknowledged by Roberts, Rousseau), especially if a unitary pathway can be established from lexicon to grammar. (...) From a cognitive and functional point of view, it would therefore be desirable with a theory that establishes a non-absolute but motivated distinction between lexical and grammatical elements in language (...). In that case, the term grammaticalization can be given a motivated definition as covering all processes that bring grammatical elements into being, and it is not a problem that processes like bleaching and phonological reduction also occur in other contexts.” (Boye, Harder). Saunders wrote that “according to a consensus of psycho-physiological and philosophical theories, color sensations (or qualia) are generated in a cerebral “space” fed from photon-photoreceptor interaction (producing “metamers”) in the retina of the eye. The resulting “space” has three dimensions: hue (or chroma), saturation (or “purity”), and brightness (lightness, value or intensity) and (in some versions) is further structured by primitive or landmark “colors”—usually four, or six (when white and black are added to red, yellow, green and blue). It has also been proposed that there are eleven semantic universals—labeling the previous six plus the “intermediaries” of orange, pink, brown, purple, and gray. There are many versions of this consensus, but they all aim to provide ontological, epistemological and semantic blueprints for the brute fact of the reality of color ordained by Nature (evolution).” (Saunders 302).

2. Case studies I: The Ancient Greek Difference of Sight and Vision

Liddell and Scott wrote in *A Greek-English Lexicon* that *eikôn* comprises the meanings likeness, image in form of a picture or statue, image in a mirror, personal description, living image, representation, semblance, and phantom. It is also used for similitude, comparison, pattern, and archetype. (Liddell, Scott). The meanings of this term fall into the fields of arts, sight, and mental representation. But also highly differentiated terms were used in Greek: In ancient Greek *phantasmos* and *anatupoma* is used for a mental image. *Phantastikos* refers to the ability to produce the appearance of something. Plato used the word in this way (Pl.Sph.266d, 268c). For Plato it is the art of producing appearances opposed to *eikastikê*. (ib.236c). (Liddell, Scott). *Phantasma* is phasma, apparition, and phantom. In ancient Greek *agalματοô* is used for the activity to make something into an image. *Agalmatophoros* means carrying an image in one's mind. *Aktineidôlon* means ray-image or visual impression. *Anadeigma* is an image for show. *Anatupoô* means describe or represent. *Anazôgraphêma* is a memory-image. *Andreikelon* is an image of a man. *Andrias* is image of a man or statue. *Aneidôlopoiêô* means to represent in imagery. *Antitupôsis* is an image impressed or impression. *Autêknuma* is one's very image. *Deikêlon* is a representation or exhibition. *Anapomagma* is an impression or image. *Eikasma* is likeness. *Eidôlopoiêô* means to form an image. *Eidôlopoiia* is a formation of images. The *phantastês* is someone, who makes a parade or a boaster. Referring to the sense of sight, *autopsia* is seeing with one's own eyes. *Doxa* is expectation, opinion, and judgement. (Liddell, Scott). *Epopsis* is a view over, oversight, and superintendence. (Liddell, Scott). *Enupnion* is a thing seen in sleep. (Liddell, Scott). *Opsis* is objective, aspect, appearance of a person or thing, countenance, face, visual impression or image of an object, a thing seen, sight, vision, apparition, subjective, power of sight or seeing, vision, act of seeing or looking, organs of sight, and eyes. (Liddell, Scott). *Optasia*, derived from *optazomai*, is vision. (Liddell, Scott). *Parorasis* is false vision and overlooking. (Liddell, Scott). *Theophaneia* is the vision of god. (Liddell, Scott). *Sunoraô* is to be able to see, have within the range of one's vision. (Liddell, Scott). *Hupar* is a real appearance seen in a state of waking, waking vision, opposed to *onar* (dream). (Liddell, Scott). In Latin *species* is a seeing, sight, look, view and that which is seen in a thing, i. e. the outward appearance, outside, exterior, shape, form, figure, mien, etc, something seen, a spectacle, sight, appearance, that which is seen by the mind, an idea, notion, a look, show, seeming, appearance, semblance, pretence, cloak, color, pretext, etc. (opp. that which is real, actual, etc.). (Liddell, Scott). *Visio* is the act or sense of seeing, sight, and vision. (Liddell, Scott). *Visualitas* is the power of seeing, the faculty of sight, vision. Derived from the Greek verb *sullamballein* *symbolus* is a sign or mark by which one gives another to understand any thing (Plin. 33, 1, 4, § 10). *Sêmeiôsis* is an indication, notice used by Plurarch (Plu.2.961c.). In rhetoric it is an inference from a sign (Phld.Sign.2). *Evidentia* means clearness and distinctness. In rhetoric it is clearness and perspicuity. It was used by Quintilian as a translation of *enargeia* (*Institutio Oratoria* 6, 2, 32; 4, 2, 63; 9, 2, 40.). (Thomas of Aquin). *Enargeia* comprises clearness, distinctness, vividness as used by Plato in the *Politeia*. In a philosophical context it stands for clear and distinct perception as used by Epicure. In rhetoric it is a vivid description (D.H.Lys.7) and joined with *suntomia* (Phld. Po.5.3). (Lewis, Short). *Enargeia* is a rhetorical term for a visually powerful description that vividly recreates something or someone in words. Rhetoric has developed figures that are actually just employed with the power of such an authenticity of words. Among them one of the most important is the so-called '*evidentia*', evidence, the authentic description of a topic. In Greek this figure is

called '*enargeia*'. It is the vivid description of something as a way to persuade people of something. It is actually an ideological concept of its own, which tries to enter the mind of the believer with a vivid quasi-authenticity to give him/her an illusion.

Alternative Eastern Concepts of Vision

In Sanskrit *adarzana* is non-vision, not seeing, disregard, neglect, non-appearance, latent condition, disappearance. *Adarzanapatha* is a path beyond the reach of vision. In Sanskrit *aizvarya* is the state of being a mighty lord, sovereignty, supremacy, power, superhuman power consisting of such powers as vision, audition, cogitation, discrimination, and omniscience. In Sanskrit *alokamarga* and *alokapatha* are used for line of sight and range of vision. *Animittaligganasa* is an unaccountable loss of distinct vision. *AnuvikAz* is the action of penetrating with one's vision. *Caksusajjana* is knowledge which depends on vision. In Sanskrit *divyacakSus* is the divine eye and supernatural vision. *Drstividya* is the science of vision. *Drzyatva* is visibility, vision, and sight. *Jjanacaksus* is the eye of intelligence, inner eye, intellectual vision. (*Cologne Digital Sanskrit Lexicon*). In mystic Jewish culture letters were associated to human activities and qualities. The *Sepher Yetzirah* is one of the ancient Qabalistic texts written around 200 C.E. In the *Sepher Yetzirah* (chapter 5, 43-44) the letters h w z j f y l n s u x q are called the simple letters: “1. The Twelve Simple Letters are Héh, Vau, Zain, Cheth, Teth, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samech, Oin, Tzaddi and Qoph; (43) they are the foundations of these twelve properties: Sight, Hearing, Smell, Speech, Taste, Sexual Love, Work, Movement, Anger, Mirth, Imagination, and Sleep.” (*Sepher Yetzirah*). In Tamil *aiyakkatci* is vision or perception too dim to decide whether a thing is this or that. In Tamil *akakkan* is an inner vision and wisdom. *Anantataricanam* is a limitless vision. In Tamil *cutcumataricanam* is a quick perception, acuteness, keen intellect, occult vision. In Tamil *jnanakkan* is a spiritual vision and inward illumination. *Jnanatirutti* is a spiritual light or illumination, occult vision, second sight, knowledge of the past, present and future. *Kannottam* is glance, look, vision; 2. regard, kindness, partiality, glow of kind feeling towards a friend or even a casual acquaintance, reluctance to deny a request made by a friend or acquaintance, humanity, fellow-feeling, discerning by the eye, close examination, careful scrutiny. In Tamil *katci* is sight, view, form, appearance, vision of a deity, sight of a great personage, audience, exhibition, attractive object of sight, perception, knowledge. *Katpulam* is sight and vision. (*Cologne Online Tamil Lexicon*). In Urdu *bishārat* (بشارت) are good news, glad tidings, joyful annunciation made to one in sleep or in a vision by some saint, happy dream or vision, divine inspiration, revelation. *baṣārat* بصارت is 'to see'. *baṣārat* (بصارت) means seeing, perceiving, discerning, sense of sight, vision, insight, understanding, and knowledge. *bīnāī* بینائی is eye-sight, sight, and vision. *jnān* جنان is cognizance and consciousness. *Jnān-ćakshu* is the eye of intelligence, mind's eye, or intellectual vision. *Jnān-dṛishṭī* is a clear vision or perception (untainted either by ignorance or by sin). Derived from *kh-* -*ě-bāṭīl* is foolish imagination, a wrong idea, false notion, and misconception. *dṛishṭī* दृष्टि is seeing, looking, at, viewing, the faculty of seeing, sight, vision, view, the eye, look. *darśan* दर्शन is seeing, looking, observing, sight, vision, observation, look, view, appearance, aspect,

semblance, perception, exhibition, inspection, and examination. *दर्शन* (*darśan*) comprises examination, going into the presence of, visiting, an interview, visiting a sacred shrine, worshipping in the presence of an image, a view or theory prescribed in a system or book. *درشیتا* *drīśyatā* is visibility, vision, and sight. (*A Dictionary of Urdu, Classical Hindi, and English*). In Hindi *आँख* *ā:kh* means to be unable to fix the gaze on something. *उद्भावन* *udbha:vān* is origination, imagination, invention, vision, and conception. *क्रांत/दर्शी* *krā:ntdarshi:* is a seer, visionary, gifted with preternatural vision. *ज्योति* *jyoti* is light, flame, luster, and vision. *सूझ* *su:jh* is insight, vision, imagination, perception. (*A Practical Hindi-English Dictionary*). In Persian *بصر* *baṣar* is seeing, discerning, sight, vision, and the eye. *بصیرة* *baṣīrat* is sight, vision, insight, mental perception, perceptive faculty, knowledge, understanding, intelligence, discernment, skill, circumspection, and prudence. (*A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*). In Bengali *কবি* (*kabi*) is a poet, a scholar, a philosopher. *কল্পনা* is a visionary thing, fanciful imagination, a baseless and unreal con caption, (rare) poetic imagination. *কল্পিত* is visionary, fanciful, baseless and unreal, imagined or invented by a poet. *গান* is a kind of song-tournament or duel. *কবিত্ব* is a poetical imagination or talent, poetry, and poetic quality. *কবিত্ব শক্তি* is poetical talent or genius. *প্রসিদ্ধি* is any imaginative de scription of nature originally made by a poet and afterwards repeated by other poets, a poetical convention. *নজর* is sight or vision. *নজর লাগা* means to be affected with the evil eye. *নজরে থাকা* means to be under observation or watch, to be in view. (*Samsad Bengali-English Dictionary*). *आँख* *ā:kh* means to be unable to fix the gaze on something. *पड़ना* is to sight per chance. *उद्भावन* *udbha:vān* is an originator, one who conceives an idea, and inventor. *उद्भावन* *udbha:vān* is origination, imagination, invention, vision, and conception. *उद्भावना* *udbha:vanā:* is idea, concept, and imagination. *क्रांत/दर्शी* *krā:ntdarshi:* is a seer, visionary, gifted with preternatural vision. *चक्षु* *chakshu* is an eye. *ज्ञान* *gya:n* is knowable, learning, sense. With the suffix *~चक्षु* it is the inner vision. *ज्योति* *jyoti* is light, flame, luster, and vision. *तत्त्व* *tattv* is metaphysical knowledge, the realisation of the Supreme Truth. With the suffix *-दृष्टि* it is vision, truth-probing vision, insight. Derived from *त्रि* *tri* for three is *त्रि ~कालदर्शी* for a seer, sage, one gifted with a vision to see through the past, present and future alike. *दिव्य* (*divvy*) is divine, celestial, charming, beautiful, and brilliant. Attached by the suffix *~चक्षु* it means gifted with divine vision, charming-eyed, or blind. *दी/दा* *di:da:* is an eye and vision. Attached by *~दावर* it means a connoisseur or one who can appreciate. *दृष्टि* *drishṭi* is sight, view, vision, and glance. *दृष्टि ~कोण* is viewpoint or point of view. *नज़र* *nazar* is sight, eyesight, vision, look, glance, attention, gift, present, offering, and influence cast by an evil eye. *निगाह* *niga:h* is look, glance, sight, and vision. Derived from *मन* *mān* *मन* —की *आँखें* is mind's eye or inner vision. Derived from *हिया* *hiya:* (agony) *हिये का अंधा* means having no mental vision, block-headed, and foolish. In Pali *Kanha* is the sense of sight. *Cakkhu-- āyatana* is the organ or sense of sight. Attached by

-*indriya* (*cakkhundriya*) it is the organ of eye and faculty of vision. *Ñāṇa* is the range of one's intelligence or mental eye (clear sight). *Vipassanā* means inward vision, insight, intuition, and introspection. *Supina* is a dream or vision. *Supina* is also used for the dreams of the Buddha. (*The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*).

3. Case Studies II

The Contemporary Use of the Word “Vision” and

Example of "Spectare" and the Spectacle for the Relation Between Ideology and Visuality

The adjective *visual* has the meanings 1. of or relating to the sense of sight: a visual organ and visual receptors on the retina, 2. seen or able to be seen by the eye, visible in a visual presentation, and a design with a dramatic visual effect, 3. optical, 4. done, maintained, or executed by sight only: visual navigation, 5. having the nature of or producing an image in the mind in a visual memory of the scene, 6. of or relating to a method of instruction involving sight. As a noun “visual” stands for a picture, chart, or other presentation that appeals to the sense of sight, used in promotion or for illustration or narration and is often used in the plural. (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*). Visual as adjective means 1. done by or used in seeing and 2. capable of being seen. (*Collins Essential English Dictionary*). “Visual” as relating to or using sight means "ocular inspection", "an optical illusion", "visual powers", "visual navigation", ocular, optic, optical. “Visual” as visible is used in "be sure of it; give me the ocular proof" by Shakespeare, "a visual presentation", and "a visual image". (*WordNet 3.0 Farlex Clipart Collection*). Visual as adjective means optical, optic, and ocular. (*Collins Essential Thesaurus*). Edmund Burke wrote in *On the Sublime and Beautiful*: “Vision is performed by having a picture, formed by the rays of light which are reflected from the object, painted in one piece, instantaneously, on the retina, or last nervous part of the eye. Or, according to others, there is but one point of any object painted on the eye in such a manner as to be perceived at once; but by moving the eye, we gather up, with great celerity, the several parts of the object, so as to form one uniform piece. If the former opinion be allowed, it will be considered, 1 that though all the light reflected from a large body should strike the eye in one instant; yet we must suppose that the body itself is formed of a vast number of distinct points, every one of which, or the ray from every one, makes an impression on the retina. So that, though the image of one point should cause but a small tension of this membrane, another and another, and another stroke, must in their progress cause a very great one, until it arrives at last to the highest degree; and the whole capacity of the eye, vibrating in all its parts, must approach near to the nature of what causes pain, and consequently must produce an idea of the sublime. Again, if we take it, that one point only of an object is distinguishable at once, the matter will amount nearly to the same thing, or rather it will make the origin of the sublime from greatness of dimension yet clearer. For if but one point is observed at once, the eye must traverse the vast space of such bodies with great quickness, and consequently the fine nerves and muscles destined to the motion of that part must be very much strained; and their great sensibility must make them highly affected by this straining. Besides, it signifies just nothing to the effect produced, whether a body has its parts connected and makes its impression at once; or, making but one impression of a point at a time, causes a succession of the same or others so quickly as to make them seem

united; as is evident from the common effect of whirling about a lighted torch or piece of wood: which, if done with celerity, seems a circle of fire.” (Burke).

It would be naive to assume that ideologies are simple, black and white distinguishing political systems connotated with dictatorship or political structures that are other than democratic ones. We ask at this place what makes an ideology acceptable to a majority of persons? We assume that the acceptance must rely on a status that is beyond the level of application of reasonable questions and inquiring its ethical impact. We will show that major categories of vision like to see, to see imaginatively, and to understand play here an important role. While in recent time the field of visuality has become an area of academic teaching and research, we assume that a major area of studies in visuality deal with topics we can cover with the term research in ideology. Ideology is a positive and normative social system that approaches its norms from a common ideal perspective and its rules are normative for the society. We will examine the major basic categories of visuality in the European language family and in other non-European language families discussing the shift of connotated meanings within the etymological range of related languages. We will also show the connotated meanings of the visual terms that are somehow related to ideologies.

Major categories of vision referring to different concepts are

1. To See
2. To See Imaginatively (religion, spirituality)
3. To Understand (transmission of information)

The interesting point is that the terminology of visuality is a thesaurus of conditioned ways we "see" something. This "seeing" comprises actually much more than just the activity of visual perception. It comprises activities that are far beyond the circle of the visual perception. We use here the term 'ideology' with a broad, better said: very broad, meaning, as any framed cultural setting distinguishable from the neighbouring settings and with a common belief system. We assume that the linguistic conditions are expressions of these ideological positions. In the narrowest literal sense of traditionally used terms we must distinguish between the following fields of research:

Object	Field	Topic	Status
Icon	Iconology	Study of visually mediated phenomena	Research Field
Idea	Ideology	Application of Ideas	Not Research Field

Latin *spicio* has the meanings ‘to look’, ‘to look at’, and in post-classical Latin ‘to behold’. (Lewis, Short). *Spectare* meaning "to look at" or "to watch" has found its realisations in modern European languages in the expression "spectacle" for an entertainment show for the mass with a low quality of the performance, but a highly efficient visual performance and visual effects. The culture of spectacles we can trace back from the Roman gladiator games to the modern circus and wrestling performances. Griffiths wrote: "In short, this is a hegemonic-based argument that

posits that the spectacle is an instrument of ideology that via images permits the maintenance of social relations without force. Although the sporting examples taken from antiquity are not from capitalist-based societies, it is clear that they were intended to serve an ideological purpose, which revolved around warfare and gender roles." (Griffiths). According to Stråth, "ideologies can be seen as cognitive structures with legitimizing functions. There is no principled or very clear demarcation between them and other knowledge structures, although there clearly are differences. In the old understanding ideology was seen in terms of some kind of representation. There was something behind the ideology, and the ideology made this 'something' reappear. The erosion of the concept of representation during last decades has concurred with the erosion of the concept of ideology. This is not to say that ideologies have disappeared." (Stråth 23). For Stråth "the language of globalization and the ideas of clashes of civilizations are sufficient evidence of the role of ideologies, in the form of master narratives, with totalizing ambitions or pretensions of being the explanation of the world. However, the analysis of ideologies has become much more complex. Instead of taking ideologies as pre-given they must be critically deconstructed and contextualized. Their emergence must be historicized and their appearance must be understood much more in terms of opposition, discontinuities and contradictions, internally as well as externally, than in terms of cohesion and continuity." (Stråth 23). Freccero mentioned that the visual dominates in a "society of spectacle" (Freccero 100). The spectacle needs order of its elements. Xenophon describes this necessity in *The Economist* (chapter 8): "For instance, what is a chorus?--a band composed of human beings, who dance and sing; but suppose the company proceed to act as each may chance--confusion follows; the spectacle has lost its charm. How different when each and all together act and recite with orderly precision, the limbs and voices keeping time and tune." (Xenophon).

Proudhon wrote in *What Is Property? An Inquiry Into the Principle of Right and of Government?*: "For whom, then, is it intended? For the richer consumer; that is, for only a fraction of society. But when the whole society labors, it produces for the whole society. If, then, only a part of society consumes, sooner or later a part of society will be idle. Now, idleness is death, as well for the laborer as for the proprietor. This conclusion is inevitable. The most distressing spectacle imaginable is the sight of producers resisting and struggling against this mathematical necessity, this power of figures to which their prejudices blind them." (Proudhon). The *spectaculum* is a place from which shows are witnessed, spectator's seat, or place in the theatre. *Spectaculum* derived from the verb *specto* and comprised the basic meanings show, sight, and spectacle. In particular settings, it means a spectacle in the theatre, circus, a public sight or show, a stageplay, or spectacle. Transferred, it is the place whence plays are witnessed, the seats of the spectators, seats, places in the theatre, the amphitheatre. It also is used for a wonder or miracle; so *spectacula septem* are the seven wonders of the world as mentioned by Vitruvius (2, 8, 11). The term *spectacle* refers to an event that is memorable and presented to an audience. The term derived from the verb *spectare* for 'to view' and 'to watch'. According to *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, a spectacle is something exhibited to view as unusual, notable, or entertaining; especially or something (as natural markings on an animal) suggesting a pair of glasses. (*Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*). Kellner stated in *Media Culture and the Triumph of the Spectacle* that "industries have multiplied media spectacles in novelspaces and sites, and spectacle itself is becoming one of the organizing principles of the economy, polity, society, and everyday life. An Internet-based economy has been

developing hi-tech spectacle as a means of promotion, reproduction, and the circulation and selling of commodities, using multi-media and increasingly sophisticated technology to dazzle consumers. Media culture proliferates ever more technologically sophisticated spectacles to seize audiences and augment their power and profit.” (Kellner).

The bread and circus-spectacle type is used for the entertainment of the masses in order to escape from social problems for the masses. It refers to low cultural show events operating in an environment for the masses. The U.S. American Wrestling shows are spectacles in the 21st century. In modern mass media communication entertainment matching popular taste in TV programs or block buster movies designed for the taste of the masses is serving the purpose to entertain the people and keep them comfortable in their function as consumers. The opera as the 17th century *Gesamtkunstwerk* was a spectacle that supported the emperor’s esteem. Today companies support events such as musical spectacles financially or as a partner using it to promote their brands or in order to promote public relations aims. In 1967 in *The Society of the Spectacle* (chapter 1 *The Culmination of Separation*) Guy Debord wrote:

I

In societies dominated by modern conditions of production, life is presented as an immense accumulation of spectacles. Everything that was directly lived has receded into a representation.
(Debord).

Debord wrote about the root of the spectacle:

The root of the spectacle is that oldest of all social specializations, the specialization of power. The spectacle plays the specialized role of speaking in the name of all the other activities. It is hierarchical society’s ambassador to itself, delivering its official messages at a court where no one else is allowed to speak. The most modern aspect of the spectacle is thus also the most archaic. (Debord).

4. Case Study III: The Concept of Mental Vision

Above we have mentioned linguistic examples in different cultures referring to mental vision. In the English language the term *idea* is an example. Pitt wrote: “The notion of a "mental representation" is, arguably, in the first instance a theoretical construct of cognitive science. As such, it is a basic concept of the Computational Theory of Mind, according to which cognitive states and processes are constituted by the occurrence, transformation and storage (in the mind/brain) of information-bearing structures (representations) of one kind or another. (...) Hume 1739/1978) seem to assume that nonconceptual representations — percepts ("impressions"), images ("ideas") and the like — are the only kinds of mental representations, and that the mind represents the world in virtue of being in states that resemble things in it.” (Pitt). According to Thomas, “mental imagery (varieties of which are sometimes colloquially referred to as “visualizing,” “seeing in the mind’s eye,” “hearing in the head,” “imagining the feel of,” etc.) is quasi-perceptual experience; it resembles perceptual experience, but occurs in the absence of the appropriate

external stimuli. It is also generally understood to bear intentionality (i.e., mental images are always images of something or other), and thereby to function as a form of mental representation. Traditionally, visual mental imagery, the most discussed variety, was thought to be caused by the presence of picture-like representations (mental images) in the mind, soul, or brain, but this is no longer universally accepted.” Thomas also mentioned that “the English language supplies quite a range of idiomatic ways of referring to visual mental imagery: ‘visualizing,’ ‘seeing in the mind’s eye,’ ‘having a picture in one’s head,’ ‘picturing,’ ‘having/seeing a mental image/picture,’ and so on. (...) Some, such as Hume (1740), hold that percepts (impressions in his terminology) and images (ideas) do not differ in kind, but only in their causal history and their degree of “vivacity” or vividness. (Thomas). Berkeley wrote in *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision* about ideas: “9. It is evident that when the mind perceives any idea, not immediately and of itself, it must be by the means of some other idea. Thus, for instance, the passions which are in the mind of another are of themselves to me invisible. I may nevertheless perceive them by sight, though not immediately, yet by means of the colours they produce in the countenance. We often see shame or fear in the looks of a man, by perceiving the changes of his countenance to red or pale.” (Berkeley). According to Peirce, a sign is anything which can represent a thing or an idea. In other words: It has a meaning. An index is a sign that is physically connected to its object. A symbol is an arbitrary representation of an object. Peirce wrote 1894 on imagination: “§1. This is a most necessary question, since all reasoning is an interpretation of signs of some kind. But it is also a very difficult question, calling for deep reflection. It is necessary to recognise three different states of mind. First, imagine a person in a dreamy state. Let us suppose he is thinking of nothing but a red colour. Not thinking about it, either, that is, not asking nor answering any questions about it, not even saying to himself that it pleases him, but just contemplating it, as his fancy brings it up. Perhaps, when he gets tired of the red, he will change it to some other colour, – say a turquoise blue, – or a rose-colour; – but if he does so, it will be in the play of fancy without any reason and without any compulsion.” (Peirce. *What Is a Sign?*). A topological concept derived from the human body is the concept of chakras. As a group of imaginary topoi they are located in the body along the disk as matrix. This is a 3-dimensional concept of the body. Here the locations are associated with specific centers of energy for specific human areas. Here colors communicate meanings. Energy can here be both metaphysical and physical energy. Chakras we find mentioned already in the *Vedas*. (Anodea). Chakras are considered loci of life energy or *prana*, called *qi* in Chinese. The disk here is the matrix for the chakras. (Haase). The *Third eye* (*ājñā*) is the highest *chakra* in indigo color that stands for the human activities of direct perception, intuition, imagination, visualization as human enlightenment. It is known that “ajna, ('command' in Sanskrit) is positioned at the eyebrow region and it has two petals, said to represent the psychic channels Ida and Pingala, which meet here with the central Shushumna channel, before rising to the crown chakra, Sahasrara. One the left hand petal is the letter 'ham', and on the right the letter 'ksham', the bija mantras for Shiva and Shakti respectively. It is here that all energies of the body meet up and become one, and meditation on this chakra is said to bring about the dissolution of the individual mind into the cosmic mind. Manas, the subtle mind, is said to be here, and Ajna is considered the chakra of the mind. When something is seen in the mind's eye, or in a dream, it is being 'seen' by Ajna. A developed Ajna is said to bring about extraordinary intuition, and the ability to see the underlying reasons behind everything. Residing in the chakra is the deity Ardhanarishvara a hermaphrodite form of Shiva-Shakti, symbolising the primordial duality of Subject

and Object, and the deity Hakini Shakti is also present in this chakra.” (*Encyclopedia II*). Buddha eyes are depicted on Swayambunath Stupa in Kathmandu. On stupas, Buddhist shrines, in Nepal giant pairs of eyes exist staring out from the four sides of the main tower. They are called ‘Buddha Eyes’ or ‘Wisdom Eyes’ looking out in the four directions to symbolize the omniscience (all-seeing) of a Buddha. Between the Buddha's eyes where the nose would be is a curly symbol that looks like question mark. It is the Nepali character for the number 1 symbolizing unity of all things. (*ReligionFacts*). ‘Buddha eye’ (Japanese *butsu-gen*) is the supreme perceptive faculty possessed by a Buddha. It is “one of the five types of vision. A Buddha is said to perceive the true nature of all things and phenomena, transcending limitations of time and space. The Nirvana Sutra says, "Those who study the teachings of the great vehicle, though they have the eyes of ordinary beings, are said to have the eyes of the Buddha." (*The Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*). The ‘dharma-eye’ not only penetrates the reality of all phenomena but also can discriminate all illusory phenomena. Bodhisattvas who have come to the Enduring Realization of the No-birth of Dharmas ascend to the Eighth Bodhisattva Ground and acquire the pure Dharma-eye, with which they help sentient beings to go through various Dharma Doors according to their natures and preferences (*Buddha Sutras Mantras Sanskrit*). The ‘Five eyes’ include (1) the Physical-eye that a sentient being is born with; (2) the God-eye that can see anything anywhere; (3) the Wisdom-eye that can see emptiness of phenomena; (4) the Dharma-eye that can discriminate all illusory phenomena; and (5) the Buddha-eye of omniscience which includes the preceding four (*Buddha Sutras Mantras Sanskrit*). Locana means "eye" and is a Buddhist goddess, assigned as partner to Vairocana or to Aksobhya. She is white in color, signifying the spirit of peace. Her attribute is the wheel. (Lindemans).

5. Visual Studies and its Theory

Rhetoric and Semiotics

The rhetorical options that visual phenomena offer in order to be effective means of persuasion can be exemplified by the rhetorical figures and terminology that deals exclusively with the transfer from the medium speech/written words to the imitation of the medium visuality in the same media. From the perspective of the rhetorical system, the rhetorical terminology and the functions of the related terms only offer quasi-visual effects in order to persuade with effects of authenticity that are based upon the directness of the visual experience compared to the secondary authority of the written word. The grammaticalisation of language is *per se* a semiotic practice giving meanings to structural elements of the language regardless of their appearance on the surface. These meanings refer to a grammatical system and were relatively constantly handled in the tradition of grammar arising from ancient Greek culture. Especially syntax is here the sub-discipline dealing with the connections of linguistic meanings drawn from rules of their orders in sentences of a specific language. The basic assumption is that any utterance of a language can be divided into several elements with a relatively stable order (syntax). The semiotic approach in this study is referring to the fact that the words we examine are representatives of different levels of visuality as a cultural phenomenon we can examine in linguistic settings. Semiotics comprises sign processes, signification, and communication of signs, and sign systems. Within such signs systems the study of constructed meaning and its

understanding is studied in semiotics. We have reasons to assume that the specific use of a form of visuality contributes to a specific ideology and also is an expression of a specific ideology in the sense of a commonly shared idea of a community we can find linguistically preserved in related texts. We can conclude that the linguistic tradition within the Indo-Germanic languages determinates the use of specific roots connotated with a specific set of meanings. Considering the process of semiosis as a process of linguistic diachronic shifts resulting in new meanings or mind concepts associated with the word, we can say that specific meanings of words have a certain consistency bound to the etymological roots they come from. A completely new set of meanings associated with a word we can call a new set of meanings of a concept or ideology. The users of the words, in most cases speaking not aware of the etymological roots of the specific words, transmit the encoded meanings of the words. Sonesson wrote on visual semiotics: "The feasibility of such a domain as visual semiotics, a speciality purportedly concerned with the investigation of all kinds of meaning conveyed by means of the visual senses, may well be doubted: following one common interpretation, it should be excluded by the structuralist conception according to which form, not substance, is relevant to meaning." (Sonesson). Visuality is received in different in various cultures. We will select several concepts of linguistics of different languages in order to discuss their differences. Based upon the various concepts we can claim that visuality is a highly differentiated concept. We will trace back the concepts behind visuality differentiating between the visual as sensual experience, the metaphysical un-sensual visuality, and visuality as employed in the arts (rhetoric, poetry, visual arts).

Works Cited

"Ajna". *Encyclopedia II*. Experience Festival. May 25, 2009. <http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Ajna_-_Description/id/1282975>.

"Buddha Eye". *The Soka Gakkai Dictionary of Buddhism*. Soka Gakkai International. May 23, 2009. <http://www.sgilibrary.org/search_dict.php?id=201>.

"Buddha Eyes". *ReligionFacts*. May 23, 2009. <http://www.religionfacts.com/buddhism/symbols/buddha_eyes.htm>.

"Eye". Glossary. *Buddha Sutras Mantras Sanskrit*. Sutra Mantras. May 23, 2009. <<http://www.sutrasmantras.info/glossary.html#eye>>.

"Spectacle". *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. May 23, 2009. <<http://dev.m-w.com/dictionary/spectacle>>.

“Vision.” *Samsad Bengali-English Dictionary*. Ed. Sailendra Biswas. 3rd ed. Calcutta, Sahitya Samsad, 2000. DSAL. June 23, 2009. <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/romadict.pl?query=vision&table=biswas-bengali>>.

“Vision”. *Cologne Digital Sanskrit Lexicon*. University Cologne. <<http://webapps.uni-koeln.de/cgi-bin/tamil/recherche>>.

“Vision”. *Cologne Online Tamil Lexicon*. University Cologne. <http://webapps.uni-koeln.de/cgi-bin/tamil/recherche**>.

“Visual Culture - The Visual Turn, Visuality, Historical Emergence Of The Field Of Vision As A Site Of Power And Social Control.” *Science Encyclopedia. The History of Ideas*. Vol 6. June 23, 2009. <<http://science.jrank.org/pages/8145/Visual-Culture.htm>>.

“Visual”. *Collins Essential English Dictionary*. 2nd Edition 2006. The Free Dictionary. June 23, 2009. <<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/visuality>>.

“Visual”. *Collins Essential Thesaurus*. 2nd Edition 2006. The Free Dictionary. June 23, 2009. <<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/visuality>>.

“Visual”. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Fourth Edition 2000. The Free Dictionary. June 23, 2009. <<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/visuality>>.

“Visual”. *WordNet 3.0 Farlex Clipart Collection*. Princeton University. The Free Dictionary. June 23, 2009. <<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/visuality>>.

A Greek-English Lexicon. Ed. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1940. Perseus Project. June 23, 2009. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057&default.scheme=section*&default.type=section>.

A Latin Dictionary. Founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary. revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and Charles Short, LL.D. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1879. Perseus Project. June 23, 2009. <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0059>>.

A Practical Hindi-English Dictionary. Ed. Mahendra Caturvedi. Delhi: National Publishing House, 1970. DSAL. June 23, 2009. <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/caturvedi/>>.

- Anodea, Judith. "The System of Chakras". Llewellyn Encyclopedia. October 20, 2007. <[Http://www.llewellynencyclopedia.com/article.php?id=249](http://www.llewellynencyclopedia.com/article.php?id=249)>.
- Armstrong, David F. "The Gestural Theory of Language Origins." *Sign Language Studies* 8, 3 (2008): 289-314
- Berkeley, George. *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision* (4th ed. 1732). June 23, 2009. Classics of Psychology. York University. June 23, 2009. <<http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Berkeley/vision.htm>>.
- Boye, Kasper; Harder, Peter. "Encoded Secondariness: A Usage-based Theory of Grammaticalization and Grammatical Status." Abstract of Paper for: International Cognitive Linguistics Conference 11. Berkeley, California. July 28, 2009 – August 3, 2009. University of California, Berkeley. March 23, 2009. <<http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~iclc/pdfs/a230.pdf>>.
- Burke, Edmund. *On the Sublime and Beautiful*. The Harvard Classics. 1909–14. Bartleby. June 23, 2009. <<http://www.bartleby.com/24/2/409.html>>.
- Caturvedi, Mahendra. *A Practical Hindi-English Dictionary*. Delhi: National Publishing House, 1970. DSAL. June 23, 2009. <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/caturvedi/>>.
- Charlton T. Lewis; Short, Charles. *A Latin Dictionary*. Perseus Project. Tufts University. May 23, 2009. <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/morph.jsp?l=spectaculum&la=la#lexicon>>.
- Debord, Guy. *The Society of the Spectacle*. Wikisource. May 23, 2009. <http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Society_of_the_Spectacle/Chapter_1>.
- Freccero, Carla. *Popular Culture: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Game, Ann; Metcalfe, Andrew. "The Significance of Signs." *Social Semiotics* 18.4 (2009): 493-502
- Griffiths, Richard. "In Your House: Wrestling as Televised Spectacle". Lecture Wednesday April 3rd, 2002. Sociology 331. Visual Culture. Semester 1 2002. University of Auckland. March 23, 2009. <<http://www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/online/sociol331/lec0304.htm>>.
- Haase, Fee-Alexandra. "States of the Common and the Unique." An Introduction to a General Functional Communication Theory. In: SSRN. Social Science Research Network Abstract Journal. PRN Philosophy Subject Matter Journals. Continental Philosophy. Structuralism, Post-Structuralism, Deconstruction. CMBO. March 10, 2008. <<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1100062>>.

Holtorf, Cornelius. "Cultural Memory". University of Toronto. Research Repository. June 23, 2009.
<<https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/citd/holtorf/2.0.html>>.

Kellner, Douglas. "Media Culture and the Triumph of the Spectacle". Website Douglas Kellner. University of California Los Angeles. May 23, 2009.
<<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/mediaculturetriumphspectacle.pdf>>.

Kjeldsen, Jens E. "Talking to the Eye: Visuality in Ancient Rhetoric." *Word & Image* 19.3 (2003):133

Lepore, Ernest; Ludwig, Kirk. "Ontology in the Theory of Meaning". *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 14.3: 325–335

Lewis, Charlton T.; Short, Charles. *A Latin Dictionary*. Tufts University. Perseus Project. May 23, 2009.
<<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text.jsp?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0059%3Aalphabetic+letter%3D%3Aentry+group%3D57%3Aentry%3Dspe%5Eci%5Eo>>.

Lindemans, Micha F. "Locana". *Encyclopedia Mythica*. June 23, 2009.
<<http://www.pantheon.org/articles/l/locana.html>>.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. "On Visuality." *Journal of Visual Culture* 5.1 (2006): 53-79

Natharius, David. "The More We Know, the More We See: The Role of Visuality in Media Literacy." *American Behavioral Scientist* 48.2 (2004): 238-247

Peirce, Charles Sanders. *What Is a Sign?* Philosophy Archive. Marxist Archive. June 23, 2009.
<<http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/peirce1.htm>>.

Pitt, David. "Mental Representation." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. June 23, 2009.
<<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mental-representation/>>.

Platts, John T. *A Dictionary of Urdu, Classical Hindi, and English*. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1884. DSAL. June 23, 2009. <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/platts/>>.

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph. *What Is Property? An Inquiry Into the Principle of Right and of Government?* Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library. May 23, 2009.
<<http://etext.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/ProProp.html>>.

Saunders, Barbara. "The Trajectory of Color." *Perspectives on Science* 10, 3 (2002): 302-355

Sepher Yetzirah. Tr. Wm. Wynn Westcott. Mind. June 23, 2008.

<<http://wolf.mind.net/library/ancient/qabala/sephir.htm>>.

Sonesson, Göran. "Visual Semiotics". Department of Semiotics. The Internet Semiotics Encyclopedia. Lund University. June 23, 2009. <http://filserver.arthist.lu.se/kultsem/encyclo/visual_semiotics.html>.

Steingass, Francis Joseph. *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1892.

DSAL. June 23, 2009. <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/steingass/>>.

Stråth, Bo1. "Ideology and History." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11.1 (2006): 23-42

The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary. Pali Text Society, London. DSAL. June 23, 2009.

<<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/pali/>>.

Thomas of Aquin. *Summa contra Gentiles*. Corpus Thomisticum. June 23, 2009.

<<http://www.corpusthomicum.org/scg1001.html>>.

Thomas, Nigel J.T. "Mental Imagery". *Stanfords Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. June 15, 2009.

<<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mental-imagery/>>.

Van Oort, Richard. "Cognitive Science and the Problem of Representation." *Poetics Today* 24.2 (2003): 237-295

Xenophon. *The Economist*. Tr. Henry Graham Dakyns. University Adelaide. May 23, 2009.

<<http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/x/xenophon/x5oe/chapter8.html>>.