

Lana Skender⁹²

THE SPECTATOR PHENOMENON AND THE POWER OF THE GAZE⁹³

Scientific paper
<https://doi.org/10.59014/GONK4945>

Abstract

This paper explores the relevant knowledge in philosophy, psychology, art theory, and visual culture dealing with the phenomenon of the spectator. Spectatorship is explored through complex relationships between authors, works, observers, and the environment, which condition the view and consider how social and cultural patterns mediate the image. In this approach, interest is no longer primarily focused on the visual object but on visibility, a complex set of conditions in which a work of art is created, observed, and interpreted, researching the history of the gaze theory: perception and its physiological and cultural conditioning, the implicitness of the observer in the aesthetics of the reception, psychoanalytic theories about the constitution of the subject with a gaze, feminist ideas of voyeurism, and the male gaze, theories on technological and cultural conditioning of the scopic regimes, the cultural history of gaze and the gaze politics that approach viewing as possession of power. An analysis of the theory shows that the role of the body as a perceiving mechanism is present in the naturalistic approach to observation but is avoided due to its subjectivity and relativity. Although it was created in the 1960s, the theory of gaze has roots in the hermeneutics of art history and the aesthetics of reception. The cultural determination of gaze, its dependence on social norms, and the technological conditions of the medium indicate that our view of art and the visual world has been learned, which opens spaces for the acceptance of other gazes that are equally valuable.

Keywords: observer, spectatorship, theory of gaze, relativistic perception, scopic regimes

92 Academy of Arts and Culture in Osijek, lanaskndr@gmail.com

93 The paper was based on the chapter of Lana Skender's doctoral thesis *Visual Culture as a new paradigm of teaching visual art* (2021), the University of Josip Juraj Strossmayer in Osijek

Introduction

The spectator phenomenon is closely related to the concept of visuality, which German art historian Suzan von Falkenhausen (2020, 11) describes as a socio-political discourse because the relationships of human life in societies and cultures are visibly described. The paper will highlight different attitudes towards visuality, the real action that takes place when looking at works of art, and the world around us, from the points of view of art history and visual studies.

Any reception between the object, spectator, and artist begins with analytical observation. Expanding the visual field can include historical and cultural factors relating to the history of academic discourse that influences the spectator, artist, and backward-looking works of art (Falkenhausen, 2020, 183). The meanings of images are formed in the process of observation, but are dependent on the social environment, client requirements, and the determinants of the spectator's perception. Falkenhausen (2020, 16) points out several opposites established between the object and the subject in historical art texts: cultural versus empirical, interpretative versus scientific, and historical versus biological. This takes us to visuality, the main interest of visual studies, which is directed to the subject, and not the object of observation (Purgar, 2009, Falkenhausen, 2020).

The interest in the spectator phenomenon lies in the relativity of observers' perception and is incorporated in the theory of gaze, which approaches perception from a relativistic point of view. The relativistic approach to perception starts from the idea that no look is innocent and objective but is always saturated and determined by the internal and external conditions of perception. Inner determinants can include previous knowledge, belief, and customs, but also subconscious desires that, according to the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan (1986), are realized mostly through looking. External determinants of perception act as the framework through which we look and are determined by cultural patterns of observation and representation.

Interpretation was found to be but subjective and dependent on the body as a perception mechanism, rather than accurate. Spectatorship is explored through complex relationships between authors, works, observers, and the environment, considering how social and cultural patterns mediate the

image. In this approach, interest is no longer primarily focused on the visual object but on *visuality*, a complex set of conditions in which a work of art is created, observed, and interpreted.

American art historian Michael Ann Holly (2005, 345) points out that every question of looking is a political issue because the spectator possesses the power, just as the power is necessary to make someone watch. This subjective and relativistic approach emerges from semiotics because the primary goal of semiotic analysis of visual art is not to produce interpretations but to explore the understanding of art and the processes by which spectators create the meaning (Bal & Brayson, 2005, 86).

In line with the above, the author has formulated three research questions:

1. What are the relevant insights in the field of philosophy, psychology, art theory, and visual culture that deal with the phenomenon of the spectator?
2. How are theories of art history and visual culture set according to the role of the spectator in reading a work of art?
3. Is it a question of observing a cultural or empirical character, and how are relations between the two opposite poles established in the theory?

The implicit spectator in the aesthetics of the reception

The importance of spectatorship in art history hermeneutics is affirmed in the reception theory. The most crucial starting point of the aesthetics of reception is that the spectator's function is provided in the work of art (Kemp, 2007). According to German art historian Kemp (2007, 229), the aesthetics of the reception have three tasks: to know the signs and means by which communication between the work of art and the spectator is realized, and to interpret their socio-historical and real aesthetic message.

Interest is focused on the communication process between the spectator and the work of art, including visual coding and decoding skills and techniques of transmission. Kemp (2007) emphasizes a dual approach to reading the work of art, which relies on the external conditions of the appearance according to social conditions of interpretation, and internal states of appearance that depend on the visual characteristics of the form and aesthetic experiences based on observation. He recognizes that the timing of observation and the environment it takes place in define the framework

of observation by spectators. It emphasizes the duality of the nature of the reception, which we can associate with naturalistic and relativistic theories of perception. It tries to connect these two phenomena to the integrity of the experience by separating them into external conditions of approach that we can identify using the cultural framework and the internal determinants of perception that we can identify with literal observation.

Kemp points out the importance of the historical conditions of observation and the present moment in which it occurs, emphasizing that the interaction between the work of art and the spectator can never occur on its own, isolated from the cultural and psychological conditions in which the observation takes place (Kemp, 2007). Kemp also reflects on the inability to reduce reception to universal observation, because the contexts in which it is observed constantly change. The reception situation is always open, because old connections remain even when the context of the original environment is lost (Kemp, 2007, 231). He emphasizes the importance of the original context, traced within its visual and representational characteristics.

Austrian art historian Otto Pächt (1999) acknowledges the openness of artwork to multiple interpretations characteristic of polysemic structures. In his descriptions of observation, he uses metaphoric syntagms like *taking an eye* and raising awareness of the observer's gaze and the importance of his presence (Pächt, 1999, 87). Just like Kemp, he emphasizes the importance of liberation from the isolation of formal analysis and seeks methodological ways of organically fitting into a particular historical context without relying on artistic genius and autonomy of the form (Pächt, 1999, 62). In this concept, the object is no longer the main interest of research, like in traditional art history hermeneutics. Still, the ways of seeing come from the subject and the historical context in which the viewing occurs. Such approaches will start the theory of visual culture or visual studies, which will affirm the extreme role of the subject in the reception of art.

The role of the spectator in the naturalistic and relativistic approach to perception

Each interpretation begins with an observation guided by the genetic predispositions of a species but is subjectively shaped by personal life

experiences and the context in which the observation takes place. While looking is an intuitive, reflexive act that actively engages human physiology and psychology, seeing is dependent of the subject's cultural environment and individual predispositions and occurs in the sphere of cognition. Giving meaning to what we look at depends partly on the visual characteristics of the phenomenon. Still, it mostly depends on the cultural conditions of the observation, as well as on the spectator's attitudes. The first theories about perception in the 1950s relied on gestalt psychology, which approached perception as a natural process guided by genetic predispositions. In such a naturalistic approach to perception, two actions are clearly distinguished: looking as a biological-psychological action and seeing as a sociological-cultural action.

The naturalistic approach deals only with looking, although modern relativistic theories about perception have found that the boundaries between looking and seeing are hardly identifiable. Visual observation is crucial to experiencing a work of art with a natural approach. It is closely related to Ruskin's idea of the innocent eye, and its origins can be found in the theories of psychologists Rudolf Arnheim, James J. Gibson, and Richard Gregory. However, they partly opened the door for relativistic interpretations. According to Gestalt Psychology, parts are not treated as separate and isolated entities but are grouped into units (gestalt) by the rules called principles or laws of perceptual grouping. The theory of gestalt, in addition to psychoanalysis, has been proven by visual observation. Each part is inextricably linked to other parts and cannot be understood outside the context of the whole. Arnheim (1985b) disagreed with the idea that perception and thinking were separate actions, believing that the thinking process was integrated into observation on an unconscious level. However, perception abilities can be improved by learning. The mental image of an object is not identical to the object we perceive. In receiving stimuli from the eye to the brain, the viewed shape changes its appearance and becomes geometrically simplified (Arnheim, 1985a). In the process of perception, the cognition of the whole will always prevail over awareness of details.

James Gibson advocated a theory known as an environmental approach to perception. He believed that direct perception is how we receive information by reflecting light in a particular environment. Gibson's (1950) contribution to perception also consists of the stratification of two levels of perception, the schematic and the literal level, which appear in parallel

during the perceptual process. Schematic perception is an observation of valuable and significant things on which we usually focus our attention, like objects, people, places, and written symbols, and literal perception is an observation of the natural or spatial world which we experience by observing surfaces and colors and spatial relationships (Gibson, 1950, 8-10). While literal perception is the foundation for our experiences of the world, schematic perception is necessary to understand the world in which we live. Schematic perception often appears first by spotting the elements of narrative forms, while literal perception must be awakened by raised attention. In observing the artwork, these two types of observations produce different aesthetic experiences that have grown from opposite sensibilities (Tokić, 2016, 19).

Perception, therefore, requires something more than what is presented in Gibson's ecological approach. Perception and intelligence have traditionally been separated in philosophy and science, but the boundary between them has recently been erased. One of the more recent ideas, which defies traditional opinion, is that perception requires intelligent, knowledge-based problem-solving (Gregory, 1997, 1121). Gregory developed a paradigm of active perception in which observation is not only what a person currently sees but also the knowledge they had accumulated in the past. He approached perception as a constructive process, in which knowledge is necessary because the senses convert stimuli into signals using known codes (Gregory 1997, 1122).

These three theoretical approaches to perception, gestalt, constructivism, and ecological perception, have biological grounds, although they also consider the individual construction of observations. They rely on visual experiences during looking and the visual characteristics of the observed form, making all three approaches naturalistic.

The relativistic approach to perception starts from criticism of the naturalistic approach, but it also takes on some characteristics of Arnheim's active perception and Gibson's stratification of perception. While the natural approach relied on the myth of the innocent eye and the development of literal observation, the relativistic approach will be directed at the schematic observation and social construction of ever-changing visions. It focuses on reading pictorial narratives that are historically, geographically, and culturally conditioned and changeable. The development of a

relativistic approach was strongly influenced by the philosophy of Maurice Merleau-Ponty and his theories about the phenomenology of perception. He believed that perception could not only be a strictly defined relationship between the subject, who is outside of the world, and the object inside the world, but must encompass both the subject and the object. According to Merleau-Ponty (1978, 47), perception is a physical rather than a psychological phenomenon, regarding the body both as an object and as a subject.

Austrian-British art historian Ernst Gombrich (1960) considered the relativistic approach especially important because the first theorists interpreted seeing not only as the mechanical action of the eye, but also as an action conditioned by the spectator's foreknowledge and beliefs. Similarly, American art critic Hal Foster (1987) believes that vision is a social act conditioned by a cultural environment and cannot be reduced only to mechanical observation. According to this approach, perception is predetermined by the cultural conditions of visibility and is grounded in the gaze theory. The gestalt theory and the literal perception is more appropriate for reading the visual form, while reading the narrative form, grounded in the schematic perception, is more suited to the relativistic theory of perception, since it considers the conditions of their interpretation in different spatial and temporal constraints, exploring the relationships between the subject's eye, gaze, and vision. Sturken and Cartwright (2001, 31) introduce the phrase *practices of looking* and suggest that looking is not an individual act but is conditioned as any practice by protocol and patterns. They explore the role of the spectator and his gaze in social practices.

The theory of gaze has become a new paradigm for studying perception in the modern multidisciplinary theory of visual studies. According to this theory, the idea is determined externally by the cultural and technological conditions of vision and serves to discipline and construct the subject. This problem mainly arises from psychoanalytic theory, which is a different way of approaching the subconscious from Freud.

Psychoanalytic theory of the subject's construction

The psychoanalytic theory focuses on the processes by which the spectator creates meanings, considering the pleasure we feel about images, which

serve as bonds between our cravings and the natural world. It was most strongly reflected in the research of the audience in film production, from which feminist film criticism developed and established the theory of the male gaze. Croatian art historian Ljiljana Kolešnik (2004, 23) points out that the feminist theory of film developed a theory of gaze that includes: the nature of visuality, differentiation of the way of looking, and the specificity of the subject's identity.

A special significance is attributed to British feminist film theorist Laura Mulvey (1975), who affirmed the concept of the subject's gaze, and first proposed the theoretical approaches to seeing it as a manipulative act. The fundamental interest of Hollywood film production is to satisfy male heterosexual pleasure and power by enjoying the craving look (scopophilia) (Harris, 137). However, she proved the theory on a particular sample of Hollywood *noir* films from the 1920s to the 1950s. Mulvey formulated several ideological reviews from these narratives because commercial films depict ideological patterns in which a woman is portrayed as an object of sexual lust. By emphasizing the male gaze, according to which the world is organized, and therefore art as well, it raises awareness of the possibility of existence of the other, female gaze, and the widespread presence of different interpretive positions.

Practices of looking relate to Jacques Lacan's idea of how people develop their personalities. This author gave great importance to the visual sense and pointed out the formation of the subject as a mirror. Lacan (1986) approached the man as a subject, not an individual, constructed through unconsciousness, language, and lust. People are perceived as individuals even though social structures give them their identities. Lacan (1986, 90) argues that the subject's look is not unencumbered and free but is determined from the outside. He calls it the *preexistence of the eye*, a vision function expressed by the screen. The idea of a screen that defines the look will appear in Norman Bryson (1983, 91), who believes that blind spots and screens cast a shadow between retinal observation and the outside world. He approaches seeing as a practice established in the name of something else, and examines relationships between the seeing subject, social structures, and power relations. Bryson (1983, 94) distinguishes between two types of looking that appear during observations: the gaze (passive directional look, staring) and glance (random, temporal). Glance is an active look, guided by the traces of a process (during the line and brush strokes)

that draw the observer into the temporality of the work's emergence. At the same time, Bryson connects glance with the painting of the East, and the gaze originates from the oculo-centric image of the West based on mimesis and the construction of reality from one point, which is why such a look is static and fixed. Bryson (1983) points out that the gaze indicates much more than the act of looking; it suggests a violently determined and constantly repeated show. The gaze denotes satisfying personal desires by craving staring. The modern theory of the film does not denote the action of looking itself but the vision of relationships characteristic of a particular social environment.

Bryson (1983, 10) highlights the five disadvantages of the naturalistic approach; neglect of the historical dimension, dualism (separation of schematic and literal observations, separation of form and content), the centrality of perception (an oculo-centric vision of the Western European world), style as a limitation, a model of communication (between author and observer that excludes cultural influence). He sees painting as art that signifies something beyond the image that structuralist explanations cannot understand.

The main problem in the approach to painting is the attitude that image belongs to the domain of perception and that the painter who misperceives the world will not be able to meet the criteria of the essential copy (Bryson, 1983, 6). Different cultures create completely different scopic regimes reflected in the ways of creating, experiencing, and representing works of art. It compares temporal Chinese painting to Western painting, guided by the gaze according to the body's activity and the temporality between process and looking. According to Bryson (1983), Western painting renounces the body in two ways, by denying the body of the author visible through the process and by the body of the spectator who reveals the process with a glance. The image always shows the past tense and is painted with techniques that require time-consuming and layered work in which traces of the process will disappear. Unlike European painters, Chinese painters use a painting technique with a spot of ink and brush that does not tolerate error and fixing. Bryson (1983, 89) points out that such a union of bodies and processes, in which the eye of the spectator consistently monitors the brush strokes that build the form, can only be found in performance arts. While in Chinese painting, the background and idea

complement each other and permeate each other, in Western painting, the beginning of painting is the act of hiding the substrate.

Awareness of the cultural variable of the seeing, imposed as natural during observations, is essential for understanding how we create meanings about works of art and a broader range of visual phenomena. Exploring how culture shapes perception and vision can significantly improve the understanding of art and encourage multicultural approaches to teaching. The goal, in addition to raising awareness of diversity, is to promote critical reflection on the possibility of the existence of several different views.

Scopic regimes – the influence of technology and culture on changes in visuality

Some philosophers and art historians listed below have clarified the link between the culture in which observation arises, the technological development of optical aids, and the representation of images. American philosopher Martin Jay (1993, 10) believes that observation occurs within the framework of the scopic regime, the cultural variable of the visual experience, because the ways of seeing are constructed, and the visible world is a social fact. Some cultures, such as European culture, are dominated by a vision based on oculo-centric practices. Throughout history, various aids and tools have been developed to serve as an extension of the eye. Like the other authors listed, Jay explores the influences of various optical aids on the dominant practice of looking, such as camera obscura, stereoscope, telescope, microscope, and cinema. Jay (1993) argues that such practices in Western culture are associated with the conduct of surveillance and spectacle. For Jay, the observation is not only an intuitive action interpreted by the gestalt approach but also involves spotting the cultural rules of different scopic regimes. The cultural variability of visual experience can be considered from different perspectives since not all cultures, periods, and styles have a scopic regime equivalent to the Western one.

According to Jay (1993, 12), optical regimes also have a history, which has been reflected through different practices of established gazes. The introduction of the third spiritual eye, as a corrective that compensates for the shortcomings of binocular vision, is characteristic of religious societies. The aspiration to decentration the monocular subject was achieved

by demolishing the dominant ocular ways of seeing, especially in Hans Holbein's painting *Ambassadors*, combining two visual views in one flat space (Jay, 1993). At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, modern art was characterized as non-visual because it was viewed by the dominant ocular regimes, which was considered a universal rule (Jay, 1993). Jay emphasizes that visual culture has changed in the art of modernism because artists have focused on alternative approaches that explore the non-corporeal and cultural character of visions.

Art critic Jonathan Crary argued that the new image production technology affects primary social processes because they run according to dominant visualization models. In particular, he looks back at the art of the 19th century, during which inventions and scientific discoveries created a new breed of the spectator. He sees the difference between the heterogeneous modern vision regimes and the homogeneous Renaissance (Crary, 1992, 2). Heterogeneity is manifested in the fact that most of the historically essential functions of the human eye are replaced by a practice in which visual images no longer have anything to do with the spectator's position in the real world. Vision problems become problems of the body and processes of social power (Crary, 1992, 2). It singled out two models of vision in the 19th century, one that breaks with mimetic representation and perspective space, and another that, driven by photography, develops to perfection a realistic Renaissance ideal (Crary, 1992, 3). He approaches artistic design in history as an indicator of the historical mutation of visibility, expressing interest in the spectator's phenomenon, which he sees as the seeing subject determined by a set of procedures, institutions, and techniques of subjectification. He believed that the transformation of observers in the 19th century was defined by social practices and discourses of knowledge, but also by the roles of different devices such as camera obscura and stereoscope (Crary, 1992, 5).

German philosopher Walter Benjamin also deals with the technical reproduction of art and its influence on the reception of art. He attaches great importance to the invention of photography because it is the first time in history that the eye and lens have replaced the artist's manual work. Benjamin (2006, 23) states that the technical reproduction of a work of art devalues its "here and now." One of Benjamin's fundamental preoccupations is that in the era of technical reproduction, the work of art is losing the aura of authenticity and originality. He believed that human

sensory perception was not conditioned only biologically, but also historically. Benjamin (2006, 24) thinks that technical reproduction caused the work of art to change its function, which is why it is now based on politics instead of ritual. The problems highlighted by Benjamin explore the relationship between vision and visuality and the complex conditions in which viewing occurs.

One of the authors, who approached vision as a complex cultural phenomenon by problematizing the relationship between vision and visuality, is the English art critic John Berger. He emphasizes visual dominance in communication in the modern world, and deals with how we see the world influenced by knowledge and belief. He felt that vision plays a vital role in understanding the world and social relations because it comes before words (Berger, 2009, 7). Berger felt that today we see images differently than ever before, which can be considered explicitly from a perspective. The geometric perspective structures the representation according to the spectator's eyes, so we perceive the image of space as a reality (Berger, 2009). Due to the reciprocal nature of the images, the image could restore the look but also make us aware that we are looked at because the look of others is combined with our look, and we become aware that we are a part of the visual world (Berger, 2009, 9). He also sees the reasons for the change in visions in the fact that the images are no longer related to the space in which they were created because television simultaneously brought images to various places, which changed their meanings (Berger, 2009, 19). He pointed out that images arise in a specific time but can outlive what they represent because the purpose of images is not something closely related to the image itself but can be transmitted or changed (Berger, 2009). Although each image already has a built-in visual mode addressed by the spectator, each spectator also has its vision modes that necessarily change the source codes, especially if there is a significant time distance between the creation of the object and the moment of looking. The technical reproductive nature of the image allowed all images to become timeless as the time distance between the creation and looking of the image closed (Berger, 2009). He believed that certain social relations are already pre-embedded in the image. This technique and representation can only be the means of such relationships because by purchasing the image, we also buy the relationships embedded in it, so the relationship

between seeing and owning the image is one of the essential aspects of understanding.

German art historian Hans Belting tackles the problem of the cultural history of seeing and the invention of perspective as the essential basis for creating the Western gaze. The relationship between Eastern and Western cultures is considered through the aspects of the Eastern and Western gazes and influences circulating through the permeable membranes of the two cultures (Belting, 2010). He does not see the problem of perspective solely in the context of art. Still, he considers its origin from the medieval Alhazen optical tract to applying geometric perspective in modern painting. Belting (2010, 10) suggests that perspective is a cultural technique that influenced changes in the visual culture of the new age. He believes that perspective is a fundamental discovery because incorporating an eye into the image has also contributed to the awareness of the subject of seeing. The subject is equally embodied in the author and the spectator because the primary measure of the images is the spectator's gaze, which summarizes the space into a single point. In the Renaissance, painters and architects found a way to resolve the conflict between abstract obviousness and the actual body, a matter of indefiniteness that shows the spectator's symbolic place (Belting, 2010, 17). He disagrees with the idea that perception is biologically determined and innate, because he believes that each culture subjugates the natural perception to social norms, which is why the look is historically and culturally conditioned. He believes that Western new-age images look back at us as a reflection of anthropocentric thinking and the inner eye in different ways (Belting, 2010, 23). The subject is present when the image shows a view that the spectator considers his own. Belting describes a new culture of perspective imagery through metaphors of windows and horizons. A real or painted window symbolizes the subject's point of view, who looks at the world through the window, and the horizon represents the boundary of the look. When he says that the Western gaze has been rehearsed in his history, he means that collective norms of views are written into it that can be historically explained because, in every society, it is collectively practiced even though everyone perceives it as their own (Belting, 2010, 267).

Conclusion

Although the interest in the spectator phenomenon, considering the spectator's role in the reception of the visual, emerges with the gaze theory in the 1980s, we can trace it to earlier philosophy, psychology, and art history theory. Lacan's ideas about the role of vision in the subject construction and Merleau-Ponty's role of the body in the cognition of the object are among significant philosophical insights that influenced the gaze theory. Psychology has contributed naturalistic theories to observations that approach perception as a physical-psychological action, in which the primary influence has predispositions of the body. The power of subjectivity is also recognized. Under the influence of Lacan's and Merleau-Ponty's philosophy, a relativistic approach to perception emerges, approaching vision as a socio-cultural action. Art history hermeneutics considers the spectator's role within the reception theory, represented in Kemp's view of implicit spectator and open interpretation in Pächt's polysemic approach. The theory of visual culture radically develops an interest in the spectator and focuses almost exclusively on the spectator's observational point of view. Art history theory considers the relationships between the observer and the work of art, mainly dealing with the research of the original context and the author's intention. While acknowledging the openness of the interpretive process, it mostly turns to objective insights about perception. At the same time, visual culture/visual studies explore the relativity of observations and how the environment or context influences the patterns of the observer's gaze. The issue of image observation has both cultural and empirical foundations because looking is biological, and seeing is a social process. Authors listed in the text mainly deal with one aspect or another, and never the interrelationship between these two aspects of observations. The power of the gaze is closely related to the spectator phenomenon, because the gaze is conditioned by the cultural context and the individual subject's predispositions.

Literature

- Arnheim, R. (1985a). *Umetnost i vizuelno opažanje: psihologija stvaralačkog gledanja*. Beograd: Univerzitet umetnosti
- Arnheim, R. (1985b). *Vizuelno mišljenje: jedinstvo slike i pojma*. Translation: Vojin Stojić. Beograd: Univerzitet umetnosti.
- Bal, M. & Bryson, N. (2005). Semiotika i povijest umjetnosti. In: Ljiljana Kolečnik (ed.), *Umjetničko djelo kao društvena činjenica: perspektive kritičke povijesti umjetnosti* (pp. 51-104). Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti.
- Belting, H. (2010). *Firenca i Bagdad: zapadno-istočna povijest pogleda*. Translation: Nataša Medved. Zaprešić: Fraktura.
- Benjamin, W. (2006). Umjetničko djelo u razdoblju tehničke reprodukcije. *Život umjetnosti*, 78/79 (2), 22- 32. Retrieved from <https://hrcak.srce.hr/265297>. Accessed March 17, 2022
- Berger, J. (2009). *Ways of Seeing*. London: Penguin.
- Bryson, N. (1983). *The Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Crary, J. (1992). *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: MIT Press.
- Von Falkenhausen, S. (2020). *Beyond the Mirror: Seeing in Art History and Visual Culture Studies*, Verlage: Bielefeld. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839453520>
- Gibson, J. (1950). *The Perception of the Visual World*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gombrich, E. H. (1984), (1st edition 1960). *Umetnost i iluzija: psihologija slikovnog predstavljanja*. Beograd: Nolit: Beograd.
- Gregory, R. (1997). Knowledge in Perception and Illusions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 352(1358), 1121-7. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1997.0095>
- Foster, H. (1987). Preface, In: Hal Foster (ed.), *Discussions in Contemporary Culture* (IX-XIV), Seattle: Bay Press, The Art Foundation.
- Harris, J. (2001). *The New Art History: A Critical Introduction*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Holly, M. A. (2005). Gledanje prošlosti. In: Ljiljana Kolečnik (ed.), *Umjetničko djelo kao društvena činjenica: perspektive kritičke povijesti umjetnosti* (pp. 313-349), Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti.
- Jay, M. (1993). *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-century French Thought*. University of California Press.

- Kemp, W. (2007). Umjetničko djelo i promatrač: pristup estetike recepcije. In: Hans Belting, Heinrich Dilly, Wolfgang Kemp, Wilibald Sauerlander, Martin Warnke (ed.), *Uvod u povijest umjetnosti* (pp. 227-245), Zagreb: Fraktura.
- Kolešnik, Lj. (2004). Utjecaj kulturalnih teorija na povijest umjetnosti kao znanstvenu disciplinu, In: Milan Pelc (ed.), *Zbornik 1. kongresa hrvatskih povjesničara umjetnosti* (pp. 321-327), Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti.
- Lacan, J. (1986). *Četiri osnovna pojma psihoanalize*. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1978). *Fenomenologija percepcije*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša – Svjetlost.
- Pächt, O. (1999). *The Practice of Art History: Reflections on Method*. Translation: David Britt. London.
- Purgar, K. (2009). Uvod u vizualne studije. In: Krešimir Purgar (ed.), *Vizualni studiji: umjetnost i mediji u doba slikovnog obrata* (pp. VII-XXIX). Zagreb: Centar za vizualne studije.
- Sturken, M. & Cartwright, L. (2001). *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tokić, M. (2016). Metodika Jadranke Damjanov – osviještavanje doslovnog vida osjetilnog opažanja. *Metodički ogledi* 23, 1, 7-25.

FENOMEN PROMATRAČA I MOĆ POGLEDA

Sažetak

Cilj rada je istražiti relevantne spoznaje u području filozofije, psihologije, teorije umjetnosti i vizualne kulture koje se bave fenomenom promatrača. Gledateljstvo se istražuje kroz kompleksne odnose između autora, djela, promatrača i okoline, koji uvjetuju pogled te se razmatraju načini na koje se slikom posreduju društveni i kulturološki obrasci. U ovakvom pristupu interes više nije primarno usmjeren na vizualni objekt, nego na vizualnost, kompleksan sklop uvjeta u kojima se stvara, promatra i interpretira umjetničko djelo. Pri istraživanju povijesti relativističkog pristupa percepciji u obzir se uzimaju: percepcija i njena fiziološka i kulturološka uvjetovanost, implicitnost promatrača u estetici recepcije, psihoanalitičke teorije o konstituiranju subjekta pogledom, feminističke teorije voajerizma i muškog pogleda, teorije o tehnološkoj i kulturološkoj uvjetovanosti skopičkih režima, kulturalna povijest pogleda te politika pogleda koja gledanju pristupa kao posjedovanju moći. Analiza teorije pokazuje da je uloga tijela kao mehanizma koji opaža prisutna još u naturalističkom pristupu opažanju, ali je izbjegavana zbog svoje subjektivnosti i relativnosti. Teorija pogleda, iako nastaje šezdesetih godina 20. stoljeća, svoje korijene vuče iz hermeneutike povijesti umjetnosti i estetike recepcije koja se afirmirala u književnosti. Kulturološka određenost pogleda, njegova ovisnost o društvenim normama i tehnološkim uvjetima medija, pokazuje da je naše viđenje umjetnosti i vizualnog svijeta naučeno što otvara prostore prihvaćanju i drugih pogleda kao jednako vrijednih.

Ključne riječi: gledateljstvo, promatrač, relativistička percepcija, skopički režimi, teorija pogleda