

**The body** of the embodied body

Cho Hyunjung, Ädellab / Metallformgivning

Konstfack University College of Arts, Crafts and Design

Master Thesis Spring 2011, Tutor: Aurél Schiller

Date of examination: 14, 15 April 2011

## **Abstract**

### The body of the embodied body

By questioning the feeling of uneasiness coming from seeing the real body, I aim to cast a light upon the relation between the body and the objects that are displayed on it. Starting with a doubt that the object would not only change the surface of human, I investigate how the body of human totally embodies its representational object to itself.

Areas of interest – Sociology, Philosophy

Key words – Body, Distinction, Representation, Merleau-Ponty, Cloth, Jewellery, Cultural objects, Embodiment

## **Index**

**1**\_Introduction

**3**\_Body is subjectivity in itself

**8**\_Visual representation as the second body

**13**\_We embody our representation

**19**\_Conclusion

**21**\_Bibliography

## Introduction

When one sees the other, he or she will try to find more from how this person looks. One might then start to wonder about what kind of person she or he can be from what is displayed on her or his body. Like playing in theater, people become what they display on their body within their society. Though not as significant as a king's crown or bishop's hat, clothes and jewelry that are meant to be displayed on the body have certain cultural meanings that give distinction to the wearer. They are visually representing the wearer's personality, by creating the wholeness of the wearer's appearance. Man needs visual representations of himself to be distinguished as a unique being. Adorning the body is a unique human behavior that cannot be found from other animals. Apart from complementing the lack of hair or softer skin, man wants to show his body with a layer of image which comes in individual differences. Can that mean we want to be distinguished as a unique being in the whole universe - from other men, from the nature? Is the bare body an obstacle for distinction? Man is also a being of nature whose subjectivity exists within his own body. What he experiences and learns in the world as a complete body builds up his uniqueness, which is invisible before finding visual representation. To manifest his unique being, man seeks for visual representations.

If we imagine someone to be naked, without any representational object, we probably would think of our favourite pin-ups or at least a body that can be 'modest' in form rather than to think of an anonymous realistic body. Even if we sometimes get to see real body of naked people in common showers and know that our body is not in "perfect" form, it is so unfamiliar to picture a realistic body. Is it because of this, that we are always seeing the body in disguise? Have we even become what we wear? But wasn't it our body's need to have representation?

In this essay, I will study how human beings embody their representational object and what happens after by reviewing former studies that have been made on related relevant topics. Initially, there will be a review of Merleau-Ponty's concept of the body. The second chapter will discuss how the objects of representation are becoming the second body. Then I will precede to show what happens after embodying the representation in the last chapter. What I aim by this research is to cast a light on the relation between human body and the representational objects.

### **Body is a subjectivity in itself**

A body is a self of being or being itself. There have been a lot of discussions and thoughts about the relation between the consciousness and the flesh of the body along the thousands of years in western philosophy. Still there are many people wondering if the material body and our consciousness are separable in the way how a driver and a car are separate. However, I find the 'driver' is within the body itself, which consists of the flesh and its activity, the desires and the consciousness. An existence of a living creature cannot only be pointed to its material body but to the phenomenon of life taking place on a certain body. For an example, when saying 'a man is here', it means a man is present in a physical world with alive body. Material body and the mind cannot exist without each other. What seems to be ephemeral inside our body is actually a part of our body, which one cannot specify its whereabouts but only can say it is unseparable from the body. On this issue, Merleau-Ponty focuses on the materiality of the body; "questions of consciousness, of self, of mind and of being cannot be addressed independently from the embodied form they take. He emphasizes the body as an integrated whole of motion, perception and cognition which cannot be considered as independent but linked by mechanical connections." (Dant, 2005: 90). As I find my opinion on the 'body' is relevant very much to Merleau-Ponty's theoretical argument of phenomenal body, I will review his concept of the body in this chapter and bring out the discussion of how human faces its material limit.

In *Chiasm*, essay from his posthumous publication 'The visible and the invisible'(1964), Merleau-Ponty discusses the cross-over relation of subjective consciousness and material objectivity of the body. The human body is sensibility itself that can both sense and be sensed. He brings back what he have mentioned in 'Phenomenology of perception'(1945) that is when one can touch one's right hand, which is touching something else, with one's left hand, one would realize that he is the one that who is touching with intention meanwhile being touch as a materiality.(Baldwin, 2005) Being a sensed and sensing body is at the same time means that the material body is a subjectivity in itself. Which means, body is not a vessel carrying a soul but the merged whole, like a clay figure, taking a form of function centering on one consciousness.

The way human's perception, cognition and motor systems being correlated to each other allows one to learn and build up himself through experiences in his lived time. A judgement seemingly based upon cognition is rooting to what one had learned from the experiences of

perceptions and ideas. Memory plays its role in making judgements of what one feels and judgements of what one thinks of ideas. As the operation of judgement inhabits within individual body with its experiences of past, even analytical reflection is not separable with those experiences. (Dant 2005: 96) What one learns through sensing and reflecting and also by physically committing oneself through various experiences builds up one's own subjectivity. For an example, imagine a girl who was given many crayons and papers from her childhood and was encouraged to do anything with them. She might become very sensitive with colours and more observative of her surroundings, not to mention being skillful in her own way of dealing with papers and crayons as well. More complex situations that this girl would go through in her whole life will build up her physical capability, behavior and way of thinking and they will intertwine and influence one another to build up her own subjectivity through her whole life time.

If the imaginary girl recalls the first time learning to draw with a crayon, she must realize that it has become such an easy task compared to her first time. She would just naturally put a crayon between the thumb and index finger in a comfortable grip. Merleau-Ponty points out that man's reaction to a certain stimulus comes before conscious as the body orients itself to the world and the objects within it. The reaction situates one's body as a being-in-the-world which way that one might take for granted. Objects are given meaning by being in the response to one's body, that decides how to react depending on the object's 'aims in the world', its 'possible operations' and 'the scope of our life'. It is the feeling of continuation from one's bodily being in the world which comes before specific objects and enables one to give them meaning. Merleau-Ponty calls this embodied sense the 'habit-body' and differentiates it from the 'body at this moment'. The experiences of 'body at this moment' become gradually fed into the habit-body, the past consists the present in consequence. Merleau-Ponty writes in 'Phenomenology of Perception' that "Habits and skill, including those that utilize objects, are acquired in this cumulative way within the 'habit-body' and so are available for action in the current moment and for making sense of what is present in the field – it is 'a grasping of a significance, but it is the motor grasping of a motor significance'" The example that he gives is a woman who wears a feather in her hat and automatically keeps a safe distance from things that might break it off. (Dant 2005: 97-98)

The habit-body merges the object to itself with its intentionality. The imaginary girl would decide whether to use a crayon or a pencil depend on what she wants to draw. Thereby the continuity from the girl to the crayon or pencil is formed. In 'Phenomenology of perception', Merleau-Ponty reviews Husserl's definition of 'Intentionality of act' and 'Operative intentionality'. The former to the girl can be 'the intention to draw a green apple' and the latter is about that it is the girl who is the subject of what she draws not some spirit of old master's. Such as habits, the way of doing things that seems natural comes from operative intentionality. When one is using certain object, the action and object locate on the continuation from the intention and physical capacity of the body. subject. (Dant 2005: 101)

"The life of consciousness- cognitive life, the life of desire or perceptual life – is subtended by an 'intentional arc' which projects round about us our past, our future, our human setting, our physical, ideological and moral situation, or rather which results in our being situated in these respects. It is this intentional arc which brings about the unity of the senses, of intelligence, of sensibility and mobility." (Dant 2005: 101) By building a coherency of subjectivity, the operative intentionality centers one to be the subject of what one experiences.

The subjectivity that builds up itself by embodying its experience is the invisible of a person while the body is the visible of the person. A man archiving his own life in his body is partly invisible in that sense. To mention again that every subjectivity situates on the existence of a physical body, the body of human is a participant of the visual world. When the human sense is limited to what is only perceivable, the partial invisibility is inevitable to human body. Concerning the visible of the body, Merleau-Ponty asserts that having the 'thickness' of visible body is a style of existence; which he calls 'flesh', the 'element' of being. Every visible existence is always followed by certain tangibility and the tangibility promises certain visibility. So he calls touch 'palpation with look'. (Baldwin 2007) The gaze of a seer palpates the seen with its look, thereby constitutes a visible of the object. "It is that the thickness of flesh between the seer and the thing is constitutive for the thing of its visibility as for the seer of his corporeity; it is for the same reason that I am at the heart of the visible and that I am far from it: because it has thickness and is thereby naturally destined to be seen by body." (Baldwin 2007: 252)

The visible of a person exists because of human's ability to see and be seen. However, Merleau-Ponty points out that by being able to be seen –having a mass of body- man is only seen with

the visible side; which the situation he calls 'constitutive paradox'. (Baldwin 2007: 253) Body allows us to have consciousness, an invisible insider which might be wondering if he or she is a soul inside a shell when looking at one's own body. Merleau-Ponty says, "I who see have my own depth also being backed up by this same visible which I see and which, I know very well, closes in behind me." (Baldwin 2007: 252-253) The others cannot see us like the way we see ourselves because one's visible encloses one's invisibility inside. As for being a visible matter which the visual is 'constituted' by other's gaze, body is enveloped with that gaze. The body faces the 'constitutive paradox' at the very moment. Man is visible because he exists, but he is not visible totally because of the way he exists as visible. What one sees is always limited to the surface. "We mean that carnal being as a being of depths, of several leaves or faces, a being in latency, and a presentation of a certain absence, is a prototype of Being, of which our body, the sensible sentient, is a very remarkable variant, but whose constitutive paradox already lies in every visible." (Baldwin 2007: 253) Human-being is a 'remarkable variant' in depth of which man's vision cannot pass through. Likewise the surface of object is defined by looking, one will judge about the other by what one can see from the other. Thinking about how subjectivity is built, every living creature must have certain individual characteristic that naturally shows outward in certain degree. In the case of human-being, it appears through the way one talks and behaves. However, if one stops talking and does nothing what constitutes a certain person is mere the visual of the surface.

Then Merleau-Ponty asks, "Whence does it happen that in so doing it leaves them in their place, that the vision we acquire of them seems to us to come from them, and that to be seen is for them but a degradation of their eminent being?" (Baldwin 2007: 249)

Body the subjectivity in itself is existing as a visible materiality. In other words, it is complete being in itself within which the systems of such perception, cognition and motility are integrated as a whole. The body builds up itself through what it experiences itself in its life. Human being might be a 'remarkable variant' considering the diversity of individual's life. However, its existence inevitably allows certain degree of invisibility in itself. Living in the world that only can be unveiled with the bodily sense, man has no choice but to bring in what is invisible in himself to the world of senses.

“Since the total visible is always behind, or after, or between the aspects we see of it, there is access to it only through an experience which, like it, is wholly outside of itself.” (Baldwin 2007: 253)

### Visual representation as a second body

What one feels about oneself cannot be the same to what others feel because every man is discontinuous selves. One cannot be visible to others in the way one can see oneself. However, the unique 'I' can only exist when there are the others. As discussed in former chapter, individual is 'carnal being' that lacks its visual of subjectivity. When living with others, people wants to give out their identity visible to others; to show who they are and where they are to be in their society, as well as to give distinction to themselves from the nature. Man display some objects on the body to incarnate the images that are considered to fit his personal and social identity. The objects of representational images such as clothes and jewellery are used for giving distinction to individual. In this chapter, I will discuss how the object that is displayed on the body is becoming the second body by complementing the lack of visibility.

One of the important figure in modern sociology, Georg Simmel asserts that "fashions differ for different classes-the fashions of the upper stratum of society are never identical with those of the low; in fact they are abandoned by the former as soon as the latter prepares to appropriate them." (Benjamin 1999: 77) What can be read between the lines from this is the human desire to distinct oneself from the others. It is possible to infer that people want to differentiate them as much as possible therefore the progressive difference from the most affluent and the least has been created. If a quick review is conducted to the history of Jewellery and clothes, their development was mostly initiated from the ruling class. For example, in Joseon Dynasty of old Korean peninsula, the range of clothes and jewelleries people could wear were strictly stratified. The ruling ideology of Joseon dynasty was Sung-Confucianism which appreciated submissiveness of the younger to the elder, female to male, lower class to upper class. Therefore, there was clear distinction through many cultural aspects, especially on clothes and its ornaments. Kings had their own symbol for regality such as dragon. For king's costume, dragon was embroidered with gold thread on both shoulders. What is interesting is that there was a graduation of the appearance of the dragon. The king's dragon had five claws, the crown prince's had four claws and the son of crown prince's had three claws. Similarly, phoenix was used for female. The royal families could wear clothes and jewellery of most luxurious materials while common people could only wear white clothes. (Lee 1992: 31) According to Kyung Ja Lee's Publication about Joseon's traditional adornment, *Norigae*, material for jewellery was restricted in different levels, depending on social status.

“The composition and size of the *Norigae* corresponded to the social ranks of the wearers and protocol for ceremonial costumes. The correlation between social ranks and *Norigae*’s styles is most aptly illustrated in the story of Yeonsan Gun (1494~1506, The 10th king of Joseon dynasty), who used *Norigaes* to distinguish the social ranks of the hundreds of women who were brought into the palace to be his concubines. (omitted) On the other hand, common women were restricted in the *Norigaes* they could wear and also could not easily afford such expensive ornaments. Instead, they wore modest one-part *Norigaes*, which were decorated with embroidery or decorative mini triangular cushions called *gwaebul*.” (Lee 2005: 21-22) As can be seen from the above, the development of the craft skills and the material used for costume and jewellery depended much on the ruling class because they were the ones who had excessive income to afford the resources needed. Moreover, they were the ones who made restrictions. It is easy to tell that the clothes and jewellery have had a function of distinction through out the history from all over the world.

Having another layer of image on the body tells not only distinguishes one person to another but also the uniqueness of being itself as well. Covering up the body separates the body from the surrounding nature as well as hiding the body’s own nature. When Adam and Eve took the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge, they became suddenly embarrassed of their naked body and started to cover them up with leaves. The Bible which says human is a creation that resembles the form of God and is allowed to used the nature of their own will reflects the idea of distinction to the mankind that Christianity have had. Being embarrassed of their own nature, Adam and Eve started to disguise their body out of recognition that they are special. Out of the Bible, people in the real world stand out from the nature by covering themselves from it.

Wearing clothes and jewellery gives distinction to the wearer while merging the human body with their representational images; which will make people to become the representation. As what is mentioned from the above, people with special status in the society would wear appropriate costume and its ornaments to officially have the function of that person. For example, rulers of one county such as kings and queens had the crown as a symbol of their position. Today we are still familiar with clothes that represent certain occupations. Medical Doctors’ white gowns represent their status in hospital. Judges in the court and priest in the church would not be recognizable without their gowns indeed. However, people want to show who they are with what they wear regardless of their social status. Patrizia Calefeto’s comment on Sartre’s saying of human ability to be a pure subject asserts that by certain way of dressing,

people shows their identity. “ According to Sartre, it indicates the specific human ability to be a pure subject, by disguising the objectivity of the naked body exposed to the gaze and exhibiting, instead, our ability to see without being seen. Being a subject means, in this sense, recognizing that clothes have specific functions and dressing in order to convey a specific meaning, including the social meaning attributed to the notion of modesty. Moreover, in the case of costume (including uniform), functions are related to those aspects which make bodily coverings the sign of a person’s age, social or sexual role, political career, and so on.” (Calefeto 2004: 6-7)

In the world today people can choose from a variety of clothes and jewellery to find what is most appropriate for their identity. Since specific style indicates a certain identity, choosing clothes and jewellery in certain styles can show people’s sex, age group, what sub-culture they belong to and so on. Reviewing a comment from Walker would be helpful to understand what style represents. “Art historians considered style vital because they thought of it as the outward manifestation of the inner being of a person, social group or an age. If one can understand a style one gains, as it were, direct access to the whole value structure of a foreign culture, a bygone age of social strata. For example, Nicos Hadjinicolaou describes style as ‘a particular form of the overall ideology of a social class’. Actually, he dislikes the word ‘style’ and proposes to substitute ‘visual ideology’. That is an ideology made visible. If one can understand the reasons for stylistic change through time, one has also acquired a key to the laws of cultural evolution.” (Walker 1989: 153) Referring to the quote above, it is possible to say an individual choice that is made upon what they wear is reflecting the identity of a certain culture group and time. The society today is so complex, that it is hard to categorize people into groups of clear border. There exist diverse sub-cultures in addition to mainstream cultures which is reflected on the diversity of styles. Within the diversity, how one chooses to look is influenced by the different groups of the cultures one experiences. “In all these cases the word ‘style’ immediately displays its semiotic status; it declares the fact that we are in the presence of a system of intentional signs.” (Calefeto 2004: 27) Certain style has its own cultural meaning that gives distinctions to different culture groups. Pierre Bourdieu, a French philosopher of determinism insists in his book ‘La distinction’(1979) which is based upon a research of taste in 1960’s France, that to dress as certain others do is to assert an identity with them but, simultaneously, it is also a choice amongst the total spectrum of ways of dressing which signals as a rejection or difference from those other ways’. (Walker 1989: 192)

One important point here is that it is the person's own intention which makes the choice. It can be said that the style of a person forms a continuity from his or her subjectivity by originating from one's own intentionality. In addition, when speaking of somebody's style, people direct the word to the wearer not to what is worn. Jewelleries and clothes, existing as separate wearable objects allow people to merge themselves with representations during the time they are worn. The visual representation of certain style conjures up a total appearance of a person. The appearance created from it is what could have been invisible from the body of a person. Displaying the object of representation is an attempt to make a second layer of the body which shows one's invisible with oneself. On the extreme end of displaying representational image on the body, there is the phenomenon of Tattoos. Tattooing is a modification of body which attempts to make a permanent unity of one's visible body and invisible body. "The structural anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss has shown that in many societies not only does tattooing have a special social significance, but it also contains messages with a spiritual purpose. The social and aesthetic significance of tattooing as a sign-image – observed by Lévi-Strauss in the Maori of New Zealand – may be better understood if one considers the effect of 'doubling' the face and body, which are decorated as if they had been split in two. According to Lévi-Strauss the decoration *is* the face, or rather, it *creates* it, thereby conferring on the face social identity, human dignity and spiritual significance." (Calefeto 2004: 6) By inscribing one's identity to the body, Maori people could dignify themselves as a 'spiritual being' which is considered to be beyond the law of nature meanwhile showing their social identity.

Briefly summing up, body of human complements its lack of visual with representational objects. The representational object that one displays on the body serves the human desire to distinct itself as a unique being from all surrounding and the other beings. In the world today, certain style chosen shows the Identity of a person who have made the choice. A body that is constantly in redefining through what one experiences in life can either adapt or reject from a variety of style to visually manifest his identity. The invisibility of a person becomes visible with what is displayed on one's body. As mentioned from the above, people's remark of the word style directs not to the objects but to the person who wears them. By creating the whole ambience of the person's visuality and by originating from the wearer's intention, the representational object has become the second body of a person.



### **We embody the visual representation**

The representational images are not only how man is seen but what he sees with. In everyday life, people live with their representational images displayed to others. Like one can embody the use of certain object, the feeling of wearing clothes and jewellery are physically embodied to humans in our culture. Most people feel more comfortable dressed than naked even when they are alone. There are some people who even claim to feel naked without wearing their favourite jewellery. People adapt so naturally to the feeling of wearing clothes that they move around without ruining the extra layer of the body. Wearing clothes and jewellery have merged to people's 'habit-body' so that putting them on and moving around with them has become pre-conscious actions. When man has already physically integrated to the second layer of the body, could it also influence one's way of thinking?

People always see each other with embedded layer of clothes and jewellery. As discussed in the former chapter, man uses his clothes and jewellery to represent his identity by displaying them on his body. The objects of representational image set distinctions of one body to another and certain style represents certain characteristics. On the subject of how one recognizes the cultural objects, Merleau-Ponty explains. Objects can be divided into artificial object and natural object. The former one's significance is preceding its existence while the latter's existence is prior to its significance. The artificial objects 'seem to be placed on the world' with clearly defined intentionality. An artificial object is brought to our cultural understanding rather than to be perceived of its existence. It is experienced by people, internally occupied and redefined by them in so far as it is related to the world which people share the basic structures. What significance a cultural object has is that one can experience the presence of others within them even without knowing the people whom the object belongs to. It is because that people are sharing the structure of their bodies, the relationship between conscious subjectivity and the material objectivity which allows them to share the world. How people share the material environment of the world by the way they adapt to and adjust brings them to an understanding of culture as they know it. (Dant 2005: 104)

Through the influence of society man have embedded the way of viewing the objects of visual representations. It has become the top layer that is totally merged on people which they are not only seen with but seeing through because they recognize and learn certain cultural

meaning with them. There are discussions about similarity between clothing and language or sign system which points out the clothing as conveyers of meaning. "Gianfranco Marrone writes, fashion is an emblem of our 'progressive awareness of the indissoluble bond between sign and society, semiology and sociology'" (Calefeto 2004: 12) Similar to the way people read signs, people understand the displayed body through association. When seeing a girl who is nicely dressed, we might only say "How beautiful!" but we might also wonder if she is dating, where she goes shopping, if she is rich and so on. Marx have discussed about commodity being associated to certain cultural meaning within the context of contemporary mass production. "Marx viewed the commodity in modern times as a *'phantasmagoria'* which disguises human social relationships in the fantastic form of a relationship between things." (Higmore, 2002: 14) For instance, a designer shirt shows no meaning of the context in which it is produced. "The consumer is given no information about who sewed it, the factory where the material was produced, or the culture in which it was made. Rather, the product is affixed with logos and linked to advertising images that imbue it with cultural meaning quite apart from those of its specific production conditions and context." (Sturken, Cartwright, 2005: 200)

Because we know that the objects of representational image such as clothes and jewellery have immanent cultural meaning, people use it as a language with intention. Significantly, it can be observed in the way the image of public figure is taken care of in a great deal of importance. Calefeto writes in her book 'Clothed body' (2004) that there is "a direct and inescapable relation has been set up between two languages –the language of dress and the language of politics." (Calefeto 2004: 23) She gives an example from John Grisham's novel 'The Pelican Brief' (1992), that "The advisor of a fictional United States president urges him to wear a cardigan when he appears on television to comment on the murder of two members of the Supreme Court. The aim is to simulate a reassuring grandfatherly figure." (Calefeto 2004: 23)

Concerning the matter of using the language of representational object, Calefeto takes reference from Wittgenstein's use of clothing as a metaphor for language in the *Tractatus logico-philosophicus* which states : "Language disguises the thought, so that from the external form of the clothes one cannot infer the form of the thought they clothe, because the external form of the clothes is constructed with quite another object than to let the form of the body be recognized. Language, thought and dress are here associated and clothing is explicitly considered as a kind of bodily disguise, just as language is a disguise for thought. Language and

dress are sign systems through which, Wittgenstein seems to be saying, what counts is not so much what is 'underneath', but rather the surface as such, the system or pattern itself which body and thought assume." (Calefato 2004: 5)

The visual representation is on the continuation from the body which of its constitutive paradox still entails. The body's attempt of becoming full visibility hinders the original body from being fully visible. While existing as sign that conveys meanings, clothes and jewellery's significance exceed their body's existence. By displaying them on the body, the real body has become invisible. "Bodily coverings, clothes and skin decorations 'create' the body, shaping it together with the surrounding world. What we might call the 'degree zero' of clothing, the naked body, is itself replete with significance, since it is either the result of a significant absence, as Barthes says, or a construction permeated with meaning and value (the body incised, tattooed, tanned, wrinkled, scarred, exposed beneath transparent garments, etc)." (Calefato 2004: 6) People often judge the others with how they are dressed but the difference between a punk and a snob is not recognizable indeed, when they are naked. The meaninglessness of the naked body that explicitly reminds people of animal nature is not welcome any more. How human body appears in the media indicates how the body supposed to be in people's mind. Body is either suppressed or shown in a condition of certain distinctions so people see only the body in the way that dignifies ourselves. If we try to create a picture of naked body in our minds, what would it look like? Probably it would look like one's learned ideal such as glamorous body of a beautiful woman or naked skinny model; the body in any form of attraction. But why do we think about attractive body? Simply out of the sexual desire? Or having too much idealized body image around us?

"The naked body doesn't really exist,

it is a *construction of representation*, be it photographic, filmic or off the drawing board; it is the result of beauty treatments, exercise, medical history and age; it is both product of and fuel for imagery. And today such imagery manifests itself in all its plurality and hybridization." (Calefato 2004: 77)

How people want to see the body without the layer of clothes and jewellery is still on the continuation of seeing the representational objects. People seek for certain distinction from the body even without any piece of clothes or jewellery. The naked body has to be distinguished from the naked nature. The body on the media should be either healthy, young, elegant, erotic- all kind of attractiveness - or totally opposite which are "sick, old, poor war victims which the images are usually used as historical documents, accusations, symbols and warnings, but they remain outside normal public consumption." (Calefato 2004: 77-78) The general concept of the body should be dignified to show certain distinction from the animal or law of nature. Eventually, the second body has become fully embodied as it directs the intentionality of the real body's view on itself.

"One television commercial, however, even dared to show an old lady naked in the bath, overdoing, perhaps, the grotesque effect of the lively granny in her colourful shower cap, her modesty preserved, nevertheless, by an abundance of bubbles. Better to cover up that presumably withered and wrinkled body. On the other hand, everyone loves the bare bottoms of TV toddlers." (Calefato 2004: 77)

Imagining this unfamiliar picture of granny taking a bath in commercial, one would realize how we are reluctant to see the body that is without any association of modest representation. Before concluding the chapter, there is one quote that I want to introduce:

"The pictures of the autopsy of a supposed extraterrestrial recorded in utmost secrecy in America at the end of the 1940s and released to the public some time ago (who knows why) raise a smile. But perhaps they also make us think a little: the dissected alien, be it real or not, naked on the autopsy table, gives the impression of an old, helpless foetus. Newborn babies, aliens, the old and the sick are all alike: they make us think of a nakedness that is part of us all and that makes us, despite media reassurances to the contrary, a bit alien in our daily lives." (Calefato 2004: 78)

Summarizing what has been discussed in this chapter, the embodiment of the representational image initially takes place on 'habit-body'. Wearing clothes or jewellery is a preconscious action that situates on human body. Man, as well, embodies the way of viewing the cultural meanings of the representational object. When man is seen with it and seeing with it, the embodiment completes. Eventually, the significance of the embodied layer exceeds the existence of the body. Since the concept of the real body lies on the continuation from viewing representational objects, the embodiment generates the paradoxical relation between representation and the real body. By embodying the visual representation of its invisible, the body has become invisible itself.

## Conclusion

The body, a living material, builds up itself through what it experiences through its life. In other words, it is complete being in itself which might be a 'remarkable variant' considering the diversity of individual's life. However, the body of human knows that it has to give distinction to itself otherwise its uniqueness will remain invisible.

"Since the total visible is always behind, or after, or between the aspects we see of it, there is access to it only through an experience which, like it, is wholly outside of itself." (Baldwin 2007: 253)

By having representations of the inside self, the body seems to complete itself. However, the significance of the incarnated objects is taking over the existence of body, leaving the real body in the shadow of one's desire of distinction. The objects of representation chosen by man give distinction to the wearer with certain cultural meaning. This second layer of the body becomes fully embodied when man is no longer only seen with it but when he sees with it. Man is always seen with the second body furthermore he sees the other with the embedded view of reading cultural meaning. The way of viewing the real body of ourselves is on the continuation from of viewing embodied body. The human body on the media should be associated to certain cultural context that indicates human uniqueness. People seek for certain distinction from body even without any piece of clothes or jewellery. In their minds, the naked body has to be distinguished from the naked nature. The uneasiness we have from seeing the real body tells we are alienating the real body underneath by embodying the second body. Why are the bodies in the mass media so stylized? Why do we feel so reluctant to see the real nature of ourselves? The representational object that we have invented for ourselves discriminates against the real body in favour of the embodied body.

## Bibliography

Baldwin, Thomas

2007. Maurice Merleau-Ponty: Basic Writings edited by Thomas Baldwin. New York. Routledge

Benjamin, Walter

1999. The Arcades Project. Cambridge. Harvard University Press

Calefato, Patrizia

2004. The Clothed Body. Oxford, New York. Berg

Dant, Tim

2005. Materiality and Society. New York. Open University Press

Highmore, Ben

2002. Everyday Life and Cultural Theory. London, New York. Routledge

Lee, Kyung Ja

2005. Norigae: Splendor of the Korean Costume.

Translated by Lee, Jean Young. Seoul. Ewha Womans University Press

Lee, Sang-Eun

1992. History of Joseon Dynasty Costume. Seoul. Dongbangdoseo

(이상은. 1992. 조선왕조복식사론. 동방도서. 서울 )

Sturken, Marita. Cartwright, Lisa

2005. Practices of Looking. New York. Oxford University Press

Walker, John. A

1989. Design History and the History of Design. London. Pluto Press