

1B William E. Parker, Lecture at Visual Studies Workshop, 1977

Reel 1B: Continued, ontological aspects of the photographic image

...It is that same thing we hear in Walter Benjamin and extended by his devotees, the idea of aura, the credible presence that the photographic image has, particularly portraiture. Now aura is far more complex than what I am trying to define. In other words, where something seems to linger, that exquisitely carnal presence... We often feel... I often use this, it is a very accessible illustration, that many photographs as opposed to paintings, Durer's *The Head of Christ*, where the eyes seem to follow us as in a number of Durer's paintings and others can never have the compelling presence of something like ... French Primitive Photography. Quite often, It is a strange paradox, we feel as if we are in the presence of the photograph as opposed to it being in the presence of us. Cavell mentions these issues as a kind of psychic effect that occurs, and in this mid-19th century... it has been polychromed, obviously... we have that peculiar sense that, as Cavell is saying, that the weeks, the years, the stretches of time separating our present time from the photographic time is transparent to the... seem to be erased by, we feel in the presence of the original subject. And yet we know, we know very emphatically that it obviously *is not now*... It is that bizarre effect that the photograph holds detail... we also know the process through which it emerged, and this has become collective, we know the process, we know it doesn't look handmade, as it were, to the point that we feel ourselves confronting something that is not only with us, but at the same time beyond us. Not available for our... there is something about the Durer eyes that depends upon its effect, as we move, the eyes follow us. Or like William ... the ... painter who does a great deal of mimetic portrayal, human figures with eggs, still life objects and so on. He has an uncanny way of causing us to observe a simple... you might expect an... where you walk into a... still life and as you walk to the right or the left, the whole table shifts. A master of perspective illusion, and as I have been saying, that depends upon the cooperation of the observing individual. The painting as such has been willed through a series of schemata, or schemes, to force us into a condition of, so to speak, having to become sympathetic or responsive to schemas as defined by idea or by formal construct, as willed by a medium that is not itself-reflexive. Photographs have a way of remaining constant, like the woman who stares at us as opposed to our staring at her to accept that as a moment... Has a tendency to remain constant, fixed forever, not in time, space, a... moment of a manifestation of light upon a light-sensitive plate. And Kozloff says, "We have almost to shake ourselves to overcome the feeling that we peer out at the other place, in that different age. Yet we are always aware of this illusory dislocation, for such is the ambiguity, in principle, that seduces us over and over again in the photographic experience." This idea that we are looking at something present to us, and what Kozloff reminds us is that part of its credibility is dependent upon the fact that we cannot affect it. Even with its credible presentation, we are not able to influence it. Whereas in a painting... I had this 80 year old student, a remarkable woman, years ago when I taught adults... in Florida, and she used to come to class ... and she bought very expensive reproductions of paintings that she enjoyed, and the one I liked especially was her transformation of Seurat's *Sunday at La Grande Jatte* at the Chicago Institute. And she had a two hundred dollar reproduction and she

would paint out things that she didn't enjoy (laughter) so she removed the monkey, she took the bustle off the woman (laughter)... She never added anything; it was always a process of removal. (laughter) I am trying to impress upon you, one can strike through the negative, alter by processes of using photographics or there are any number of things to alter a photographic image, insofar as it remains the original image subject to the principles of light affecting a light-sensitive plane, we can commit those alterations or willed acts that occur after the phenomenological effect of wave energy impressing itself on a light-sensitive material. And as a result, we can sense that, in her issue of removing the bustle and the monkey, and several other items, she never added anything, this was a typical illustration of the idea of the process of how paintings are willed, and even the process of observation can be an act of alteration. Whereas in the photographic image, if we alter we radically alter the original sense of how it was formed. And we can't take the light back as it were... and reconstitute it back into that time and space. In painting, I can mimic the light, the media, and continue the painting, even restorers do this, right? In photographs, I am more inclined to have to accept the fact that a phenomenological occurrence *did* occur, was constant, now in the photograph, and then when I add something that is very present to me, and I am very absent from it in terms of the time-space order of its original manifestation. I always have to remind myself, that I am also absent from the wall paper on the wall, because even as I am looking at it, they are continuing and I am dying as it were. However photographs tend to confirm, Cavell has a marvelous way of putting it, in the last commentary in *The World Viewed* he states that one thing about photographs that depresses him, is not only does he have to bear witness to a world that we cannot affect, but he also recognizes that photographs have a way of confirming the world is presented in such a way that its judgment upon it me, that I am not going to have to suffer alone... he is saying that the basic fundamental issue is that the judgment upon the now, I have the confirmation that it will not be the last, it sounds like a very negative view but it isn't. What he is trying to say is that photographs have a tendency to really confirm the world's presence free from our subjective interference.

Student: Who said that?

Stanley Cavell. I am going to deal with him later. Kozloff goes on to say a number of things, he talks about painting in the moist substance and the image must rise out of the manipulation of that moist substance. He talks about photographs being particle-ized, and being dependent upon the phenomenological effect of light... Hollis Frampton, in the October 1974 issue of *Art Forum*, a marvelous essay, very imaginative... It is called *Incisions in History, Segments of Eternity*... he makes reference to something like this: a meeting with a woman in a gallery, and she disappears in a shower of atomistic light particles, revealed through metaphoric imagery the whole issue of the photographic process and the issues of light. Time and again, the Danae and Zeus' visitation..."For whatever wisdom language holds, I would point out that our verb, *to create*, and our technical term for the strictly human part of the brain, *cerebrum*, both derive from the Latin verb *creo*, which means '*I beget*.' And Aristotle, who excused himself some time ago, says of the gonads and the brain that they bear a functional resemblance to each other, in that both are capable of exteriorizing a form without reference to anything else.

He goes on to call *spermatikotatos*, 'most sympathetic,' the optic chiasm, which is that intersection within the physical mind where our two eyes compare notes, before writing home to their respective parents, the twin hemispheres of the brain." Isn't that wonderful? ...I want you to note the number of times that critics and others write about this issue of light...this issue of the idea of time past and time present and so on. I'll quote, he said, he talks about the Lake Como experience: {provided here for context, not quoted directly by Parker: "speaks of a vision that had come to him nine years earlier, at Lake Como, where he was trying to make landscape drawings with the aid of a camera lucida: 'This led me to reflect on the inimitable beauty of the pictures of nature's painting which the glass of the camera throws upon the paper in its focus/how charming it would be if it were possible to cause these natural images to imprint themselves durably, and remain fixed upon the paper.' He will quote, he'll say: "The accent is familiar enough, if we substitute the elevated diction of Madison Avenue for Talbot's emaciated echo of Keats, we get something like the opening benediction that accompanies every new Kodak Brownie: 'your camera is a magic black box for capturing precious moments that you will treasure for many years to come, so always take your pictures carefully and they will come out nice.'" And the phrase, that you will treasure for years is obviously not painting something and repainting it, and that you revisit as if it is present, although you are now in your octogenarian state...and then he mentions, "On the other hand photographers inherited, at the very outset, and hardly unawares, some centuries of hard-won knowledge of just the sort that painters were losing interest in: as much as the Renaissance, North and South, had learned perspective, chiaroscuro and surface rendering, was simply incorporated by the lens-grinders into their optics/ so that photographers were able to plunge straightaway into the maze of time. Only color was lacking, and even that problem yielded, theoretically at least, in little more than a generation: the earliest color photograph dates to 1865. Which is not to say, at all, that painting had never ceased to bedevil photography: no man who refuses to clean his house can remain long untroubled by vermin." Meaning that photography is still affected by painting and the reverse. And I am not talking about the look-alike approach of Van Deren Coke, in that sense of painting being influenced by photography. Talking about the interchange that occurred between certain types of... attention, and there is this, when he mentions the Joyce *Paris Notebook*, "Question, can a photograph be a work of art? Answer: a photograph is a disposition of sensible matter and may be so disposed for an aesthetic end but it is not a human disposition of sensible matter. Therefore it is not a work of art." James Joyce, *Paris Notebook* 1903. Here is the same issue, he says it can't be ultimately in terms of the process of its formation not due to the human will, therefore it can't be art, and that is something we will trace too along the way with references to early photographic journals and so on. The issues in the presentation are somewhat complex, in the sense that as we move along, and deal with some of the concerns that I am just giving you a broad hint of some of these things, there is one thing I would like to stress, and control the image, that my approach to this initial visual material has a number of precedents, that also appear in relation to photographic history and criticism...the thing I want to show you in *Camera Work* was an article by a writer who appears in a number of issues, particularly in the 1905 and 1906 period, named Roland Rood... it is a marvelous essay called the *Evolution of Art from Writing to Photography*...it is in *Camera Work* #12 October 1905...

I treasure it because I like things that confirm where one's own interests lie... I might add that he begins his article with Albrecht Durer and Jan Van Eyck commentaries. Rood goes through much more, this is in *Camera Work* #12 October 1905, *Evolution of Art from Writing to Photography*...page 30 in that. And you will see even the precedent on that level in this type of commentary. I might add that there are other precedents that are equally important, and that is the idea of certain concerns in philosophy, and certain concerns in the theories of vision... to confirm that everything that I am going to present you can be validated on the basis not only of scientific testing, no matter how normative it may be, and can also be found in relationship to certain theoretical constructs that have been part and parcel of philosophy...and there are several books that I will mention to you to that are sort of a sequence...to accompany the discussion of the Grady article I think you would be very wise to read the introduction to *French Primitive Photography*. Bob Sobiesak's commentary on the influence of Positivism on the development of early photography is extremely important... Linda Nochlin's book, *Realism*...it is in her first chapter...on the nature of realism. Now, remember, I am distinguishing mimetic portrayal as having to do with any work of art, the principle of mimesis, prior to the 19th century, that has as a primary concern the mimicking of either the world and its forms, or of states of mind, or of conditions of psychology, or viewpoint, it has got to be thought of as broad. However, not every form is mimetic...I could say German Expressionism is mimetic because it includes certain distortions and alterations that might affect a kind of personality transmission...I don't think of it that way at all. What I am trying to say is that we have to deal with some things thematically, other times we deal with it in terms of physical structures and the way they are defined, the mimicking can have various stages. Linda Nochlin deals with realism which actually is only one brief period as we know in terms of Realism, Romanticism, etc.. And you would think the signal realist would be Courbet, but keep in mind that in Art History when we speak of realism we are not talking about realism of effect in terms of the image presented, because there is nothing realistic about the detail in a Courbet, *any* Courbet. And the sources, like Assyrian Art and the developmental aspects, the propagandistic influences of Flaubert-istic philosophy-- even the way they are painted almost looking like they are studded on, the later ones with palette knives and thick impasto paint-- would deny the idea of atomistic detail. And unit structures that seem to defy the eye's search for a satisfaction of detail. But it is the realism of the subject matter, genre subjects, stone breakers. Subjects that have to do with political events occurring during the period, Baudelaire does not appear in the studio by accident, nor do the various other figures who are accompanying, nor does the woman...or the child. These are iconographic systems that relate to particular political and social concerns of the period. And we can say they are real subjects, and events, and concerns, whereas the look of the painting is anything but....but, it still, nevertheless, the term realism applies to, as I said, a brief period. However, her (Nochlin's) introductory comments, *The Nature of Realism, Realism and Reality*...it is marvelous...She has a thing on Realism, History, and Time...She talks about there are two different types...there are several distinctions that we have to understand in relationship to the term, realism: "A philosopher would distinguish more sharply than I have done here between the various meanings that have been given to the term realism even in the discussion of art, A: as implying a close correspondence between the depiction and the depicted object or between a description and what it

describes" -- and that is the realism of the theory of correspondence or parallelism-- "B: as implying that mere imitation or mirroring of natural objects is surpassed and we confront the thing itself." That is what we have been talking about in relation to Bazin and other theoreticians. That in other words, the B part is that the imitation or mirroring is surpassed when we confront the thing depicted, that is why Greenberg's criticism of photography... he waxes on, idiotically really, the camera's glass eye, the great commentary on Weston, he talks about the transparency of the photograph: he means that we fall *through* the photograph, literally, back to the subject... it is Bazin in reverse order and he takes Bazin and turns it against photography instead of confirming it. "C: as implying that what is represented is an idea or a form or unchanging prototype of the actual things of this world and then eliminates whatever is particular or peculiar to the natural object which substantiates the idea," which is all to say that the world is composed primarily on Platonic concerns. The ideal..the best form no matter what the manifestations of matter are, we must give it credence, only as far as it expresses an idea or norm or unchanging prototype of the actual things in the word, and that it eliminates whatever is particular or peculiar to an actual object which instantiates the idea. and that idea is to become universal, to the ideal... And we are going to trace all of these ideas. That is why I think that, you will get it from me, but I go further back...I think you might enjoy reading that little introduction...This book is a must, and if you haven't encountered this, and if you have any interest whatsoever in photographic criticism, this book is sine qua non. It is one of the great books of the century. This is Marjorie Hope Nicolson's *Newton Demands the Muse: Opticks and the 18th Century Poets*." It is extremely important for us to understand what happened in the 18th century... She says,"While reading widely in 18th century poetry for other purposes, I found myself constantly teased with dozens of references to Newton which had nothing to do with the *Principia*, until I became persuaded that, among the poets, the *Opticks* was even more familiar than was the more famous work." And Newton's *Opticks* has a profound influence upon 18th century thought. There is a chapter in here, *Color and Light in the Descriptive Poets*...we can deal with Textual evidence to show you, now I can't deal with a whole range of literature that deals with the phenomenology of light...we will have to deal with fragments, much of it is going to be over views... And then she has one on *The Physics of Light and Scientific Poetry, Optics and Vision*. Now there is the most remarkable commentary on the development of the camera obscura and its influence from the 17th century and into the 18th century. And also defines, for the very first time...the fact that it is very evident that certain philosophers and authors, particularly of the 17th and 18th century had a profound influence upon the inevitability of photography. And she has an incredible discussion of not only the mechanical, technical realm for the camera obscura, but then also of the literary developments, as well as documentary evidence... to confirm that sight became the prime measure of consciousness. It had always been a prime measure but never *the* prime measure for sight in the 18th century--you can say that without fear of being flagged over what you're saying-- was the prime measure for defining what the world is. And that is extremely important when we find out about that tradition. Those three chapters, particularly...you will love them. And you won't have to read too much from this fundamentalist bible belt minister... She says, (page 94) "Newton had shown that even as the layman knew from the camera obscura, 'pictures' of external objects are "lively painted" on the 'thinner

coats' of the eye, and that 'these Pictures,' propagated by Motion along the Fibers of the Optick Nerves into the Brain, are the cause of Vision. He discussed, as had Kepler and Descartes, Molyneux, and others before him – a persistent problem: why, having two eyes, upon the retina of which the inverted image of an object is 'painted,' do we ordinarily see 'single' rather than 'double?'" She goes through all of these questions that people still ask today, and she will also, that is why I have you read Wald first...then you can elevate, you can build structures up to this more complex material. "Sight to Locke, as to Descartes, was 'the most comprehensive of all the senses, conveying to our minds the ideas of light and colors, which are peculiar only to that sense; and also the far different ideas of space, figure and motion' the several varieties whereof change the appearances of its proper size, viz., light and colors.' To Berkeley, sight was the most noble, pleasant, and comprehensive of all the senses. To Addison it was the one essential sense on which imagination rests." Now listen to Addison: "Our sight is the most perfect and most delightful of all our senses, the sense of feeling can indeed give us a notion of extension, shape, and all other ideas that enter at the eye, except colors; but at the same time it is much straightened and confined. Our sight seems designed to supply all these defects, and may be considered as a more delicate and diffusive kind of touch, that spreads itself over an infinite multitude of bodies." Remember Kozloff today saying, the fragment taken from the flux, that whole, that multitudinous world, "We cannot indeed have a single image in the fancy that did not make its first entrance through the sight."...this gives you the roots of the kinds of notions that gather within a period...the bread and substance of human action...She has a marvelous index, so what you can do is start with, camera obscura, etc., etc., page 77. It is the best commentary...on the camera obscura...this is a book to treasure. (laughs) This man has made a remarkable contribution on the history of photography, the whole issue of our understanding of philosophy. It is David C. Lindberg, he has written a number of major essays and articles. This one is called *Theories of Vision from Al Kindi to Kepler...* The Backgrounds of Ancient Theories of Vision, Al-Kindi's Critique of Euclid's Theory of Vision, Galenists and Aristotelians in Islam, Al Hazen and the New Intromission Theory of Vision, The Origins of Optics in the West, The Optical Synthesis of the Thirteenth Century, and finally, Johannes Kepler and the Theory of Retinal Image, which basically persists to this day. Now, this is not an easy book... read chapter 6, *Early Concepts of the Senses and the Mind*. If you start with this and you won't have a problem with this (laughter)... Tielhard de Chardin appeared in the last issue, and Carl Jung, and anyone I mentioned, Al Kindi will probably be there next week. Read them just to prove that there are things that are so vital that appear on all levels...he has an appendix, The Translation of Optical Works from Greek and Arabic into Latin...he gives you every major source, text: the notes here are as interesting to my mind as the text itself, and we can't deal with all of it, I certainly will deal with the preliminary, the ancient modes of attitudes toward vision, and how they evolved into the idea of retinal imaging and prove to you in reality that everything I say is confirmed (laughter). But, there is a methodology, there is no coalescence here, like Chuck Hagen...sketching out notes and fragments and... as part of his graduation thesis, he has tried to deal with that coalescence of the field of science and optics that occurred in the 19th century that inevitably led to the development of photography... This is a book that you should read but you should be very careful of it. Vasco Ronchi, this man, he is an Italian, has written

a number of major works on light... the sense of vision and the phenomenology of light. This is a very good survey, the only thing you want to avoid is his interpretations of what he is relaying (laughs), because he is dead wrong. Whenever I read something...new...I immediately look for the second check...I'll go and find a counter argument. And I found one, in David C. Lindberg, in this book and a number of essays, and he shattered what he (Ronchi) says here: he praises the information but in essence despises the interpretation...some tasted, some chewed, and some digested.... Lindberg on Ronchi: he is broad in scope but highly respectable, but he has also written enough about interpretive levels. Ronchi will comment on optics in the Greco-Roman age, or let's take the Middle Ages. He will say, because touch was more important, therefore certain media uses occurred, certain distortions, alterations, schemas were approached. He... gives you a marvelous historical locus, but then he amplifies it to interpret where there is no room for interpretation. Nevertheless, it is a marvelous survey. And this has nothing to do with perception. To my mind, too much attention has been given to the Gregorys and the Gombrichs and others, because everyone is talking about the psychology of perception, how we see things, and no one is dealing with the issues of the thought processes that are still persistent today in someone right now who is out there clicking their camera, that confirm certain issues that are extensions of the past. And the chapter headings in this are, *Optics in the Greco-Roman Age*, *Optics in the Middle Ages*, *The Downfall of Ancient Optics*, *From Descartes to Grimaldi*, *Newton and Huygens*, *The Transition from the Eighteenth to the Nineteenth Century*, *The Triumph of the Wave Theory*, and then finally, *What is Light?*. It is a marvelous chapter, the last one I would read first before the others. It gives a concrete summary of the various principles. That is a must at some point...now folks, I am just going to read you something from...it is a fascinating book, and it is really a must, if anyone wants to understand anything about photography, particularly photography...the linkages that occur are very important...I do want to read you now something that is like a thesis for this whole course... This is by a man I am sure you have never heard of, Errol E. Harris, does that name ring a bell? I hadn't heard of him either until I heard him lecture at Clark University. The Clark University lectures include...Piaget, Bruner, Jacobson...Waddington, Burke... this is a remarkable little book that is basically a critique of Husserl and Merleau-Ponty's Positivist Phenomenalism. He agrees with them and yet he concludes his book with some very simple statements...and I want to read you a few fragments, and I have marked them, they begin on page 63...He says this, "Psychology rests on physiology, that again on biology, that upon chemistry and chemistry on physics. All these relationships are internal to science, yet the whole scientific schema bears a similar relationship to common sense and to primitive sentience. Finally, the scientific advance is itself dialectical in ways I have attempted to demonstrate elsewhere. Its progress is demonstrably continuous, yet subject to major revolutions. Successive theories, though mutually dependent and professedly offering explanations of the same data, present themselves as mutually opposed. In every case, among the successive phases, the later, though it seems to (and in a real sense does) abrogate its predecessor, yet contains within itself, in a modified and developed form, everything from which it has evolved." All that is to say, certain units cancel out other units, but they also include the affect or influence of that earlier unit. He says, "The body, in whose feeling we have found the root of all explicit consciousness, is discovered in explicit consciousness to be

a physiological, organic whole of the same general character as each of the wholes we have so far mentioned. And the organism is organically related to its environment in a biocoenosis which is itself an organic whole.” Now you might not know what biocoenosis is, and what the hell does that have to do with anything. It is a series of diverse organisms...in a common biotope. Like, that is what we are folks, (laughter) biocoenosis, we are humans and inhabit a what, a biotope: what is that, our environment, our world. It is that simple, our habitat. Then he uses a word here, *sublates*... it means to negate or deny or to cancel, to eliminate something: sublate is to eliminate, but you also preserve it and elevate it. Now isn't that a peculiar paradox, how can you eliminate something and preserve and elevate it? Just simply think of the sperm ovum, the ... development of your own personhood. You have constantly, in your growth, sublated the various forms of your being, in natal and postnatal development. And you will continue to do so until even your form is sublated by another form...call it transformation, death, or anything else, I don't care. But the idea is that you preserve, for example, a simple genetic structure. You eliminate the form of your being, physiologically at an earlier stage. For example, it was obvious that in the genetic code of my being, that at one point in my development, I was an hermaphroditic, there is no doubt about it, everyone is, you were too. The genetic code structured and triggered a series of what we call sublations in which that which will define me as male became apparent in natal development, and that which would define me as female becomes recessive, it doesn't mean psychically, or on other levels, they are not posits of a contra physiological identity or physical identity. And so for example, and that is why Jung can... the anima aspect of the male personality and the animus aspect for the female personality. We are not dealing with Jung at all (laughs) on this occasion. He says, “Every organism can die, and the organism is organically related to its environment in a biocoenosis which is itself an organic whole. This biocoenosis has no fixed limits short of the whole biosphere of the planet, and is not only restricted to that, for everything within it is subject to physical influences impinging upon it from illimitable range. The modern physicist teaches that the physical universe is a single whole within which every component affects and is affected by every other. At every level, therefore, whichever way we approach the facts we find wholes, dialectic in character, related to each other such wholes dialectically, and the dialectic series in every case is a scale in and through which development proceeds” you see the Hegelian nature of this, thesis/antithesis/synthesis: wholes forming out of parts and then coalescing, and then they become the opposition to something else and so on, he says, “What is developed is discovered is in the later phases more adequately than in the earlier, so that we may say as Hegel did that the later phase reveals (or is) the truth of the earlier. Each phase is in some degree of revelation of this truth, of what it is that is developing, yet each successive stage appears as a contrast to, and a contradiction (in some sense) of, its predecessor. It supplants and supersedes its predecessor, but, as we have seen, it preserves no less the essential factors which it has inherited from the prior phases of the scale.” Just as in biology there are sublations that take place, just as in the realm of ideas there are sublations that take place. Just as certain philosophers have said that the human mind is a sublation of the physical body. Good heavens, just think of poor Berkeley going out to kick a rock (laughs) to know that it is there... particularly with the Metaphysical Idealists who define the world primarily as idea... He says, If science is thus the truth of

the common sense world view, that again the explication of ordinary perceptual experience, and that of primitive sentience,” – and primitive sentience is knowing both body and mind because it *lived* knowing, not taught, lived knowing, the senses combined with... “it would seem at least plausible that sentience relates similarly to prior phases, of which the proximate stage is the biological whole. Through its own biocoenosis, the organism of the body sublates the biosphere (and with it the prerequisite physical totality)” that is in case you wondered what our universe is, this man is telling you that you have already sublated it (laughter) because you can’t function...he is saying that you are an egocentrist, and a very important egocentrism, he is not talking about egotism: egocentrism is a vital necessity for the biosphere to even be known. It is almost like the old saw, why would God have the world unless he wanted to know for himself, or if you want to think of her, or it, whatever, it makes no difference. Why do we, or the world, be needed? Why the permissiveness in which matter must be manipulated in some way, or brought to bear? Unless something wanted to reflect itself. Now I must remind you...of the Revelation of St. John... in the book of John, the first book of John, in the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and what did the word become first? Light. The primal force. Not flesh, the light became flesh. He says, “In the complete scale the biological phase goes over into the psychological just at the point where the organic processes within the system of the living body are integrated to the level of intensity which issues as feeling or sentience; and sentience, as we have seen, is just such a whole as we have called dialectical. It contains within itself, as it were in suspension, all the diversification consequent upon the variety of organic processes which are felt in it. As these again are physico-chemical processes in reaction to effects upon the organism of environmental influences, which is sublated in sentience is the whole series of stages which preceded it. It is moreover a continuation of the activity of self-organization typical of organic process itself, and it issues, as a result of further self-organization, in perception. Perception, may, therefore, appropriately be described as the world coming to consciousness of itself in and through the living organism.” So there is a great deal of credence to the human mind, the human being, as being, in essence, that medium through which the world is known, and even on the physical level as well. “Thus the body does hold implicitly within its self-sentience, and is what Hegel would have called the truth of, the whole of its nature, its precondition. Yet it is in itself no more than a phase in the dialectical series of forms which constitutes the world of nature; and out of itself it develops the awareness of the world– a knowledge which is true just so far as it is systematically coherent. As a phase in the process it is a finite form within the total scale, but as a knowledge of that scale, including its own place within it, it comprehends, sums up and sublates, the whole.” And then he says in the final conclusion, “If the world were not such a dialectical development, our awareness of it, however we interpret its content, would be unintelligible and incapable of accounting for itself, as the epistemological impasse,” – the way we would know– “resulting from a causal or a representative theory of perception in naturalistic terms gives evidence. It does become intelligible and can give an account of itself as the dialectical outcome of a dialectical process operative in nature. So viewed the theory of knowledge becomes coherent with the theory of nature, an outcome not provided by any other approach. This very fact, then, is evidence in favor of the dialectical character of the actual world process.” And he leaves at the end

with a parting shot to Husserl and Merleau Ponty. And I will sum all that up and simply say, as Jung did, at the bottom of psyche is simply world, and I don't think any of you missed that point... But he is also saying the psyche is the elevated principle of the world, and he is also saying another thing, is that when we think of the idea of each unit as it progresses in essence to a higher level, the higher it sublates the origins and yet preserves them and regains them. When we are looking at slides concerning the development of the mimetic tradition, I want you to let that be a controlling idea, we are not talking about some rule that is very specific, we are talking about transfers. If I say Carravagio influenced Rembrandt, I can point and trace that, or how Antonello da Messina created a link between the northern and the southern countries... but that is an example of specific relationships that we can point to and document. I am also talking about a series of sublations. That is, the first evidence of positive and negative, as you probably are already perfectly aware of, occurs in Paleolithic Art. It was a very conscious, insofar as we can speak of that period as having conscious, it is a very conscious lineage that leads from that point on, where the hand, the positive and negative images become a very powerful motif. And certainly...the positive and negative behaves no differently than it did in the Paleolithic period, in the photograph. It just happens to be a higher level that preserves the character of the original source, has no direct linkage to it, except that I can say, thus, Niepce, or Hippolite Bayard, or Talbot, or Daguerre are just Paleolithic painters. (laughs)...children had to follow their ball into Santander or Altamira, or other places, in order to discover... but nevertheless, what I will stress to you...I am talking about visual developments, and philosophical and perceptual developments that point to a series of sublations. One idea built on the other until finally photography emerges, inevitably. And it will indeed one day itself be sublated....(laughs)...you've already sublated it...really did...(laughs) Another way of looking at this, this is a marvelous book... It is called a *Handbook of Perception... Historical and Philosophical Roots of Perception*...I don't want to sell my life into dealing with normative testing or even giving theoretical constructs that can't be applied to direct sense. I want to know the historical roots, and see where we are as a result of the teleology of that development. I just believe in that, and some people don't, and that is alright...*Historical and Philosophical Roots of Perception* marvelous essay, and I want to call to your attention, this is called *Cognition and Knowledge: Psychological Epistemology*...it is by Joseph Royce. I will just read you his little conclusion, it is very brief...the whole essay, and it includes copious examples of prior research, is to say that basically there are three ways, or three modes of perception, and he also uses diagrammatic illustrations... where he talks about, one, Rationalism, or Empiricism, which would be knowing about, he is not dealing with...knowing by virtue of analytical cognition...very informative. He talks about metaphor-ism, where we make relationships between elements. And then he talks about...he is not terribly clear on this, but he talks about an asset that might be best referred to as symbolizing. He uses the word symbolizes....Royce is very respected in the field of perception...He says, The relevance of the previously described three ways of knowing should now be apparent, for each of these provides processes, that is, how the components of thinking, perceiving, or symbolizing are organized) of one's cognitive structure on the one hand, and the epistemological rules— that is, logical-illogical, perception-misperception, universality-idiosyncrasy— for positive or negative feedback from the environment on the

other hand. That is, in pure, empirical knowing perceptual cognitions of a world view are checked against the epistemic rules for accurate perception, that is, yes, that is a chair. Pure rational knowing involves checking thinking cognitions against the epistemic rules for logical thinking— yes, that deduction follows within this particular logical system,” that that is a chair, “And metaphoric knowing involves checking symbolizing constructs of a world view against the epistemological requirements of universality, that is, yes, Mr. X’s play, written 500 years ago, and still produced in various parts of the world, meets the criterion of universality.” He makes that point in terms of its temporal duration, and spread, and affect...because it is still produced “In short, world views are validated, or we know, when there is some kind of isomorphism between personal cognitions and structurable segments”... not just “thingy” of the world.” (laughter). So it is like baby talk. Like when I grew up, my best friend was walking across the street...he just gave everything a generic name. Their dog was dog, cat was cat (laughter) They never had names for anything...tree...those are “things” attitudes toward the world, and he is talking about personal isomorphism in relationship between personal cognition and cognition at every level: emotive, intuitive, feeling, reason, sensation, and structural segments of the world. That is that the world itself is...that is at the bottom of psyche is just simply world, as Jung said. And the two are interrelated. And you would say, well of course you fool, didn’t you know that? But that is not the point, there is a prevailing symbol that is in this construct that refuses to permit anything to appear without a teleology. There is the acorn that is the tree. And it refuses to permit anything to be thought of as unique, as discrete, as separate from the other...and not a form of monism, where everything is unitary. I once believed that theory of knowledge...years ago, I changed my mind...the irony is that this is a form of saying that there, in terms of principles from contemporary physics, chemistry, biology, that is much closer to a kind of dynamic interchange between forms than we think beyond the dualism of mind and matter, which we will have to deal with in the latter part of our sessions, particularly as it informs photography....give credit where credit is due. The only other person I know of... was Lancelot Law Whyte. Do any of you know his work, the book called, *The Unconscious Before Freud*...An idea called the Great Chain of Being. It deals with the idea of...and how it occurs over time. And Whyte will deal with that idea in *The Unconscious Before Freud*. He traces the whole word, unconscious, and what it means to us today in its variety, but he traces where that idea came from...This book is called *An Essay on Atomism*. Now I use the term, and I tell my students, and I can confirm it, Talbot is a mathematician, and Talbot was a scientist. Talbot uses the word atomism. He was considerably concerned with the idea of unit detail. If I look at the field of operations around him, it is not surprising at all. He was attending the Royal Society. He was aware of the issues that were occurring. It was daily fare for him to hear discussions of that nature. He may have been trying to make an incision into history, to in essence stop those images that so quickly fade from memory and perception. But in essence what he was also trying to do was confirm the particle structure of the world...confirmed through the photograph. But Whyte, in *Essay on Atomism, Democritus to 1960*, And if you don’t want to read his commentary on atomism you can skip right to the chronology. And then he has *History and Geography, Chronological Table, Analysis, Postscript: On the Ideal Marriage of Continuity and Discontinuity*. And he has the same thesis, this idea of isomorphism between...and the world... trust this man explicitly...very trustworthy. In

the Chronological Table..he starts off with phases: quantity first applied to the structure of matter, Newton, Bosovich, Dalton, Faraday. He will start like, 600 BC, Pythagoras, flourished 550, visited Egypt and Babylonia as a young man and was probably the founder of the Pythagorean mathematical school at Croton, Italy, which held that number is of the essence of things. They represented numbers as patterns of points... Anaxagoras considered that the universe was originally a chaos of infinitely small seeds. Just watch how this idea gathers, and watch how it is apparent in photography's first...And notice the comments...I do want to mention one other book, this is my third category (laughs) it is in my other suitcase. I carry my library with me, Kobo Abe...he wrote *Woman in the Dunes*, Kobo Abe. Have you seen it yet? The most recent extension of the whole issue of the camera obscura has occurred in our time folks by this brilliant, magical man. It intersperses, I just can't believe...it not only includes photographs...but it is about people who retire into a box. And they get into a cardboard box with an aperture. And they become completely self-sufficient. And it is a frightening testament to what photography is doing to our minds. You don't have to agree, but I really do believe it has the power to do so. As I said, to my mind, it has become now the tragic medium, because it reminds us of the world that we no longer accept as being there...most people don't...otherwise we wouldn't have these Esalen Institutes and other...it reminds us of a world that we must have now as illusion instead of as fact. It also reminds us that when we inquire into the consciousness of selection, the problem...and that we are so pervasively dependent upon photography, that we are now in essence retiring into the camera, so that no longer is there a world in essence out there, or behind the camera, performing the task of exercising their...but we are encapsulated into the illusion of that we...it captures...we'll go from there (laughs) we'll go in sequence and end up with Abe...

Afternoon session:

Where we are beginning, I just have a few slides to show you left over from the commentary this morning. They have to do with establishing some kind of identification of what I was trying to draw the distinction between photography and the issues that are related to painting. And I will be dealing with painting extensively as it is related to the mimetic tradition. However I thought at first I would be a little didactic and try to get my point across in another way visually, through the use of two or three slides. And then we will deal with our first group of images that are in the mimetic tradition, and that will deal with primarily Paleolithic and Mesolithic art forms. Now again I want you to understand several factors that are involved here, that I am going to be trying to deal with this material not in the typical approach to either form or iconography as you might expect in an art history class, but try to tie this in all cases to the principle thesis that I was mentioning before, that mind and matter are basically reciprocally interactive. And that perhaps one of the ways we know is by exercising matter, and then in essence reading back from what results, and in other cases where we exercise mind, and then of course matter is forced to be accommodated to the wishes of mind, but we will get to that momentarily. Let me make that distinction I was trying to develop this morning by showing you two slides...Ok, now, most of these slides, a great deal of the material that I am going to show to you will be in the vernacular or related to things that are suitable

to the context I wish to establish. In the image on the right, you often see this in Gernsheim and in other texts with commentary on Daguerre in special studies, but this is an illustration from *Aujourd d'Hui*, and it is by the graphic artist Gerard Fontallard, and this was done on the 15th of March in 1840. And you can see that the date is rather significant, because it was a kind of satirical commentary concerning the nature of talent that lies dormant, or basically we might even liberally translate, not specifics but literally translate the issue of the artist or the photographer, who lies sleeping holding his timing device...the bottle and the hat, other elements... while the camera being stabilized with the stone set upon it is photographing something that we might speak of as an early topographic image... an extension of the rooftop of this Parisian environment. And basically, the signals, this is thought of to be a satirical polemic against photography that is associated with the idea that the photographer is really not required to be active at all in the process. You remember this morning when I mentioned Cavell and others who speak of the automatic and autonomous nature of the process of the photographic image, including Bazin. This is sort of a signal to that issue as well. That despite the fact that it is professing in graphic form, a stigmata in relationship to the photographer, it also tells a very great truth, surprisingly enough, Fontallard did not realize that he was dealing with an issue that had been persistent not only in history, theories concerning our visual perception but also certainly, actively, predictive of the theoretical concerns which occur not only in aesthetics but philosophical theory related to photography. In short, this is really the case: that in fact, this long exposure taking place in this Daguerrean camera does *not* require the manipulations of the photographer. Talbot may indeed lie in abeyance while the camera does the work. And we might suggest that the issue that is involved here is something that also foretells the basic signals that occurred very early in photography, the introduction of subject matter that did not necessarily have to do with traditions in which schemata, or value structures, or forms of composition, or design, if you want to simplify it to that level, in which we might say there was a necessary subject to be idealized, or authored for attention, that in reality one could take a photograph of the banal, of the mundane, of those forms that humankind had never been attentive to. Now you may look at Talbot's *The Open Door*, illustrated in Newhall, but keep in mind that he had a painter, Henry Colleen advising him on certain types of composition. And that really is basically a pastiche of certain examples of Dutch genre painting.

{Caption to Fontallard's illustration: Ce' sublime instrument- a gauche-- travaille a retracer par la chambre noire (ce qui n'est pas clair) tour les mommens, girouelles, paysages, tuyause de poete et banques philantropique generalemen! Quel con ques mammes et saus mouvement on vous porte a domicile votre maison plaque sur metal non d'Alger, pour la bagatelle de 25 f, ne pasture 25 sols Le grand artiste a druite-- landis que le Soleil pioche pur lui, dori du somrueil del'innocence, illusire de son bommer de colon et earesse par la brise comme un abricot en plein vent. Parles, d'emandes, prenes vos lunettes! Ou va vous servir tout chand et a la minute... deranger vous pour laisser passer le monde}

However, if you look at the other illustrations in *The Pencil of Nature*, or in the larger corpus of Talbot's work, you will find that issues are involved in which we are hard put to find any reason for his selection of certain types of topography, or of certain types of subject matter, in essence we might say that a great deal of the interest of early photographers, and including I might add Daguerreans other than that obsessive interest in the eventual development of the portrait, had to do with the ability to appreciate, not necessarily to know in a preordained sense what was to be pre-selected, but to appreciate forms of the world in which people had given no particular attention to prior to photography. In the first place, fragments could be taken totally out of context and become interesting for themselves...Southworth and Hawes developed numbers of images that dealt with configurations that do not serve as signals to a complete gestalt or schema of clarified and understandable, logical organization. Masts of ships, radical croppings, the Niagara series in which often we have vantage points that are inexplicably ambiguous. Granted if you trace their sources, but nonetheless we find that in a great number of early photographic images the piecemeal, the fragment, the utterly banal, the not interesting in itself, was the subject of attention, so again this form seems to define that as predictive of the type of information that could be incorporated in the camera image, in this case the Daguerrean camera image, and also reveals as we will find out...in the conclusion of this whole series of slides, the meaning of the idea of taking images not only from the interiors of laboratories and studios but the extensions of this idea of the world that is captured by the box or the darkened room of the camera obscura. And as I said...this illustration is less pejorative than it is predictive, from my point of view. The image on the left, I took this right out of a typical Kodak advertisement page in a magazine. And I think it beautifully expresses something that we all too often forget: this happens to be a silver halide crystal and it expresses what happens when light is the affective agent to initially alter the molecular structure of that silver halide crystal, and then of course what happens in the developing process. And I want to go through it with you because... if we keep this as a controlling image, this idea of sublation, forms elevating to a higher level, let's say of consciousness and of structure, and at the same time they may cancel and negate the earlier and more primitive models, I don't use primitive in the pejorative sense, let's say they are more naive levels, and gradually refine. But by the same token, if we keep a controlling image in this case certainly it would be only applicable to photography, not to Dageurreotypy, but nonetheless we can see it as certainly following the same principle as earlier modes. In the first place, you will notice in the sequence, it says "the film reacts to light and produces an image because of the presence of silver halide crystals, these crystals may look like this, their size and shape may vary considerably but even the largest are invisible without the help of a microscope." Now that telling little signal, unwittingly whoever the pocket manual was, is not only defining this ad or showing this process because of a faster speed film, that would also have proportionally smaller grain, for example the new Tri-X professional, with the ASA reduced to 400... I have used it recently... you get the speed and you get less grain of the typical 400 speed film. At any rate, the telling signal here is the idea that in the first place these particles are so minute that they are inaccessible to vision and that is equally true in the final photograph unless we have an amplification of size and then in reality we are not seeing the particle, we are seeing the metallic silver that has been developed. And so in essence... that states

emphatically what the medium of photography is about, not only a light sensitive particle but a particle inaccessible to our vision with the naked eye. Secondly it says "when you take the picture, light hits the film," and you see that marvelous Cecille B. DeMille ray of light coming down from the upper.... hardly visible, like the finger of God emerging, striking the silver halide crystal, then it says "the energy of this knocks electrons off halogen atoms in the silver halide crystal. How many electrons are set free depends on how much light hits the film. These free electrons, then drift about inside the crystal." Again another very significant issue, that one unit, now watch this, one unit of the crystal can be affected which then in turn will set about, in essence, a sublational principle in which often the entirety of the crystal can be affected, only one particle of it receives the light and in turn, gradually through the process of refining the image in the developing process to turn into metallic silver, we have basically the one element of the crystal, the affected, which then in turn, gathers, elevates, cancels out that original area of affect and then gradually incorporates the whole, in other words, the same principle of sublation that we mentioned. Three: "In time the electrons are caught by cracks in the crystal. These can be irregularities or cracks in the crystal structure or chemicals in the crystal. In any case the effect is to hold the electron temporarily in one place." And this electron is vitally important. A big trap held in one place becomes a center for development, and this is the first prelude to what we might call the principle of the establishment of the latent image. That image which is there but in the process, there, but not as an image as such, but the physical properties, the atomistic properties, the nuclear properties are apparent so that they can be developed, as it were. So there is the latent image, it is primarily *in potentia* principle. Most people confuse this and I am shocked at how many times people really do believe. You will find out when you read the commentary on *Camera and Eye*, the parallelism, it is a marvelous commentary on, there are certain latent image properties within certain value structures within our receptive optical organ. But in this case we have the same principle, that these are not as such, the apparent image is transferred to the brain...but then they are *in potentia*, an image, and this is what is implied. Number four, "Electrons have a negative electrical charge. As a result they tend to attract any silver ions free in the crystal. These silver ions have a positive electric charge and can be thought of as atoms that are missing an electron. These ions already exist in the crystals." So therefore we have an interactive principle, and the fundamentals of the physical process, and later will become a chemical process, we have the interaction of the silver ions with their positive electric charge being attracted to the electrons which have a negative electrical charge. Now, "if the electron attracts an ion, the two join to form an atom of metallic silver at the trap site. Partly because of its larger size and partly because of its effect on the crystal structure, this new silver atom makes the trap still more effective." Now I would like to establish a kind of metaphor, remember the second study, where the issue of the idea of coalescence, or the isomorphism between mind and matter, here we have something that we might speak of as a *conjunctio*, a connection, a coming together. Again, the one particle affected in step two and three, and then finally the electron trapping an ion and forming the atom of metallic silver at the trap site. Now it is extremely important that we recognize this, because we start finding a clustering effect, that this one centered originally affected, and the gradual movement through the crystal itself, and finally we have a center of coalescence, a center of *conjunctio* between the ion and the electron.

Then it says, "this larger trap catches more electrons. They in turn attract more ions, forming more silver atoms. This growing speck of metallic silver is the latent image" already predicted in step four and now finally becoming the emphatic latent image, as it were, because of the deposits of metallic silver. "When it becomes sufficiently large it will become a development center, one of the many on the surface of the crystal."

Seven: "Development of the crystal starts at the development centers and spreads out from them until the whole grain becomes an irregular mass of black silver." And we all know these things, it is a fundamental principle, but again what I would like to suggest to you is that first, from the principle affect, of the ray of light hitting the principle, the activity is already taking place that is totally in this process independent of any human willing act. This is a medium that is indeed self-reflexive, or itself-reflexive... sometimes I like to believe that this is all alive, and it is...the development of the crystal starts in these development centers and there is this coalescence, there is an extension, so again, the phase when the metallic silver sublates the original molecular ion, electron activity. And finally, "These development centers enable a developer to change the entire silver halide crystal to silver. The ultimate effect of development is the amplification of the effect of the light hitting the film." Notice this: "as much as a billion times. In normal development only the grains that have been hit by enough light will develop into an image." But in this case these development centers the progress of science has permitted us to take the single unit and basically amplify the light that originally hit it by as much as a billion times. I may now suggest to you here we have a kind of reciprocity, the original ray is now amplified by as much as a billion times. Again, though, free from the interference of any human determination. Primarily an amplification, it is like nature amplifying nature through the use of basically chemical and physical components. Nine: "these microscopic specks of silver may clump together, eventually becoming large enough to see. They form the grain of which you are all so familiar. As you might guess, the bigger the original silver halide crystal the more light it will accept." And we all know this as well, "Basically, bigger silver halide crystals ultimately form bigger clumps of silver and so seem grainier. But this greater efficiency in catching light is precisely what makes fast films possible." Now notice Wald's commentary on the relationship between grain in the photographic form and grain in the optical receptors of our eyes, the retinas. This is, simplistic things often can be amplified, it is a very marvelous distinction, because in his commentary, he is forcing us to recognize that, yes, the parallelisms are obvious. However, the implications of the similarities are extraordinary because we indeed see as we might speak of, autonomously. One does not say, I think I shall now see. And indeed that was a question, whether or not we controlled our senses, rationally or otherwise...and we do not say, I think I shall now be hungry-- we are hungry. There are certain aspects of instinctual or autonomic, or aspects of the autonomic nervous system that function independent of our will, and exactly the same parallelism Wald implies exists in relationship to the materials and the mechanisms of camera work and photography. (Back to Kodak ad) "Consider then the level of technology built into the modern Kodak films that you buy. A technology that has been sharply reducing grain while maintaining--and even increasing-- film speed." Now again we have this implication of the issue of the grain incorporation and... in cooperation with nature. And the stress, the stress...and the grains coalesce to become this eye which will become eventually a

face. Now, as I said to you before, It is a very simplistic and obvious illustration, but if we think of the implications involved here, at least on that first level, insofar as Bazin said, it *is* the model by virtue of the process of its becoming. Now he says by virtue of the process of it becoming the model, but I am reversing it. What he is doing is talking about this kind of automatic, self-governing, autonomic aspect of camera work and camera chemistry. By the same token, what Fontallard inadvertently did was confirm a mimesis that had become increasingly important. This was laughed at, it is the comic routine like the Jack Paar show with the worms crawling across the canvas, ha ha ha, no artistry required, no account, no ability. And in reality, what is being suggested here is also an ontological issue, that is, photographs, we may discover in time...were responded to not because of the credibility of the atomistic detail. That was not the prime reason. Not because of the fidelity to original subject matter or identity, but primarily because of the independent agency of light, and it persists constantly in hundreds and hundreds of reports. I ask you to read the Marx article only to let you see how one great writer is affected by the implications of the detachment with which light serves as the agency of the report, and in particular not only the reported form but also to indicate character. And he uses the Daguerrean image to primarily indicate how this worked as a mirror image, as a form that can articulate not only the structure of a person but that peeking moment. Judge Pynchon, many of you remember him... how the fact that we try to pretend to smile and the ingratiating appearance, and yet the camera really catches is a smirk and a cynical physiognomy. This kind of immediacy of effect, which did not require the immediacy factor, was very persuasive in making people believe in photographs, and even some of the most absurd, unfocused, unclarified photographs. Photography needed no apologetics, Richard Lewis made this point exquisitely, needed no apologetics for its inaccuracies... because in reality the identity of that automatic act rendered something credible that no human mind, no human hand was in the way of the cultivation of this image. And I simply stress that because it has to be thought of that from the very earliest developments of human consciousness, in at least insofar as we can start to articulate specific images and specific relationships between human groups and forms that were made manifest by human groups, because in the very earliest groups we cannot speak of individuals, we have to reckon with the fact that this issue of an attempt to try to see in the first place something that could occur, that the world offered up images that the human group had perceived. We can't say we know they perceived it, but we know the evidence of their artwork itself confirms that. Secondly, the attempt on the part of the human being or beings to impress their identity upon the earth, this kind of reciprocity. This reciprocal interaction. This idea of an isomorphism between mind and world, or mind and matter. And we find that that is a hallmark of the earliest gestural marks made by humankind in various media. And generally in the very beginning, they are earth media: it is not media that we find in early work that is independent of the earth itself: compounded, structured, transformed. It is media such as clay, rock, stone, natural pigments, ochers, umbers, various pigmented-elements of natural materials. And that is not a great deal different...over a span of time to an advertisement in a magazine of late 1975, and find this same issue, this belief in not only a company's ability to reduce grain size while maintaining film speed, but also to confirm once again almost what we might call this sense of urgency, one might ask the question, why do you photograph, why do you

want reduced grain size and increased film speed, perhaps there can be an even greater coalescent identity between what one wishes to see and how one can obtain what one wishes to see independent of one's own desires, one's heart's desires. And while that may sound rather romantic, the issue is the objectivity, the credibility, the self-governing activity that takes place. The issue is, not so much because of the greater fidelity or speed, time, money, it basically inculcates a greater degree of belief... I want to show you a few examples... Now many of you may know Frank Stella's work and you might say what in the world does this have in context of what you were just mentioning, well I think it has a great deal in context because we are going to discover, in time, and I am not saying that the art of today is exclusively oriented around phenomenological forms such as these... I want to make one other critical distinction: if we speak of the developments of western art in various stages up to the 19th century, we are quite conscious of the old saw, that purportedly a great change began to take place, particularly in an artist named Manet. And it was Manet who purportedly introduced the elliptical into the development of painting, that is, the interest in reducing the terms of both schema-- we will deal with Manet later on but I just want to indicate this now-- if he uses schema they are adopted from the past, for example his *Luncheon on the Grass* which is a pastiche on Giorgione's *Pastoral Concert*, and then has its origins traceable back to motifs discovered in the Marc-Antonio Raimondi engraving after Raphael. The interesting thing is the way he painted, the reduction of detail, the introduction of a value structure, the strong emphasis upon value contrast rather than thematic identity, all of those elements, post-photography, I am talking basically the 1860s when the work became elliptical. All of these elements tended to predicate painting as painting, and certainly Manet's development toward the latter part of his work introduces, which will become apparent in the new atomism of Impressionism and the various stages of Symbolism, Expressionism, Post-Impressionism, and the structuralism of Cezanne, and gradually gathering momentum until painting establishes one view point, that became most contributive in our time as a new posture, and that is the non-referential work of art. Developed by the hand of the human being and without scale or proportion but was basically super human, that is above and beyond the scale we might expect paintings to have conventionally been, although there certainly large paintings in the past, Rubens and others. I am simply saying that the phenomenological aspect of the new painting, and particularly as it made itself manifest in Colorfield painting, in the works of people like Stella, Lewis, Noland, Zelitsky... and others, introduced an entirely new postulate concerning how the nature of a visual image affects us, and I might add it is considerably counter to photography. We will deal with this idea later on but I want to get the point across. Now Stella is one of the first of the phenomenologists in painting. His background was both in mathematics and physics, and he also had a considerable background, understanding, and appreciation in art and he chose painting. I am also not implying... as we have thesis, antithesis... that we have after Colorfield paintings of Frank Stella...we have neo-figurative painting turns back into...Philip Pearlstein, David Hockney, and others. We also find then that the photographic image became a suitable subject in Photorealism. My point is that in this one strain of humanly willed art, that is to say that Michael Freed, Clement Greenberg..were commenting on this peculiar development, and they often make their parallels to photography by saying that photography seems to obtain and retain the world, while painting tends to *become* the

world. Now I want to get this point across because it relates to practically every period that we will discuss, so I will just work around it and if you have some questions we'll spend a minute before I go on to the Paleolithic slides. The Stella image, let me just give you a few factual clues that might be helpful to you for a moment. In the first place the image on the left and the image on the right-- the image on the right is a much earlier form-- but they represent similar postulates, they are not so much conclusions as they are directives to himself in the development of his work. In the image on the left, (1961-62) notice the scale, ten feet one inch by six feet one inch...and then the one on the right, (1969) called *Jasper's Dilemma*, six feet five inches by twelve feet ten inches...we might at first glance want to say at that the work on the left was a development out of the persuasions of European artists like Victor Vaserly and the whole emphasis upon Optical Art... the recent show at the Museum of Modern Art... Castelli Gallery by Stella. Others made parallels to the structures that appeared of a whole series of the rust colors, the copper colored, the metallic paintings, and the black ones in which those lines, they are not actually additive, they are not just painted on the surface, sometimes they could be, but generally, each of these internal units are painted separately and made to appear almost as if they are engraved as opposed to being marks on a surface. When these were first exhibited in the late 50s and early 60s, they had this sort of immediacy of an announcement of a new order of a work of art. Pollock had already established what we might see as a phenomenological work of art, seemingly devoid of referents, as in number one through thirty two of his major calligraphic period. And established that the work of art as a reference only to a series of actions or energy transfers, One knew that certain types of motifs, the arabesques of lines, or the scale of the paintings, was only be accomplished by someone highly active, someone moving about. This is what you know Steinberg, Rosenberg, and others will speak of as the whole principle of the canvas as an arena, and the artist's actions within it as the actor, the one who enters the arena and affects that milieu or that environment by virtue of a transfer of physical definitions. Stella seems to pull the reins in on the kind of cathartic aspect of Pollock. We have reintroduced a very fundamentalist geometry. And a rather simplistic geometry. And even the ambiguities such as the lack of coherence in the way these actual units develop as well as their fundamental optical transition from flat plane to volumetric plane by implication, the optical illusion effects are not clear, are not clearly defined. At least we could say that their ambiguities are simplistic...

End reel 1-B