

## 6-A William Parker at Visual Studies Workshop, July 1977

Notes on the transcription: Comments made by Parker during the reading of texts are set in ( ). Additional information set in { }. Inaudible or gaps in tape indicated by ... Parker laughing indicated by {laughs} Students laughing indicated by {laughter}

### **Reel 6-A: Continuation of schema, model, pastiche, paradigm, Manet's *Luncheon on the Grass*, more on parody, begin Pompeian painting.**

Student: ...Of forms carved out of small rocks of various animals and there is a specific reference site to the north of France in the caves and to the south of France in the caves. They found images that were identical and then they found these little, what they call models. So again I am trying to find out, is this object a model, is it a schema, it can't be a paradigm in the sense that it is separate from the final thing.

No, not a parody, but paradigm maybe. Parody is another thing altogether. But look, Dave, I gather what you are saying but let me deal with both issues. I'd love to see that article about finding the little models but I just can't believe that.

Student: He has photographic evidence in the book.

But it sounds like reductionist thinking because I don't know how he can determine that is a typical projection of labor awareness upon an original form. In the first place I can't believe it is we would never know, the only thing we can deal with is the evidence, and there is no evidence, insofar as I know, of any kind of construct which would...those little tiny animals. The body differentiation. The better studies show that some of the animals do differ, not just in formal treatment but in type, like in Czechoslovakia to France, like some of the animals have shaggier fur than others. That is reasonable because we are dealing with the possibility of fossils and so on. Or climate conditions or what have you. But it would be just as reasonable to support the thesis that these are like the *Venus of Willendorf*: hand held, portable units of animals. And they are evident, remember the baton...I was showing you the phallic forms engraved with images. I didn't show you, but *The Eternal Present* has innumerable examples of small, intimately scaled animals, human forms, composite forms...and they are for portability. If you really believe in something you generally carry it in your pocket, like a rabbit's foot or a picture in your wallet, something like that. I think that is more reasonable in terms of even comparative behavior than the idea of trying to say because in the fifteenth century the Academy was born, and indeed people drew from the model and then from plaster casts and then the mannequin came in as a convenience. It is simply a matter of convenience. Mantegna could not have, nor could Tiepolo have possibly afforded, at least insofar as we know

what he received for his commissions, 400 models for a ceiling on a temple in Italy. It just couldn't be, so as a result, even a today a person in their studio, many of us might have these small mannequin models and it is not as absurd as you think, so if you really want to know how to articulate a position, if you happen to be working from the figure, then we have them sitting in studio rooms, and painting rooms, including skeletons hanging, hung from their racks...there are two at least we have.

Student: Then the problem with the word model is a matter of a noun and a verb, isn't it?

Yes, we can think of modeling.

Student: ...actually, to model is the appropriate term. It is not really a noun.

No, you can talk about a model, but a model is a replication...There are several instances in which model could refer to a predeterminative form but I would say to you that that has to do with, it is like saying, she is the model of decorum in that Pre-Raphaelite painting. Even though she slipped, and I almost got the title, she regains her moral stance. So if we say she is the model of decorum, what are we saying: she reflects some prior form, see? So the model is always after the fact. Or if we say, I would like you to take this clay and model me an ashtray {laughs}...now indeed there may occur some, the person may simply press it in with their fingers...but utility can often be the preexisting form that determines what the model will become, so again the model is after the fact...I think certain examples in physics, or even in chemistry, they can talk about models that then force relationships by virtue of their existence, and it isn't that the second form necessarily imitates the first...but that the model is like a provoking agent. But I think that is just the way a term has been used in scientific research, it doesn't have much to do with our usage of it. Model is generally thought of as after the fact and it is always subject to a source, to be related to a source. A paradigm is the influence of a prime unit, a prime source, or a prime subject, or prime organizational principle. It is the first among all possibilities that at least we can determine. It is an archetype. And not in a Jungian sense, it is the first of a kind. It leads to other elements and processes.

Student: In a sense it is almost metaphysical while the model is physical.

Uh, no. Because...is it metaphysical that I, as a paradigmatic, biogenetic human being. And my wife is a {laughs}... And granted, we are the paradigm for our daughter, after all though this is traced back, we didn't arise out of the sea like Aphrodite or descend from the heavens {laughs} but nonetheless we are the paradigms, and through a physical

relationship obviously became, the juncture of ourselves became our daughter. I wonder what my daughter would think if she heard this, she'd say 'you fool.' At any rate, the idea is, I am trying to point out that that is a very physical, and I am not talking about the act I am talking about the transfer, the physical material terms, electrical, chemical, whatever. So don't think of a paradigm as just being metaphysical, it can be someone. If I look at a photograph by someone...it is like Emmet Gowin saying, 'I was in that dentist's office, {laughs}, when did you do your first photograph...and he said, 'There I was, waiting in the dentist's office and I picked up that issue of *Look* or *Life*...and I saw that Ansel Adams photograph with the stump and the weeds growing around it, and I had to go home and photograph a stump with the weeds around it.' And thus in the 60s we have this paradigm, and out of that his willingness by influence, he has been playing the role of one who makes a model of a particular form, but you can say that Adams became the paradigmatic influence upon that structure...but he has hundreds of paradigms {laughs} he is quite a commentator upon other photographers, a really major commentator in his work. And you might say that his works often stand as not direct replicas, but they are reflective of a source and often very closely. A parody, did you ask me about a parody?

Student: No, that was my mispronunciation that made it sound like paradigm {long e sound for i}

Well I say paradigm {long i} {Laughter}

Student: Well what about parody?

Parody relates to, it can be an imitation, it can be a satire upon it, all these works we have...I like to use the term when we think of it in relation to art as a form of mimicry and what is called the pastiche. Pastiche normally is normally considered pejorative if you think of when someone walks into a show and says that is no more than a pastiche on Picasso. Well if it were it would be rather unique, which means that, watch this, it uses a pre-existing paradigm, aspects of either the schema, or color, or use of line....or a model of the previous paradigm but it also extends the original and sublates its original form and causes it to become a new form. And therefore it has become a pastiche, meaning a parody subject to the principle of imitatio, or imitation, but with transformation. And thirdly, that it introduces a sublational principle, it sublates the previous existing form. I am going to give you a perfect illustration, I thought this might come up...I am going to give you all 52 images in support of the thesis I just gave you. And we all know Manet's *Le Dejeuner Sur L'herbe*, right? It has also been recently redeclared, and I brought the issue with me because I thought I might want to refer to it again...If you start tracing the origins of this formal structure, and obviously you can turn to very easy sources that are available, but...it can become the most incredible journey because with absolute

assurance you can trace tracks of direct influence, and then when I say you can even get into peripheral areas of influence where you know even though this artist didn't know that, he was influenced by this later form which then in turn was influenced by that form, you see what I mean? And you can find yourself with a web of networks and you feel so wonderfully satisfied that indeed everyone got involved in the act, ultimately, and it certainly does something to one's humility, {laughs} because you find that you are not unique, and I mean it in that sense...This is a recent study, which I said I brought it with me, I'll put it out there since I mentioned it, of...an article about political iconography of *Luncheon on the Grass*, and it is very convincing and I have no reason to doubt it. But let's look at paradigm, model, and pastiche or parody. Wasn't there a third?

Student: Model, pastiche, paradigm, schema.

Schema, ok, schema. You can read the article for yourself, but I just want to point out a few things that you need to know. If I say to you and I start talking about a schema and I will prove to you that there is a distinct organizational schema that underlies this work, that if you...understood Venetian painting, and you understood Renaissance painting, and if you even understood Greek relief sarcophagus sculpture, and certain examples from the later Roman period, you would understand the schema as constant right through 1864 my friends, you know that is the date of the period in which your country was engaged in its great conflict. So now we put that in the context of time, we know this moment in time in 1864 Washington and Lee...

Student: Isn't that the wrong general?

All right now, the schema is primarily, it does not have to invade the entire structure of the work. It would seem perfectly evident that the schema is an extended triangulated structure that moves between three figures here. The schema could be diagrammed...and I could prove to you that it based upon a predetermined series of organizational principles that are not principles of design according to the painter's art. They are principles of prior art...I'll simply say that it is primarily indicated by that central group of figures. There are other elements where the triangle is so emphatically defined, there is a little bird, you see up at the top, that red patch? That is a red-breasted finch. And that bird is extremely important and it isn't there accidentally. It has a lot to do with Manet's attitude toward French politics and its difficulties...there are certain references that these painted figures do become models, replicas after the fact, of his favorite model, and of his brother in law, and in the background, a third figure, who I cannot remember. So that all three figures are identifiable persons who he did draw and paint individually before he imposed them into the structure. Now when this was shown in the Salon it created an extraordinary sensation. In the first place, the outrage: this man had

a way of getting into public hypocrisy. The outrage of a woman sitting there unabashedly nude, obviously having engaged in a picnic with two men who are seen in their wide-awakes, as the critic Astroll {Astruc?} wrote {laughter} But the impropriety of such a scene. And it was admitted to the Salon, by the way, but the thing is it created such an outrage simply because it was considered a mark of impropriety. Women do not just sit around nude. Woodstock hadn't occurred yet...collective living, communal living, communal nudity was not commonplace. And in particular for a woman who is cleansing herself and you will note that small tidal pond in the background, it appears as if she has lifted her chemise and is preparing to use what we might call a natural bidet. And this was considered utterly obscene. Now this was the popular reaction, and including popular critical reaction, fools who knew nothing about paradigms, and that this was a model of something. And the other issue that is apparent in the painting, it is very rich in iconography and I really could spend a great deal of time going through the whole thing but I will let you read it for yourself...that is the best source for it. There is another recent interpretation that is very convincing, it also uses photographic examples...there are elements like the boat that you can see here which is indicative of the fact that they had moved into this environment to enjoy their picnic. It is like, instead of the *Disembarkation from Cythera*...they are leaving the island of bliss, in Watteau's great painting, this has a lot to do with the *Prelude to a Concert* ...but in this case they come to the covert glade as it were to carry out their illicit affairs. Everything I am saying to you are quotes directly from some of the vile criticisms that were attended to this painting. There were others though who said we understand the intention, and this is Venetian painting cast into contemporary terms. And it also reflects the grandeur, the exquisite organizational principles of Raphael, and there were some critics who were enlightened enough to say a masterpiece of parody, a man who is capable of not only achieving his own interests but while giving the critics and the public what they claim is classically beautiful, quote unquote...Now one of the direct references that is mentioned in one of the reports is the relationship of Giorgione's *Pastoral Concert* to the painting. Now each of the schemata of the central group is triangulated and they are in an open area of a landscape, and you indeed have two nude women and one partially draped, as in the woman in the background who lifts her chemise. And we also have two clothed men and they are also engaged in rather, in this case the implication of romantic activity by the playing of the lute and the music accompanying the women. But Giorgione was interested in the theme of sacred and profane love. The women are both extensions of the Eros motif. One represents the archetype of Sophia, she attends the sacred well, she pours the libation of fluid, she is not getting a drink of water or pouring out the empty pitcher, or cleaning up after a party. Basically what she is doing is showing in the midst of this hedonistic sensual moment in time of a relationship, she is attending the gods, and to holy things, she is the goddess of sacred love, an Eros attendant to wisdom. Sophia, that is why we often speak of her earlier prototype as Sophia the

goddess of wisdom. Whereas this young lady even holds the flute, she is like that figure on the side of the *Ludovisi Throne* that celebrates the birth of the sensual goddess of love, Venus. She is not accidentally holding that flute, she repeats herself, as an example of earlier paradigms which Giorgione was obviously aware of in sarcophagus sculpture, in which the feminine flute player is a Greek motif for the one who celebrates the ritual of the birth of divine or even of earthly love, Eros. And she is indeed the Eros figure, she would be associated with the harlot, the strumpet. She can be associated with prime earthly matter. She can be associated with Mother Nature of the most primal sort. And we even have the extent that this is a bucolic scene, the world of domestic or even urban identities, such as the architectonic structures in the background, is at a distance. What do we find, even the shepherd tends his flock and in essence is unaware or uncritical to the event that is taking place. He does not interfere because this is indeed a celebration of nature. So *Pastoral Concert*...is a harmony of both the profane woman in conjunction with the sacred woman. The bifurcated, polar identities of the feminine in her spiritual as well as her earthly guise attended by young men of, obviously both educated, cultured, and tutored identity. And obviously very wealthy by virtue of their clothing who are understanding the facets of nature. This is part of their tutoring. It is obviously a vision that they are having. It is a dream as it were. It is a situation of understanding the spiritual nature of nature and also attending to its physical aspects as well. It is an allegorical motif. Manet saw this, folks, it hangs in the Louvre. He was an avid visitor to the Louvre. He was an arch *flâneur*. He was an arch visitor to every park and every sidewalk cafe, and constantly goes to the Louvre and looks at the masters and talks and writes about how the critics and historians totally misunderstand earlier painting. So he mimics the Venetian Renaissance work by Giorgione, and he lifts, very directly, the schema for his work and let me remind you of it again, directly from that supremely divine classicism constantly mentioned in the general reports, Raphael. But if he had obviously taken something like the schema of the *Madonna and the Goldfinch*, or if he had taken something from the grander, dramatic narrative themes of Raphael, or even from the portraits of Cardinals, then obviously his intent would have been found out too quickly. What he does is try to find the cryptic identification of Raphael since he was so supremely informed not by words but by visual images, he was aware of a considerable number of reproductions and replicas of no longer in existence, or non-extant Raphaels. So he turns to the engravings of Marc Antonio Raimondi, who, as a laborer, in appreciation of Raphael's work, spent most of his life giving us reproductions of the fine Master's work, and he records in the utter fidelity insofar as reproductive techniques occur...I said to you there were 52 arguments and you are only getting four. But look at that...who appears in the upper...left. I don't think I need to put you in the back of a Manet for you to be convinced that the two men...are in exactly the same position, and looking in the same direction, and even the woman who looks out at us, and even though the spreading of the silk cloth and the fruit forms and

the basket are not apparent, you certainly see the schema now. And you also see the paradigm for the exact relationship to the Raphael structure of the central group. Agreed? This is Marc Antonio Raimondi doing an engraving imitating a work that he saw and sat before and developed his plate, not developed it but marked it with a burin, in order to reproduce Raphaels for public witness. It is an example of influencing the public to recognize what works should be seen. And also those works which are in essence reflective of the long ago and far away, those Romantic notions of early engravers who wanted to have the exotic brought to their doorstep, as it were, and they were very popular engravings. Manet knows his graphics. So he finds a paradigm that he can utilize, and this is only, keep in mind, this is part of a grand thematic construct, and again I would be showing you the entire series. But this painting was of mural dimensions, and that is only a small portion. No more if you were thinking in footage, no more than one and a half-foot of the lower right corner of the entire image. So Manet has not only hidden his intent, or his paradigm, in one way by selecting something that these fools who never look at things, would never have known about as they worship the obvious Raphael, and generally his worst work, and revere that. They also wouldn't even dare to look at any detail, so he has lifted right out of the corner of the work, the small compositional unit. And again, I will return to it, the only thing that he has done, what happens in his painting is that shepherd who tends his flock has now been replaced by the figure in the chemise, who the public thought was performing a cleansing act, using this environmental pond as as a grand bidet. But need I say more, isn't the exact relationship to the original source is apparent within the consequent image. Now the Raimondi engraving after Raphael *is* the paradigm, at least insofar as we can speak of it for Manet. It is the direct paradigm of expression of a structural point of view which Manet utilized with exactitude in the constellation of those central figures, which is his main event within the work. The Giorgione is the paradigm for the theme of his work. In reality these two men in their wide-awakes are gesturing to one another and are engaged in conversation, but you will note that they do not look at one another. They are not suffering allusions, or dreams. They are really engaged with the understanding of nature. They have gone into, this is opposed to American Transcendentalism, they are not interested in world souls and so on, they have gone into the covert glade in order to commune with nature. And they are seen now in the presence of and are engaged in a picnic, and all of this business, every image in here is semiotic. Reductively portrayed around previous paradigms, the overturned basket, the cherries, not sexually, I am talking about to past themes including the fact that he painted the figures indoors and he painted the landscape out of doors. So he has made a composite as it were. And the only thing he has added to replace the image of the distant shepherd in the Giorgione, he substitutes the woman with the chemise and the boat as a kind of event that is taking place in the distance...insofar as we use the terms again, the paradigm for Manet is, to illustrate this term again since you asked, is the

Giorgione in terms of theme, the Marc Antonio Raimondi engraving after Raphael of the formal structure of the main group. The schema is also bound up in what we might call...in the engraving after Raphael. The basic triangulation...converges at the center, and we also have to consider the horizontality of the gesture here, and the diagonality. Those are not just compositional choices. They are direct indications of an underlying organizational principle that he has observed in another work. And then finally...I'll let this one unit suffice to illustrate...the same image with variations appears countless times. As I said I show 53 variations, even your Jansen text shows two, the sarcophagus image with the same kind of structure. But you can see where, I can't remember whose it is, it is a Mannerist painter, this is virtually almost a century after the...originally Raphael...an earlier painting. The Marc Antonio Raimondi engraving is a reproduction process. Here is the same figuration, at least of the Nile River god with attendant river figures, and the position of the leg, and the splay of the legs, and the structure was exactly the same. You can find this even further traced back in origin to sarcophagi figures of river gods...in my tracings, I found a direct lineage. In other words, *that* would not have occurred by Raphael had he not been attentive to examples of Greco-Roman art, particularly late Hellenistic and Roman sarcophagi...and by the same token the construct of this idea of the figures seen in a three-quarter back view, this may be more sprawled, but nonetheless it shows one of the examples of that. And we find in the drawing by Michelangelo a similar articulation of this type of structure, and the gradual... in which the legs sprawl up and the upper body is inclined and the head looks out. It happens to appear a number of times, the same type of paradigm even earlier than the Raphael in the examples of Sibyls in the Sistine Chapel ceiling. In other words what I am trying to say is that there are prime units, there are paradigmatic units out of which other forms emerge. The later forms sublate, cancel out, I don't think we say that in essence Raphael intended for his painting to ever become a reference to French politics or metaphorical definitions as defined by the choice of the way he has articulated those figures. Nor did he intend for it to eventually evolve into a point in which it might cause public shock, an offense. But on the other hand it just so happens that Manet canceled out all the variable intents of previous paradigms and became itself a new, in effect a new attitudinal construct. In fact, now a downright polemic. And as I said, read that essay for yourself. Does that clarify it? Clear enough? Also you can use the word pastiche because what has Manet done but develop a direct pastiche, a parody, a variation on a theme or a construct. Is that clear?

Student: Does there have to be an element of vulgarization?

Of vulgarization? Not necessarily, no...I know exactly what you are suggesting, in other words...we speak of things being vulgarized from their original prime source, and sometimes we talk about a cruder execution or...



Student: Making it more ordinary...or forced.

No, I see what you mean. Instead of going from a sort of hierarchical development from the spiritual or mythological, divine things down to that which is more earthly. Not necessarily, it can go just the other way. I am trying to think of an example. Let's say a photographer, who in writing and much of his work, tended to *wish* to sublimate the obviousness of physical forms, like Minor White, and the attempt constantly to sublimate the obvious image of prime matter into the realm of something that purportedly had spirit. And the idea of destroying the spatial view, the spatial construct, or coming close to the subject as others have done, and even in the writing in *The Octave of Prayer* and having the hierarchical order starting with matter and beyond the fourth octave you don't go. At that point photography is shucked off like the snake's skin {laughs} I'll use that metaphor again, and one ascends into the upper levels. It can work from matter to spirit or spirit back down to matter. I would suggest to you that Raphael's original intent was a grand presentation of a mythological theme, and those river gods are sitting there, they are just like leftovers to confirm that this is a special river, a divine river. In Egyptian, Hellenistic Art as well as Greek Hellenistic Art, often the river god takes that same position as the figure who is sprawled out gesturing, and little babies crawl all over him, the river god. Have you ever seen those? The little homunculi, they are marvelous.

Student: Yes, I am asking this specifically about parody.

Parody would generally be a vulgarization. I thought you meant a pastiche. A pastiche is not necessarily in the service of vulgarization or transformation or spiritualization...Parody is a way of defining the pastiche in terms of one's intent. To imitate but also to transform. Because a parody does somewhat generally transform. Dave, does that help, does that make sense? So that is where we are, let's get back to our slides...you might not respect this but one thing that happened just to illustrate the point one step further: sometimes, I think it is enjoyable, if you were to say to students... to think of a way of approaching, let's say, developing an image. If you take an example of their work and you put it in relation to that, and sometimes you have to plan ahead, it can't always be done on the spot, but you might take an example from one or two other photographers. Now let's imagine that we are going to mix these: your form marries to these other two. What would it be? What can you go out and find that would express that? And you can also take them right into the realm of understanding the meaning of the paradigm and the pastiche because they are obviously going to want to imitate, it is like people in creative writing quite often will have students do exercises in writing in the style of. Well I am not just talking about formal approaches, and I would never unlink it to their own work. But to try to get them to see a relationship between their work to two

other forms and then see what the synthesis of it would be. It might be surprising. Too many people often think that they want to be unique, and as a result they claim to have no possible influences. This is really a real issue in every type of media today and ironically they are not going to do a damn thing unless they find some brother or sister from the past that they can link to. I really believe that there is no artist of any significance who is not always at some point in complete devotion to a paradigmatic influence. And the breaking of the vessel.

Student: Do you think that it is then important that the student is conscious of what that link is?

I sure do.

Student: Harold Bloom espoused this in the past four books that he has written where the contemporary artist has to kill off his predecessor that he is bound to and yet has to surpass.

That is right, I completely agree.

Student: And it becomes worse with each generation.

And it does...who is this, is it Norman O'Brown?

Student: No, Harold Bloom.

The reason I say this is because it is a very powerful image of the killing off doesn't mean...I'd rather look at it as subsuming. Eliminating, canceling, denying, but yet incorporating the effect into the new level of awareness. And I do think that you have to be conscious of that. Now why do I say that? Give me a single example of anyone. The only person I think that pretentiously defines the issue of so-called complete independence and yet he is one of the most extraordinary mimeticist and imitator I have ever seen, is Garry Winogrand. You know that smart ass remark, Beaumont says in contempt, he deserved what he got back, you throw the ...in the water and someone will shove it right back, well how long did it take you to make that? One-twenty-fifth of a second. No, he meant it in contempt, how long did it take you to arrive at that idea? John Ward writes the commentary on the cow or whatever it is falling in front of the car, oh that is bullshit, I don't do things like that...and yet why do we call it *The Animals*? That is like ...look-alikes. {laughter} You know, the girl looks like the llama. Here is a man so obviously intentionalist in his relationships. He doesn't even know *when* he is doing something that is obvious. Now I don't mean that to be cruel, I have argued the

point with him. I've said you are not kidding me. Even of women. I have never seen a more imitative construct in my life, it is full of pastiches. And I'd say, "Garry," and just hand him a few images. He doesn't like it. Because you see he likes to think he is pure and unfettered. Do not infect me with any idea of influence. I am a free spirit. I don't talk about art, not words, action! Name me any individual that you can point to, the work or anything else, who is not subject at one point in their development to a very pervasive and active influence. Today it is almost like you have to have six or seven that you have to wrestle with and kill off (laughs) I know what Erich Neumann says, to me, on archetypal terms there is a whole passage before we all go through, and he speaks of it metaphorically and in mythology and literature, all of the forms we go through, the influence of world parents, and I don't mean Mommy and Daddy, the separation from the world parents, the killing of the parents, the reassimilation of them...How do you all believe, do think people work independently without influence, or can they work without knowing their influences?

Student: I think often people try to deny their influences in the sense of not wanting to think about what the connection might be, but that it comes through their work anyway, subconsciously.

Student: Well I find that students often do work unaware of things that reminds me of somebody else's work and then I draw their attention to it...I don't know whether they saw work at some point and were not aware of it and it was somewhere in their subconscious, or they are doing something that has really been done a while, therefore they are seeing it as a particularly unique event.

There was a meeting of Freudian analysts who interpreted Freud's concerns about the importance of psychic infection, and they concentrated particularly on the creative artist. And do you know that old theme, it is like Leo Castelli telling John Casseri and others, who knew Lee Bonaque when they were teaching all at Cooper Union, please don't sleep with Lee because her psyche is very delicate and you will ruin her art. Now she doesn't do anything anymore but no one slept with her insofar as I know, and the point is, she didn't have that delicate a psyche. That comes from 1893. This notion that the artist's sensibility can easily be infected and it is such a delicate sensibility, like little filaments: break off one and you have destroyed the energy. Jung said that is nonsense. Parent is a slender twig that is easily snapped, creativity is a matter of volitional necessity...It is a struggle. I don't mean the heroic struggle, climbing the mountain ala Sisyphus and the rock {laughs} but it is meaning you really have to struggle to find out who you are by virtue of living through something else...Stieglitz could not even have conceived of an equivalent without what?

Student: Without having studied in Germany.

Exactly, what else?

Student: Cubist painting.

Well I wouldn't start with Cubist painting I'd start much earlier.

Student: The Symbolists?

The Symbolists, exactly. And what was hanging in his home, Franz von Stuck with the snake around the woman's neck and all that morbid symbolism. Why he was so steeped in it as a child, you cannot dismiss those influences, they are absolutely directly linked. They might not appear as snakes around women's necks, I just chose that as one that hung in his home. But I am talking about the fact that the whole symbolist intent was already there.

Student: Influenced the painters, too?

Yes, and not only that, but also the influence of earlier concentrations upon clouds, we can't refer to Muybridge's clouds, but we damn sure can know that he saw Constable's studies of clouds. You can't make a direct connection but Peter will even confirm that. The thing is, is that he saw them...to linger on, but particularly the Symbolist strain. Why he saw relationships between things to the point in his power mad identity, he became the arch-Pygmalion of the twentieth century (laughs) You know, women, men, dogs and animals want to come to life...I am often struck by that fact, I just don't see this idea of uniqueness and I'll never be able to accept it because it doesn't prove to me in any art form I've ever observed. The paradigm underlies everything.

Student: ...if you look into Emerson and *Self-Reliance*...it might be distorted in terms of what self-reliance means, breaking away from but not incorporating at the same time, there is no way you can it can happen...simply separating yourself from the past and traditional issues, but somehow students feel that they are not connected to a tradition, at least they are not aware of it. But it does exist.

I tell you...you are quite right...When Emerson says true genius is in believing in one's own thought. But you know it is interesting that Emerson constantly gives credence to every influence he ever experienced. What he meant was, this is a sort of expo-facto dictum: now you have had enough, you understand your paradigms, you've had your pastiche experiences {laughs} now get on with the business of doing something with it,

that is what he meant by self-reliance. Those people are more influenced by the last four letters of American, i-c-a-n. They have all that sloppy jargon shoved down their throats by, go west young man, you can do it, I can do anything, I am an American, I can. That was told to me in the second grade and I used to say {in a timid voice} I can do anything because the last four letters of American has it...{laughter} I had a second grade teacher scream that at us. It didn't become you might, it was, you must or you are a failure. And that is what they thought, and they inevitably read Emerson's *Self-Reliance* in the eleventh grade curriculum which still persists in New Jersey and New York State, Connecticut...as it did when I was in school in the forties and fifties. It is just stock curriculum material in the eleventh grade, I don't know if they been pushed back to the ninth or eighth grades in the more advanced schools, maybe they've substituted some commentary on the World Soul instead of that, but I don't know, but I think it is still very constant in some areas. And what interests me is the fact that that is an often misunderstood text of Emerson's. Because you can't separate that from the fact that that is a development in his own writing. Where it is not the noble savage who can depend upon his wits, even the self reliance that one has to depend upon is in communication with a very strong sense of essence, world-soul. A self reliance in which you are imbued with the powers of nature therefore you and the self can conjoin with the power of nature, therefore you can. It implies it is teleological and after the fact of a considerable number of influences. You are right. But what I think it comes down to is that someone told people they could excuse their sense of necessity. I said their necessity by copping out on the basis of, 'I don't need to have any influences.' I just say well that is alright, but you do anyway {laughs} Because you see, ironically, even *that* is based upon a paradigm, a separationist attitude...it is like a form of, I mean I believe if a person is not being an agnostic, they never say anything about it. {laughs} The person who wants to convince you of the nonexistence of a god, and I don't care about the subject, listen to me...if I start trying to convince you to prove it then obviously I am a true believer. Do you all remember that thing that came out from, remember I got off on that fact last fall, I just love that *Whole Earth Catalog*...that dumb thing was published out of New York, that is the comic routine of the century, I treasure it. Were you here that time when I was reading those excerpts from it? You all know what I am talking about?

Student: The California one?...

No, the New York one, it has the imitation, the montage/collage thing, it looks like the *Whole Earth Catalog*, oh you have got to see it...I will show you something, you will die laughing. It has the most extraordinary excerpts, and whoever can do something on this, this is something to give your students to read and say watch out, this is what they'll do to you later {laughter} It is the laugh of the year, of the last five years. But do you know people are requiring that for class usage. They are, they are saying this is

THE text...we sure are spending a lot of time on this, well we have a little bit left to do the slides.

Student: So the word pastiche is not then always negative.

No, it is like the word dilettante. Originally, in Italian, *dilattare*, to take delight in, In terms of usage, people excuse themselves from the requirement of seeing a lot and to delight in seeing things that were easily accessible, and therefore it became a pejorative term, it had pejorative connotations, it became, you were held in contempt if you were a dilettante. But if you trace back the meaning of it, at one time that was the supreme accolade to give you if I was say, fellow dilettante. That was like giving you the mark of a person who has creature interest in taking delight in the world or art or anything else.

Student: That is a nice word.

It is a beautiful word. And that is the same thing with pastiche. Its original meaning is to imitate by necessity. In its original etymology, we need to find the roots of certain words because what is interesting how words that are volitional, motivational in one period degenerate into negative connotations, definitions in a later one only because, not of the word or what it originally intended but by the misuse of it, and the misappropriation of it, in action. Because a person who says a pastiche in imitation is plagiarism, well there are plagiarists, and I think that is not a pastiche, {laughs} when you take something and lift it directly. Wait, where is Lee, get her, she has got to hear this, I have got to give you the one on Fred Sommer first. These little comments concerning contemporary photographers...about Imogen Cunningham, prepare yourself for this, if you don't see the humor in this we are going to have to sit down and have a long talk about that.

Student: Is this supposed to be humorous?

It is intended to be deadly serious. Remember I just talked about believing the true believer? Did you know that certain photographers are true believers...an elite group that are true believers, and you can ask the question, in what? And you will never know. But there is that true belief, and they are deadly serious. Let me...this will kill you, this is Fred Sommer.

Student: Who wrote it?

Well a bunch of people, like Carol Kismaric, Norman Snyder...and I would be embarrassed, I just think it is a tragedy.

Student: Have you ever read anything further about it? They say at the back that they are planning to start a new magazine.

Oh yes, I ordered it...have you all seen this thing? Photography, hopping down the workshop trail with Ralph Gibson {laughter} The tragedy of... America's great photographer, RX for the TV's news blues, it is like that dumb photograph, you know, I sent in my seven dollars, got the first issue, and they sent me a second copy of the first issue and I wrote back and said, look, I don't care, you can keep the money if you are in hard times, but are you really doing this thing, I finally got the February issue, I guess as you all realized, six months later, and now one more in March, and it has just disappeared.

Student: No, it is at the printers now.

Hot dog! {laughter} So here is the new literature in photography: Fear and ecstasy in the Avedon studio. The first technological history of photography in twelve installments. Focus on Gene Smith from six...to Minamoto, a tormented odyssey. I thought this was a joke but it isn't. (laughter) I thought it was a supreme cartoon but it isn't. Wait a minute, you haven't heard it yet, listen, Polaroid versus Kodak, a patent lawyer's analysis of the coming epic battle, and it goes on, the private life of Diane Arbus, a personal reminiscence...who is photographing the male nude, question mark, a letter from Japan, photo contest fever, sex on the workshop circuit, {laughter} my work is done, a serialized biography of George Eastman. A week on location with Ebony's Pulitzer prize winning Moneta Sleet Jr.. And reports about camera collecting, print collecting, gallery openings, dash dash, the works. You get all of that for twelve dollars. Where is Lee? Each one of these, just nuggets of delight. {laughs} Here is Fred Sommer: I will try to read it, well I can't {laughter} I'll just read it direct...One could rhapsodize over the lovely composition shown above...that says a great deal about the artist's subconscious...since it is an example of the surrealist term, automation...which is for the plastic arts the equivalent of automatic writing. What Sommer has done is to stick a large sheet of paper on a wall and slash at it with a mat knife and then photograph the composition...{laughter} not all of his work is so lovely, he has been known to gather up dead and vile objects {laughter} they want to clarify so we don't accuse him of necrophilia and manipulating fecal matter. The amputated foot and leg of a tramp, and then to transform them into fantastic, somewhat frightening landscapes. His landscapes, reassembled found objects and cut paper photographs range in price from \$450 to \$3500, Light Gallery, 744 Fifth Avenue. Wait a minute, here comes Imogen Cunningham.

Student: I'm glad they only mentioned my book without making any commentary on it.

Dave, I looked you up, I really did.

Student: Somewhere in there is a mention...a list of books or something.

One night Jim Dow and I sat around and we read this thing for hours and we were in stitches, we just couldn't help it. {laughs}

Student: I'm sorry I haven't bought the book.

Students: {Inaudible, laughter}

Let me find Imogen Cunningham, here it is. They always give you the dates, Imogen Cunningham 1882 to 1976, and they show us the...design of the 1920s which again is very ambiguous, you know these little reproductions...photographs as art and they are called collectible photographers, would you please exhume the suicided body of Diane Arbus I would like to collect her, collectible photographers? "Cunningham was in her 90s when portrayed in Judy Dater's shot of a pixie old lady wearing a long dark dress and a peace symbol bib. Hanging from her neck is a Rolleiflex. She and a beautiful nude woman are looking at each other in the woods, period, symbolic, period {laughter}... She has spanned the history of modern photography... She printed for Edward S. Curtis, mingled with Alvin Langdon Coburn, and it is spelled Coburn. Mingled with, not commingled. I'm surprised they didn't say, and she knew in the biblical sense (laughter). She mingled with Alvin Langdon Coburn, Alfred Stieglitz, and Edward Weston, she was a member of group F-64. She took pictures of nude men before Betty Friedan was born {laughter} She also made delicate, sexually suggestive horticultural studies" (laughter).

Student: Did I miss something in her work?

She makes sexually suggestive horticultural studies {laughs} Look at Dave looking in disbelief. Let me read you the one on Garry Winogrand. This is illustrating a very good point...

Student: Read the one on Nathan.

Yes, the one on Nathan...I have got to read a few more, please..."Garry Winogrand, 1928 dash, if you enjoy city street life, i.e., hanging around parks, going to the zoo, or attending parades, you are bound to run into Garry Winogrand. Year after year Winogrand pounds the same beat, hunting with his Leica on the streets of the city." (High drama, hunting) "Being on familiar ground enables him to react



spontaneously to the little things that happen, a gesture, an attitude, life's small pleasures," (... so strained, I mean as if it must require physical exertion to tilt the camera, I am serious) "To the uninitiated his photographs seem unconsidered for" (I have never considered his photographs unconsidered, I consider them pretentiously, effortfully, strained in their effort to try to look spontaneous, but they are not. They are marvelous, by the way, I love them, that is not criticizing them, I am just talking about the bullshit about how they occur: they are not from the hip) "To the uninitiated his photographs seem unconsidered for his craft lies not in the print quality but in his ability to capture what his roving eye notices. You must search around within a Winogrand photo for what he apparently sees instantaneously" (What does that mean? {laughter} Oh I see now that is where you were instantaneously active, pointing at a shoe or a foot) "For example, in a photo of a group of canine bitches one discovers a woman who at first glance was camouflaged {laughter} Not a joke dash dash, but if eyes could laugh, you would have to say it was funny"... (It goes on, but the true believer thing...oh the Caponigro...he believes so completely that his belief is true...here it is) "If photography had an answer to religion it might well be equivalence...the concept coined by Stieglitz in the early 1930s...and taken up since by Minor White, Harry Callahan, Aaron Siskind, and Paul Caponigro to denote the emotional volume within the triangle of photograph, photographer, and viewer...Caponigro makes unmanipulated pictures of nature to express his mystical feelings. His prints, which are beautiful, rely on the emotive value of shapes and textures. Enigmas in meaning, they are not records of the physical world but objects for meditation. Quote, I have no other way to express what I mean than to say that more than myself is present. I cannot deny or put aside these subtle inner experiences. They are real, I feel, and know them to be so, unquote. He is one of photography's true believers" {laughs}...(In himself? In god? In the world? It is just the strangest amalgam, who was it, Brady was called one of the true believers, it is all the way through here. But listen to this about Harold Jones. They obviously started writing these little profiles on people)... "Harold Jones, a very highly qualified mechanic." (That is what he called himself. It goes through this thing about when he studied in New Mexico)... "went to assistant curator at George Eastman House, and then they start writing about reporting what he said, he says, "He is now the director of the University of Arizona's Center for Creative Photography in Tucson and he believes that those who feel they might like museum careers should take all the business and administration courses available, they should hang around museums so they can get the feel for the reality of the how and why they work." So if you want to work in a museum you go and hang around.

Student: Like hanging around the park.

Yes, and then it says..."Jones has a...attitude about his success. Quote: I have been lucky and in the right place at the right time, he says with a boyish smile...you must know though that somehow Lady Luck has shown her favor because of his very real charm, his obviously educated intelligence and his conversational ability. And if you have those three things young man and Lady Luck favors you then you too shall succeed" {laughs} It sounds like one of those nineteenth century advisory books for young men. "He is a photographer, too. One who got his start when he sent a box of photographed...paintings to Van Deren Coke, who looked at them and took Jones as a graduate student at the University of New Mexico. One summer Coke told Nathan Lyons about Jones, who invited him to participate in the Museum studies workshop at Eastman House. A year later on the verge of receiving his Masters, his thesis was a dissertation on Paul Strand and Edward Weston, and wondering what students have done since time immemorial, what will I do now? The telephone rang." {laughter} You won't believe this, watch what he says, the telephone rang, deus ex machina: "Lyons asked him to join the staff at Rochester. Three years later the phone rang again {laughter}...A Mister...was saying that he was starting a gallery in New York to show photographs exclusively and to represent the photographers. Would Jones be the director?" The end. It really is incredible. Also the technical angle...this is under materials and chemistry and suppliers...this is the hottest sketch of the century I swear...it tells you how to use a vacuum and a damp cloth to remove dust from pipes and molding in your darkroom {laughs} Seeing the light. There is a marvelous section here on...they have one here, it is almost obscene on Grace Mayer and Edward Steichen. They don't mean it, I know they did this seriously, it is just ridiculous. And look at the images...people pouring things {laughs} Look at that, isn't that an instructive image for a manual?

Student: Hold end of bottle upright...

... I didn't mean to degenerate, I am certainly not subverting my original point. In fact we are going the other way...here it is, this is a very telling signal. I am generally unnerved by any little illustration that gives little bell curves and other types of statistical data... but you know we talk about having faith and the bible belt minister, well here is an example: "Circular images for rectangular photographs. We are now down to the *how to* level. And it has over here this very interesting diagram that says: in all lenses, image detail and illumination drop off at the outer edges of the circle of illumination, thus covering power is determined in relation to the circle, a good definition which is slightly less than the absolute maximum coverage." And I promise you the diagram reads very clearly, it is adequate. Then it says: "Since images project circular images, rectangular film must fit within this circle to be completely covered. Aside from optical quality, the most important consideration in buying a lens for a view camera is the covering power.

View camera work often involves displacing the centered relationship between lens and film.” And it goes on in a detached and sort of neutral tone, and it goes on and says, “If you want round pictures, the simplest way is to use the wrong lens. Emmet Gowin’s haunting circular photographs are made with an 8 x 10 view camera with a lens that won’t cover. In other words, the idiot doesn’t recognize that since the 1860s, photography has been deliberately putting the lens of a 4 x 5 coverage on an 8 x 10 so they get a tondo image. It is an established tradition. It moves right out of even nineteenth century tondo and earlier tondo imagery. But finally, if you want round pictures, the simplest way is to use the wrong lens...and buy a lens that won’t cover. I see that wasn’t worth waiting on but anyway I love it... Well, let’s move on to Pompeian painting...There are basically four phases of Pompeian painting, in particular as architectural decoration. And although some say, in the popular texts like Helen Gardner, she will give you exquisite definitions of each: style 1 style 2...and others seem to dismiss it. We might say the earliest style, style 1, tends to be basically an imitation of architectonic details of marbleized surfaces and so on without pictorial representation. But they show a high degree of interest in mimetic portrayal of surfaces. Like all those paintings of the late Middle Ages that we call the Proto-Renaissance period, or Italian Late Gothic, you will have what we call Cosmati inlays imitated, these are inlays of marble and so on. And so often when you are looking at those flat, even Byzantine images, don’t ever think that mimetic portrayal was forgotten. On the contrary, because it was often, like wooden chairs with gold leaf, or tile inlays and so on have the most extraordinary fidelity to patterns and surfaces and textures...whereas the Madonna and Child will tend to be completely struck by issues that have forced the images and figures to become less than human, so that they are indeed transcendent, and impress us with their relationship to other works...When the Pompeian style emerges we have two things operative. Let me say this collectively, all Pompeian painting is inconceivable without the influence of the observed principle of light falling upon landscapes, architectural structures, and objects. It is an astounding period, and tragically it is totally neglected...And if we want to be really specific we can say there are direct relationships, and I suspect that someone has got to do a study someday on the direct relationship to perhaps the influence of Pompeian painting upon, it could conceivably be Niepce, Daguerre, Talbot, who was certainly aware of this art. The reason I say that is because one of the most important influences upon even late Neo-Classic painting was the Pompeian forms. And certainly, as the competition, even the Daguerreian images that purportedly Ingres so despised was sitting there imitating Daguerrean images, and we didn’t need to wait for Scharf to tell us that, there are a number of his portrait studies, even because of the lack of reversal from the cartoon drawing to the presentation of the image. The fact that he was a virtual scholar of Pompeian painting, mythological painting, and many of his works are direct pastiches of the tomb paintings or domestic architectural paintings that we find throughout the places of Pompeii. And I

say that because you see the Pompeian influence in the 19th century was not casual. A great deal of interest in Pompeian art, innumerable published reports of...including those where the syntax is somewhat repressed as in the use of mezzotints and the use of lithography...and the whole issue of Neo-Classicism is not to be thought of as a repetition of Fifth Century Classical Greek sculpture, but it is obviously...a synthesis of Greco-Roman Hellenism and Pompeian Roman Art, with the balance of the scale given to effects of light and less the articulation of what we might call the gross effects of light and shade. If we are sitting here now, that would be a gross example of light and shade. This light is on and that light is on, and certain people are obviously bathed with more illumination on one side than the other, others have a more full frontal since they are facing the light...You people over here have got a stronger shadow on the far side, and I don't know what I look like because I am to the light, I am beautiful though, (laughs) I am sorry, I can't get serious after that book. At any rate, I am a true believer though, I just want you to know...I know of no direct connection but it is inconceivable that the issue even in the commentaries upon Pompeian painting would have escaped early practitioners of photography. Now I am just convinced that it will be found or else we will find some fragment that will confirm that a great deal. They obviously saw it. Daguerre, he chose to develop pastiches that were based primarily on relationships to what he was aware of. As we know, he was a painter. How many of you have ever looked at, I have seen the originals of Daguerre's paintings. You saw that one in the Metropolitan, in the French, wasn't that remarkable? This was a man with an acute understanding of...you don't have to read just about the diorama, but you have to recognize that his own painting, of which I have seen seven of the works, shows an incredible understanding of historical paradigms. This is no man working out of clever talent. He was a very informed figure in painting. And Talbot was a very tutored man, a very literate man, and no young British gentleman, we wouldn't even have the reason...

Student: He visited Pompeii.

Exactly. Absolutely, and we have the photographs, isn't that still in question whether that is he amid the ruins of Pompeii or not?

Student: I am talking like 1820 to 23, 24.

Oh you are, he went back then a second time, I didn't know about an earlier visit, well there it is, confirmed {laughter} When was that visit?

Student: I don't know, I've got it in my paper I think.

I know he was traveling in Italy, I never knew that he went to Pompeii.

Student: I am pretty sure that he did.

We have those later photographs. That was a second visit, and I understand that they are still in dispute as to whether, one of them is purportedly Talbot in the image, at Pompeii. Do you know which one I am talking about? Seen with the top hat?

Student: I think so.

Well, at any rate. But what I mean is that we don't have any record of his direct statement of influence. But it is just inescapable, because even the way some of the subject matter appears, like remember Niepce's destroyed plate of the table, and then Talbot's concentration on the table set with the various, cream pitcher (laughs)...It can't escape your attention. I would have to check as to whether or not it was extant even at the period when he was in Pompeii, but most of them are, and also as a result, it has a striking resemblance to many of the early concentrations upon that idea of photographing domestic scenes, table tops, objects distributed and so on...

I just want to give you a sense of the identities that are involved.. As I mentioned, in the so-called First Style, the sense of mimetic portrayal is evident in the imitation of surfaces. Now this is terribly...so don't start seeing things in the central panel. You can see, for example, the implication in the central panel, it looks like it is...an imitation of some type of marble, just as the imitations may be of wood panels or of grain stone, or of various types of surfaces. So the First Style shows already an architectural decoration in the use of pigmented materials to make a facsimile of other types of materials, like you buy an ashtray that looks like lava rock but it is made out of plastic... it is the same kind of substitution to another medium, to another form...are defined through these different types of stone, wood, marble surfaces that are defined with utter exactitude. Now I don't mean you can walk up to them and see the syntax of the painted brushstroke...and not the surface tactility like rough or smooth, but the apparent visual effect in Pompeian painting shows an incredible interest in what I would speak of as unit detail in terms of the way surfaces appear to our eye from a reasonable distance. We don't have to walk over and touch a stucco wall before we know it is rough...The Second Style introduces the next radical development because there is no example, and it is equally true even though Zeuxis...invited his compatriots to take the painting away because people were admiring only the clay of the work...where in the Second Style there is a strong tendency for works to be spread over large areas, sometimes in continuum, and they introduce architectural subjects, large urns, buildings, various types of temple structures, domestic and sacred architecture, which at first glance are very convincing. And a lot of this interest in material representation will reappear with the different types of marble, stone...split facades, and rotunda structures...and even

columns and colonnades. I would stress these are not imitations of the columns out in front of the wall. And (laughs) what if I could convince you that those weren't the thing. But the space, the perspective is introduced, and it is obviously a confused perspective because there is no systemic use of the vanishing point. There is no consistent eye level, and there is no understanding of the proper combination of recessional space according to rational terms. Even though you see buildings...with respect to elements they do not obey...notice this...we follow these lines down, they may indeed find a vanishing point, but they have no relationship to other elements so for example here...so even though an illusion of perspective is presented, or at least a suggestion of perspective, there is no coherence to the perspective. Also, even though you will begin to notice spatiality in these works, keep in mind we tend to be blocked. It is like in the early works of Hippolyte Bayard, I always state that only on the basis of the evidence of his work, and I have seen a great deal of it...he tends to force us to go through stages of the progression into the photograph's sense of space. And he often deals with these weird paradoxes, the minute you are receding all the way back suddenly something pulls you forward...but what I really want you to notice is the treatment of light and shade, particularly on this architectural form in the center of the work. This is not the simple understanding of chiaroscuro. Most of the light in defining in architecture or this urn that appears within this painted niche...the effects of light...is not a simple understanding of rendering volume by virtue of defining light and dark planes. This is transitional definition, it is subject to sfumato effects not only along edges but the gradual and continuously gentle transitions so that indeed the horse part of the woman and her human part are imperceptibly joined. And that is the same when we start reading surfaces, so to speak, without separation into planal structures, the way we might look at a column. We also get variable identities of light according to a source that is implied. We do not have the light source although in some cases we do, visible within the painting, but we do indeed have the possibility that the light is reflected variably, let's say those in the forefront of an object and then the way they gradually reduce in their value of sharpness, or color intensity. That is when the chroma is pure when it is fully illuminated or gradually is neutralized and it pushes off into the distance. Or whether the value contrast is sparkling or reduced. The other element I'd like you to notice is that...there is indeed an observation of the effects of light falling upon objects and all I ask you to do is look...and the reason I chose that slide, the color is not bad, is a rather incoherent slide as to where the mural is located is because most of the way the light behaves on that column in the foreground and the way the light tends to...gradually reduce because the light...from the columns above. You can see a direct relationship. This will continue and occur in the time of the early Renaissance, for Raphael himself was very interested not so much in Pompeiian art, but he was interested in that effect in what would happen if you could include, in the setting as it were, the light that might fall through a window, and how could that be incorporated into the painting. So, as you

might know, da Panicali, his paintings on the upper registers, Masaccio chooses the lower less important registers for the Brancacci Chapel images. How many of you have walked through that marvelous red dust floor of the Brancacci Chapel? And you hear your foot as it pads the sands. And the dust, the red dust rise. It is a very small...and you turn to the right and there you will see those marvelous first purportedly Renaissance images of the human form. And one of the first images that you see (laughs) and you almost want to say so what, until you notice, is that *Expulsion of Adam and Eve From Paradise*. And then you are aware of something very peculiar: my god that light looks real! And the way they are modeled in light and shade, and suddenly you realize, my god that light is real, just turn your head over your shoulder and will see that that brilliant man chose, for the alabaster...that sends the beams of light down, he painted in exactly where the beams would fall at various times of the day so that it would model the figures in chiaroscuro...That is an extension of the same type of instinct that was involved in Pompeii. Letting what is observed become apparent within the form according to the principles of reflective, refractive, and altered definitions of light. Now keep in mind that we are talking about 180 BC, and here is again the Second Style...What I want to call your attention to here, you see even this kind of, for example, certain types of marble inlay dealt with geometric pattern structures, illusional devices, and those are part of the architecture of Pompeii you can still witness these kinds of developments today in terms of mosaics, inlaid tiles, and so on. Tessera and thin slices of marble that create these optical illusions... similar to the way that Josef Albers presented his rather remarkable optical illusions. And we can say that the imitation is quite accurate including the kind of basket weave pattern and other elements...And what interests us is...in these, quite often, the effects of light, where they bring light into the chromatic identity, or darken it in order to show recession, or some change is introduced right into the structure of those pattern designs that represent an imitation of the original surfaces observed. And in this style we can also have certain types of geometricized and pictographic forms pictographic forms occurring on top...This is still the Second Style, although the slide chosen does not have any referential material, what I want you to see is this unit that starts to establish a distinct framed rectangle, and in essence this is where we also know that we have a distinct reference to what we might speak of as a picture plane. Having its integrity, the integrity of what will be defined on that plane is thought of as seen beyond the window. The window onto the world issue that we associate with Renaissance painting does not begin in Florence, it begins at Pompeii. Now you might say, wasn't Zeuxis having his people carry away his painting, and I would say of course he did, but he never thought of, in fact all the illustrations of the bird coming down to the grapes to the point where the bird came to the grapes again but he shouldn't have done so because the boy wasn't obviously painted well enough, it is because he still thought of the mimetic effect of units and there is no evidence that we know of, even that marvelous description by Lucien of the father centaur entertaining from a distance the

children suckling, the issue there is that we never have a principle of organization defined within peripheral structures that become an integral part of, either the pictorial representation or suggest a demarcation of boundaries. And in Pompeian art we have the visual evidence and certainly, even though we are dealing with the recovered territory, the late recovery, there are textual evidences that refer to this issue. Now I want you to notice what happens, this is still in the late Second Style, early Third: these frames begin to introduce...here is one, these extraordinary columns that were based upon vegetative motifs, and those are all painted. Isn't that rather convincing?...All of this is painted. Every bit of that is painted. How does that grab you? It wants to convince you, doesn't it? And it is an extraordinarily mimetic portrayal. And what happens is, is the tendency for the same plane... leans forward and notice there that is not an understanding, like here we have, this isn't an Oriental landscape, that is just surface definition. Look at the little urn sitting up on the molding up at the top...an extended molding on which urns or vessels would be placed...here we have a little man running along this water, and the dog in front leaping. And then we have attendant figures and then we have another figure in an architectural setting...a group of buildings, and they don't bear any relationship to one another. It is almost like an archaic stage of vignetting, spots of activity occurring across the plane. However, we do have one thing for sure, and that is the idea that they appear only within framed structures. That is these people in scenes and we also have with their relationship, they are not trying to confuse us with the space of the implied architectural identities, such as the urn, apparently on the ledge of the molding. What they are is the first signs of an interest in trying to project a group of figures, which bear no relationship to one another, all the varied vignetted forms, yet they do appear within the construct of a perimetral edge, and in time...will move into the Third Style. We find that they invade that precinct, and become, and this is an example of the Third Style. We find that the setting feature almost becomes virtually a stage...the absence of images within those constructs, but you will notice that we have a demarcated area, some of these rectangular areas...and this architectural form...there will be the illusion of openings and that they are associated with the wider plane that extends around the entire area and then inside each individual unit plane and each one will carry and in time they will impinge upon one another...and the plenitude of the forms will carry over from one into the other, as you will see in this other extension. Now the pictorial period, into an example of the Third Style, with subject matter. Now this is what I mean. Am I making that clear enough for you, because the window on the world is not just a demarcating edge, it is as though we have to see the edge, like imagine looking out of a window. And that window on the world, that is a direct phrase from Leonardo...The edge isn't to be thought of as a terminus, it is what permits a kind of selection, or demarcation of the subject's presence. In essence we are to go through the window, the edge is only a temporary boundary. We pass beyond that edge into the event itself. Now earlier examples show a distinct



emphasis upon edge. The visual material, the pictorialization within it, shows no relationship whatsoever to any kind of coherence in relationship to the plane. However, we view the forms as if through a kind of scanning process, like looking through the wrong end of a telescope, and finding that unit for attention, this unit for attention, and that unit for attention within a construct that is demarcated, a planal construct. In Second stage we will have these large planes that will include architectural forms that show the effects of light and shade, and in succession we will find a sort of stage setting in which larger areas are defined as gigantic panels, and within them you will have not only proto-perspective, or approaching perspective definitions, as well as figures. Now we have this Eros figure standing on the edge of the balustrade, as opposed to the urn sitting on it. And we begin to get a convincing illusion of space. I also would suggest again, note the way, I'll just take one example, the sense of silhouetting of this... architectural form, or even on these columns, notice how certain forms are not in the light or are reduced to silhouette while others will show the modeling of light as it falls upon their cylindrical form. So you really start finding that this style of observation is not an imitation in the service of volume, in fact many of these forms would look quite flat if we remove the light to dark modeling on the various members of the structure. What happens in reality is that we are convinced by virtue of the play of light much more than we are attentive to the crudity and misunderstanding of the perspective system. The recession is not convincing by virtue of the overlap, and by virtue of the perspective, but convincing by virtue of the modeling of light. And we might say a very powerful form of chiaroscuro. All I ask you to do is notice beyond that silhouetted column, notice the treatment of the wall...you almost get a recessionary sense of the...light and shade. Here is the last style where we get into a grand, dramatic matter, a stage idea...

Student: It looks like a movie theater.

It does. It looks like Grauman's Chinese Theater. I love that place. But at any rate, all of this is painted, and if you notice this is a terribly misunderstood perspective, there are no consistent vanishing points, again, you look for yourself, why are you convinced. The scale, the hierarchical orders, all those factors occur. But you see here the stage itself has been introduced, the window on the world, the box that contains the reality. That what you no longer want to think of the demarcating limitation of above, below, right or left as being a terminus, but simply a convenient way calling attention to what is happening within *its* environment. It is as though we can virtually enter the environment itself. If you follow this perspective line...so the vanishing point should be somewhere out here...this has multiple vanishing points and it is not at the service of something extremely important in a theological sense, as we will find in late Gothic painting, where scattered vanishing points are typical in Van Eyck, he does it to prove that what he has defined is a vision as opposed to a fact. And that includes the *Arnolfini Wedding*

and...But even...scale, the reduction of size, not a more telling feature. But when I look at the way this mast form, or these bronze horses, and the nature of the cornice work, the way the light plucks out on the upper part of this gold-leaf, that is an implication of surfaces here on this medallion. And then I look below and see the upper coppered-ceiling suddenly becoming a value structure, I know that a human being, for the first time, has been incredibly influenced by the perception of light behaving upon surfaces. And as I say to you, this shows the advent in human consciousness where perspectival coherence began, it is not that strong, accuracy of detailed description began, but above all, let us be faithful to the effects of light. And these things show us that. Even to the point that the ephemeral nature of things being showered by light, units being destroyed as the destruction of certain details by the effects of light appear. Even in some of the mythological things, like *Laistrygones attacking the ships of Odysseus*, and by the way the remarkable thing about this image is not the narrative, or even the actions of these savages throwing and hurling stones at the fleet of ships. The remarkable thing is the change of the identity of light. For example on that boulder and we arrive at the distant scenes you notice they reduce in their coloration, they neutralize, they turn a bluish gray or in later art we will call it a greenish color, but always neutralized. In fact, the whole principle of aerial perspective is born in Pompeian art. Aerial perspective does not mean seen from above, that is spelled differently from the aerial perspective that I am talking about. We spell aerial perspective 'a'...

End of reel 6-A