

4-B 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}

Transcription by Bob Martin

Reel 4-B: Pliny on the Knidian Aphrodite, response to and consequences of psychic projection.

...Unnatural, and unreal, and difficult in its actual relationship when seen from any view other than the dimension which is intended, and when we understand the reference from Pliny the fact that this was in the open...works of these nature were not originally identified as works that were to be seen in open precincts, they were seen against walls, they were seen as part of interior niches within architectonic structures. Therefore we have the difficulty in ever witnessing, in fact it is rather absurd to be able to observe this copy, in the Museum...we can walk around it, because it was never made to be seen that way. However it was also made to be convincing in all quarters as it were, so therefore Myron introduced that...We now know there was an inventor {?} for this work...definitely to be observed, because it calls attention to, in the round...As a unit which is definitely within a milieu, which includes the possibility of observing it in a continuous manner. And it is quite satisfactory by the way from all perspectives, whereas many of the other forms were not, like the *Discobulus*. Then he {Pliny} goes on to say this, "...That statue's shrine is completely open so that it is possible to observe the image of the goddess from every possible side. She herself is believed favored to being made that way." Now how would you interpret that, how would you like to interpret that? {laughter} It is so favored {?}, it seems as though an intention was given as opposed to arrived at...This is one of the first examples of what we call apologetic, justifications of purpose, sometimes apologetics explain things away, sometimes they are a system for proving an issue. And it says the intention seemed so remarkable for a form to be in the round, to be witnessed environmentally, to occupy the space in which all aspects of the figure can be observable... And even that issue of Praxitelian sense of stress on the foot and her sense of projection forward and entering our space as we observe her total environment, her matrix as it were... It is remarkable, because this is not a minor statement that even the gods favor such an environmental view. And I think that should give you plenty to be struck by something on an individuated basis.

Student: It is interesting, you mention her entering our space, in Manet's portrait, it is possible, the same analogy, that the eyes enter your space, violate the viewer in terms

of the attitude of the culture of the day, and why that was such a problem...then complication is with the eyes. She was obviously in a prostrate position, she wasn't moving forward in any sense.

That is, however, may I say to you that there is an example of a very radical form of composition she is projected so close you can see, for example, compare that to Titian's figure which reclines on the bed, and the maid servant is reaching in through the...in the background. She is close but we also have a certain degree of distance because of the plane of the bed. The Olympia has a tendency to be so close that we are entering on the edge of the frame, there isn't a drop down {?} into her precinct. It is not just the eyes, not at all, it also represents the recognition too that the very nature of the courtesan, those flowers that are being presented by an early "Mammy"...who is virtually an attendant figure, the black figure, and I don't mean that in a crude sense, and I am serious about that, in the sense that she is a harlot, she wears all the signs, the ribbon around her neck...every courtesan would wear one, she has rings on her fingers and Cranach would even put bells on the toes. But Cranach was putting that at the service of earth, of the supreme example of nature or Eros, whereas Manet is presenting it as the supreme example of direct confrontation with real life, in terms of the image of the courtesan. Her eyes do confront us, but she doesn't look down, notice those eyes again, she looks out, so she is as neutral as a person unabashedly presenting their sense of identity with a sense of what is in reality...as detached as even a photograph might be able to draw attention to. The eyes don't see you, she looks beyond. It is her approach to the plane, and the definition of her encroachment upon the edge of the plane, she is subject to the principle of plenitude, where literally her presence spills outside of the window on the world, and so it is a denial of the Renaissance tradition. Do you see what I am saying?

Student: I thought she confronted the viewer, that is why, I thought that her eyes...

Well in the first place she is too elevated...he (Pliny) goes on to say, "That statue's shrine is completely open so that it is possible to observe the image of the goddess from every possible side, an arrangement which was favored by the goddess herself, it is generally believed." And some kind of implication "Nor is one's admiration of the statue less from any side," Now if you fail to believe the importance of her volumetric, in-the-round identity, and even that extension, of *arete* or goodness not only approves of the form that it part of the architectonic structure but it is good now because it can be witnessed by the peripatetic observer. We are to see all facets of her identity. Now here is a very telling image: you might say, all we know, at least according to the text, is that the people of Kos bought the clothed goddess, and why. It simply states that it was the sober and proper thing to do. Now there are a number of reasons because actually the

people of Kos were very much influenced by certain examples of Stoic behavior...they were also influenced by respect for conventions, and after all this is the first, so far as we know there is nothing to supplant this at this point, the first nude cult goddess. Sometimes a radical acceptance of something that goes against the grain of convention is too much for a culture or a society or group to bear, and I think it's that simple. However, the Knidians were very much concerned with certain incipient developments of, belated developments of hedonism, and they happen to show in a number of their rituals, a kind of liberational attitude...It isn't so much they thought nudity gets the prize over the clothed or draped figure, it has to do with a different set of responses, where attitudinal sense both in their literature or what they were reading and their attitudes towards...were far more accepting...and not so much an obedience to convention. It just so happens that people in Knidos had not been, we talked about it this morning, attuned, remember when John brought up the issue about today we don't see animals often so therefore only on television we see the lion and the monkey...on Animal Kingdom... The thing is, I don't buy that, because, except for one reason, it is true that in certain earlier groups, the people of Knidos were not as familiar with the convention of classical forms of the Periclean period, and the people of Kos were, that we can prove. So we might say that their liberal attentions to the Knidian Aphrodite, or their acceptance of the nude rather than the clothed, and it wouldn't ...is basically an expression of a group that valued something in the beginning even though they didn't have any repressive paradigms, they didn't have any coercive traditions that might enable them to elect, cancel this and favor that which has already been confirmed. I am trying to point out that this happens even in our own time. Often that which we are unfamiliar with, we acquire or obtain, or appreciate, until some fool comes along and tells us that our taste needs improvement, or that we have wasted our money, and that we lose faith in our own selection. I think it is really that simple, according to the evidence. But there is this introduction, now this to me is really remarkable. "They say that a certain man once overcome with love for the statue and, ...he had hidden himself in the shrine. During the night time he embraced the statue, and that there was a stain on it as an indication of his lust." Now, is this pornography? Pliny is establishing the context, and I promise you, this is the first so far as we know, of evidence of a form becoming, evidently, so convincing, not by virtue of its mimesis, you see, in the form, but by the response of the observer. To the point where the individual had engaged in a private ritual of adoration (laughter)...that little vignette is given, and I can't believe that any of you have never read it, there are hundreds of things from Pliny in this book, notice his detachment, he brings evidence in not to be used as metaphor, he tries to imbue concrete reportage with a sense of the factual. He ends that little illustration by saying there are other statues in Knidos by illustrious artists....and there is no greater testimony, and those by the way that I showed a considerable amount of...good heavens you could a truck that happens prior to, and Priaxis, they were both

radical...and he goes on saying,"and there is no greater testimonial to the quality of Praxiteles' Aphrodite than the fact that among all these works, it alone receives mention." (He is even saying the fame of this work, notice what he keeps referring to, the kingdom of...wishes to acquire...that is not reaction, that is reportage of recording response. It is not Pliny's reaction, it is reporting of a response, communal, public, the city valued it. They chose it). "And there is no greater testimony of the quality of Praxiteles' Aphrodite than the fact that among all these works, it alone receives mention." (Scopas and...were extremely known figures, not in terms of following canons of tradition, but they were respected figures, and yet even among those persons, the Praxitelian work received mention constantly). "By him, Praxiteles, there is also an Eros, a Cupid, which Cicero used in his charges against Verres and for the sake of which people used to visit Thespiae, it is now placed in the lecture rooms of Octavia." And there is a long footnote that says, "These were part of a large complex of buildings dedicated by Augustus...that consist of porticos, surrounding the temple of Jupiter...and Juno...a library and a...all for political assembly...and the Scala which I mention here, which were rooms for philosophical disputation, lectures, and artistic exhibitions." (So we now know that obviously...Eros was in intellectual precincts). "There is another Eros by Praxiteles, without drapery, at Parium, a colony of the Propontis, equal to the Knidian Venus in the fineness of its execution and said to have been the object of a similar outrage."...(Here we go back again to strange reportage. Strange but similar. One, we don't know where it is, it is lost, it states here...both...from the injury it suffered). "For one Alceas, a Rhodian, fell in love with it, and also left upon it the same sort of trace of his love." (Now that is a reconfirmation of the reaction of an individual first to an Eros figure...a Cupid figure, and obviously we might wonder what in the world people...nonetheless, in both cases, two individuals, by name, one unnamed, the other named, reportedly leave the traces of their love behind, becoming utterly attached or absorbed, or responsive to, the form in the image. What they see, and the image obviously...in the response). "At Rome the works of Praxiteles are the Flora, a Triptolemus, and a Ceres. In the gardens of Servilius, statues of Success and Good Fortune...also the Maenades, which they call Thyiades, Caryatides, Sileni, which are among the monuments belonging to Asinus Pollio, and Apollo..." (He goes on to talk about Praxiteles...I want to read you a bit more to show you an echo of what he stated earlier). "Praxiteles, who was more successful in marble and hence was more famous in that medium, also however made very beautiful works in bronze, The Rape of Persephone...A Dionysus and a figure of Drunkenness...and a...to which the Greeks attached the surname...the much talked of or the notorious." Now notice he even speaks of a reference to Praxiteles' work, and the Greeks have attached a surname to his work, and speak about his works as being much talked of, and notorious. Again, responded to by the collective as well as individual...He goes on to say...along with an Aphrodite which was consumed by the fire which destroyed the temple during the...of

Claudius...work was equal to her sister statue in marble which is famed all over the world and that is the Aphrodite of Minos...and in addition to these...and it says in the footnote Pliny ascribed to Praxiteles ...the young Apollo who...in hand is lying in wait with an arrow for a lizard which is creeping up and for which reason they called it the..." which means lizard-wearer. "Also well regarded, two of the statues which express diverse emotions, his matron weeping and his courtesan smiling." Now we have this reference: something that is indicative of statues which express diverse emotions, and we have the example of weeping and smiling as categories of physiognomy. "The last of these were believed to be Praxiteles' mistress and they detected in it the love of the artist and the reward revealed in the face of the courtesan." That is a terribly peculiar statement. Here we have now a kind of private response: they detect who they are, we don't know, but at least Pliny is reporting, again, the response of the public to Praxiteles' work. Please, find for me, and not just in this wonderful...any other sculptor who provokes such an obsessive mention of communal and individual response to a work of art. In fact, in that response they detected the love of the artist. Now here is where we have to deal with the idea of investment of intentionalist identity within a work. And this is one of the first examples of objectivism as a form of critical appraisal, which presumes several things: innate values reside within a work of art, as opposed to the observer...objectivists believe that eternal values are posited in a work of art and that they will remain constant. And that it is your responsibility to arrive at the level of consciousness where you might be able to perceive those eternal values. It is also a way of keeping people down, who don't have the education or the awareness of agreeing with the objectivist's point of view. It still persists in critical dialogue today. It also postulates that...beauty is conceived to be by best minds, and I mean that in just that sense, elevated minds, to be a constant. It is never relative, it is never part of a response of individuals--an objectivist criticism abounds even to our day...all you have to do is pick up any issue of *Art Forum* or *AfterImage* {laughs}...you see subjectivism is creature response. I felt moved, dah-dah-dah, it is wonderful as long as...I think this therefore every...should be responsive to it. That is subjectivism, the appendage of the problem. Objectivism presumes a constancy of value, and all we do is unlock the value. And that relativism, which a lot of people don't like because it sounds rather sloppy, it pins value as a suspended dimension of affect. That means value is...for consideration. Context is first, the intention of the artist, again, there is a lack of appraisal...can even dismiss what a person wrote or said...all I can say to illustrate this is that people, like that man at the Rose Bowl some years ago ran, and made a touchdown, but just so happened to reach the wrong goal post. And many of us are extremely sincere and have the best intentions, but they are often the last to arrive at the affect of their work. I mentioned DeChirico yesterday, who didn't have a clue as to what he was doing, purportedly, had a trauma with his father, and suddenly sacks the whole scene. And at the age of 26 states, I didn't do these, and was dragged into court. Those tilted

perspectives, those railroad choo-choos coming into surreal spaces, those mannequins, and what did he do? Turned his mind to those schlocky... horses galloping on beaches, and he was selling his work, at least when I saw, a room this large in a pensione in Italy, and there is DeChirico, and there is his work hanging from floor to ceiling, selling for 25 dollars a piece. Whereas you couldn't buy a DeChirico in the Norton Gallery in Palm Beach, or in the Louvre, or in the Metropolitan...of course he came around, eventually, and started imitating his earlier, purportedly, cathartic presentation of form. Critics understood, or people who valued the work tried to analyze it. It was James Paul So... who finally capped the issue...but his intentions couldn't be followed through, and the response was greater than the value given to his later work. You see as he says here, "This...they believe to be Praxiteles' history and they detected...this presumption of a state of mind that is presumed to be evident in the work or perceived by individuals, you can ask yourself...it presents us with a dilemma: is the love of the artist in the form. Is the satisfaction, or the reward, or the giving reward in the face of the harlot with whom he was involved: is that evident in the form or is it evident in the observer? Or what the observer wishes it to be? "There is also a statue which deals with his kindly nature...for he placed the charioteer made by himself in the quadrena, made by Columbus...it was the latter who was better at representing horses should be thought to have failed in representing..." he even permits this structure to place the charioteer, and not only identifying as his own in another man's construction of horses, and as it says, "who was better at representing horses should he thought to have failed in representing..." Now again this has something too about the, he was extremely generous...that is the only evidence we have, the behavior of Praxiteles' personality, where obviously he was willing enough to even let his work help...to be supported in another man's intention...you know the division of labor, and that might be one of the first examples of the permitting of one's work to appear in a construct, to be supported in another man's intention. I am thinking of the fact that much seventeenth century work that we see, particularly those large commissions by Rubens...and others, are not, we must not see them as by the hand of a single individual. Rubens was the supreme director, certainly in the later work, but he would command, and you would have whole stables, it was like an early advertising agency. {laughs} He had a stable, and he had someone who was good at Nabisco crackers, and you have someone who is excellent at rendering football helmets, whatever it may be. We have men who paint dogs well, who paint botanical subjects well, who paint certain types of flesh well. Even differentiating down to the point of people who painted hands well. The artist was often, and this was certainly true of Rubens, good heavens, many of the things debated, specific documents state when they were done, he makes he wasn't even in the country when they were done, he left his instructions...and he would come back and either approve or not approve. And often in the final...just prior to varnishing, he would add those remarkable Rubenesque touches, the best examples are in the...Museum...there are two stories practically. And

no human being could, go up and down scaffolding, or encompass all of that. There were sets of human beings who were skilled at painting various things, and you might say this is an impulse. I would suspect that it is just as possible that Praxiteles might have had the capacity to deal with tableaus, or with complex organization. So is that generosity, or is it really referring to...a person who wishes to have their work collaborate with other forms...Now, what is the meaning of all this? This appears to be, poor Dad, poor Dad...what is the meaning of this, I take this very seriously. I said to you that I know no text prior to this particular text which indicates three things: the obsessive recapitulation of emphasis upon community, individual, and public response. I know of no text prior to this that speaks so clearly of the investment of values as innate to the work that really relates to human emotions, such as love, reward...I also know of no other text prior to this, and I would appreciate if you know of one, in which we have this very distinct disposition toward choice, which I think is readily explained...but nonetheless the sense of, where convention may override appearance. And a number of people have commented on this, how do we interpret this passage, if we try to speculate on its possible meanings. Could it be that the people of Cos respected convention? And that it wasn't the nudity? Or could it be that they found an offense to nudity? After all, it was perfectly natural for a male to appear before the public with frank nudity. And any of you who have encountered that marvelous study...Sir Kenneth Clark, *The Nude*, he makes a big issue of this. He talks about the responses to this...historians refer to this as utterly barbaric. However women were not presented nude...the closest approximation, and if you look at any popular text, there may be a suggestion of certain examples of Greek vase paintings, or the Dying Niobid. Do you know the group of the Niobids? This is a mother who offended a god, and she is becoming very angry by her presumption because she called her children exquisite, chased her down with a bow and arrow, Artemis, and fired the shots into her children's spine, both of her sons and her daughters...and as a result, this is one of the groups in which originally she also would also be at the moment, the supreme example of pathos, also in the form of transition, she is not preparing to arrive, good heavens she is grabbing that arrow that is sticking in her back, in her spine. She is preparing to sink, like that paralytic hindquarters of that lion. She struggles but at the same time she is descending, and her face shows, almost like that joke you know the man dying in the desert...castrated and so on, he was asked did it hurt...the face is utterly absurd when you look at the...there are no figures, this would never be seen either as nude or naked, it is part of a thematic presentation, call it what you will, it is a daughter of Niobe, and this is an Aphrodite, but nonetheless, this is part of the schema of the theme: she appears without any thematic identification, her gesture does not follow the principles of a narrative act that could be inspected by textual evaluation...this woman who presses her toes against the base, who tends in her gesture to project the possibility of, "Hello my dear lustful one," it is no wonder that simple little acts of mimetic identification, such as the pressure of the toes

against the base can trigger extraordinary responses in human beings. However do we misunderstand gestures, "Oh I thought you meant," and the person says, "Oh no I was just putting my finger in my pocket," {laughter}...I will never forget once when an architect and his wife, they were the godparents to my daughter, Herschel Shepard, Neptune Beach, Florida...we were at a...and someone was entertaining us with expert guitar playing, classical guitar, and everyone else was being very dutifully attentive, and Herschel starts {laughs} this illustrates my point, he is sitting there and his wife is sitting next him, and I am sitting next to her, and I was really enjoyed the music but I kept noticing that he kept pulling on his pipe, and no fire was there or smoke, and he was so attentive that he began to reach for his wife...and he was pawing at his wife without even knowing, he was trying to reach his elbow into his pocket, and I notice that she looked up and said what is this manifest expression of ardor on my husband...and to my amusement I am watching this occur, of this man obviously wanting to light his pipe, who finally glances over and realizes that he is virtually pulling her dress off, and he gets very amused at his mistake...how often we can confuse a gesture, and realize that it is really a pragmatic issue. At first I looked over and thought, I wasn't even holding my wife's hand {laughs}...I was confused by the fact that here was a man showing endearment for his wife but he was really looking for his pipe. Now what I mean about gestures that can be confused. Maybe Praxiteles introduces a very radical gesture by the pressure of those toes...to show you where this will lead, I just want to illustrate something. By the period of...Hellenistic realism, stresses upon particular identities, and I grant you, you may want to refer to Roman influences, because...Greco-Roman art. This happens to be the third century BC, it is sufficiently early to say that stresses upon particular exertions, muscle strains, we see apparent in this portrait of the drunken old woman. She doesn't virtually suck on a bottle, she is in an advanced stage of acute alcoholism, she sucks on a complete urn (laughter). This is the typical Hellenistic identification of fact carried to its extreme, and yet it is quite impossible. Look at her gurgling the liquor in her throat. Can you sense it? Have you ever gargled, and watched your mouth, that shifting of the jaw? That is an extraordinary...the sagging of her facial tissue. The ecstasy implied in the eyes, had it been polychromed, because there is no evidence that it was, but it could have been. Hellenistic sculpture, third and second century sculpture tends to retain just simply...defined in marble. And her eyes do roll back, at least insofar as the way the orbs are expressed because of pressures on the upper part of the eye. Notice the way the hands and the arms and particularly that kind of arc, look at the hand, the arc really pronounces this, look at the swelling of the joints, that is typical of advanced stages of arthritis. And the fact that the definition of the toes is very differentiated, and there is a certain degree of relaxation, even the idea of her sitting directly on the ground, in this case the base, but nonetheless she is not a woman... having the dignity to be in a proper location. She is virtually slugging it up, right there in a street, in an environment, whatever, but on the floor. And that telling

signal, here we have, even the way drapery behaves, there is no stylization in the way these folds are articulated. There is *rakunis*, {?} presently at power in the work, even the slipping of the drapery off her shoulders. We have all seen the person who says we can help that sweater back onto her shoulders, here is an example of the extreme attention to those random moments, and those typical moments, that we observe daily. And it also represents the idea of, when I use the word random you might want to say these are particularized. I would say no, they are so natural that they are not intended, they are observations and orchestrations of typical moments of gravity, or pressure, or the projected stress upon tissue, or what have you. And therefore they don't orchestrate into a coherent gestalt or whole, or something with *arete* that would invade fifth century sculpture, the goodness of the harmony of parts cannot in {?} proportion, here we have virtually natural identity, random identity. Now I say that because of the pressure on the toes. And that gesture of the hand is predetermined, or a precursor, or the prophetic possibility of a form that suddenly will remind us directly of objectives that happen in our natural world, and in the realities around us, the gesture or action of the thing happening. And I only stress that because it seems completely polar. What it is is an amplification of the stress upon the toes, and also that stress upon the {?}... You will not escape the progression toward that moment of the development of public consciousness, and the projected response, and I need to deal with it but I think that I want to push this at this point and simply say that we do reach a point in time in which, whether or not we can resolve what the reasons for choice of a clothed figure or a nude figure, we can certainly say we evidence of several reasons projecting its value into the form. Projection of emotive content that no longer depends on, remember the day when I talked about the lamenting poem of Sesostrius III, he wrote that. The fact of the persistence of the...sandbags under the eyes, the petulant mouth, the gravitational pull of the flesh, keep in mind, this is constantly referred to. We have no document that states that the sculptor would try to show the anxiety of the pharaoh. We can take his laments, we can also take the persistent and individual types from youth to elder age, of his anxious expression. And we can comparatively tie the two together. In this case though we can say surely, somebody was talking about this work. People believed someone, some early person engaged in self-gratification as a result of this...by hearsay and by name, at least to another figure that was revered as much. So we have increased evidence that we can postulate now that there is a slight transfer, the convincing nature of the work is not so much by ... that we talked about earlier in relation to the work. It is not referred to on the basis of, how shall I say this, content that moves to typing, or according to conventions so you have a repetition and a variation of the prime forms extended into the development of a particular type, such as in the wall painting, or sculpture. It becomes important that we have communication of the evidence that now the mimetic identity is also being carried, at least the response to mimesis is very definitely evidence of a group {?} or individual response. Desire, which

is one of the themes of mimesis that Aeurbach speaks of, the transfer of the real, despite the literature...when Aeurbach speaks of the desires, or Cavell, your heart's desire, it is not about...it is the simple issue of where we project value is also associated with belief. Aeurbach speaks of aspects of mimesis in which it is not just thematic mimesis, or genre mimesis, or vernacular mimesis, but he also talks about the idea of the mimicking that is associated with the observer responding to something, and virtually holding it in belief to be other than what it is. In other words, the Knidian Aphrodite...an unnamed...and an Eros figure...a named ..., became the actuality of the goddess and of the Eros figure...there seems to be something, at least insofar as the act is expressed...the Eros figure and the story of the man seem to imply that they {the people of Knidos} felt that the state of the identity of the figure itself became so convincing, but it isn't that the figure mimicked a woman, but in their own mind, mimesis becomes an internal psychological necessity. In other words they project the mimicry upon the form. They are convinced that it imitates their heart's desire. They are convinced that it becomes in essence one of the first examples of intra-psychic projection. Now I will explain this in a moment. If I am to view the world of things, and I wish to do it from the standpoint of...objectivism, be objective about this issue, you keep letting your emotions interfere with it. Purportedly I am to become neutral, and it is very difficult for me to unhinge myself from my own personal...what is happening in this report is that it seems that we are seeing a valuing of intrapsychic projection, where even the inanimate can be perceived as animate. Even the blind, inchoate, lacking in definition of form, can be perceived to be animate. In other words the figure forces the form to mimic the heart's desires. The mimicry is in essence a projection. The mimesis is a projection. It is not that the form mimics the idea, only two small parts, the pressure of the foot and the gesture of the hand. The rest of it seems to obey radical alteration: alteration in size and scale of the head, suppression of exertion of the musculature of the body as we see in the Hermes. The man who visited the statue at night...was evidently a response in which we find the ability for us to believe in things that are indeed not. It forces us to enable an understanding of why many works of art, and I would say successive to...I will not say successive to Praxiteles, become involved, in principle, even the sense of organizing material and presenting structures in the service of a simulacrum...detachment... that is the pattern of things seen in a one to one relationship...by the same token we can also see that there is a change of...response. Now this is not a symbolic reaction. It is not a semiotic figure. There is no declared system as such. In fact...deny the traditions declared...of systems. But what we do have is the fact that people believe that she is indeed sufficient to cause love, to cause lust, to cause response. Even the traces that are referred to by Pliny, the stain left upon the statue is very reminiscent of the same theme that occurs virtually...the last expression of it appears in Isak Dinesen's work...*Out of Africa*, Countess von Blixen...she realizes her loss of fervor, her inability to be able to invest in material matter, and believe in it as

animate, as having it-faith, it has faith. Not sponsors faith, but it has faith, therefore I project...I mimic an intentional state of mind that I cannot achieve myself. And in one very active moment, she sees this figure...and she is struck...she dismisses her Aristotelian differentiation, her tendency to want to separate mind and matter, she overcomes her dualism and herself...falls to her knees...virtually implies that she ingests the... and then of course the denouement is that she eventually discovers that she has syphilis...now that has been going on for ages, the irony of, do you remember --- she wishes to transform, the same theme, a common sense of irony, the figure who would love everyone, the figure who would hope to bring the sick, the needy, the meek, the maimed, no greater therapy has been achieved when you say blessed are the meek, watch out, I mean that Last Supper theme and the destructions, and the seductions, and the carnal desires, this woman goes in search of... kiss the foot, is to virtually ingest it, is to believe something that ...including germ transfer. And I would suggest to you that the irony of this...this is a moment in time in which we have the internalization of response. And that the projection, the mimicking, is of a human subject responding to a form and investing in it as though, "I will now make you into an imitation of the real, and I will disregard and hold in suspension all matters of differentiation. I will express my lust, my hate, lopping off the heads of statuary, pecking out eyes, removing the cartouche...to deny its viability. And even in later periods, "I hate you darling!" And then tearing up the photograph. Or those peculiar instances in which we want to deny something, and the one man I know threw a brick through his television set. Another person I know simply walked...this tendency to want to project either our rejections of value...as if we had made it our belief, our wanting the object to be the identity of our heart's desire, or our adorations ...you may comment on this theme...what about the mythologies about Gilgamesh, the innumerable images...stand between those bulls... did people believe that as a kind of story, but there is no evidence that they invested, or believed that this...man...project his identity as a conqueror of nature, would lead to break a fool's neck...would in any sense cause other people to run out and try and break fools' necks. I know of no instances...you can go through any kind of text and you would be exhaustive in your analysis of form, I might say that a figure such as this...this is early nineteenth century, but this is an advanced awareness of physiognomy, and I'll show you where the issue I am talking about becomes a later stage. For example, in the helmet masks. How many of you have noticed these forms? How many of you have used the Jansen text? ...All you have to do...I make my students do this, I force them, I make them do several things. They have white card for observation, and they also have to have a graph, and we start out with a system...nothing is worse than dumb nomenclature...you will read the first illustration in the text, a Picasso's bull's head made out of a bicycle seat and handlebars, and it says, "16 $\frac{1}{8}$ inches," and what I would have them do is...graph, and they make each little, this is wonderful, it is small graph paper, the kind mathematicians use, each little block is an inch, or later they will have to make

into feet for architecture...and they go through the whole text and they end up with all these little lines, and they can go back and say, yup, there it is, the bull's head, and they can compare it... they understand something about size and scale. How many times do people come back and say my god I went to the Academia and I saw these figures, and I didn't know they were so large. Did you do it yourself? Good heavens, Mary, I discovered this form, I can hold it in my hand! We have so robbed, in this museum without walls, even some simple measure of the perception of scale that might even apply to the sense of touch...the other thing is the white card motif: it enables me to prove to them that things happen in works of art, like, you could imitate this face {growls} But you notice if you cover it up, this side is considerably exerted physiognomy. Even the eyes, now watch what happens, want to see something remarkable? Even though the mouth opens, I'm going to get exactly on the spot, I am not going to cheat you, it is a simple...how do you like that, he looks like he is smiling, like when I say, "Ha ha ha I am an amiable fellow." You see there is no muscle exertion around the eye region, is there? There is no identification of grimace, of fearful power. It is like animals--all of these psychologists sit around and do these studies about aggression, you know we found out after all that gorillas were quite kind. But here is an example: if a man wants to wear a...and this is not just ritual, and convince someone to be afraid, there is nothing like a person who smiles on one side of their mouth, and cuts you to ribbons on the other, is there? This is the identity to presume the individual will mimic the state that is implied in the form. Either by sensing trust, and fear, on the one hand, so it intrapsychizes {laughs} if you will accept that terrible word, but anyway, it forces the projection of a formed identity within the observing individual. Do you get the point I am trying to get across? Does it make sense to you?... You don't have to be convinced by it, just do you understand the point. Because it is really real from this point on. The intrapsychic response to mimesis, I would suggest to you, does not occur singularly with the Knidian Aphrodite, but certainly that is one we have textual evidences of reportage that seems to imply at least a couple of documented...

Student: It sounds as if you are going about two different responses: one with the picture you just showed us would be one where the object suggests, through its own gestures, certain qualities in us. And the other one, the response to the statue, would be that of the observer believing the reality of, the corporality of the...

You are right, I am indeed suggesting two different responses and we will have to deal with that, even though that...later. And by all means, we can say that even in the most rudimentary forms of consciousness. That is why we find it surprising to discover those Filipinos... who were discovered to be living like stone age people, but who also had in their possession certain contemporary items and goods and seemed to be using them appropriately or if not, were transforming them into costume or jewelry or what have

you, what I want to suggest or at least try to illustrate that there are instances where people evolve from that kind of conscious use of our tendency to want to mimic what we observe. You see, that is from the art object to the observer, the affect principle. This Praxitelean stage...is the projection from the observer and the animation of its substance and the identity of the form as well as projecting something to be the heart's desire. You will find out under theories of vision my friends, look at them, you are going to find out and I can prove this just by showing the set of presumed dimensions of how people identify with the world.

Student: I just want you to repeat that combination.

Two responses. One is simply called psychic projection. That means you animate a dumb substance. You presume it is viable, and you force it into the state of such believability and credibility that it is subjected even to cruder aspects of appreciation... We know what we see on bathroom walls. People still have the tendency to project upon crude diagrams, lust. It is still...of what we call psychic projection. We also know that certain forms cause us to engage in what is called psychic introjection, where the mimicry occurs either on a subliminal or sometimes it happens quite consciously. When one says, "I am going to believe it no matter what." Seeing is believing...do you believe what you see or believe what we see, is one of the most important questions of our time. But what I am trying to stress is that the one tends to project upon the form, the other the form causes the response, in which the human being mimics the expected set of intended or forced responses. That helmet mask is a very fearful thing. Particularly as the eye...tends to wander, from the very ingratiating clown smile and then suddenly notice the other side, in that schizoid way, that schizisual division right down the central axis that the other side is menacing in fright. That is why in horror movies and other areas you will notice there is always an accommodation of that characteristic which is benign coupled with the character being vicious. What does Dracula do?...he enters in his top-hat, remember the marvelous one...what is his name, Jack Palance, he did it best of all. The dashing tuxedo, the cape, the top hat, I love...he did not do Dracula, I am sorry I got him confused, but it fits...or Bela Lagosi, who could give you that...smile with the grotesque. In other words, nothing makes us more afraid than when it appears to be comforting and comfortable and benign coupled with that which menaces, that causes a response in us to be afraid. I don't know what otherwise I am often... to be afraid of certain events and figures and statements. We call it lay {?} paranoia, as Jung would say, people ought to cultivate it in imagination and evil because little do they know that they are speaking through one side of, they are hearing things being spoken out of one side of the mouth, and another seems to defy...they are also seeing things not binocularly, but one eye sees the comfortable and the other eye perceives what is caused...one projects, the other perceives..assumes that theory of vision, the idea, you

don't ever use that as a metaphor but you get the idea. And what I am trying to get across is simply the fact that I will use this as an illustrative example of people who like to define... but insofar as we know, my illustration will fit until you can convince me otherwise...I am trying to clarify a moment in time, not exclusive, but least as far as we know we have two forms of evidence to support the thesis that we have the beginnings of projection: the figure forces the image to mimic reality. Not perceive reality, it is not the mimicking of body parts, careful execution, slavish emphasis upon detail, it is what one wants it to be. And in time it evolves towards what the form wants you to believe. You see one is a projection, a psychic constellation projecting out. The second is the form begins to call you to introject, and we often get involved in that issue of saying we want to believe what is presented to us. I think this is a root idea, we will find singular evidence in the first responses to photography...To title a book, *The Pencil of Nature*, Marx's commentary on Hawthorne's Daguerrean, you notice even in that early essay we have that same issue with Talbot in 1850, about phenomenology occurring in the photo process. Given all the popularisms, notice the theme of projection and introjection in Marx. Read *The House of Seven Gables*. Notice, whether it is Judge Pyncheon, or Holgrave...constantly subjected to pictorial forms. Notice his discussion of the oil painting, and the miniature painting, and its discussion of the daguerreotype. And notice the different degrees in which projection and introjection occur. Then you will have an understanding of how those people saw things. I chose those because they are signals to be broadly aware of...there are serious studies being done on this issue of do we believe what we see or do we see what we believe...I am trying to find a paradigm in which the first issue of projection occurs. The individual mimics what the individual wishes to be. As in early photography, we have a notice to the reader in the *Pencil of Nature* reminding us that these were imprinted by the agency of light. Now folks you know that in your time you don't get a book, I don't open my little history of art and say, and be reminded that the pictorial representation of this volume is neither drawing nor a form of graphics, and that these are photographs of the real thing. We are well beyond that, but I think that advisement is probably taken quite seriously...show me examples of first responses to photographs...first reports...I am dying to see it...there is another issue...I am using illustrations that relate to...Robert Graves...*The Great War in Modern Memory*, by Paul Fussell, Oxford Press, the response to war...that perhaps the most unnerving aspect of war is not the event but the immediate post-war period in which the casualties return, and I thought immediately that this reminded me of photographs that are repressed...the fragile...of the aftermath is often the main...which is...in the photograph...unless the evidence comes forth later. To mention Robert Graves...he wrote a marvelous book...*The White Goddess* is a study of mythology associated with aspects of the feminine...of cryptic systems which were ways in the world could be perceived and kept private. And in that he has a rather interesting illustration about the moment of aggressive intellectual consciousness...the moment at which, wait a minute,

I'm sorry, recession of intellectual consciousness, or consciousness which believes in things without justification or apology, he states the moment in which power over reason became extremely evident, and he says even into our own time, occurred when Alexander cut the Gordian knot. And in the first place, if one says, oh really, how do you know that? And of course we do know that there was a city of Gordias, we do know there was a knot, both in stone and perhaps the ritual was to be engaged, and indeed could be a knot... a facsimile knot, a mimetic knot that would mimic the permanent knot. And what we do know in fact, there are evidences that confirm that there was a precinct that this knot remained...the city of Gordias believed in the importance of mind over force, physical prowess and force. For example, just by looking at the...offered to cancel all the debts of Knidos if they would give him the statue..I am getting ahead of myself trying to make a parallel relationship. But in Graves' image of Alexander cutting the Gordian knot...he states that...to the conqueror...you are here at our gates...you may have us, we will not offer resistance, as long as you can reveal how the knot can be untied. This is a very complex...it is a very complex interlace, and you know those puzzles...Chinese pentagrams...try to shift things...or at Howard Johnson's find the face in the...it is a typical Gordian knot problem. It presumes that you look around...ritual...just like those women who stood on the edge of the Nile and had to receive the possession of the men who raised their tunics in the passing boats, they believed that was what they had to submit to, that was not demeaning, it was the only way they could ritually make the transition to witnessing the slaughtering of their male population and accept the assimilation into a totally different value. In the Gordian knot image...what did Alexander do? We know he cut the knot. We don't know what he said, but purportedly the issue was nonsense, he sliced right through it with his sword. And Graves says, from that point, power, physical aggressiveness, force, vigorous suppression, became predominant. And that same intelligence, same exercise of intelligence, or even the willingness to engage in a magical consciousness that could still be figured, was repressed. And therefore the reason for the study of mythology in The White Goddess...and by extension...signs became extremely important as private, semiotic or symbolic dimensions, they could not be overt. And you can say that this might have led to the Gnostics sense of privacy, you can say that this might have lead to the alchemists. The earliest chemists were the alchemists, because they tried to turn base metals into gold. {laughs} And we say, and THEN the Renaissance. And those dumbbells sitting around trying to make gold, they knew exactly what they were doing...Paracelsus...they thought, as any fool could see, we are the dumbbells, for abusing....while they projected into matter, intentions that they knew were intrapsychic, and while the rest of the people thought they were wasting their time..chemistry.... and they were messing around with those flasks and torts and...tubes...In reality they were exercising a dimension of saying, I will now perform a foolish act, I will tear a paper, sitting in my catatonic state, or whatever {laughter} and then discover in reality no one

knows that I am thinking about something else, and perhaps that gold, that philosopher's gold... was perhaps the possibility of turning crude psychic energy into profoundly motivated psychic energy that is retained in oneself, and shared by the initiate, the brotherhood, the sisterhood...that is the same issue, the generation of one's psychic interest, unless it has the power to be able to alter...I am starting to sound like Sunday School {laughter}) I am not moralizing {laughs} I am trying to give an illustration...there was something I wanted to tell you that was related to all of this, going back to that notice to the reader, I think that was a way of trying to convince and double the issue that in spite of what you may be familiar with in other forms of reproduction, keep in mind that the agency that presents these forms is light. For those of you who are paying the price for the issues...of the *Pencil of Nature*, those who are already tutored and aware of the generation itself, but how the lay public...the "keep in mind," this is a radical constellation: matter has now invented itself to reflect itself. And I again would like to stress that all those commentaries, when Lady Eastlake later refers to, neither letter or document, text or image as it were, almost as if she infers, I am not quoting her directly...almost something unnamable, a new form of communication between man and nature. And obviously implying a new form of communication that implies it is a path (?) of new intentions (?) identities of man, and that does not mean that this dismisses the photographer, or intentionalist aspects of selection of subject matter am value, but I would say the persistence of the credibility factor, the best recounts in the transition, period by period by period, in terms of the deliberate intentions of human beings to define a world either in part or by respect for that area which was most *respected* in terms of nourishment and sustaining...as defined from earlier today, or by at this moment in time in Greek art, by the development of psychic projection. Not magical projection, because remember I used the word "mysterious participation," and we talked about the animism--I and the tree are one-- the chthonic response to reality, not a cortical response that implies differentiation...the sense that earlier symbolic projections did not differentiate between the object and the mind, so we can't talk about those fools, they saw granddaddy in the rock. The totems of North American Indians were presumed to be spirit traps, or the Jericho head as a spirit trap: it was *believed* the spirit resided in the form. It wasn't believed, it *was* the case. There was no doubting, for a moment, there is no differentiation between such forms, it was indeed a fact. When psychic projection occurs, we also have the culmination in which differentiated consciousness no longer can be satisfied with its clarity, so therefore it must now by necessity project upon forms, dimensions that can never be. And finally that problem becomes so unnerving that Descartes will have that dream, wind will rush through the windows, the candle will float through the air, the shutters will swing back and forth like in a B horror movie, and the book will descend to the table, ERGO COGITO SUM: I think therefore I am. He gets up from his bed, writes it down the next morning and says, "My god, what dreams offer!" And the rationalist, the mathematician,

has a dream to deliver to us that thinking is more powerful than matter. What happens to matter after the seventeenth century in the post-Cartesian period and up to today, *res extensa*, things extended...extending into space. My arm's length confirms the issue, as I said the very first day...Berkeley reminded us, go out and kick a rock so as to discover it is not all of the mind. That we realize the developing issue causes another twist or warp in the human psyche particularly insofar as perception is concerned. We started at the stage where the form is beginning to affect the observer. Suddenly the observer is forced to mimic what it wants the observer to be. So even forms can cause us, in essence, to mimic their insistent reality. That's good, I like that: the mimic that insists of reality. In needs to be reversed: instead of the form being projected upon, the force becomes what one wants it to mimic...intrapsychic dimension, and the next phase will be where the form will cause the individual to mimic *its* signals....the idea of trying to deal with these two tracks, instead of trying to bring them together...so that we can at least see the evidence, I think you will find it very convincing, and a lot of the things I am asking you to believe are not presumptuous...but offer evidence of perceptual attitudes that we now turn to. What I would like to remind you of is that...even statues were put on trial. No one really believes a statue committed a crime, it is just that very wealthy people can buy their way out and deal with systems of suspended belief. And convince people...to have substitutes and that at least he got his just due, while the statue...have been rouged, bewigged, braceleted...paying for the crime that a human committed. Now that was a {?} projection of the first order...excuses...where someone says, it wasn't my fault, wasn't my fault...in later periods, it is interesting to discover...of photographing in a very peculiar way, of forcing us to believe...even, this is the punchline, even the Knidian Aphrodite appears in every porno shot. She is apparent in any image that causes people to behave as though the provoking subject caused him to respond as if it were...and in general, those images that have that power are, today, photographic. A drawing will no longer satisfy us. Even *The Encyclopedia of Sex*, published under the Catholic Church, must use photographic evidence, whereas earlier approaches of the edition used...I don't mean that to suggest anything salacious, I am simply saying that we must be convinced. In general, animism is projected...primarily through photographic images...I don't know if you can appreciate this comment, but one time I accidentally...I have a colleague, he is like that man unnamed...he has books, that I am so fundamentally (laughs) puritanical that I used to be afraid to look on his shelf every week because he orders this *terrible* stuff. And one day I saw a book that I happened to want, and I ordered it myself, I got the address off of it, and I mean this wasn't the *Kama Sutra*, he was into some really heavy stuff...so I bought this book and I found myself on the list, and if you have ever looked into things like...this is not a confessional I really think this is important literature. Did you ever look at ...alternative newspapers, the *Boston Phoenix*? Have any of you seen that? Have you ever read the personals? They are magnificent. And the urgency of humankind to express themselves in

remarkably bizarre ways. {laughter} And I now understand in Hartford, Connecticut I can even join a club in which my fantasies can be matched with another person's fantasies. The continuation of projective mimicry or intrajective mimicry...you can now advertise that, "I wish to project upon you my need, will you please mimic what I want you to be, {laughter} I will serve your need...while I imitate your necessities: young male slave wanted to be exerted to heavy S and M." I love it. {laughter} I don't do that, that is not my interest, don't misunderstand what I say...{laughter} an interest in the intentions of our world...another illustration...and you should have seen the material that came into my office...I did not know that there were suggestions of objects that would cause me to mimic...there are pneumatic forms, that is balloon like creatures {laughter} that can satisfy people...have built a machine that can ingest or also eject. There are innumerable devices, not those that you read about in an historian's interest in contraception...even Jansen in his new text talks about contraception...but the issue of literally people who do feel that you or I, we all have those hidden dimensions, if I did I tell you about...you'd be afraid to hear (laughter) the point I am trying to get across is the persistence of intrajected and projected psychic...still occurs...And it is most prevalent in the literature you would least suspect...Tom Barrow said to me that maybe *TV Guide* will become one of the most important documents declaring the prevailing interests of our culture or society...now you can take that any way you want but I do think that often the...literature in the least suspected places is the signal of certain types of psychology. And I would be the last person to speak of this as pathological...those people are believing in things that they just don't have a clue as to the tradition they are respecting. Unfortunately many of them have thrown their...head over their shoulder and they are looking back at archetypal...and I am sure that what ever these people do to develop their fantasies are indeed transcending, in essence, the necessities of their age...looking backwards or in essence some of them may be forging out new worlds of possibility of psychic behavior and perception. Now I wish Anita had heard every word I said. {laughs}

End reel 4B