

6-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}

Reel 6-B: Pompeian painting, Symbolism of wind, air, pneuma, Connection of Pompeian painting to nineteenth century photography, Medieval art.

...The upper reaches of the form itself. This is a remarkable contribution...too much credit is given to the issues of later art without recognizing the fact that optical phenomenon becomes a major issue. As I said, it is a kind of charming primitivism {*Nilotic Landscape with Pygmies*} and they are fighting with a hippopotamus and an alligator...They are a very brave people, one of the Roman heads...just please notice the effect of light on the animal, the hippo. Or notice how the light is pumped out on the extended oars, or on the little boat that is about to be overturned. Even though these reins are defined...notice what happens when it reaches the upper regions where the figure grabs it, that again is not accidental. This is observed. The observed effect of light forming on objects and where glint, reflection, planal identifications, shadowing of detail, or even definition of detail, or increasing chromatic intensity. Notice for example the plucking down the line along the forearm...despite the line here on the side of the nose ridge, on the temple...or on the arm itself and on the leg. That is an incredible understanding of what happens when light defines identity. Notice the clarity of contrast value here, and then notice how the diffusion of light occurs on the humans in the distance. The direct distinction between not so much size, scale, perspective, or logical perspective, but they certainly understand what happens with light. Even to the point that, for example this one of 50 AD, even very hieratic composed ritual events, such as this priest, and the priest is up under the canopy attended by both the black and the white-skinned individuals...and in the center, there is certainly an elongation and continuation, it was rather a formal structure where female and male attendants greet one another on either the side of this altar area, and there are animals and creatures. And there is a spontaneous and calligraphic quality to the treatment of the forms, notice the bird up here. Notice the way that light plucks out to define the volumes, it is not a planal construct. There is no intent to try to cultivate an attention to volume by virtue of an understanding of the relationship of anatomical part to part. Or by multi-planality, or by the principles of sculpture. We are now back to graphism. And we are back to a graphism that is defined by the behavior of light as opposed to the marks that are made to convince us of the shapes of things so that linear contours are more important than the volume. When in reality we are facing the graphism that says the spots of light, those pointils, those points of light, those areas of light coming out from dark convince

us of the advancing and receding of forms, as well as their volumetric identity...These are from Naples...Here is what I meant by how are we convinced of the understanding of recession in this picture of an architectural scene. Quite frankly, if you want to be convinced, if you look carefully enough, you would recognize a totally aborted perspective. The thing that really fools the eye, the trompe l'oeil aspect of this is primarily the recession from chromatic intensity, stronger value contrasts gradually reducing in intensity until finally we reach that almost grisaille identity of the forms in the background. Even notice how the identity of these foliate forms and these figures as they move up to the top, they lose their sense of opacity, they become transparent. And how certain forms seen against light tend to silhouette, or cast shadows, or how light bathes certain portions while other areas go into complete shade. Those principles never heretofore been even perceived, and certainly we can say it was perceived, it has nothing to do with environmental conditions, architecture, the type of climate or what have you...in Pompeii. It simply happens there was no necessity for human beings to even feel...the responsibility for recognizing the principles of light. Architectonic forms and sculptural forms had indeed been bound. Painting prior to this had not been typically architectonic, that is involved with architecture. So a great deal has to do with art entering into domestic architecture. There had certainly been decorated tombs and ritual precincts in Minoan art and Mycenaean art, and in practically every other culture, but not typically at the time, as what we might call, if I think of a person living in the 5th century BC, winding his way up the Acropolis, which he or she would have done, and granted he would have seen extraordinary color, and including dressed sculpture as I mentioned to you before. He would have seen colored temples. But the problem is, remember all of that was attached to the reality of the architectonic form entering the dimensions of the sculptural form already in three-dimensions. When illusionism became important within a picture plane itself, a window on the world, the idea of relief and so on was no longer the only necessary approach. What became necessary was the understanding of the behavior of light. And that became subject to a primacy of concern in Pompeian art, and is one of the most magnificent contributions that visual consciousness ever made, and is seldom seen, I might add. The effect of light as it begins to shatter form. Now what you might want to look at playfulness, spontaneous, a sort of scattering of brushwork, a suggestion of fracture. A fracturing of form means to break it down to component units, not to allow the integrity of the structure to be continuous. Or even we might speak of discontinuity, fracture f-a-c-t-u-r-e will refer to surface differences...but the main thing is, I am talking about the fracturing of form...it is as though we could find the animal and the attendant as if they could break apart, but in reality we know that they are subject to the coalescence of light and shade. So that we tend to believe that there is an external light source. Do you not feel the heat of that light falling upon that temple. You almost sense the climate, whether the wind is blowing. So a lot of the spontaneity and discontinuity is obedient to portraying atmosphere,

portraying where light shatters detail, makes the fluting of the column, the crenulations of the surface, disappear. Where in other cases it plucks out anatomical aspects, or shows us the edge of a landscape form...Or even in this little goat over here, how certain portions are spotted by light while others are not. And then how the upper reaches beyond the tree, notice how the difference in value in certain portions of that calligraphic marking of the foliage and then other areas tend to diffuse into the background.

Student: Is that tree...is the sensation one of motion in terms of wind?

Absolutely, within these constructs even figures will show a sense of the kinetic. I don't mean that they show multiple directions of movement, but there is a tendency to show climate, wind, acts of atmospheric change, chromatic emphasis because of the effect of the light or destruction of chromatic integrity. Oh yes, it has been thoroughly studied indeed. Quite often the marks that are made are to imply motion as opposed to the idea of...let's just show some examples of domestic...here is a woman painting a painting, an artist at work. And the most peculiar examples, and to my mind and to my vision, and to all the research I have ever done, the first examples of what I call plenitude, and I insist that we call it that because it starts connecting to a very ancient idea which we will talk about tomorrow, as a way it becomes a prelude to the conclusion of this material. Plenitude implies this: I can have the world, and only contain within that world insofar as I define the location within some kind of contained milieu. Even if you put me into a casket, I don't want to be in a casket yet...I am subject to the principle of being contained but at the same time I know that what I am contained in is also contained, all right? The only way I can explain this to you is that everything is subject to, Plato would have talked about the suggestion of the ephemeral illusionism of the world we inhabit. Not only are we, but also the objects that we surround ourselves with are mere reflections of a more permanent, ordered dimension: the ideal. Aristotle comes along, and of course...every little eighth grader is taught that Aristotle gave us the distinctions that we need in science and language and other things. Everyone thinks Aristotle separated the idea of categories and so on. I am sorry folks, he didn't. Probably his most powerful statement was, even though things find their distinct order, there is a universal overlapping-ness of all things in the world. Now he doesn't mean things in front of one another, he means that just in the persistent schema of ideas where right through into Leonardo's notebooks there is the principle of the idea, and right into the contemporary Casteneda literature, where there will be the principle that all things are interconnected. Even to the point of auras. Think from Rudolph Steiner...to Kandinsky to even contemporary occultism in Rochester. Or maybe even you have seen a few auras. The idea of auras, of emanation, an illumination that extends from *any* object or form. Kirlian photography is another example, a more scientific proof...where no form has...

an integrity of form subject to closure. All things are interpenetrative. Even our simplest ideas of atomistic particles and energy, like this table is indeed highly active and so on, could confirm that. Now to show you the persistence of an idea, and it really begins here. If you were living in the sixteenth-century...particularly if you were living in Italy, although there were other variations of this in other territories, and I asked you the question, how do you remember anything?...And you would immediately be able to answer me. I want to make a parallel illustration: you see we would not have the necessity of Henry Fox Talbot to have had that urgency to use a device to mimic the world unless he also felt terribly embarrassed. And this is one thing Holis Frampton somewhat leaves out because every young British gentleman, one of the necessary prerequisites of being tutored and aware and cultured and indeed civilized, was to be able to draw. And maybe you have not dipped into Sir Kenneth Clark's commentaries on Ruskin, or maybe you have not read Ruskin, but you will realize what an incredible necessity this was. Do you remember when I mentioned this morning one of the most demeaning, to bow down before something, to be like a barbarian forced to your knees before, indeed, a foreigner, or an imperial emperor? Perhaps one of the most demeaning signs of almost regressive degeneracy for a young British gentleman would be not to be able to draw. You don't even have to play a psychologist, you don't have to do any reduction. Talbot obviously felt that way very strongly, and he stated it himself, so I need not have any further interpretation. I am suggesting to you that he could have told you, if you asked him this question, why have you become interested in instrumentation that will enable you to record things? Because I *must* be able to record things, I am not total without it. I am not civilized. I bet you a dollar he would say that. It's all a bet, you know. The point is he say it, without even having to go very far into the kind of interpretation I am giving to it. If I were to ask you, how do you remember, if you were living in the sixteenth-century...in either Florence or Siena, let's choose those two places because it seems as though this is where the persistence of these ideas occurred. {Snaps fingers} You would be able to tell me immediately. How would you tell me you remember?

Student: Through writing?

Through writing? No. Through sweating, perspiring. That is what you would tell me. It was just as commonplace. When you sweat and perspire you are losing consciousness. Because this is how you know. And it is right in Leonardo, that extraordinary man who could invent and predict flying machines and discuss the waterways, and the relationships of how water moves through traps, or the extraordinary dimensions of aeronautics and things of that nature. A man who would still believe and could even show colitis in these remarkable x-ray drawings with every detail, and he has those three little lines in the spinal cord, and the semen is being ejaculated, and then of

course the text that reads in reverse mirror image tells us that the magic pneuma, or wind, is being transferred. And the spirit is being transferred, it is not the semen that does the work, it is no ovum and sperm, it is the magical nature of breath that is being transferred. He will also tell us that indeed he persists in the ancient, understand it is an Aristotelian problem, in which purportedly consciousness enters your pores. You are subject to receiving information. Information is not something you know cognitively, it is something that is already preexistent. It is like an efficient cause, or a series of efficient causes. And there is all this little stuff floating around, knowledge, and what happens is I absorb it through a number of orifices, I can breathe it, and particularly through my pores. It finally absorbs into the base of my spine and rises up through my spine, enters into my brain and I know, OK? And then indeed what happens is, when I forget, or can't remember, it is because I perspired too profusely and my knowledge has disseminated out through vaporization. And then when I am remembering it is because I had to sit and become very concentrated and realize that I reabsorbed those particles that I have lost, they come back into my pores, enter my spine, into my head, and I remember. Now I know you are saying, the rational mind of the Renaissance? The rebirth of awareness? I am telling you folks what was actually the popular case, just as commonplace as the child who would say the reason I can do it myself is because the last four letters of American are i-c-a-n. I am using a little extreme here to bring the point and connect it back to what we were talking about. But this is true, these are popular notions, but based on very powerful concepts. And it shows you the persistence of a gradual degeneration. It was originally Aristotle who talked about the universal overlapping of all things and talks about illumined auras along the edge of flesh, or along the edge of a stone, and how air and fire and water and other elements are inter-combinative, inter-penetrative. And this idea persists as an explanation for all things that can't be explained. For example, why is the writing upside down when Gabriel speaks to Mary in most medieval paintings? I only know of two exceptions, even as late as Van Eyck. And what is the meaning of a visitant-announcing angel speaking to this rather average woman who happened to be blessed by the favor of God. And when Gabriel speaks, 'Ave Maria, Hail Mary,' and talks to her as the select. And in Simone Martini and even earlier images, and even as late as Van Eyck, in the 1450s or even earlier in the 1430s, the writing as is in the National Gallery's *Annunciation*, the writing is upside down. Sound, as spoken, is associated with breath. It traverses across the space between the two and what does it do? It enters her ear, she hears. That would be the reductivist's explanation. Not so, if we follow the golden archetype as it were, of this paradigm, we find out the words are written upside down because they represent the word of God. Remember in the beginning was the word, and the word became light. The word is associated with pneuma. Breath that is associated with the expulsion of even sound, it traverses across space, enters into her ear, travels down her spinal cord, enters into her womb, and thus that is the reason why we speak of her as she who remained chaste

without the broken hymen. And as a result we have the magical birth. That is why in Roger Van Der Weyden, Robert Campin, and countless Flemish artists, you have women and even today why ladies wear handkerchiefs in Catholic Churches. If they don't wear it, in early Christianity, they covered their ears because they are subject to, never again, to the fecundation of God's breath or pneuma and words that are only read upside down in these paintings because it is a magical word. They wear it because they respect the possibility also that they can be inspired by devil's breath, and need I remind you of how the persistence of that archetype, we have got Rosemary's Baby, and any number of other images where...aborted pneumas...even computers fecundating women...Well, I say all that to point out that there is yet another example of the persistence of an Aristotelian idea, the universal overlapping-ness of all things in the world. You see, things interpenetrate. And by the way, when I say to you, have any of you heard of, in the ear? I was surprised that none of you have because I kept hearing it when I taught in Brooklyn at Pratt Institute. I'd hear some guy getting mad at someone, "In the ear, mac!" Right on the streets. It is a generational archetype, and I used to say now that is confused, too, because it just does not seem to be a natural way of expressing contempt.

Student: Bill, in Hamlet, is that connected at all in terms of the death of the father?

Oh indeed it is, yes. What it is, is a closure. Remember when he attempts to pray? The murderer. My words fly up but my thoughts remain below, and of course the pouring of the oil, the poison, into the ear. It is also a very telling symbol of the idea of the center of consciousness. The sense of hearing, the sense of a receptacle, or the breath that is associated with that spell... Well I brought all that up because plenitude has nothing to do with the idea of 'my cup runneth over,' although that is one of the themes that...art starts to generate. Plenitude has to do with the contiguity, the touching of all things, the interpenetration of all things. The relational elements which define our world not having separation. And for a long period of time, this kind of touching of all things, this interpenetration of all things was a way of expressing, in some of the most bizarre manners, unusual events like divine births, and the virgin who remains in tact, as well as simple things like how we remember and as well as things like how the transfer is understood. That fecundation must occur between the male and the female in Leonardo's Notebooks but he did not understand is, what happened, what joined what...In this painting we have a woman who has been working on, we have a painter who has been working on a painting, held by a child in her household. And you notice that she is in essence imitating a type of Hermes figure... a cubic block, and then we have these observers that are seen cropped by the doorway into that interior setting. And we also have the principle that one figure tends to overlap the other, and we have gestures in terms of the kind of possibly entering into the room, or observing from afar,

but they are certainly not sharing the space of the painter's studio. When we talk about plenitude in any pictorial image which implies continuum we are talking about a definition of spatiality in which there are implications that there is more to the continuous space than simple aerial perspective or recession by virtue of chromatic identity into less chromatic integrity, into neutralization. We are talking about the fact that these figures come from somewhere, they are blocked by something, there is space beyond the space that is defined. And I don't have to remind you of that issue and how it becomes persistent literally from this period forward. Plenitude has a lot to do even when we talk about cropping and bleeding, which basically arrived with photography. And I think they are both very interesting terms: cropping means to lop off, to bleed means basically to flow into the continuum. Agreed? So in cropping is usually when something, let's say a rather small unit has been removed. Like me standing over here with my hand behind the column, you don't see that small unit. But at least the integrity of the total form is somewhat visible. Bleeding is when I stand like this and leave only my hand, and I am still talking to you from out here {laughter}...Bleeding is when you know I am there, and you hear my voice, and it is no pneumatic transfer I am making, you know my voice but I am not present to you but you know very well the multiple presence of that one unit (the visible hand). That your sense of space, not just the bleeding of me, but your sense and perception of the plenitude of space, the continuum of space, that I cannot escape and that you cannot see. I inhabit a space that you cannot see but that you know very well it is not only implied, it is *there*. And thus you get into the problem of the universal overlapping-ness, and the continuum of all things. Because I add to Aristotle's statement, he did not only speak of the relationship between things and their interpenetration, he talked about continuums. And this issue becomes extremely vital in terms of the way we perceive photographs. It isn't an ontological issue, it is an historical issue. And it first appears in emphatic form, in a universalized form...in Pompeii...I'll just show you a couple more. Just look at this sense of continuum and existent space of the crowd that enters from the left, the event that takes place on the right, rich in iconography, even the illumined doorway behind it....in that space, certainly we do not believe that those figures stop at the left hand side, they continue in front of some space not visible to us, but we are forced to believe in the continuum of things as well as environments that hold things. Even when we have a more lateral organization to these *Dionysian Mysteries*, the revealing of the phallus that the woman is raising the...from the left and the various lute players, musicians. This is a basically an occult celebration, a Bacchian ritual, and we do have the same deal throughout this entire mural because it is a continuous frieze where figures not only block one another, but we have units at their corners or terminals in which things will appear to evolve from one another, and their lateral..by overlapping and as well as figures entering in those spaces that imply a space beyond even those red paneled walls behind. And figures that continue off the edge of the terminus of the mural in the *Villa of the Mysteries*. Even

to the point where facial identities will begin to become an important factor in the art of this period. That certain emotive expressions will become apparent, even the treatment of the hair in this form shows certain extensions of the portraiture that we identified in other periods. I am going to go through and show you how from the most casual sketch of faces...how do you read the hair by virtue of the modulation of light, how do you read the face. It is hardly more competent than that early Lascaux animal head that I showed you early on in our discussion of the visual material. And that is to say if you didn't have this light and shade, notice how bold is this volume, {makes slide go out of focus} how when I reduce the contour to allow us to see the modulation of a form by virtue of light and shade. These define a more atmospheric and ephemeral effect of a sketch, such as this, notice the extraordinary reflection on the lower lip, the stopping of the light flickering across the face, of course this is considerably damaged as you can see. And even the form that tends to open or bend at the edge of her face, again, throw it out of focus and you begin to read the volume quite well by virtue of the principle of light and shade. Even the picking out of the curls of the hair...is another, you get the same effect across facial structures. All according to the principle of observed light. Sometimes the definition is more emphatic. Even more so in some cases. Notice the fingers, notice the glint on the finger nail. Notice the reflection in the orb of the eye. Notice that highlight that appears on the nose region on the male. And even on the reflection on the interior of the ear on the left, we've never seen that before this time except in the Fayum portraits, which are somewhat contemporaneous with these forms, but that just appeared in the eyes. Even if we look at this black and white illustration of a tondo painting, even in the value structure you get that strong sense of the light/dark value contrast of variable degrees of tonality, and the sparkle of what we might speak of as light/shade contrast in terms of grades from black and white and including black and white. Look at the drapery. That really is a rather inchoate treatment of the articulation of naturalness in the drapery lines, they all remain basically a similar thrust or force, where not for the variation in color, let's say in parts of the reds like in the foreground where that simple torso area is and in the upper regions...where it darkens. Even those landscape scenes which don't convince us of their space, we have the imitation of a garden wall, the fence, the trees with their fruit, the atmosphere of sky that rather loses its coloration as well as the green grasses. Really a kind of blocked space. A space that we really cannot enter but nonetheless convincing as we stand away from it and see the effects of light falling upon the forms. Look at the volumetric nature of the little fruits on the trees themselves. The little partridge down below in the lower right of this detail. Or observe again what happens with landscape figures, how even as simplified as they may be, throw it out of focus and read the volume of the figure on the right, very convincing, only light permits us to see this kind of form. Not the planal definition. A more planal definition, which may include either or more strong value contrasts. Planal definitions usually depend upon what we might call the arbitrary stressing of light and

dark. Throw it out of focus and they tend to coalesce. And spots of light are perceived and defined and begin to become justifications of volumetric-ism by virtue of the phenomenology of reflections. All of that wall does not recede. And it is not planality, it is not even the coherence of the perspective that does it, it is the gradual reduction of the intensity of the contrast of the value units as well as the intensity of the coloration as we look at the foreground trees, the foliage units just behind the wall, and we go into the landscape notice beyond and notice even the atmospheric disappearance of the trees by the neutralization of their color. But, without much commentary, I'll show these to you, these are the works I mentioned, these still life forms. Definite light sources causing the rendering of three-dimensionality. I ask you to think again even as late as ... and others of these scenes of gathered flowers, or birds hanging from walls, even a number of early Daguerrian images of the genre scene, like in Flemish or Dutch art, I would suggest to you, I would suspect they come more from the observation of such forms as these. I can't say that Henri Le Secq looked at Pompeian still lifes and thus was enraptured also by reflections in glassware, silver pots and pewter ware, but I suggest that the instinct for a return to that kind of phenomenological perception is certainly apparent during the period, and I call it the Pompeian influence in early photography, it is still yet to be proved by textual evidence. But certainly context would tell us it is a very strong possibility. Transparency, opacity, translucency become so apparent and does not appear prior to this. Extraordinary definition of volumetricism by virtue of dealing with reflected light. I just keep saying it over and over again because this would be an example of multi-planality only if I have the principle of this being extremely dark and this being the middle value and this being the lighter value. So the reflection behaves as one of the natural principles of blocked light, or light and shade. It is not only in the application of chiaroscuro occurs predominantly in late Italian art and in the art of seventeenth century Holland, and in Belgium, or we say Flanders...Dutch countries. The important thing is that here we find the visual instincts moving toward the definition of forms that are seen, and these are certain decorative motifs that are on the wall. Remember our geese in Meidum? Remember our emphasis upon animal life? Well, flower petals, seashells, flying birds, were treated with far less attention to the accuracy of showing the feather pack, but what convinces you is the glints of light reflecting from their, in essence oiled feathers as we speak of it, or that confections of shells, or gold coins, or petals, or other objects are floating in space, or these little cords, these braided gold strands, are convincing to us as they overlap and intertwine with one another because of the glints of light that reflect off of their surface. We can very well have the lineal pattern, but we wouldn't have the sense that they are existing as differentiated space without the alternation of reflected light....And one of the major influences of Pompeian painting in the nineteenth century. How one could speak of the understanding of even the access, I might add, much of the original Pompeian material was presented to early photography, Daguerreotypists as well as photographers, in

value structure and form. Color is not seen...and I would say to you that this was also publicly witnessed. Read again what was exhibited at various expositions. Notice, and this is often illustrated, the peaches and the glass jar, again, perspectival integrity, the understanding of the ellipse, be damned: what convinces us is indeed the difference in the reflected light and the change in its value contrast due to the fracturing of it. The understanding of what happens when the glass reflects upon the foreground and then gradually reduces intensity toward the back. Notice the forward peaches or the leaves and what happens to them as they lose the upper plane. How shadows are cast. One doesn't think those things exist, one sees that they exist. And one knows the forces active have nothing to do with the ability to accommodate volumetric-ism by intentional sculpting. This is the mimicry that takes place when the artist respects something that is autonomous and self-governing, something that is itself-reflexive. I can't resist the relationship with this final form that I wish to show you in relationship to a number of the images of early Daguerreotypists as well as photographers. This concentration upon the table top. With multiple objects and reflective identity.

Student: Are you saying this proves they did see these?

I never said that. I never said that at all. If you presume that you are making a profound error. I said it is quite conceivable that they saw these.

Student: Ok.

And I know this, they saw Pompeian art in reproduction.

Student: Oh, ok.

Student: If they didn't see this, it seems like Fox Talbot in the *Pencil of Nature* text makes specific reference in Plate six to the Dutch school for everyday events and similar genre.

Plate six is *The Open Door*...but you see he is not quoting his own interests, he is quoting Henry Collin's directives. And the painter Henry Collins is requiring him to, he is the one who tells him to change the ladder. That is just an example of a painter trying to direct the photographer.

Student: I am thinking of it in terms of, probably directly and more toward the general Dutch school as they use the model of table tops...I am not sure if it is more than this, but I am saying there is indication that he would cite the Dutch school as a model of this type of...

If you can find me a single example, in Dutch still life painting, which has that kind of perspective, or any others that I have been showing you, I'll pay you a thousand dollars. {laughter} A single example. I will show you a number of examples of Dutch still life that represent the typical types. But you see this idea, and I am telling you that yes, and Daguerre was quite conscious of that, and uses it quite consciously. You can take the work of Heda and match it up to even some of the still life interiors in his {Daguerre's} studio. They are so obviously pastiches. What I would suggest to you is this absence of context, the table without really an interior setting. The table top and objects placed either at random after lunch, before the table is set, including that destroyed glass before the glass plate in Niepce's work. The idea of objects that have no integral organizational order, for example, organized around some schema, so that we are supposed to read the gestalt and find the organizing principle. This is discontinuity, randomness, objects which are set for the occasion of not only showing domestic, festive silverware and other elements, but also indicate the, and look again, this is like a Pompeian behaving like a respectable Persian. He or she, whoever did this, doesn't care about the inverted perspective. What impresses us is that remarkable concentration upon light that reflects from metallic as well as glass objects. I know of no other example, and there are too many images that show this type of random organization of objects set out on a table. How many can you think of in the early beginnings of photography?

Student: The famous one of Fox Talbot is on the cover of the new publication.

Ok, what else. Isn't that a peculiar image to your eye?

Student: But the grain in the syntax interferes, it doesn't seem that random to me, I don't know, maybe it is.

Wait a minute, I am not necessarily insinuating that the photograph will not be pre-arranged, I am just talking about the view that is taken from the table of the objects. For what reason, for what purpose? Why? Why the lack of context? Do you believe that that mad scientist really did destroy that man's plate? Do you?

Student: No.

Well do you, Chuck?

Student: I think so, yes.

I do too. And I am certainly glad we had that crude evidence to remind us of what it was. I kept thinking, that is a very peculiar image. Find me the paradigm prior to that. And find me why Le Secq, with all of those exquisite still lifes and other forms, could also do a table top that simply showed that kind of an unpretentious arrangement of objects. Do you know the Rheims Cathedral Treasury images? It is like in French Primitive Photography, some of those images are the most peculiar vantage points, and they are unnecessary, they seem to echo a kind of consciousness of visual forms that appears in Pompeian painting. You don't have to believe it, I am just suggesting it to you. And if anything where we can say the emphatic definition, the aspect of mimesis that deals with the phenomenology of reflected light, and what I will speak of as a somewhat continuous, plenitudinous order that is continuum rather than contained, first begins on a collective and universal level in Pompeian painting. It was one of the most pervasive influences on the painting of Ingres. It was the most pervasive influence in Neoclassical art. This is no longer the Classicism of the fifth century, or Hellenistic art, but primarily of the Pompeian painting. Those works that were found in Herculaneum as well as other sites, and there is enough by the way in Herculaneum. Do you know the image, what is her name, Mademoiselle Moitessier. In one of the images, and she also appears in that goddess-like structure. She is based upon the goddess structure from Herculaneum and Pompeian painting. And there is a basket of fruit as well as other reflective items, so it doesn't have to be anyone saw this, I am not trying to make that connection. That is why when Lee asked the question, please don't...but they were definitely looking at Pompeian painting, and visited Pompeii. And interested in, even the idea of the civilized gentleman's tour, regardless of what nationality you were. Or the fact that Daguerre had a considerable amount of interest concerning painting. But he might have been picking up his clues primarily from Dutch art, and I would say his work is evidence of that. But other primitives tended to be responsive to this notion of, oh well, let's be direct, or, it is more of a scientific inquiry so we don't care about the subject, some of those things are informed and imbued by distinct stylistic devices, and I suggest they do. {end afternoon session}

Morning session July 14:

...I wanted to clarify one thing real quick...I forgot totally about those books in there, so this morning we have got to do that before we go to lunch. So that you all get a chance to look at them...I will hope that everyone has already read {laughs}...The Charles Erroll {??} book, the first one I started with, it is still in there...The first two chapters you don't have to read them because I'll be going over them myself, but on chapter three, *Phantoms of Photography*...that is all of two pages, and four, the *First Conception of Photography*, you just might want to remind yourself of that again, it is about six pages in the Gernsheim book. Now the only thing that I did not get a chance to state

emphatically to a number of people, and I am not trying to bring up this saw. My purpose in yesterday in introducing the Pompeian painting, and I want to make sure it is very clear so no one misconstrues this, or rather that I don't misconstrue it for your purposes. You notice how easily the transfer of the possibility of blame to you {laughs}. It is a neat trick. It comes in handy. When I mentioned the Pompeian material, I'll stress, hold to this, and you can trust this, and I know of no way you can deny it, nor anyone, including the Pompeian scholars, the fact the Pompeian painting is the first period in which the phenomenology of light defining subjects appears as a collective activity. It is not just in the wall paintings that I showed you. It is apparent not only in the attitude toward light in their architecture, but in whatever records we have on daily life, light is a very important factor. And frankly, not deified, is a way of putting it. It is a very strong disposition toward the use of light and bringing light to bear within pictorial forms. And when I say collectively or universally used, not isolated around a single master. Or one or two or three figures. And as we mentioned, and someone said, well didn't Zeuxis concern himself with light, I'd say yes, but you still have, remember from our textual reading, the identification of special individuals. And good heavens, when you are talking about Greek painting you end up selecting two or three out of centuries of activity. Where obviously some are better than others. We don't find that, not because the evidence doesn't exist, but we don't find that in reference to Pompeian art, because it is persistent, this phenomenology of light. Now, I then made a reference to, and what some of us sat around and talked about, and I assume no direct influence in relation to Niepce. But I was talking about, this is that damaged plate of which we only have this print remaining of the table top...and most of you have read about this but it is about that mad German who took it for analysis, {laughs} went nuts, tore up the entire laboratory and destroyed this along with it. So what we have is, a table laid for a meal, a physautotype photograph on glass by Niepce, often mistaken as his first photograph, not so, probably 1829, and it is a reproduction.

Student: Bill, what is a good source for visual material on Pompeian painting?

There are dozens of them... Rogers is a major book. I am going to give you a bibliography on all that material...and I also was making reference to, and I am not again saying Regnault was concerned with Pompeian painting, I am just saying the attitude that is apparent in images of this nature have been called, and I want to read it if you don't mind...I want to get this point across very clear. When we read that the Primitives, and keep in mind that primitivism is referred to in any period of art, that it should not be thought of as a negative usage. It means first practitioners, or first activity within a kind of prime unit or as I was talking about the development of a paradigm of activity in terms of visual form or even practice, how one behaves with a medium and so on. And Bob Sobieszek makes this statement: "From the beginning, the early

photographers, the Primitives, attained the facility for creating incredibly accomplished pictures. By no means were they primitive in their inability to fully utilize the materials given them.” (That was my point yesterday, certainly that is recognized, that these were not people fumbling around with a box and light-sensitive materials without having some rather advanced awareness of what they were doing). “But then we give it and then take it away. The stark expressionism, crude and monolithic forms and the problematic symbolism of many primitive cultures are absent in their work. Rather,” (so we don’t want to make the mistake of saying that suddenly early camera work dealt with transformations, alterations, or investments which we could speak of as being totally externally invested in the work itself. There are some investments, that is psychic projections upon earlier forms, but I don’t think that was typical for practitioners. But here is where I think even though they were very accomplished, and created some incredibly accomplished pictures) “Rather, there is a primitivism of simplicity, of reverence to material nature, and of non-artifice, except perhaps the artifice of directness. The majority of the photographers gathered in this exhibition made no attempt to duplicate specific painterly problems, or to translate paintings into their own medium. In France, this confusion of visual languages did not occur to any degree until much later in the century” (Meaning the influence of painting upon photography. And at the conclusion of the essay, I think there is a hypothesis of doubt on that statement, and then it ends with the statement)...“The primitive photographer came close to the botanist or the naturalist in his direct approach to a systematic inventory of the subject. Yet it was an inventory made by a naturalist sensitive to what he observed, conscious of the effects of light upon the scene and the play of masses and contours of the picture. He was also a primitive in that he was naively infatuated with what he saw and photographed.” Now that last part is absolutely true, this sort of exhaustive documentation of street life, objects, of persons, and so on. I can’t seem somehow find the passage that I immediately turned to yesterday, but what it has to do with is the idea of the Primitive glorifying nature, and it references into a kind of plain, frank, simple approach to the world. Well, a number of these individuals, whether having behaved as artists, painters, in some cases sculptors, or as scientists, or as individuals trained in philosophy, most were involved in rigorous disciplines, including academic painting, which I consider a rigorous discipline of the same period. So...I have always found it difficult to accept the fact that human beings who have an extraordinary level of accomplishment in terms of not only attitudinal but even pragmatic approaches to other disciplines. For example, Talbot: botanist, very aware of chemistry, an Arabic scholar, a translator of early Assyrian writing. An individual who is civilized in every sense of the word by being a Classicist. An individual who had...an understanding of period literature, not only of his own period but of ancient literature. I can’t imagine we can look at his work necessarily as primitive: plain, frank, or ingenuous, simple, without regard for the possibility of influential forms. And I am suggesting to you because of the excavations

that began in 1808, and because of the possibility that since we know Pompeian art had a very strong influence, both in Great Britain and in France, that it is conceivable, I only say it that way, it was conceivable that there well may have been observations of types of forms. Certainly Herculaneum had been discovered in the late part of the eighteenth century, it wasn't until the 1850s that Ingres and so on would reflect that influence. On the other hand there is evidence in his very earliest work of an attitude towards the play of light upon figures that could have very well been influenced by Pompeian painting. The early Pompeian painting, the first excavation. But the major excavations began in 1808 and there were reports, verbal plus also visual; drawings, engravings, and so on. I am not trying to make the case for the possibility that Pompeian painting is the reason for the attitude of early primitive photographers. I just simply say, this interest in having objects that are not, according to all the information I have been able to gather, arranged here for an experiment, or for the structure of a scientific project, they are just randomly, it is like a storage shelf, placed upon here. And the photographer, and by the way the title is simply identifying the subject matter, it has nothing to do with an official title given by the photographer. But that the way they indicate reflected light, the absorption of light, the almost non-schematic organization of form: there is no underlying schema or controlling. You might want to read all sort of organizational principles into it, but as I said to you all, you will have to read from the present day backwards, and I don't think that is quite appropriate. Let's take a form such as Le Secq's: some of the still lifes have such an incredible sense, like the half peach, and even the decorative motifs within the structures although they are subject to a sort of Orientalism, but many of them have what we call the Pompeian calligraphy, even in these more naive examples. But laid side by side, an interest in reflected light, and the knife in front, and obviously a man who understood painting thoroughly, and he could develop a rather traditional approach to the still-life. Even if we looked at only these two, and there are others as we know, and Eugenia Janis, in her lecture that she did in Boston, of course she has lectured up here as well, on her work on Le Secq, shows maybe thirty of these particular images of...still-lives. But in the landscapes and still-lives, we have that strange division between a kind of one, two, three side-by-side placement, or even stacking things back in recessive order, which might indicate some kind of influence. I only say it might indicate it. As opposed to the idea of the grand manner of the still-life. It could very well have come from traditions that were quite obvious, and that isn't. So the second part of this I like to add to, it might have been influenced, the interesting part of the hypothesis to me is that, I am not presuming that any of these people ever saw anything, I just can't see how they escaped it, but nonetheless I am not saying they did see any Pompeian art. But let's say Cuvelier, or LeSecq again, in the recording of closer views of foliage, the light reflecting off of forms, that is a radical stance. And you can even call it plain, frank, simple, raw response of, I don't know a thing about Cuvelier in terms of his background, a sufficient amount, about his father

being accomplished and the son, I would assume, having been influenced by family and environment. But the thing is, is that it is conceivable that these works could well be misinterpreted. They could well be an example of a type of work that is enabled, attitudinally, by a witnessing of a classic form, and in the sense of even the early nineteenth century, remember Classicism is not associated with the fifth century BC. The prime unit is the *Apollo Belvedere*. That sappy image of the late fourth century. Or, particularly, Pompeian painting. And I am trying to stress this because the Classicism is either late fourth century or Hellenism, and Pompeian influences. It is not the organized canonic forms of the Periclean age. And that is something that most people totally misunderstand. And I stress what would happen if individuals might have just instinctually given up their differentiating consciousness and had moved about to record the world and document it, but what happens when they deliberately take things and place them on a table, side by side, and put a knife in front. Or they turn their attention to a group of laboratory instruments in which there is no coherent relationship of those units. Then perhaps we are dealing with either just like they liked the light, or they just happen to say I've got to get all of this stuff done, like in the Rheims Treasury images where they are side by side...I have got to get this commission over with, hurry up... I don't care what reason. But the point is that I think it is possible to make an image that is against the grain of hundreds of years of conventions of what is meaningful in form, I mean significant in form and meaningful in content. And to accept it. It could very well be also influenced by the acceptance because it is in reality a classic move, the objects sit by side on the table next to other forms. I only suggest that to you as something worthy of my continued exploration and yours. Because it would certainly mean that we can't call them Primitives then. We would call them, in essence, Neoclassicists. And they would probably come closer to the Neoclassicism that we associate with the painting of the period, but another dimension of it where there is not this effort to try to marry the Renaissance schema to the classic forms of Pompeian painting, where light becomes an important phenomenological factor. Here they tend to deal with the world directly. And that is quite true just as the Pompeians did. Now I just want to make sure everyone understood this, because it would be very dangerous of me to suddenly say, Henri LeSecq was influenced by Pompeian painting, and don't you dare tell anyone that because you will make an ass out of yourselves, and make an ass out of me. {laughs} Only know that it is a good hypothesis. And I don't have enough information yet on certain expositions to make this emphatic. But you have got two choices: you can either talk about, he just did it, for whatever banal reasons; or second choice, they were glorifying this world, or that they were influenced by Positivism, particularly Comtean Positivism, and that is a very complex system, and anyone influenced by it would have to understand it and suddenly they took it all back, threw it out, and went out and went, click, as though they were noble savages, and I just can't accept that, these pictures are too complex. Or thirdly, you have the possibility that maybe they were developing a sort

of sublation of a previous paradigm, that really proves that they were dealing with a very unique form of extension of a tradition. Now the other thing I want to talk about is, here is that magazine with that iconographic, and of course you might know (laughs) they published the painting in full color backwards. You have to be careful, but at any rate, this is from Art News and the date is February 1973 and it is called *Manet and the Judgment of Paris*. And here is that full image of the Marc Antonio Raimondi...all the information I gave you has been around for ages, including three days after the painting was opened and the critic who was able to carefully, saw the whole picture, so this has been around since it was first shown. But I thought you might want to see the whole print. And then to realize, as I said, that the problematic, political imagery in the work, including the meaning of the little bird, and that would be absolutely typical of Manet to deal with this pun. The pun on the grand tradition and to get *Maricate* {?} into it. You just have to read it, it is by Wayne Anderson, a thoroughly scholarly comment upon this. It is a wonderful example of how we look at a work and we think it is radical, and this is primarily in the response of the public to the nudity and the impropriety of these women, and finally we find out that maybe...and now this man has cultivated a lot of evidence for this. And that there were other reactions that were appearing in journals that were not associated with art that were outraged by this form because of its open insult of his virtually snubbing his nose at the establishment. I thought you might want to read that on your own. And remember to read those two little conclusions. All right, that's it. Now we'll start looking at some work... We will be dealing now with more unit ideas, so this morning what I want to do is show some of the developments that occur in, not early Christian, what I should say Byzantine and Medieval Art. And to spot check certain issues because obviously we have to accept the fact that Pompeii was engulfed by...a natural disaster. So we can say literally there is an obliteration of the interest in the phenomenology of light that will have to be virtually re-discovered. And what I'd like to stress to you is that you find, again, in the forms of Byzantine and Ravennian art, you will find a complete series of influences: east meets west, and you have to deal a wide variety of issues: political...I can't do that at this point, otherwise I'd be waxing on what Constantine did and Theodosius and the various...movements of people to show how some art objects were shown to others...by transfer of influence. But for our purposes we can say that it isn't until one thing, really, and one thing alone, it is truly a prime source, and that occurs in the late Gothic period and early Renaissance in Italy where the true identity of natural light beginning to be a prime source for describing objects will occur. And I'll show you that this afternoon...And then everything becomes interlocked with the development of the camera obscura, you will see the paintings and see what happens in terms of observation. But on this point, certain things are transferred through. For example, Greco-Roman art is transferred through, not only in Byzantine images that you might least suspect, were subject to certain principles of earlier art. It is also transferred through in manuscript illuminations, not only the expressive aspects of

mimesis but also the idealized aspects of mimesis. And there are hints of the interest in light, but not until Giotto in the late Gothic period do we have a true interest in the development of aspects of mimetic portrayal that will return to the idea that it is not so much the mimesis of light. There is a mimesis of volume, there is also a problem of scale and size, like architecture around the figures but there is the most extraordinary understanding of mimesis of kinetic or sequential action, and narrative anecdotalism...will occur...The image that you are looking at, and I would like to remind you that this is a rather late piece, this is illustrated on page 176 in the Jansen text...it represents a work that is somewhat diminutive in scale, 32 by 19 ½ inches, and it is late thirteenth century, so it is obviously not of the Byzantine period. But on the other hand, it represents a continuation of the earlier Byzantine style. And I use it primarily because if we look at this and ask ourselves about mimetic portrayal, we might find ourselves hard put to look at this rather decorporealized, and flattened section and patterned image of the *Madonna and Child* with the protective angels above, as having anything to do with mimesis. But the thing that I would call attention to, and I won't take time to discuss the full system, this is in the National Gallery of Art in Washington, and this is subject to the principle of canonic order, that is to say everything is subject to measurement, so it is not a primitive invention, it follows the Greek tradition of nose links instead of heads, like seven heads high, as in the canon of Doryphoros's *Spear Bearer*, it uses a system of nose links. And I might add that a nose link did not determine every figure to have a specific number of nose links but there are nose links that are appropriate for the head and from the neck to the groin region and then from the knees to the feet. They may vary but they are always constant in terms of their ratio, so as a result it depends upon the scale of the form as well as the definition of widths of images. So the idea of the use of an encoding system that purportedly gives you the most perfect definition of a type, so that we can talk about mimicking a law, as in the Doryphoros. And whether or not the form ends up looking as though it is credible or not credible, we might speak of it as having the mimicking of a canonic system, so as a result one can guarantee similarity of type, so that you get a consistency of form. So that is why we always have to be concerned about the use of the word mimesis. With Auerbach's approach or even in terms of what I read to you from the book on literary studies, that we might be talking theme, we might be talking about psychological aspects...formal aspects... or even situations where there is a mimicking of a system of proportioning or structure that guarantees relationship from painting to painting or type to type.

Student: On that basis, could you say that about any system though? Like Cubism or any system where there is a type of proportion to moderate everything?

There is no system operating in Cubism, so let's use an illustration that we can be sure of, because there is no canonic system in Cubism, none whatsoever. We can take any

term, like Expressionism, and apply it back to anything...no, because simply the idea of mimesis is, we might have a recording aspect with the idea of documentation, but we can also have introjected or extrojected concerns with the work causing the individual to behave as it wishes itself to be perceived, or we then invest the work with properties that we wish it to mimic. And I would say that canonic proportion is typical of Classicism...and I would never include any of the works that have that kind of harried, imitative identity...but in this case I can turn aspects of Classicism, or even Idealism, into the principle of mimesis simply because of the fact that a law makes for constancy and guarantees similarity of type precludes any problem with replication or we might say it includes the guarantee of replication. And a reproduction is in essence a mimetic portrayal of an original source. Does everyone get the difference here? It is a good question and I don't want to dismiss it, but I can't take any classification and apply it to anything. Because Classicism will also have other, in terms of refinement, the idea of what philosophical strains of influence in Classicism as it proceeds forward, and some of these are examples of mimetic portrayal that just wouldn't fit into the system...There is another aspect that is very mimetic and that is in this throne upon which the Madonna is placed. Now obviously we are not going to talk about its perspectival integrity, but there we are dealing with conventions that are primarily eastern, and as a result we have to accept the fact the throne itself is a subject to somewhat of an inverted perspective where the recession is actually in the foreground of the plane as opposed to the back. There is a tilting up on the back, all those conventions that we associate with the deliberate attempt to deny credibility. That is this Madonna is not to be thought of as in the church, or within the construct of earth, but she is indeed a heavenly Madonna and therefore all forms should somewhat *disobey* the principles of variability within the order of our world. So as a result, the throne is completely distorted in terms of perspective orientation. However, in terms of that reference we saw also in Pompeii, the inlaid wood in this case, quite often they are of stone...or very much like wicker, but in this case it happens to be a wood throne. And the order in which these little arched and rectangular openings along the outside, or the various parquet identifications that are carved are quite accurate renditions of what would be expected in a thirteenth century religious environment such as a church. Even though distortion makes it no longer belong to this world. The mimicry occurs in the very definite observed identification of furniture type, which was existent at the time. The other aspect is that although the Madonna holds the infant Christ, who always is a peculiar adult in a number of these images, and he has his hand held in that sort of Cub Scout code that represents the two raised fingers, father and son, and then the third figure crossed by the thumb is the holy ghost...and the three represent the trinity...you have him literally engaged in the idea of a benedictive or salutary gesture that represents this idea of the trinitarian doctrine. And she is also a goddess who protects, and she stands her child...for presentation, in this case it is the...model of heaven so she presents the son

of god, it is not her husband obviously in that sense that we saw in...but it is the same principle, the magna mater presents the masculine to the world and to our attention... But all of those have nothing to do, there are semiotic motifs in here that definitely occur have nothing at all to do with the idea of the mimetic tradition. These are investments with certain gestures, signs...with meanings that really leave the realm of description and enter the realm of the text and canonic law in terms of scripture. But there are features, even though that Madonna has those typically, a rather Roman form in terms of the treatment of the face, particularly in the suggestion in what is happening in the modeling of the head, although the head is disposed on the axis of the neck quite unnaturally so suddenly she has shifted her head like a Modigliani, a completely different axis from the neck. There is a...distortion, the elongation of the nose, the almond shaped eyes, to suggest that we are not really dealing with something that is referential to human physiognomy, but invented physiognomy. However, the modeling of the light and shade, even in this early form, is beginning to become convincing. We do sense the head starting to suggest the idea of dimensionality, and that is very true of the head of the young Christ, because it begins to show an identification of the Roman influence, mostly Eastern influence, coming back into play so that even the treatment of the hand and its gesture, showing the pads, and the musculature showing a strong sense of light...and shadow. And that is very true in the modeling of the face, and even though the angels above over their heads share an axial tilt. Even the gold...drapery of these figures is at the service of what will eventually become a recognized feature of mimetic portrayal. I think it is very difficult to see of the later work of Talbot in which you eliminate this gold...drapery entirely and suddenly have real fabric on, in essence, a real figure, behaving as fabric does. We start though with these wonderful bursts of light, and again I would stress to you this is not a crude interest in decoration but again this woman is to be suggestive of inhabiting a plane which is transcendent, even drapery does not show natural folding, or the weight of gravitational pull, but it still shows the effect of light. In this case a kind of numen light, or holy light as defined by the gold thread when you speak of gold...drapery. But you will notice that certain things are being portrayed, for example, the drapery dips and we see the slippers. Or even as the artist attempts to flatten things, particularly when the child...the way the fingers pull the drapery, how many of you notice that? That is atypical. That is why it is a rather important form and a very early paradigm for which eventually, the gold...drapery will disappear and then you will really see cloth being pulled, going back to the earlier issues that had to be rediscovered which were already accomplished in human visual consciousness at an earlier stage. But virtually were eliminated because of other attentions and other influences. Well, I just want to show that because even the issue that, the fact that we have a convention, and I am not going to trace by the time we reach Sienese and Florentine early examples, I'll just use this one because it represents certain influences of the transfer of the Roman tradition, the modeling of forms, the

convincing three-dimensionality, it even implicates certain principles of pressure. We will find a number of these images where the pillow, and also the fact that this form does project forward so she is contained in the cathedra, or the chair, and that she is also subject to, as is the child, as well as the angels above, subject to certain controlled principles of organization of canonic measurement...there are innumerable examples of this type in which the ratio of proportions is constant, extending from the sixth century all the way to the thirteenth. And in the other aspect of the gold...drapery in which light is behaving to define the folds, yet it has been reduced to pattern simply so that it will remove her from the context of this world and imply a transcendent one. So there are hints there of what will become a major concern...in the later middle ages. Now there are a number of images that we can speak of during the period of early Christian art and the influence upon Roman art, upon Eastern art, and the reciprocal influence of Eastern art upon later art. I'd like to just skip ahead and show you two examples...both in Jansen's text, and this is one from the early fifth century AD, and we have a motif that represents a completely new attitude in terms of description. It has certain influences that we say whether or not directly influenced by either Hellenistic or even Roman painting, or even the possibility that this could have been influenced by the transfer of certain examples of Pompeian painting. We have a rather remarkable image in some of the early manuscript illuminations in which we find again a return to light becoming evident in the description of the form. I'm going to give you the exact date on this...as I said, early fifth century AD, it is in the Vatican Library in Rome, and it basically, I was hoping for the size but it is not given, but it is a rather typical vellum size, probably somewhere in the, say five by seven...what we have really here a kind of image of...an omission scene or...and the figure on the couch, and even the attending figures all represent, as you can verily see for yourselves, are wearing Roman tunics. And they also represent an environmental scene taking place, that is we see the couch, we see the attendant figures behind the couch, we see gestures in the figure on the upper right, and probably the most telling image of the interest in light appears in elements such as the change of the wood back of the couch itself, certain features in which you can see the highlight on the pillows and on the gowns, on the folds, as well as what looks to be a series of inlaid marble walls, you will notice that they are meshed and creviced as they fit in juncture. Let's say the mason's work have created these groove-like elements in the wall and those are not just black lines that divide these panels, but the white areas represent the idea that these are literally crevices or units that are...the light as the panels dissipate and goes back out...It would be the same as looking at a concrete block wall and seeing slight depressions where the mortar has been placed between the blocks themselves, like the beautiful illustration of the back wall so you don't have to look far to know what I am talking about. But the main area that I would like to stress is the fact that even by the early fifth century AD you had this interest in the play of light upon surfaces. But it is very momentary. And you also have environmental scenes, and

so therefore manuscript illumination permit us, you know all those little cliches about those monks toiling away creating their visual forms for us...well they are very true, indeed they were, and they were permitting us to be able to observe certain aspects of earlier accomplishments, but they never were collective or universal. So let's stress that such forms continue the traditions that we have been observing, but they are not as secularized, they are not public as it were. And the other example, just to remove it from any further consideration, is the *Vienna Genesis* of the early sixth century and you have to greet an issue of mimetic anecdotalism implied because we have...continuous narration. I won't deal with all the themes in this, but you have a progressional development in which figure groupings are all linked in a storyline...and the development will include figures that are in multiple times and there is a tendency to see the same figure in varied locations moving around a simple band at the top, which then curves across the bridge form and then enters into this area, so that the act of riding or walking and the kissing of the hand are all indicative of the definition of a continuity of narrative, a mimicking of an event in sequential order. And then too notice the lively play of light upon the sleeves of the clothing, upon the drapery folds, and so on. This is the theme of Jacob wrestling with the angel, I want to read to you...the popular presentation that you find in...and by the way Jansen deals with this because he mentions all the things that I am referring to and yet tells us some other factors that are important in relationship to the issue, he says, "This figure shows the story of Jacob, in the foreground we see him (points to figure in foreground) is wrestling with the angel (I assume you know this, it is like the earthly man wrestling with divine forces and of course we always know that Jacob, he is begging...for a blessing, this encounter, and insisting almost like Moses did for a direct encounter with the numinous, and of course the wrestling occurs...and Jacob was marked on the heel, and the angel teaches him a little lesson in humility, but we have the wrestling scene taking place in the middle foreground, and you notice also one thing that is rather important that the angelic form is very similar to the human form, there is an introduction of the shadow...to define the structure of the wing, but basically it is like a combat between protagonist and antagonist and they are both on the human level) "And we can see the angel's benediction (the benediction is indeed the mark) "The picture then does not show a single event but a whole sequence strung out along a single U-shaped path so that progression in space becomes progression in time." (Now that is where you will find Jansen at his most remarkable, because he will start producing, for example, commentaries on spatio-temporal issues at exactly this point in his text, and then he will continue to refer to it up through the Renaissance. You can't lose things like that when reading the text because this anecdotalism and this sense of continuous narration is also an introduction to a mimicking of events taking place in time and space. Even though we have to excuse the fact that I don't normally see when I make the action although some people claim when they see me coming in the door as I walk out, but

generally we know that we don't anticipate seeing as I am talking here suddenly my echo and a person walks in here and comes in front of you, that we have to excuse. But on the other hand we have a very credible representation of a narrative and what we might even call kinetic progression). He also says this, "This kind of continuous narration has a complex and much debated history going back as far as ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. Its appearance in miniatures such as ...reflect earlier illustrations made for books in rolled form" (And we all know, even today, I am sure that at some point you have developed something in your visual studies that relates to a codex progression of a scroll or even a flip book can be an example of continuous action where there is actual movement, it doesn't have to be in rolled form...and the same principle applies to ...the prototype) He also says, "Our picture certainly looks like a frieze," (As we saw earlier in architectural forms and is a perfect example of continuous narration turned back upon itself) He says, "For manuscript illustration, continuous narration offers the advantage of spatial economy. It permits the painter to pack a maximum of narrative content into the area of his disposal. Our artist apparently thought of his picture as a running account to be read like lines of text, rather than a window demanding a frame. The painted forms are placed directly on the purple background that holds the letters, emphasizing the importance of the page as a unified field."

{The tape ends before the quote is completed and is added to the transcription directly from the Jansen text}

End of Reel 6B