

PART I

SLIDE #4 (We skipped over the first few slides and began the lecture here)

Let's see what we've learned ... **The significance of reality.** What do I mean? Because the significant view of the face is in profile, the significant view of the body is that it is facing sideways, the significant view of the foot is sideways – the *law of frontality*.

With the beginning of the Old Kingdom, centered at Memphis (2680–2258 B.C.), there was a rapid development of the stylistic conventions that characterized Egyptian art throughout its history. **In relief sculpture and painting, the human figure was usually represented with the head in profile, the eye and shoulders in front view, and the pelvis, legs, and feet in profile (the law of frontality)** ... In statuary in the round various standing and seated types were developed, but there was strict adherence to the law of frontality and a tendency to emphasize symmetry and to minimize suggestion of movement ... Probably because of its relative impermanence, painting was little used as a medium of representation; it appears to have served principally as accessory to sculpture ... **The artist's task was therefore to produce a statement of reality in the most durable materials at his command.**

(source: Egyptian Art, http://www.perankhgroup.com/egyptian_art.htm)

Dick: And like a child, the significant view of my neighborhood is the sky is up there and so I paint a blue line, and the ground is down there and I paint it green, and then all the white in between.

And so when I use the term *the significance of reality*, this figure is more important than this figure [the Egyptian painting]; this is not true to the appearance of reality, which would be the opposite: *the appearance of reality*.

More child-like in thinking – it may be more child-like but that is *real* to them. **Watch how we use that term 'reality', because it has nothing to do with the appearance.** The reality here is much more spiritual, and that particular reality is again in sync with their beliefs. And when we get up to Cézanne and we realize that Cézanne for the first time challenges the fact that 'I'm sitting here and looking at this still life here' is pure chance. **That is not reality: the true reality is to see it in all dimensions, from every conceivable angle. And so that term reality, it has all to do with your beliefs.**

ABSTRACTION: thumbs up on any time I mention 'abstraction' because *everything is abstract: 'to take from'*.

ab·stract – verb: **abstract** /ab'strakt/

1. Consider (something) theoretically or separately from something else.
"To abstract science and religion from their historical context can lead to anachronism"
2. Extract or remove (something).
"Applications to abstract more water from streams"
synonyms: **extract, isolate, separate, detach**
"He abstracted the art of tragedy from its context"
3. Make a written summary of (an article or book).
"Staff who index and abstract material for an online database"
"We'll be abstracting material for an online database"

5

Student: I keep getting confused by '**nature-dominated**' society only in that she seems so natural. Am I confusing the words?

Dick: No, [that's not what it means.] It means that **Nature is imposing its will on man.**

Student: But with the Egyptian, we see a lot of the Man, and the Nature is in the back, so how do we call that?

Dick: Very good question. But the Egyptian, as well as everyone of that time, is involved with the consequences of Nature's action, and Man has had no say in it. And so, the floods, any pestilence, anything like that: 'I'm simply a victim. And so I will worship all of those things, *natural* things – like the sun – all of the things that Nature is doing.' Think of the Hawaiian culture: Madame Pele. That's a *nature-dominated* society. So Man tries to figure out, 'Why are these things happening to me, these forces that I have no control over?'

And so, as we will see today, if God is in control, then I have no control over any of this, it's an Age of Faith: 'I just *hope* that God will be nice to me, and I'll pray to you [God] so that you will be.'

Student: I have a question ... so how do you know just from looking at the art – without knowledge of Egyptian history, but just looking at that and not knowing anything about it – [**how do you know it is nature-dominated**]? Would it be because of the dominance of the lotus pods, and the birds, and all of the Nature inside there?

Dick: **Well, I think one of the clues would be the symbolism, and the significance of reality, where you are not really looking at this world.** What's fascinating is when we get to the Renaissance, and all of a sudden you have linear perspective, aerial perspective: all these things that are visible in *this* world. Why? Because our interest is *here* [earth], and not *there* [spiritual].

Or here [in the Egyptian painting], with Man, yes he might be a dominant figure, but he is not being looked at beyond or other than a symbol. And if we look at the Paleolithic, the bison was more anatomically correct than the man. They are not really that concerned with their own.

But that's a good question, and, again, I would highly recommend – because this is not truly an art history program, in that we're not going into all of this, because we don't have time – but the nice thing about the internet is that in a couple of minutes you can find almost anything you want and answer that question.

6 - 7

Student: [The Pantheon] is a mish-mash of stuff.

Dick: Why? That's an interesting word, 'mish-mash'. What is the difference between the Pantheon in terms of their gods? ... [What are we] comparing here: two pieces of architecture, one the Greek Classic period, and [one in the] Roman. Which is more interior oriented?

Class: The Roman.

Dick: It's unbelievable. When you walk into that space, you have no interruption, [unlike] we have seen in the interior of Parthenon, where there have to be columns everywhere. Why? Because no one had engineered the fact that you could span this enormous space with a dome: what an invention! And with this dome ... we have suddenly a space of such proportion! In fact, later on in Italian history, they [decided] to make everything colossal in scale – the Romans, you know, a little thing was fine, but if you made it ten times larger then it would overwhelm you.

[The Parthenon] was only entered every two years. It wasn't meant for the interior, and so art historians will see this more as sculpture than architecture, in the sense that it's beauty, it's integrity as architecture, is external. Just having eight columns instead of six, makes it possible (and a lot of theory has gone into this) that you don't see the individual columns; you see a façade. **The idea [is focused on] proportion, everything is modulated mathematically; everything is very rational.**

But the major comparison here, is that what motivated [the Parthenon] is quite different from what motivated [the Pantheon], and yet parts of it [were] clearly taken from Classic Greek.

8

From the interior, you can see how different the spaces were handled: **post and lintel**, and **the dome**. This enormous scale, done in the 2nd century A.D.; I mean, unbelievable! And the oculus [in the center of the dome] is constantly changing the sun; or the sun position changes the lighting throughout ... and what holds this all up? Well, the walls are incredibly thick – something like 16 feet – to support all that weight. But also the engineering – imagine, it's still standing!

9

So the Romans were on a colossal scale of building because they invented concrete, or cement. And they were able to put things together that would have never been possible for the Greeks. But I don't put a great deal of time in art history on the Romans because they were more involved with engineering feats and what was pulled off wasn't necessarily because of aesthetics. They were basically taking ideas from the Greeks, except for their [the Romans] invention of the Roman arch, which changed the whole ball game.

10

This is still standing: an aqueduct which made it possible to bring water in from a distant place, and they realized if you had this arch [built with] stones that were greater width at the top than at the bottom, and placed them all wedged in, and then you had the keystone dropped in, all of the weight is pressing inwards and holding themselves into place. And that made it possible to span a greater distance with far less weight than a lintel coming across.

11

Dick: Ok, Roman sculpture: what periods of Greek art influenced these portraits?

Student: I'm going to say Hellenistic and Classic. In Classic Greek, you said we never show old age, so I don't think that guy could be Classic. She looks very idealized, she's about the appropriate age, very beautiful: to me that says idealized, or Classic.

Dick: Ok, **the Classic is 'the world as we would like it to be': idealized = Classic.** Which is of the two is idealized? Can you all see [the young woman] as idealized? The perfect nose, the perfect face, youthful – no wrinkles, no human concern: that's Classic. That's idealized.

[The bust of the older man] **'The world as it really is': Hellenistic.**

12

Roman mural: visual illusions of a three-dimensional world on a two-dimensional surface. Look at this incredible piece of painting: we're talking *Roman, 2nd century A.D.*, or even earlier. And look at the naturalness with which this woman is leaning back, foreshortened, perspective: all of the elements that we learn in drawing, and quite literal. **Keep that in mind: they already, at this point, were able to identify a three-dimensional world and setting on a flat, two-dimensional surface.** Now this is not like sculpture, where you're actually working three-dimensionally – this is all an *illusion*: that the wall doesn't stop there but goes back ad infinitum.

So we have then already, concerns with *this world*, from the Romans, the pragmatic Romans. And [they] even [use] lighting and shadowing of the figure to give it roundness, and the correct anatomy: **all of these elements [show] a world caught up in the secular: not the religious, but the secular.** That doesn't mean that they don't have their gods; but the point is, is that **even the gods will take on a human characteristic; not stylized like the Egyptian, but quite natural.**

13

Dick: If we look at the sculpture of this Emperor, of what Greek origin would this be? Classic or Hellenistic?

Class: Classic.

Dick: What kind of pose?

Class: Contrapposto.

Dick: Contrapposto. All the weight distributed on one leg, one leg or knee relaxed ... **Look at his face: human concern? No.** So they choose to show Augustus Caesar as the *ideal*; I mean, look at the muscle under [his armor] ... and they exactly had the armor plate and the leather tunic that they wore to emphasize the correct anatomy of a body builder almost, very clearly defined. **An idealized figure**, but elements in it that suggest they also had reference to all the Greek Hellenistic, so this comes well after the Hellenistic.

But the point is that here the Roman has – at his fingertips now – the Archaic Greek, he has all of the history of the Egyptians and whatnot ... **why does he choose to show his Emperor this way? Because the Emperor is without flaw, he is perfection. So even though it looks correct anatomy wise, it is an idealized, youthful Caesar.**

14

Dick: Compare these portraits: literal, true to life, worldly concerns? Which ones are literal and true to life?

Class: Left.

Dick: Why?

Class: They show expression, wrinkles, age.

Dick: You can tell the guy is over twenty! So the Romans are fascinated with actual portraits ... you know, these people are paying to have their portraits done. I think I would ask for the money back! Can you imagine if Caesar had the sculpture do this to him? ‘Do not make me look like I am, but as I would like to be!’

Ok, now **how is that different from Emperor Constantine?** How many of you have seen this sculpture in Rome? This is colossal, absolutely huge. **Idealized?**

Class: Yes.

Dick: Transcendental stare?

Class: Yes.

Dick: What do we mean by that?

Student: Otherworldly.

Dick: Exactly. **There is no furrowed brow, there is no sign of how old he is ... and those eyes are huge, and staring not at you** – even though we don’t see the pupils of Caesar, we almost feel as though they’re looking at us, or [that he’s] right there with us, here and now. Whereas Constantine ... **Spiritual?** Now, who was the first Christian emperor? Constantine.

Here we are again folks: all of a sudden, here we have gone from this kind of literal interpretation (Caesar), and everyone says ‘Well this one (Constantine) must have been earlier because look at it, compared to [Caesar, who looks] *real*’ ... no, no, no. Something has changed now: going from a secular world concerned with this world and my pettiness with all of the [details of] daily living; to all of a sudden, I am the ruler of a *Christian* nation now. **The first Christian emperor ... and so his concerns are now moving away from the corporeal – the flesh and blood of the here and now – [to] another world.**

15

Dick: Emperor Justinian in this mosaic ... do you see anything similar to Emperor Constantine? Can you say the **transcendental stare**?

Class: Yes.

Dick: Is it photographic and [has] realism like the painting that we saw on the wall of the Roman mural? No. Absolutely flattened out, almost Egyptian-like in that sense. **Stylized**, so you’d say ‘my god, this must have come many centuries earlier than what we’ve just been seeing’, but no, just the opposite. So why?

16

If you go to Ravenna, Italy ... you have, just a few miles down the road, an early Christian church and a Byzantine church. And they're both in the same town. Now what was interesting, if you know your history at all, Emperor Constantine sets up the 'Eastern Roman Empire', in where? Constantinople, [which is now] Istanbul. So we have an Eastern and a Western Roman Empire.

The Western early Christians (and they're about at the same time in history) took the Roman Basilica as their plan, because it was already an architectural feature that was kind of important for the symbolism of Christian church. It had the nave, or the 'ship of God', the central aisle; and then you had the side aisles; and so you had 'the Trinity. **And if you go into this one [St. Apollinaire], it's a longitudinal plan, and it leads you right down to the altar [Western style]. And then this one [St. Vitale] is a central plan [Eastern style].** And here is the early Christian, if you'll see, you're looking down the nave (or the ship of God) towards the altar, and everything is aimed at the altar. And above this – I wish I had a picture of this taken at night, because this is all Italian *tesserae*, or it's a glaze on glass, mosaic; and almost all of the gold that you see there, reflects. And so the candles on the altar here at night, because of this curve, are all reflecting this golden, heavenly atmosphere.

18

And, in order to compare the two, when we talk about the mosaics, one of them is even more magical because it's all rounded surfaces, [and that] is the central plan of the Byzantine architecture.

Unlike the early Christian, **[the Byzantine] comes up with an amazing architectural device called the 'dome and pendentive'**. They took the Roman dome, and if you think of this as a cylinder breaking into a cube, you have Roman arches on all four sides, supporting the pendentive, or the transition area, which is like the spreading wings of a bird: it's one of the most graceful designs of going from this vertical shaft into this [the dome]. Again, like the Pantheon in Rome, it opens up this space, so it's totally different [from the Western design].

19

And so we have in the Byzantine, or the Eastern Roman Empire, a tradition that we even see today, very much a contrast of the east and the west; **if the church is Byzantine, it has this central core of design, and you can see how totally different the feeling is here than what we saw in [St. Apollinaire], which is longitudinal.** Plus you'll notice the fact that [there are] windows up there, and that opens it up to let light come in and filter through that space.

20

And here is Emperor Justinian again, in St. Vitale in Ravenna, and look at these figures: very, very similar to the Egyptian, extremely flat design.

And you look at this and you say 'Wow, art is at a very early stage here, it's almost child-like; what happened to all the naturalism that we saw before?' And you would marvel at the 'My god, they lost everything that the Greeks knew, and we're almost back to the Egyptians.' **None of these guys have individual faces; they all have sort of the same transcendental stare. And look that the background: all gold tesserae. So, it's not concerned with *this world*: it's the *spiritual world* and Heaven represented in this gold background. And you could say 'Well, this is not very realistic' – yes, but this is not concerned with *this world*; it's concerned with *that world*: de-materialized, no corporeality, and the spirituality prevails.**

21

And here is Empress Theodora, which is on the opposite wall. She was his Empress ... and very similar to the Emperor that we saw in the other image.

Look at the handling of this mosaic, and see that they've lost all concept of perspective. Here we're sort of looking down at the bowl, here we're looking at the side view ... anticipating Picasso. Very

much as we've seen, the handling is very stylized, very similar to what we've seen all the way back to the Nature-dominated society. But not Man-dominated, not Nature-dominated, but God-dominated. **And again, the link between what you believe and your art, how beautifully they coincide.**

Student: So, which came first? That's the question of, was that really a choice of [style] ... and you use the word 'forgot'. Is it a technical thing, did they truly forget? Or did they just not know how to make an in perspective fountain?

Dick: Did they have a model? Of more realistic painting?

Student: Well, yeah, they did.

Dick: Exactly.

Student: So this was a choice.

Dick: It must have been. **[For example, if you were] an apprentice for an artist, [they would no] longer to delve into the magic how of the world appears, because that was no longer important.** So it's sort of like art schools and universities today: they're all conceptual. These kids don't know how to draw, why? Because that's no longer important. They don't know color, why? Because that's no longer important.

So you will see in the coming periods, how people will be addressing these issues, and the same question you just did: 'What did they do, just forget? Or [change] by choice?' **They [Byzantines] weren't obsessed with trying to replicate what they see, in a literal sense. Because what is important now is the *spiritual*: to de-materialize, to take it from the material world into the intangible.**

22

I choose this particular picture because of the scaffolding, they were doing restoration, and to give you a sense of the scale of that thing ... just to go up that scaffolding to work on the dome would be a 15-20 minute climb! I mean, the *scale* of these things done when they were done, my god!

You notice all those little windows up above? **That dome allowed for those windows to be positioned where they are, and again, there is this gold tesserae – sort of like little mirrors if you will – and it catches the sunlight and it's just this other-world feeling ... and the *scale* – it takes you as a human being, and makes you feel very insignificant.**

PART II

23

Dick: Again, why am I comparing these two?

Class: They're both buildings.

Dick: We're showing two different periods: the Parthenon, Greek Classic; and Chartres Cathedral, Gothic. **One showing 'Man as the measure of all things', and the other: 'God as the creator of all things'.**

Now if we can see again, that nothing is really new, it's just our world-view that has changed, from one of which Man is the center of all things, the measure of all things – Humanism – to the Age of Faith. **Which do you think would use symbolism more, and Age of Faith or an Age of Reason?**

Class: Age of Faith.

Dick: Why?

Class: Because they are representing intangible things.

Dick: **Ok, look at Chartres Cathedral: what do you see in the just the architecture that suggests something other than just a building?**

Class: It's going up; pointing to the heavens.

Dick: **The material, this here and now, this material world, giving way to the intangible.** The tangible: the steeple; reaching to the intangible. Of the two spires, which do you think is the earlier? Remember, this takes a century to build. You see the right one is earlier, and what gives you that clue?

Class: It's less convoluted, less openings and all kinds of fanciness, it's much more grounded.

Dick: Ok, which of the two is more penetrable?

Class: The one on the left.

Dick: If you think of a brick wall, which is impenetrable, or solid, or protective ... or the lace-like structure on the left ... keep that in mind. And again, I'm looking for that link: **'why would I build this way, or why would I build that way? Is there any link [to] what my own world-view is?'**

Let's take a look at the earlier style ...

24

Springing up like mushrooms around France, were places such as this one: Conques. And this was on the trails and roads for the Crusades, and at this time, all of these are appearing almost simultaneously throughout the route. And if you look at the structure, and compare it to the Chartres Cathedral, is it more protected, is it more solid; or is more lace-like and open?

Class: Solid, more protected.

Dick: Ok, now let's take a look at what was happening – remember now, we're talking about very early in what we call 'Romanesque' (which is kind of a bad name when you think of it, but the art historians came up with this), but **why 'Romanesque'? Basically, the architecture used the Roman Basilica, as we'd seen with the early Christians, what had already been designed: that Roman arch, the curved arch, distinguishes it from the Gothic.** The Gothic arch is not rounded, it is pointed, and we'll look at that later.

So now, if you got to this village, you can see it's very mountainous, it's very protective in it's architectural style, almost as though you were going back to the Greek Archaic.

25

Dick: And at about the same time ... **what does this architecture tell you about medieval man?**

Class: Closed; he has to protect himself; they were fighting a lot.

Dick: If I put a moat between the grove and my house you'd say [he's paranoid!] **It was a society – not a nation – but a society of lords, and serfs. What are they so fearful of?**

And my god, they had every reason to be fearful and protect themselves; and if you didn't have a moat, you built up on high ground. And there are the places where you would have the guys with the bows and hot boiling oil. **This is a society of separateness and protective and fearful, and did it carry over because of their beliefs?**

26 - 27

Here is the *tympanum* at Conques, and every worshipper had to pass through these doors, most of them feudal serfs, right? I mean they had nothing to their name. **They believed – and they saw it reinforced here – that their God, Jesus Christ, was a judge.** He has one hand pointing up to heaven, and the other one is pointing down to hell, and you're on the wheel of fortune: what goes up, must come down. So if you amass a great fortune here on earth, you're going to have – not just for a few day or a few hours – but for eternity, you're going to be roasted, cooked, and all these marvelous things.

So the peasant would see the Good Lord there in the middle as the Judge. Notice the word 'lord': the Lord of the castle, of the feudal society: the Lord [Jesus Christ]. So equating "good guy" = Lord. But this lord is: 'If you don't worship me, you're going to go to hell'. And apparently the sculptor here had a hell of a lot more fun with his imagination when it came to Hell, because he's showing the most fantastic tortures and whatnot going on; compared to the guys in this very serene, heavenly portion of this scene in the portal above. So it was a constant reminder to this fellow who couldn't read or write.

And it was not by some chance that this always faced west, because that was where the sun went down and the final judgment, the Last Judgment. **So the feudal lord controlled him on the ground, in the fields, and the church controlled him and made it all look as though: 'Obey, or [suffer the consequences].'**

28

So the fear – aren't these delightful? Look at the imagination, oh boy. And obviously they were painted also, so it must have been quite the experience. Because you didn't have magazines, you didn't have television; about the only *visual, tactile world* you had was here [the church]. You're coming out of a void of visual, tactile stimulus – not like our world today where you're just bombarded with it – so I'm sure they probably spent great time looking at these.

But **look at the stylization – what period would that be equated to?** *Archaic*. Go back to the Greeks – is it Hellenistic?

Class: No.

Dick: Is it idealized [Classic]?

Class: No.

Dick: But do you see, again, [they are] under the inhibitions of the great powers that I have no control over: 'God please, let me get down on my knees and worship you and do whatever it takes.' You can see the link again between your world-view and what you believe, and what the art looks like ... and what a beautiful link. So far from the Greek: proud, standing alone, separate, ready to take on Nature ...

Student: I have a hard time not thinking Hellenistic because of the expressions ...

Dick: **Oh, but the Hellenistics are so literal. They would never have this imagination. They would paint you and sculpt you exactly as you are.**

29

If we look at a building such as this, we know it's not the later Gothic, because it still has walls which are pretty solid, and it's related to an architectural engineering device – the Roman arch – and also, by this same protective society, this fortress-like society, this feudal society. **If you're ever trying to recognize the difference between a Gothic cathedral and a Romanesque, and which came earlier, those are the features you want to look for: that we haven't yet arrived at the pointed arch, or some other devices that make it possible to do something quite spectacular.** And if you look at the relative size of this to the people, keep that in mind as we look at the Gothic cathedral.

30

When we are inside, we realize that like the Hagia Sophia [Byzantine] or the Roman architecture, this uses the Roman arch. And what a series of Roman arches created was a *barrel vault*, so if you think of a half a circle coming down, your ceiling would span quite a bit of distance [instead of] a straight wooden beam, which would have been used by the early Christians. This stone and the arch made it fairly open, and you had a side aisle, and you'll notice the clerestory up here allowed some light to filter in, as well as the windows down here; but you'll notice it's still quite massive and quite heavy, and the walls literally want to do this [fall outwards, away from each other], so you had to buttress on the outside to hold them in. **Well the minute you start building buttresses or any kind of device to make the interior work, than it might not be quite as attractive on the outside. Also, they realized that it was the intangible space, where there is no material, which is God: the intangible. So it was the space itself that became the defining element of these walls to enclose this space of God. And the space was sort of limited by the engineering.**

31

We're back at Chartres again, and if you'll notice, it's a little less penetrable here than here. Because if I asked you, 'where does the surface fall here, and where does it end?' ... it's hard to tell. I mean, try to touch a sponge: where [exactly] is the surface? It's not very tangible, rather it's *penetrable*. Here it's very clear, sharp, solid, massive.

So we sense from the earlier, the Romanesque, as we get into the Gothic, now we seem to not only be getting higher but more penetrable. **Why would we want to open this up? Why would we want less**

masonry and more open? To allow *it in*, to allow the light to come in. So the de-materializing: going from the material, and tapering off to the de-material, or nothing, the space; and yet it was the space that was the Lord's.

Student: Was there less need for protection on that side? Psychologically?

Dick: Yes, but what's interesting [now] is that the Gothic man now doesn't see God as a Judge – so his belief, even though it's still Christian, his 'Lord' is no longer the Judgment (Heaven or Hell), but instead we'll see something quite different.

Student: Can I ask a question? Can I ask where the Hagia Sophia fits in all this, the Byzantine stuff, because that Hagia Sophia had all those big interior spaces and lots of windows ...

Dick: But remember now, we're talking two basic different architectures. These people have favored the Romanesque, or the Roman Basilica, so they've gone with the Western, not the Eastern, Roman Empire. You'll see in the Orthodox Church, even today, they favor the Byzantine.

32

So here is the Christ that we saw at Conques as a judge – now he's a *teacher*. A much more gentle philosophy, in terms of what man is in relation to this Christian belief. And so the tympanum here, even though we still have those imaginative figures and all, it's not the severity, and we don't see all the torture and the things going on in Hell ... **and what is fascinating is now we don't have a feudal lord, because the feudal societies have merged into a nation of France, and a nation of England.** And so the *national* quality comes into mind, and because of the change in the way we relate to God, [you have] a change in the architecture, and a change in the sculpture.

I hope I'm not sounding too redundant, but I have to keep emphasizing, that's what this whole course is about: **what do you believe, and how does your art reflect it?** And here is *the architecture* reflecting a new openness, a new relationship to the spiritual.

33

Look at how this building dominates the landscape. From miles away, as you're approaching Chartres, you're going to see *that* is the city around which everything else is made. What a contrast to what we have today. But if you'll notice also the scale of this compared to the Romanesque, is quite different. And you might look at some of these architectural features and say 'well isn't that just a buttress to hold in that wall?' We'll get to that.

34

Unbelievable. Hagia Sophia, with its dome, has a way of addressing 'you are pretty insignificant' in contrast to the spiritual. And my god, walking in at certain times of day, it's so hard to see the top because it's so far up.

And [now the height is] made possible not by the *Roman arch*, but the *pointed arch* which distributes the weight in quite a different fashion. Not quite so out, pushing: but downward thrust. [By using] that, you can [build] up; you can see here the clerestory, and then above the clerestory, **we've opened up all of this area with new architectural devices such as the flying buttress, so that the light of God can flood this space, and can fill this space** – as you can see, the masonry is taking on the color of the light passing through panes of glass of different hue and color, and it's absolutely magical. **If you can add to that the sounds of chanting, and organ music, how it would transform from the 'here and now' into that entire spiritual level of 'oneness with God' because it was the light of God (the intangible).**

And just imagine the effort of going in and engineering this, without computers! And a lot of them did collapse, because there's a tremendous pressure pushing outwards, and as you go up higher and higher the walls simply want to fall out. Well, how do we keep them from falling out, because that energy has got to be restrained? By a device that they came up with: the flying buttress.

36

And what is absolutely incredible about the engineering feat that is the flying buttress is that it is wanting to fall inward, while the walls want to fall outward; and it's bringing the two into equilibrium and balance, [bringing them] together ... wow, it's all balance, it's all integration.

And the entire building: look at the lace-like quality. Where is the front surface? And it's almost impossible to tell where that is. It just looks absorbing; that the light of God can penetrate. It doesn't look protective, because you can't protect very well with lace, but you can with a solid surface.

Student: Did it also help to reduce the weight of the structure, to have a lace-like effect?

Dick: Well, yeah, in the sense if you have less and less stone going up you'd have less stuff to hold all this weight together. But remember, these stained glass windows were extremely heavy, because they're using lead to hold the individual pieces of glass, and then iron as the framework, and to open up the rose window like this ... my goodness.

The whole idea was less and less masonry, and more and more glass: let the light of God in more. And in order to do this, you had to have an exterior, which supported the interior. So do you see the rationale why we call this 'interior-motivation', because everything was for the magic to occur *inside*.

It didn't mean the building was ugly on the outside, but a lot of purists [think so], and I remember my art historian saying 'well, almost every architect will say that Gothic is an inferior [style] because they have to have 'crutches', you know, these flying buttresses, to hold the walls in; and that's not really as clean as you would see in the Parthenon'. Well, the Parthenon wasn't as concerned with what happened on the inside. It was up on the Acropolis so that everyone could see, but not participate.

35

A lot of people see this and think 'yeah, I see a lot of religious symbolism and here are the saints and the apostles and whatnot' ... well, what is a furrier selling fur doing in a stained glass window in the Chartres Cathedral? That doesn't make any sense at all, that's not religious, that is a secular job, the guy's making money selling furs. **Well, because everything, everything, everything was to the glory of God.** You were a furrier: yes, but you were God's creation. The furs were God's creation. *Everything* was God's creation.

Plus the fact that the furrier wanted to sell furs, he paid good money to have this stained glass window donated to the cathedral. I mean, we didn't have ads in those days ... immediately I'm equating now, 'Oh boy, if I buy a fur, that's not only good to keep me warm, but wow, I'm for the glory of God, I owe myself a fur.' But these stained glass windows, and the fact that you can see them today ...

Student: Did they have other kinds of work also displayed?

Dick: Oh yeah, yeah. Everything – **the entire building is the encyclopedia of Christian meaning: everything.** So there wasn't anything that hadn't some relation to 'well, if God created Man and he created animals ...'

Student: Well, that was actually what my group was talking about earlier in the comparison, and that idea that the ones on the left were very totem-pole-like, and a sense that they were unified. And this says the same thing to me, that it's very unifying and all-encompassing, and it wants to bring everything together. Whereas I see the Hellenistic as being very separative, and pushing people out into their own individual worlds.

Dick: And if we compare this to the Roman wall painting ... there's not foreshortening, there's no real anatomy, there's nothing really of this world: it's pretty flat.

37

So here's how they did it: in this plan here you can see the pointed arch, and what is so beautiful is the integration of all of these is like clustering all of these branches together, and then these branches come up

and then they are no longer supporting that much weight, and there can be fewer of them, and fewer; until we finally get up here, and what we have now is not the Roman arch but the Gothic pointed arch, and what was a **masterful piece of engineering, called the ‘cross-rib vaulting’**. So if you think of it, you have this one vault going that way, and another one crossing it. And this double cross worked out beautifully, to really support and integrate.

And then you can see how much emphasis goes into the buttress: look at the amount of masonry from this buttress here, to then hold up these walls, which really just want to fall out, because they’re up here so high, as the flying buttress or like a bridge, which would cross from this buttress here and make contact with the wall. But if that was too much weight, leaning inward, it would collapse. If it was too much falling out, and it wasn’t in equilibrium, it would collapse. And they didn’t have computers, can you imagine going up over a hundred years, and toiling ...

Student: They didn’t have advanced mathematics either, they didn’t have calculus yet.

Dick: Just absolutely mind-boggling. **But just look it again: the feeling of being in that space ... if you’re not moved emotionally, and feel a part of this ... I mean, just the scale alone: man doing this, not for Man, but for the Spiritual.** Just an amazing piece of architecture.

38

Here we are again ... but notice, the Virgin on the right, what is she wearing? Come one, what’s she got on her head?

Student: A crown.

Dick: Why a crown?

Student: She’s a queen.

Dick: See, if I’m a king, and my subjects are going to this church, what do I want them to equate? What is ‘Notre Dame’, what does it translate to?

Student: ‘Our Lady’.

Dick: So the Virgin Mary was at the center of the church, but the point is, she is wearing a crown, and if you have been in the Episcopal church, or any of these other churches, you constantly hear not just ‘the Lord’, speaking of the Christ, but ‘the King’: Christ the King. **So there is an infusion here of the political, or of the rule, and we have again, in this society, a transformation from earlier to later.** How do we sense now that this is earlier [right image]?

Student: The static position.

Dick: Good. Static. Which has the contrapposto pose? This [left image] is almost an exact steal from the *caryatids* there from the Acropolis, in the Classic Greek, those women supporting the building. And that contrapposto pose, the drapery and all, also even though she’s expressionless, suggests something of the ... what, the Hellenistic or the Classic?

Class: Classic.

Dick: Why Classic?

Class: Because she’s idealized.

Dick: Yes, exactly, she’s idealized. There’s no human concern, and she’s not an old woman – you could have picked her at any age, but why do we always pick this for the Classic? No human expression, the countenance is almost like a Buddha ... why would this be earlier [left image]? Well, just as we’ve seen before: it’s stylized, it’s held within this kind of restriction: whereas she [right] is almost freestanding.

And so if we can now begin to recognize there is always this correlation: if we are really looking at this, and asking the right questions, we don’t have to have some kind of guide or book to tell us what’s happening here really has been changed, **the relationships have changed. That the societies are changing, “the way I view my world” ... And so we are in a constant flux, the changes are constantly going, but our art – is that reflecting this [change]?**

I gave a talk at Viewpoints Gallery: ‘Contemporary Art’, that was the name of the show. And I think anyone who was there realized that no one, I mean no one in that show, really qualified as a

contemporary artist. **What is contemporary? In other words, where are we today, and does our art in anyway reflect that, or are we still in the 20th century, or the 19th century, in our artwork?**

And I think one of the most telling things I saw on YouTube recently was a Russian protest in which they sent up a drone to take a picture above the protestors, which took in several city blocks, and the drone was able to show the *vastness* of the crowd. Prior to that, you would maybe have it taken from an upstairs window, or from some place where you would only see a fraction of the numbers. Think of landscape. What, you're sitting on the bank of the river and painting that scene? A drone will see quite a different landscape. We are no longer earth bound in that sense.

In other words, technology and other things are happening, and either you are with your times or you're still in the past ... and how many people will even give a second look at something painted and put on the wall, when we have some of the technology that will soon be out, where virtual reality will be able to place you in [the scene] ... you don't have to decorate simply behind your couch; the entire wall can be transformed into whatever you want: 'I want to be out in an English garden': ok, the entire wall is an English garden. I mean, technology is changing us, and, for example, if you're carving like this today [late Gothic], and everyone today is thinking this way [Renaissance], then you're not contemporary. You may still be living in the present, but your thinking and your work is in the past. And how many of us can recognize that in ourselves, and what we do: that, you know, 'I'm really not contemporary', or 'I'm not a part of my time' or my work isn't part of my time?

40

Here is an anticipation of where we might be going ... *the Renaissance*.