Lecture 4: (in reading ; Ben Yammin ; read Aura as "specificity of one thing in one place & time" not fame or physical charisma)

Demoiselles D'Avignon : deliberate attempts to confound. You can't gage space anymore, you can't project yourself in space. How far is the hand in the distance? Curtain / wall? We can't confidently read distances. The second figure from the leg: seems upright, but she can't stand on her two feet. Is she standing or lying on a divan? Vertical vs backward.
The table is tipping forward to us ; but it is square. + The 5 demoiselles' gaze suggest you are back in space (but it constructs you as part of the space).
Which way is the rightmost figure facing (back turned vs she is looking at us)

⇒ Willful attempt to confuse ; to give contradictory cues to read the space.
It is shrinking compact, but convulse
You see the unconscious of Europe in the painting.

Three Women (1908) creates one painting with one shape (triangles) (technique = passage)

From Cézanne's play of the architectonical space leads to analytic cubism (analysis breaks them down)
cubism affords multiple perspectives to one thing, but it's not what Picasso is doing here.
He still has unit of passage, but has no longer clear volume
You also see chiaroscuro, but it doesn't clear graspability of objects
Play of flats on figures: schematic articulat°s of fixable volumes (no depth)
instead, they cancel each other: series of flat vs shape, weight, volume, texture.
Brueghel: one convent° spread across the picture plane.

Matisse: scaffolding, proto-grid of black lines, indicat° of volume; makes it terminate with the background. Look up: network of black lines is only half-bounding. Different textures / undecided / hues / shadowing that fields are made up of. + introduct°ion of text, musical stays (sheet music!)
The text turns the experience of looking @ a painting is now Reading a painting
You can't add them up into an object, but you can solve the puzzle
(or see how they disarticulate each other)

... color (ocre, brown, grey): V limited palette.
To brake up painting into individual methods, you have to make color superflucous.

(I) Picasso goes for painting to directly placing real materials onto the paper plane (Papier-collé, collage). Generates meaning in 3 ways:

Still life with chair caning

- Symbolic: conventionally agreed-upon signs legible because of collective meaning
  ex: language; chair, journal
- ~~Iconic~~
- ~~Indexible~~
- Iconic: resemblance, drawn to look like something (glass in middle of party)
- Indexible: footprint in the sand, meaning that someone passed there (not through some kind of mediation)
  ex: footprint, light creating a photographical image.

(II) Picasso gets a second look at African masks. You're performing analysis, eye + mouth pop out; guitar has hollow while the center of guitar is a positive space
So why do we read these as they are? ⇒ How do signs work?
1) Arbitrariness: they can be anything, no direct relationship to anything
2) Opposition: they create meaning through their opposite (in relat° to other elements)
3) Contextual ex: the guitar hole & shape
4) Limits only work within some context
   all sign system can't say a few things (works for guitar & face, but can't convey more complex object)

Combine I & II and you arrive at 1912: Violin: collage is now independant from depth. By virtue of the respective post°s of the piece of paper (journal), one reads as part of the violin while the other does not
Why are the S Q disproportional? This makes us assume that the violin is tilted towards us. He doesn't rely on perspective but on our reading instead.
Reintroduces color: Guitar, Sheet Mus., After November
Finally, he skips collage entirely by skipping Kahnweiler, he can add colors

... as if he just painted patterns on the painting ⇒ Synthetic Cubism
He is reassembling everything that he had destroyed before, under
~~that~~ new conditions.
We are even back with Bohemians (Harlequin, Musician, and other iconography)
(1915, 1921)

Picasso can now go back to classicist/naturalist, a synthetic cubism.
His radical experimentation has now come to a close.

~~Metzinger & Gleizes~~

Gleizes and Grs have another use of analytical cubism; as with Rivera we're being offered two views of one object. They re-classicize cubism, by making them more realist/naturalist

Painting without any object (Woman w/ Mandolin, The Guitar Player) 1910 Picasso without a referend, abstract but Picasso backs out
Kandinsky (1911 & 1913) pushes abstract painting: painting must achieve the condition of music; but he still has a relationship to figurative & landscape painting. These things still emerge (like giving meanings to clouds)

Leger: uses grids to break away; scaffolding grids
Contrast of Forms, 1913 (repeated, different paintings)
set of color hues for volume, bulges seem to be contradicting one another
+ locked into a grid, all over composition with bulging

Kupka: uses building blocks, stacking one on the other & refuses logic of landscape or portrait, attains vortex / cataclysmic chaos

* degrade value color in cavern

Delaunay-Terk: use grid but with color (pure hues) & circular radial disks to lock colors in place, create a sense of translucent windows.

... Delaunay - Terk introduces patterns in clothes and in cars (Citroën B12)
+ integrate public scene, but anxiety for abstract painting:
⇒ Has it become decor?

Does pure abstraction become decoration?