Conclusion

Following the final submersion in 15th-century rock iconology and its condensation in various iconographies, it is time to assess the avenues forging the route to that locale and to the modern paradigm in general. At this juncture, where we will thus again pull the vantage point back to the bird's-eye perspectival view and allow the gaze to pan from modernity's delta back along the forked river with which, despite the erosion of postmodernity, large tracts of history can still be compared, I will concentrate on the following recognitions vis-à-vis the evolution of the landscape image and its tripartite developmental contexts: self-consciousness, socially-determined perception of nature and world picture.

Firstly, I should reiterate that the central thesis linking the various subject areas of this project and opening up for its evolutionary dimension, comprises the following observations: that the spatial depth of the Western image, what I have with a photographic metaphor termed its depth of field, expands step-by-step over the course of time in tandem with a clarification of its vantage point. From the transparent Palaeolithic clusters of fragmented animals with no other setting than the bare rock wall, we move across the more coordinated Neolithic accumulations of figures and on to the Egyptian framed near space on now artificial ground, the later Mesopotamian landscape backgrounds, the quasi-perspectival architectural and landscape space of classical antiquity, and the deconstructed but brilliant celestial space of the Middle Ages, finally arriving at the fully-developed perspective of modernity, where the subjective vantage point provides a view across surroundings diminishing towards the infinite distance – surroundings which are gradually able to dispense with the human figure altogether. The depth of field's expansion, and inclusion of more and more surroundings along this historical route, is particularly perceptible in the landscape image, for also the backgrounds of the landscapes are incorporated in a sequence from close to distant: first the earth formations (Mesopotamia), then the sky (antiquity) and finally infinity (modernity).

This development, which thus implies a constantly increasing depth of field and a correspondingly clarified vantage point up until the Western 19th century, after

which it disintegrates in the polyfocal space of postmodernity, exhibits such a high level of regularity and directional impetus that I have no hesitation in characterising it as 'evolution'. This term has, certainly, long been unwelcome within the sphere of the humanities which, cautioned in particular by 20th-century totalitarianisms, has disputed evolutionism and consequently carved up cultures and historical epochs into an archipelago of autonomous parts that can only be linked via differences. But of what use is this line of thought in explaining empirical facts that do not pursue a chronology of disconnected fragments (for example, a full perspective in the Palaeolithic period, a framed near space in the Neolithic period, a quasi-perspective in Mesopotamia, transparent animal clusters in modernity, etc.), but, on the contrary, a developmental logic that is quite apparent even before we have considered by which theory it can be processed? In this I would assume that the anti-linear thought is actually relevant to post-1900 cultural experience, but has overlooked the fact that this experience has occurred precisely because an earlier evolutionary historical sequence has reached saturation point and is in the process of bursting and re-coordinating in a new hyper-dynamic state, that of postmodernity.

The evolutionary concept has all the stronger entitlement to the role of explanatory model inasmuch as the expansion of depth of field constitutes but the most conspicuous of a series of characteristics within the development of the landscape image which prove to have a morphological and content correlation with a number of models pertaining to cultural evolution devised at an earlier date – not just within the spatially-oriented parts of older art history (Riegl, Panofsky), but also within the areas of consciousness modelling (child psychology and philosophy of aesthetics), cosmology (Jungian history of religion and history of science) and, the most comprehensive, sociology (the Marxist tradition). In order to give these morphologic correspondences methodical justification and demonstrate that they are indicative of actually interacting cultural phenomena – and thus prevent them from simply appearing to be 'analogies' between otherwise separate cultural domains – I turn to a number of options within structuralist theory. Via the idea of definable societal stages, sociological evolutionism already operates with a notion that at a given time various cultural domains are subject to a common horizon of experience (as in Talcott Parsons and Jürgen Habermas); and this notion is fine-tuned synchronically by Pierre Bourdieu, who introduces the idea of *field* – a system of social forces that determine all cultural actions – and, moreover, influenced by Foucault's notion of *episteme* and Panofsky's of *mental habits* and *symbolic forms*, formalises the idea of homologies between different cultural domains. My analysis amalgamates these ideas with Thomas Kuhn's concept of *paradigm*, here understood as the mere set of rules demarcating the surface of the *field*, and also with my own Foucault-influenced notion of *epistemic field*, an overarching *field* binding together culture's

many sub-*fields*. Furthermore, I dynamise the *fields* by merging them with Oswald Spengler's theory of the cyclical sequence of cultures, so that cultural evolution is seen as a chain of cyclically waxing and waning *epistemic fields* while it is also, looked at overall, characterised by escalating self-consciousness, expanding world pictures and increasing urbanisation.

That this structuralist methodology has proved to be particularly useful in the interpretation of landscape images is because landscape constitutes an area of the image where significance is thinned out and breaks away from that theme which is often the justification of the image: the iconography. Expressed in terms of linguistics, the significance is not bound to the individual utterance, but rather to the language – what I here call the paradigm – by means of which this utterance is articulated, a level of interpretation which I additionally associate with Panofsky's iconology. Even though this does not necessarily mean that landscapes are always devoid of iconographic characteristics, without a mediatory agency it is not possible to short-circuit from iconography to paradigm and iconology, as it is more a question of using comparative studies to examine the extent to which a given landscape iconography can be taken for condensation (intensifying) or pocket (transversing) in the enveloping paradigm. The iconological interpretation of a given paradigm can thus be pinned down from two angles: a worm's-eye perspective comparing the various iconographies into which the paradigm can be condensed, and a bird's-eye perspective which, by means of a comparison with homologous paradigms and their corresponding *fields* in other cultural domains, surveys a horizon of experience.

It is through familiarity with the inter-cultural correlations and their systematism in the dynamised theory of *fields* that I have developed the tripartite context model in which evolutionist theories are structured in accordance with the key poles encountered as we wander through a landscape space, and through which different aspects of the cultural-evolutionary significance of the landscape image are thus revealed: [1] the pole of vantage point: *self-consciousness*; [2] the middle distance: the *socially-determined perception of nature*; and [3] the pole of remoteness: the *cosmological world picture*. That the idea of the pole of vantage point may reveal a morphological correspondence between the specification of vantage point in pictorial art and self-consciousness in general is immediately evident from the realisation that a certain degree of self-reflection is needed in order to signal whence an image is viewed, and that a greater degree of self-reflection facilitates a clearer indication of the viewing position. Several disciplines have indeed fostered the theory that human self-consciousness increases over the course of history, at the same time as a number of these disciplines are correlated with evolutionist art theories in which the development of perspective plays a major or minor role. This is the case with the first major synthesising theory of the evolution of consciousness, that

formulated by Hegel, where consciousness alias spirit becomes independent while it is drawing back from the pictorial media through which it manifests itself, from the symbolic architecture (matter's dominion over spirit), to classical sculpture (matter as expression of spirit) and on to the romantic painting (spirit reflected in matter). The same approach, only now without the consciousness-philosophical ballast, is given a visually sophisticated form by Alois Riegl in the movement from haptic near sight (Egypt) to haptic-optic normal sight (classical antiquity) and on to optic distant sight (Middle Ages and modernity).

From my own studies, I can corroborate the fundamental effectiveness of both these theories, particularly their recognition of antiquity's focus on the plastic ideal body which, besides being substantiated via Spengler's homologies between antique art and mathematics, is also found in, for example, Aristotle's centripetal poetics, Plato's aversion to perspective controlled by vantage point, and the antique image's supra-temporal landscape space and resistance to panoramic pictorial space devoid of figures. As regards Hegel's romantic painting and Riegl's optical distant sight as guiding visual manifestations of post-antique culture, these connections are substantiated by the disintegration of corporeality in the medieval pictorial space, especially as analysed by Panofsky, and also by the perspectival paradigm between 1420 and 1900 in which the optical eyesight configures image making and arranges it according to the subjective vantage point. That the perspectival paradigm is morphologically related to a now independent self-consciousness can be illuminated in terms of cultural history by means of a comparison with the emergence of nominalism. In this movement, which has roots in the late medieval period but gradually develops into a unifying epistemology of modernity, a distinction is made between the infinite world and the mental representations that consciousness makes of it, a distinction which both characterises the subjective (aesthetic) and the objective (scientific) dealings with the world, at the same time as the individual psyche is perceived as being unique (*individuum*). Nominalism thrives, moreover, in the same North European cultural sphere as the Gothic visual style with its emphasis of the openness of the cosmos and architectural profiling of the subject's vantage point against the celestial remoteness of the pointed arches, anticipating the perspectival vanishing point. The nominalist-Gothic cultural sphere also fosters a particularly landscape-oriented painting, which renders visible distant views, a multiplicity of details and the changeability of time, and which, around 1500, opens up for a developmental branch, the autonomous landscape picture, making independent sections of what had previously been panoramic landscape backgrounds. It is logical that against this backdrop the Renaissance, the conscious revival of antique cultural values, would seem in part to be a regressive countercurrent in modernity's epistemic *field*, a resuscitation of Riegl's normal sight, inasmuch as this particularly

Italocentric movement tones down the dominance of setting and changeability in favour of focus on an idealised and plastic human body. This Renaissance resistance to sanction of a landscape image totally devoid of figures is also characteristic of a general law pertaining to the relationship figure/landscape image in that the landscape loses its figure-compensatory *numen*, the original immanent force of nature, in tandem with the expansion of depth of field, and for this reason it will only expand without figures in relatively secular contexts. Hence, when we come across pre-modern landscape images devoid of figures, they are either part of a pre-antique paradigm with low depth of field or else, if the potential depth of field is higher, as is often the case in antiquity, they only exhibit a low actual depth of field – i.e. the view is blocked by thicket or rocks.

Another significant theoretical tradition to reveal the connection between pictorial culture's increased depth of field and the evolution of self-consciousness is the one delimited by Piaget's original ontogenetic model. Piaget's studies of the child's psychological development find that physical and social interaction with the surrounding world leads the child to develop a consciousness in which earlier physical experiences are converted gradually in interiorised representations, from the sensorimotor and preoperational stages to the concrete and formal operational stages. Furthermore, Piaget establishes that this autonomization of consciousness leaves its mark in the child's spatial representations, moving from a topological space, a fragmented and haptic near space characterised by basic elements such as proximity, separation, sequence, enclosure and continuity, to a more abstract space independent of the body, the Euclidian, which is less robust in terms of deformations, but on the other hand is sensitive to distances, curves and angles. As a sub-area, moreover, the Euclidian space contains the projective space which subordinates the representation to the subjective viewpoint, the manifestation of self-consciousness. As first Suzi Gablik and since, and in more detail, Sidney J. Blatt and Lars Marcussen have pointed out, Piaget's thinking can profitably be applied to the phylogenetic development, which displays the same overall tendencies, from the Neolithic period's additive clusters of figures as manifestation of a fully-developed topological space and a preoperational consciousness to modernity's perspective as manifestation of a Euclidian space and a formal operational consciousness (albeit both Gablik and Blatt, mistakenly, shift the Euclidian space to the 20th-century's abstractions).

In my own studies I combine Piaget's stages with the stages of the expanding depth of field, and find additional support in Parsons' and Habermas' social-evolutionary models, of which the latter in itself depends on a phylogenetic, sociological translation of Piaget's ontogenetic models. Parsons' primitive stage (Palaeolithic, Piaget's sensorimotor + preoperational) is thus characterised by additive clusters of

separate figures; his advanced primitive (Neolithic, Piaget's preoperational) by clusters of co-ordinated figures; his archaic intermediate (Egypt, Mesopotamia, Piaget's preoperational + concrete operational) by framed figures in near space, possibly with the beginnings of backgrounds; his advanced intermediate (antiquity, Piaget's concrete operational) by a quasi-perspective; his feudal (Middle Ages, still Piaget's concrete operational) by a deconstructed quasi-perspective with pronounced skies; his modern (Piaget's formal operational) by perspective. Furthermore, a survey of non-Western cultures shows that the space-representational evolution from low to greater depth of field and from a topological to a more projective space is apparently a universal phenomenon, which can again be linked with the evolutionary social stages of sociology from hunter-gatherers and slash-and-burn method users (unframed clusters of figures; for example, the indigenous populations of Europe and Australia), to theocratic city states (framed images with earth formations but no landscape backgrounds; for example Egypt and pre-Columbian America) and on to civilisations with a quasi-autonomous class of intellectuals (projective space with backgrounds; for example, Western antiquity and China). Ultimately, via consideration of the development of children's drawings in the West, I demonstrate that the connection ontogenesis-phylogenesis can also be established on a tangible design level. In order to make this seemingly rather peculiar – and extremely politically incorrect – connection understandable on something other than a purely empirical level, I bring in biological evolution where the embryo's development displays a similar correspondence between onto- and phylogenesis, thereby suggesting a general modus operandi for evolutionary systems.

If we now move on through the theoretical landscape and jump from [1] the pole of vantage point, *self-consciousness*, to [3] the pole of remoteness, the *cosmological world picture*, I should again underline the close connection between these two poles. In the same way as the remoteness in an image is only meaningful in relation to the vantage point against which it is set, the cosmological world picture is inextricably woven together with the 'I' inhabiting its centre. It is here that we enlarge the account of the formation of self-consciousness along gender lines, more precisely its entrenchment in psychoanalysis, inasmuch as the Jungian historian of religion Erich Neumann and his feminist-oriented successors Anne Baring and Jules Cashford have envisioned the first phases of cosmological development as a macroscopic version of Freud's account of the genesis of self-consciousness, from the non-differential fusion with the mother to the Oedipus complex's separation via identification with the father. Thus, the Jungian story of the incipient embedding of consciousness in the self's – in the opening phase, at least – masculine husk means that the cosmos has correspondingly been conceived as a gigantic body, the head of which, alias the masculine heavens, has gradually made itself independent

of its torso, alias the feminine earth. The incipient expansion of depth of field can therefore be perceived as evidence of this gradual division in which the heavens, the extension of the self, become disengaged from the earth's cyclical and self-fertilising embrace, instead to become an indestructible power that fertilises the now chaotic and passive matter. By this means, the non-framed and additive clusters of figures in the Palaeolithic and Neolithic periods correspond with a predominantly feminine and self-fertilising cosmos, whereas the framed images from the Egyptian near space to the quasi-perspective of antiquity are equivalent to a cosmological development in which the celestial powers increasingly take over and ultimately become the animating prototype for the earth's passive matrix. Antiquity's opening towards a quasi-perspective can be linked, in particular, with the new perception of the earth as round rather than, as earlier, flat, whilst the quasi-perspective is nevertheless controlled by a focus on the closed body, a centripetality which cosmologically finds structural equivalence in Aristotle's closed world picture and geographically in *oikoumene* (the inhabited earth, Eurasia) as the only accessible area. As regards the medieval 'deconstruction' and flattening out of perspective, I perceive it as structurally equivalent to the antique firmament now being burst into a new infinity, yet one that is concurrently the preserve of God, for which reason infinity's sensory manifestation – perspective – must logically be drained from the image.

This cosmological development is not only traceable in the *how* of the pictorial space – the way in which it is constructed – it is also rendered tangible in its *what*, the actual materiality in which its landscapes are clad. In this manner, the first stable remoteness encountered by the depth of field in its expansion is made up of earth formations charged with testimony to the material otherness from which the self must necessarily be delimited in order to see into the depth. I am here referring to the virgin rocks and mountains that characterise the landscape grounds all the way from Mesopotamia to the Late Middle Ages. These stone masses and their numerous caves allude to Mother Earth and her oral, vaginal and anal bodily orifices, and they are therefore laced in all the ambivalence of fecundity and demonism that continues to affect the earth goddess. In a kindred imagery, the rocks could be compared with the first material condensation of *chora*, the maternal primordial container in Plato's *Timaeus*, which Kristeva couples ontogenetically with the child's pre-conscious symbiosis with the mother, and they are broadly representative of *terra*, the uncultivated earth at the bottom of that cosmos which gradually becomes hierarchical. If the significance of the rocks is here clarified in a vertical respect, in the field of suspense between formative heaven and chaotic matter, it can also be approached in a horizontal respect, in the field of suspense between civilisation and wilderness, by which means, then, the cosmological angle [3] is supplemented with that of the middle distance, the socially-determined perception of nature [2].

As apparent from, for example, the Dionysus cult's affiliation to both the land and the underworld, pre-modern cultures had particularly fluid boundaries between concepts of wilderness and underworld, just like Dionysus's schizophrenic transformation into Christ and the Devil is in turn symptomatic of the ambivalence of these terrains. Besides being the province of barbarians, the mountainous country also represented unspoilt nature, ultimately Paradise and the realm of the Golden Age.

This complex significance, then, is embedded in the paradigmatic level of the rocks and can be further illuminated via iconographic condensations such as hell, the fallen angels, the *Thebaïd*, Saint John the Baptist wandering in the wilderness and the birth of Christ. Another level of meaning, where the pictorial rocks reveal their qualities, is in the very way in which they are made. Fluctuating and fluid traits in the Western High Middle Ages indicate affiliation to the primordial chaos as displayed in *chora*, and, similarly, terraces, abyss effects and rugged cave edges in the Byzantine sphere point to the gaping, labyrinthine underworld of *abyssus* and *chaos* and also allude to hierogamy and earthquakes – a chthonic identity that additionally characterises the many representations of cave-like water reservoirs. However, by means of their likeness to dripstone formations in caves, the terraced rocks also seem to be growing, and they thereby form part of a widespread tendency, going as far back as at least Minoan-Mycenaean culture, in which rock images allude to ideas of a living earth where even the minerals and metals are born of the subterranean womb – a tendency bolstered by the pre-modern idea of life on earth as a life lived on the bottom of a cave and with celestial seeds as form-initiators. Even though the idea of mineral life thrives among more rational 'geochemical' or 'mechanical' explanatory regimes, this belief in a lithic biology is widespread in pre-modern times and is outspoken in, *inter alia*, classical Roman literature.

While the exposure of rocks in the pictorial depth of field bears testimony to cosmology's most archaic cast member, Mother Earth, the visual depiction of the still more remote reality, the sky, ushers in victory for its rival, an indestructible and eventually infinite divine sphere which, at the same time as it forces its way into the pictorial backgrounds, is initially only revealed in symbolic form, be it in the neutral colours of antiquity or the sparkling planes, strips or patterns of the Middle Ages. Unless requiring a particular iconography – for example, a deity revealed in the earthly-celestial transitional medium of the cloud – the skies from antiquity to the Middle Ages thus bear no trace of optically recordable phenomena such as clouds, atmosphere, cast sunlight, diurnal cycles, seasons or weather per se in the form of rain or snow, for example – phenomena that could also be read as a manifestation of the passage of time (cf. *tempus* = both time and weather). A structural cosmological equivalence to the absence of cast light or, as in antiquity,

its extremely sporadic form, is a perception of light as being a spiritual force emanating through the world hierarchy, as seen in Plato for instance and passed on to medieval theology. The medieval precious celestial colours, not least the gold grounds, are equivalent to the priceless materials – precious stones, metals, mirrors, crystal, ice, fire – that were thought to make up the heavens, at the same time as they are only, however, a symbolic manifestation of an infinity which, as mentioned above, cannot be given sensory accessibility. As corroborated by a comparison with iconographically-determined beam phenomena such as celestial spheres, mandorlas, nimbi, clipei and rainbows, the strips of the celestial grounds in particular might allude to the transmission of spirit through the heavenly spheres, just as there are often references to a cloth symbolism that alternates between veiling and unveiling. The latter finds iconographic condensations in, *inter alia*, Carolingian illuminated manuscripts, which prove to be a stronghold of exploration into the significance of clouds given that many Carolingian images, presumably based on an idea of God's absolute detachedness from the earthly and visible celestial domains, play on the visual ambiguity vis-à-vis: do clouds constitute landscapes, or do landscapes constitute clouds?

A concluding evolutionary stage, in which pictorial space and its material manifestation, the landscape image, can be interpreted in a cosmological respect, finally emerges in modernity, where my focal period is again made up of the introductory phase in the Late Middle Ages and the 15th and 16th centuries. The key event here is the simultaneous breakthrough of the perspectival way of looking and the panoramic landscape – a combined *how* and *what* ushering in the dissolution of the hierarchical cosmos. In the nominalist milieus at the northern European universities of the Late Middle Ages, Aristotle's closed cosmos is contested in favour of a theory that not only regards God but also the world as infinite, and that thinks in relative movements which both break with the idea of the earth's static and central position and bring in the subjective observer position as indispensable. Via Nicholas of Cusa and Leonardo, this thinking prepares the foundation for Copernicus' heliocentric system (1543) and its philosophical-physical justification by Descartes and Newton – a world picture which places an independent observer in an infinite universe. The cosmological development from antiquity to modernity could thus be described, all in all, as an implosion of Plato's world cave, where the divine reality alias the heavens first swells to infinite dimensions (Middle Ages), and then also absorbs into its infinity the mortal earth (modernity). During this infinite levelling-out of the cosmos, the firmament that previously separated the destructible world cave from the indestructible world of ideas, collapses and is compressed into the membrane separating self-consciousness from the new non-differential infinite surrounding world – a metaphor that is particularly graphic in relation to visuality, inasmuch

as the eye serves as a faithful miniature copy of Plato's cave (with cave opening = pupil, and the shadows on the back wall of the cave = the retina's projections).

Pictorial art's perspectival paradigm can thereby also be seen as structurally equivalent to Copernican cosmology, given that the task of perspective, in a more or less comparable fashion to the eye, is to fix projections from an infinite environment onto a surface. Whether these projections are chiefly fixed in accordance with mathematic principles (as in 15th-century Italy) or more intuitively (as in 15th-century Netherlands) is, as I demonstrate, not crucial for the innovative quality of the image; on the contrary, the Netherlandish images often get closer to a subjective vantage point oriented towards distant horizons than does the Italians' more corpo-centric and idealistic vision. And, in any case, it makes no sense on the one hand to forge an ontological alliance between linear perspective and narration, and on the other hand to delimit the intuitive way of looking either to a hypernaturalistic view alien to linear perspective (Svetlana Alpers) or to a blatantly anti-naturalistic mysticism (Damisch, Didi-Huberman, Lacan). Regardless of its specific shape, perspective contains an anti-narrative tendency, so the contrast ought more accurately involve a Renaissance-determined ideal-plastic and narrative interpretation of perspective (cf. Wölfflin's Renaissance parameters and the Renaissance as reawakening of Riegl's normal sight) vis-à-vis a naturalism more concerned with perception, viewpoint, mediation, framing and detail, be it construed in a linear-perspectival mode, intuitive or – perhaps most often – mixed (cf. Wölfflin's Baroque and Riegl's distant sight). That the Renaissance, the revival of antique cultural values, does not have a monopoly on the initiation of the modern, but, on the contrary, can be regarded as a partially regressive pocket in the modernity *field*, is finally alluded to historiographically, in that the very concept of modernity is not linked unequivocally with the neo-antique until a late stage and otherwise has roots in proto-modern movements such as *Devotio Moderna*, nominalism and Gothic style.

As the antique vision was structurally equivalent to the geographic dependence on the *oikoumene*, so the perspectival paradigm ultimately possesses a structural affinity with the expansive geographic space accumulated in conjunction with the voyages of discovery and colonisation of non-Western domains. From the 14th century onwards the map is controlled by the same grid through which perspective sees the world, and perspective's grid develops an increasingly flexible mobility between close and distant, at the same pace as Western colonisation arrogates power around the globe. The culmination of this flexibility, the invention of photography, simultaneously denotes a structural parallel between image as absolute freezing of time and Western synchronisation of the globe's time zones.

If we now perform the final – loop-like – movement in the theoretical landscape and move from the above-discussed outer position, [3], the pole of remoteness,

the *cosmological world picture*, and back towards [2], the middle distance, the *socially-determined perception of nature*, we can, firstly, return to the expansion of depth of field and look at it in a sociological light. Just as the image's view towards distance and nature extends simultaneously with the encapsulation in the husk of self-consciousness, it also expands synchronously with humankind's isolation in another enclave: the artificial enclosure of the city. In other words, Joachim Ritter's specifically modern observation that an aesthetic understanding of nature depends upon urban alienation and isolation from an otherness, nature, may, *mutatis mutandis*, be extrapolated to a general condition of cultural evolution – with a Palaeolithic culture devoid of cities as well as images of space and landscape being the borderline case in terms of origin, and a post-medieval high-urban culture promoting perspective and landscape being the ultimate culmination.

However, apart from that, my attention as regards this sociological angle has been particularly focussed on the question: to what extent do landscapes of the various pictorial epochs contain traces of cultivation, and how does this relate to the cultures' understanding of work and its connection to nature, including the cosmic creative force which I have designated the power of conception? In this respect, taking the bird's-eye perspectival view of pictorial evolution, I identified a three-unit structure in which a lengthy central phase was flanked by two symmetrical outer phases. While landscape backgrounds in the long period from Mesopotamia through antiquity and on to the Middle Ages are thus dominated by unspoilt rocky grounds without traces of use (*terra*), in the epochs before that – the Neolithic and Egyptian – and also in the epoch after – modernity – we encounter depictions of terrains upon which networks of utilitarian traces, such as tracks, fences, hedges, cereal fields, bridges, watercourses, mines and quarries, may encroach (*territory*). In order to make this pattern comprehensible in a sociological respect, I investigate the status of physical work among the elite classes of these societies based on the thesis that work (especially the penetrations of the earth perpetrated by agriculture and mining) in pre-modern times was perceived as a component of sexuality (penetration of the body) and as such was correlated with the cosmological evolution described above.

When, for example, the pictogram-like images in Çatal Hüyük (*c.* 6000-5800 BC and Valcamonica (*c.* 2000 BC-*c.* 0) include depictions of fields and tracks, and Egyptian images, which are otherwise devoid of proper backgrounds, teem with descriptions of physical work – cereal agriculture, management of cattle, hunting, etc. – it should be seen as expressive of cultures in which the fecund, male celestial forces are only semi-liberated and enter into a strenuous reproductive-cycle with the bearing, female earth, while the societal body is still, in structural equivalence to this, coherent and not divided into fixed differentiated classes. That work thus – as

part of the power of conception and common duty, respectively – bestows prestige, at least in ideal terms, can just as well be corroborated by the modern anthropological observation that in the advanced primitive slash-and-burn-method society it was possible to become a Big Man via hard physical toil, as well as by extant contemporaneous testimony to the Egyptian paradise, the fields of Earu, that still had to be cultivated by their inhabitants. If these observations are to be detailed more explicitly in terms of space representation, it has to be acknowledged that they concern cultures in the preoperational and topological phase, with a subjective vantage position that still allows the two modes of viewing, *mapping gaze* (the gaze that looks downwards from above) and *panoramic gaze* (the gaze that looks outwards), to occur simultaneously, albeit often in incoherent montages as in, with particular tension, Egypt.

Characteristically, traces of work are ousted from pictorial art synchronously with the introduction of a more outward-looking, panoramic pictorial view, which for the first time supplies actual backgrounds – the recurring rocks of Mesopotamia, antiquity and the Middle Ages – while this pictorial view by and large brackets off the depiction of territory and its mapping gaze to a new independent and less monumental genre: the topographical map. It is thus only in markedly secularised contexts, where rulers chronicle their campaigns of conquest – as in the neo-Assyrian palace reliefs and Trajan's Column of late antiquity – that a survey of divided, albeit field-free terrains finds its way into the panoramic monumental art. However, specifically cultivated terrains with grids of fields, tracks, fences, hedges and watercourses are exclusive to the specialised utilitarian genre, the Roman *agrimensores'* maps chiefly characterised by the mapping gaze, in which the abstract system of measurement also anticipates modernity's system of coordinates and thereby a representation of infinite space.

In expanding to a trackless middle distance in the post-Egyptian era, the depth of field thus principally looks across and beyond the flat territory with its networks of traces of use, and these do not return to the landscape image until the coming of modernity. The sociological-cosmological conditions making for this combined expansion of depth of field and displacement of traces of use involve the emergence of a more hierarchical society, Parsons' advanced intermediate and feudal stages, during which urban-based elites control a rural underclass, while these elites also have privileged access to a new cleaving-off from the formerly cyclical world picture, an indestructible heaven whose masculine forms, in homology with the dualised society, control and animate a now passive and increasingly demonised feminine matter. Besides work here becoming inferior, because it is displaced to classes with no access to the intellectual life of the urban elites, it also loses its prestige given that the power of conception becomes a masculine and celestial monopoly which

should preferably, as seen in nature's organisms, have a direct effect on matter, whereas work with its exertion and assembling of scattered materials becomes, exactly like sexuality, a necessary evil inextricably linked with the dirt of matter. It is as a consequence of this that the post-Egyptian pre-modern elites prefer their pictorial depictions of various mythological or historico-political themes to be set against a background of wild and unspoiled rocks, these being land formations which in themselves, due to their remoteness and hardness, resist civilisation's utilitarian infringements.

My specific designation of the epistemic *field* covering this cultural evolutionary middle phase as the Golden Age *field*, and its imprint in pictorial art as the Golden Age paradigm, is due to the homology between the untouched quality of the landscape backgrounds and a new both spatial and temporal longing for a beyond that could appropriately be termed primitivist. As manifest in key instances such as Mesopotamia's myths of the Flood and Gilgamesh, through the Greco-Roman Golden Age myth and on to the Judeo-Christian Paradise myth, this epistemic *field* is characterised by a partial glorification of mountain life with its ostensibly more undemanding and primordial occupations such as pastoralism, hunting and fruit picking, whereas life on the plains with its farming, and extension into the mountains, mining and quarrying, is looked upon as signifying the decadence of civilisation – albeit, as we have seen, this projection of organic celestial forces on rural phenomena is extremely unstable, given that they are just as likely to turn into the opposite of the celestial forces: matter's barbarity and demonism, by means of which civilisation's plains become the bulwark against chaos. The extent to which this ambivalent primitivism influences pictorial art's post-Egyptian pre-modern landscapes is apparent from the very fact that the rural occupations here portrayed are more often than not precisely of the primeval variety, and, accordingly, iconographic condensations of the paradigm. Indeed, the entire pictorial paradigm can be taken as structurally equivalent to the limits which, in the mythical cosmos, characterise the primordial world prior to the Fall or the emergence of the Silver Age. Thus in both places – Golden Age/Paradise and pictorial paradigm – we encounter [1] a spatially restricted world (viz. local self-sufficiency vs. as of yet undeveloped perspective), [2] a timeless world (viz. eternal spring vs. light and flourishing landscapes), [3] a world devoid of work (viz. directly available food vs. terrains devoid of territories), and [4] a world based in the mountains (viz. the Paradise mountain vs. rocky grounds). As we will soon recall in more detail, modernity's post-1420 pictorial paradigm is inversely structurally equivalent to the bursting of the limits that occurs in the state of original sin following the termination of Paradise and the Golden Age, by means of which it is thus predicated that modernity rejects the elite primitivism of the Golden Age *field* and embraces the Fall with its world marked by time and work.

As the Golden Age *field* is thus actually implemented in a world that has long since been engulfed by nature's fallen state, the Golden Age must here be artificially reclaimed – that is, by means of the justified subjugation of slaves who, via the necessary evil, labour, recreate the lost energy of the Golden Age for the urban elite. The primordial state of affairs under Cronus' regime is therefore proclaimed the model for Plato's ideal state, but, as Aristotle makes clear, the advanced city-state must inevitably build upon a foundation of naturally-subdued human tools, slaves, whose activity, *poiesis*, is subject to a purpose external to themselves. This downwards displacement of work ensures that the urban elites can indulge in heroic, self-fulfilling actions, *praxis*, if not in pure leisure-time activities: politics and philosophy. And thus that symmetry is again achieved whereby the urban elites can be mirrored in the primitive *bioi*, Aristotle's primary occupations, which are predominately coincident with the rural activities of classical art's iconographic repertoire. However, as a close reading of the sacral-idylls in Roman wall paintings in particular substantiates, these pursuits are diametrically opposed to real life on the land, given that although agricultural commentators such as Xenophon and Columella wish for the return of freeholder farmers, the dominant reality constitutes large estates, *latifundia*, staffed by slaves.

The elite paradisiacal yearning characteristic of Golden Age paradigm landscape images is so strong that it is not only condensed in recurring iconographic figures such as the *Tree of Life*, *locus amoenus* and the *sacred grove*, but can be linked with the strange schizophrenic tendency preventing plants and grass from spreading in any great quantity into the rock-dominated pictorial space, while concentrations of plant growth are restricted to narrow spatial compartments, images with only potential depth of field. The more advanced Judeo-Christian patriarchal world picture thus saw mountains and rocks as post-paradisiacal or post-diluvian excrescences defiling the originally flat and thereby good earth, and the pictorial culture's condensation of plant life in rock-excluding enclaves – unadulterated Paradise images – could then be perceived as a structural equivalence of this.

Even though the Golden Age paradigm is predominant until 1420, during the Middle Ages it is interspersed with iconographic pockets in which time, weather and farm work are represented and gradually, from the Carolingian era onwards, construct a counter-tendency. These scattered iconographies, which are found in new motifs such as the *Seasons* and the *Labours of the Months* stemming from late antiquity, must be seen in context with the formation of the feudal system and its closer alliance between lord of the manor and peasant, with the penance status labour in monastic culture, and also with the irreversible and more linear timeline brought in by Christianity. In a wider overview of cultural evolution, I went on to show that the transformation of time and work as perceived from antiquity to the

Middle Ages could be elucidated on the basis of Hegel's and Kojève's sociological parameter for the liberation of spirit throughout history: the human struggle for recognition. While thus in classical antiquity the master acquired recognition via the suppressed slave, whose labour made nature permanently accessible – paradisiacal – to this master, recognition in the Middle Ages becomes an internal slave matter where the slave achieves self-esteem via the new transcendent and egalitarian God and sublimates time via work, converting it into a progressive history.

Around 1420, however, these medieval tendencies have become so satiated that they cause a paradigm shift in pictorial art: the shift from the Golden Age paradigm to that of modernity. If we again make a structuralist comparison with the course of the Golden Age myth, then in the epochs following the cessation of the Golden Age and also in modernity's pictorial paradigm we will find: [1] a spatially open world (viz. institution of trade vs. perspective directed towards infinity); [2] a changeable world (viz. emergence of time and weather vs. landscapes marked by time and weather); [3] a world marked by work (viz. invention of agriculture and mine-work vs. landscapes marked by territory); and [4] a multifarious world rooted in the plains (viz. emergence of civilisation rooted in the plains vs. cessation of the rocky grounds' monopoly). I traced the more specific cultural conditions causing the paradigm shift to the late medieval 'little industrial revolution' between the 11th and 14th centuries, when improved technologies such as mills and wheeled ploughs, a new work ethic, a proto-capitalist market economy and incipient civil democracy lead to a thorough cultivation of the actual European landscape. Apart from being traceable in the speedily expanding *Labours of the Months* and on to their culmination in *Les Très Riches Heures du Duc de Berry* (*c.* 1410-16), this new enterprising culture is perceptible in the iconographic genres that include landscapes, such as health compendia, encyclopaedias, *mirabilia* collections and topographic portraits, of which Ambrogio Lorenzetti's panorama of Siena's grid-divided territory (1337-40) would almost seem to be a dress rehearsal for the modern paradigm. In Simone Martini's contemporaneous description of Siena's military conquests, on the other hand, the Byzantine rocky ground is not affected by cereal fields, but only by roads and military camps, which recall the militant contexts in the Neo-Assyrian palace reliefs and Trajan's Column. The abovementioned genres demonstrate, all in all, that the modern landscape image springs principally from secular contexts in which qualities such as matter-of-factness, military control, republicanism and work ethic are dominant.

If the geographic sequence from mountain to valley spans an attractor, a structure of forces directing the evolution of culture, then it must be noted that the post-1420 cultural fulcrum has moved from mountain (ideal projection of the Golden Age *field*) to valley (sounding board of modernity, or Iron Age *field*), which is consistent

with my thesis that the driving force of cultural evolution actually shifts from the mountain-dominated Mediterranean area to the plains-dominated northern Europe. It is up in the North, in the homelands of the Reformation, capitalism, industrialisation and, to a large extent, colonialism, that panoramic and temporally-marked landscape images occur, whether they look at the territory's cultivated and controlled areas (realism) or terrains completely untouched by human hand (romanticism). The flattening out of territory produces a structural correlation to modernity's equalised society, just like its grid division is homologous with the perspective by which it is surveyed. In the Renaissance-dominated, Counter-Reformatory, re-feudalised and more introverted and retrospective Italy, on the other hand, the end of the 15th century onwards sees a reawakening of a neo-antique landscape image in which ideal human bodies are set in supra-temporal and pastoral surroundings. The tightness of the link between this neo-pastoral tendency and an aristocratic culture was demonstrated by means of a detailed study of Signorelli's *School of Pan*, in which Pan Saturnus was equated with Cosimo de' Medici and placed at the centre of a cosmological orbit of erotic forces.

The modern paradigm's homology with a post-paradisiacal state is not least visible in its incorporation of the synonymous phenomena weather and time (cf. Latin *tempus*), given that these can also be perceived as manifestations of a similarly original-sin-qualified inner imbalance in the bodily fluids (cf. Latin *temperament*) – an imbalance that in turn seems emblematic of modernity via its association with Saturn, the melancholy genius and polyphonic music. Yet, in the same way as traces of work are placed discreetly in 15th-century painted landscape images, which have predominantly park-like qualities, so too the traces of time are mostly of an indeterminate summer-like quality. Effects such as dead leaves, mist, darkness and *sfumato* first appear after 1470, many of them external atmospheric phenomena which, in their softening of the bodies' solid forms, prove themselves to be indispensable to the painterly style developed around 1500 in Venice and become characteristic of styles north of the Alps, culminating with Impressionism. And I could, moreover, establish a post-1500 division between Southern European 'night clouds', which with their revelatory potential are equivalent to a restored geocentric cosmos, and Northern European 'day clouds', which in their remoteness correspond to a de-sacralized Copernican sky.

The vantage position of the middle distance, the socially-determined perception of nature, would seem to find its most distinct synthesis with the pole of remoteness, cosmology's world picture, in the final focus of this study: the rocky ground in 15th-century landscape images. The peculiar, fantastical features of the rocks – architectonic, ruined, mine- or quarry-like, organically growing – could be partially perceived as a relic from the Byzantine rocks' chaotic-organic underworld

tendencies, but in the new paradigm with its potentially exploited earth they are additionally part of a field of suspense dealing with the genesis of art. In a more archaic reading, that of the Golden Age *field*, the architectonic forms can be perceived as innate to the rocks and impregnated by celestial seeds (natural architecture and growing crystals), whereas a modern reading, that of the Iron Age *field*, displaces the forces of genesis outwards – towards a soulless and sightless nature (ruination caused by time), towards industrial exploitation (evidence of mining and technical design), if not towards the beholding subject's imagination (projections from the artist and/or the viewer).

Art even has an ambivalent relationship to nature in the Golden Age *field*, given that its forms are perceived, on the one hand, as celestially sanctioned and, on the other hand, as being dubious because of the brutal penetration of nature perpetrated by mine-work. On an iconographic level, this ambivalence was seen manifested in Mantegna's stonemason and mining scenes, which in Camera degli Sposi appeared as part of a blessed cosmological hierarchy with Mantua-Rome as the obvious crowning of labour, whereas in *Christ as the Suffering Redeemer* and *Madonna of the Stonecutters* they alluded to the Iron Age and its rape of Mother Earth – in sharp contrast to the autochthonic nativity of Christ. The ambivalence is surmounted, however, in alchemy, the furthest pre-modern culture gets in the development of a philosophy in which art in all its stages – from mining to completion – is seen as part of nature's intentions. In this light, the paradigmatic-determined architectonic features of 15th-century rocks are perceived as allusions to unfinished, autochthonic monuments, manifested by the rocks' innate growing tendencies.

As Filippo Lippi and the Ferrara painters in particular were shown to substantiate, this study also stressed that the pictorial rocks are ambiguous and idiosyncratic, and that specifically modern contexts such as ruination, industrial exploitation and projections of the imagination have to be taken into consideration. The epoch-making characteristic of the paradigm's eroding forces in the landscape image was corroborated by the observation that actual ruins – ruins broken down by the ravages of time and not by instantaneous forces – are absent in images from antiquity and the Middle Ages, periods during which the Golden Age paradigm exacts stagnation and relatively unified wholes, even in the moment of decomposition. In the modernity paradigm, on the other hand, the ruins feature as melancholic-aesthetic objects of contemplation, the debris of a past that will not die to such an extent that it can rise again as fully-developed Renaissance. Besides showing signs of this eroding force – with iconographic condensation in the background of Leonardo's *Virgin of the Rocks*, where it is contrasted with the curative penetration of the foreground rocks – the 15th-century rocks might also associate to utility-oriented encroachments in the earth, such as those iconographically condensed in Mariano

Taccola's manuscripts, just as they might allude to projections of the imagination in the same way as the cloud images in Mantegna's *Pallas Expelling the Vices from the Garden of Virtue* and *Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian*. All in all, we came across many examples of 15th-century images contemplating, in a particularly self-assured manner, the genesis of art: from the image-generating agates in Mantegna's *Parnassus* and the abyss-reflection in Leonardo's *Virgin of the Rocks* – natural phenomena that create the images of which they are themselves an element – to the strangely stone-like figures generally populating the later North Italian 15th-century painting and showing, through their actual statue-likeness, the fundamentally artificial character of the Renaissance project.

This book, taken as a whole, demonstrates that even though landscape images belong to the domain of depth of field – those surroundings in which the narrative and allegorical meanings of images are diluted – this is far from synonymous with an absence of significance per se. In order to make contact with at least one layer of the significance that exists in these outer edges, the study has claimed that we have to forsake the widespread dogma of the humanities that proper scholarly analysis is only permissible on a microhistorical level. This layer of significance has namely proved to involve a shift in focus from *what* to *how*, to paradigms that are manifested through large numbers of images and through many different contexts. Given that these paradigms also find structural resonance in other cultural domains, and given that the paradigms as well as their homologies can be arranged according to a developmental logic, an evolution, my interpretation of Western landscape images can be described overall as an iconological project that beholds the landscape images as indicator not merely of self-organising forces in history, but of forces that at least on one analytical level move in a non-random, i.e. teleological, direction.

Notes

Chapter 8
"'Tis All in Peeces, All Cohaerence Gone"

1 Goethe (1962), v. 6240-6256, p. 334: Mephistopheles: "Und hättest du den Ozean durchgeschwommen,/Das Grenzenlose dort geschaut,/ So sähst du dort doch Well auf Welle kommen,/ Selbst wenn es dir vorm Untergange graut./ Du sähst doch etwas! Sähst wohl in der Grüne/ Gestillter Meere streichende Delphine,/ Sähst Wolken ziehen, Sonne, Mond und Sterne;/ Nichts wirst du sehn in ewig leerer Ferne,/ Den Schritt nicht hören, den du tust,/ Nichts Festes finden, wo du ruhst."/ Faust: "[...] In deinem Nichts hoff ich das All zu/ finden." English translation from Goethe (1976).

2 Here cited from Harrison and Wood (1998), p. 421.

3 Spengler (1972), pp. 238-39. English translations from Spengler (1971), p. 186.

4 Hegel (1988), especially pp. 57-156; Hegel (1970), especially vol. II, pp. 351-74 and vol. III, pp. 11-83.

5 Hegel (1970), vol. III, pp. 25. English translation from Hegel (1999), vol. 3, p. 232.

6 Piaget and Inhelder (1956), pp. 301ff.

7 Gablik (1976), pp. 40-47, pp. 66ff. and 80ff.; Blatt (1984), pp. 97, 235-36 and 333-34.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 202, 216 and 231-41.

9 Blatt (1984), p. 362.

10 Cf., for example, Hayles (1999). For an account of the situation of art at this stage, see Wamberg (1999a).

11 *Commentary on Genesis*, introduction (Migne, *Patrolgia Latina,* 156, col. 27B), cited in Morris (1972), p. 67. For this section, see also *ibid.*, pp. 64-95.

12 On self-exposition as Faustian phenomenon, see also Spengler (1972), pp. 330-40.

13 Morris (1972), pp. 64-65.

14 Panofsky (1951), pp. 12-16; Nardi (1966), p. 22.

15 Panofsky (1951), pp. 16-17. Antal (1924/25), pp. 209-39, also maintains that late medieval Italian culture - painting, poetry, philosophy, religion - springs from a subjectivism oscillating between realism and fervour, i.e. again the extremes of nominalism.

Jacob Wamberg

Landscape as World Picture

Tracing Cultural Evolution in Images

VOLUME II

Early Modernity

Translated by Gaye Kynoch

Aarhus University Press

Landscape as World Picture: Tracing Cultural Evolution in Images
Volume II: *Early Modernity*

First published in Danish as *Landskabet som verdensbillede. Naturafbildning og kulturel evolution i Vesten fra hulemalerierne til den tidlige modernitet* by Passepartout, Aarhus, 2005

Graphic design and cover: Jørgen Sparre
Cover illustration: Detail from Jan van Eyck, *Madonna of Chancellor Rolin* (*c.* 1433-34), oil on wood. Paris, Musée du Louvre.
Typesetting: Narayana Press
Type: Legacy Serif and Legacy Sans
Paper: Lessebo Design Smooth and Hello Silk
Printed by Narayana Press, Denmark

Printed in Denmark 2009

ISBN 978 87 7934 287 3

Aarhus University Press
Langelandsgade 177
DK - 8200 Aarhus N
www.unipress.dk

Gazelle Book Services Ltd.
White Cross Mills
Hightown, Lancaster, LA1 4XS
United Kingdom
www.gaxellebookservices.co.uk

The David Brown Book Company
Box 511
Oakville, CT 06779
USA
www.oxbowbooks.com

Published with the financial support of
The Aarhus University Research Foundation
The Danish Research Council for the Humanities (FKK)
The New Carlsberg Foundation
The Novo Nordisk Foundation