

Buttons

Line

- path
 - mediations
 - containment
 - outline
- art - outline - purpose a view of life and makes it more "captured" (under grand delimitations) between the individual act and the more conduct of all such acts. style is the artist's visual medium

Form

- discrete, ^{own} field of force, centripetal, repellent, autonomous, independence, dispersed, spaced entity, dispersion
- but strong all over, every part strong, same scale over whole field.

Conduct - expressive of autonomy, rank, power, respect for autonomy, precedence

- emergence

The design emerges from the field

in ovoid fields, an upwelling with salmon trout buds → complex

- ovoids get as large as practical

Whole design pushes (pushed) out to edges of field, like oil on a surface of water

like a flower coming into bloom

Apr 20, 72

Bateson

the "generalities of relationship that remain permanently true" can be sunk into the unconscious and become ^{skill} habit [style]

[but in art it is not just relationships, there are also idealized forms which can take on idealized meanings at a step of generality between the particular and the completely generalized]

art corrects too "purposive" a view of life and makes it more "systemic" [another grand dilemma: between the individual act and the wise conduct of all such acts. style is the artist's usual wisdom]

the archetype of Saturn = generic prototype of human it had to be 'real' enough to exist in "real world, but its fundamental purpose is fiction? and 'them' a token of what we are not (of the 'not me')

the mind world provided the Saturn with a predisposition of the "not me" - but only that, it was generalizable (specific 'them' rather than a given 'him')

me (generic) = bear (generic)
me (specific) = seven (specific)

it was in effect the search for a vocabulary of contrast as the mind had to be made in the only processed world, the world of nature

Mythology deals in 'cultural heroes' who are mostly human-like even in Herakles's part of all. But for purposes of explanation (myth and art) he has to be plugged into the totemic system - and the bear-form is as good an anchor as any.

Haida art has no horizontal straight lines

'horizontal' is not really straight (as we assume)

The only truly straight line is the vertical, the center pole.

(Skulthumme asked Ingraham to look with his telescope around a curve) The Haida lived in a curved world

Any apparent straightness was soon proved false

(horizon, apparent ^{course} distance)

Except 'up' - trees grow straight up, men stand upright,

everything upright (the world inclusive) has a center straight line (is bilaterally symmetrical)

All the rest is curved, and must be 'steered' by man

Our stereotype of "Indian" = generic stereotype of Raven

it has to be 'real' enough to root it in "real" world,

but its fundamental purpose is for 'us' not 'them' - a totem of what we are not (of the "not us")

The animal world provided the Indians with a paradigm of the "not us". Not only that, it was generalizable (specific 'bear' rather than a given bear)

"we" (generic) = bear (generic)

as "they" (") = raven (")

it was in effect the search for a "vocabulary" of contrast and the search had to be made in the only perceived world, the world of nature

Mythology deals in "culture-heroes" who are mostly human-like. Raven is Nonlifelike first of all. But for purposes of explanation (myth and art) he has to be plugged into the totemic system - and the Raven-form is as good an anchor as any.

Primary Process Metaphors

1. "I" ~ "not I" = particular ~ general
one thing ~ all such things
Raven screen ~ Hard art
an utterance ~ speech, language

2. "We" ~ "they" "bear" ~ "raven"
us ~ not us

3. Negation "I" am "not he" reversal
Contract
Chaos
Nature

4. Generalization "we"
similarity ↓
order metaphor to all conceivable like things
Culture

4a. Idealization "bear" → "the prototypical perfect idealized bear"

5. "Things" — | — "Relationships"

When big things are composed of littler things in the same system, we can then see "structure"

things in relationships
parts producing wholes

and this in turn is one utterance in the larger system of how all things are related. (how the mind conceived relationships of all things)

"Things" can be particular (a bear)
" " " " generalized 1 ("bear" - species)
" " " " " 2 ("bear" - "animal" as opposed to human)

- can be symbolized (lotus)
(salmon trout head)

then become free
of specific
metaphorical
meaning and
become open-ended
metaphors

all things that grow, emerge, unfold
or at least those of the metaphor -
continuum that the mind chooses
to focus on for present purposes
("aephus")

("ovoid")
all spaces ^{contained} have their dual edge
a bubble, seed, womb,

"Relationships" - how can the mind conceive these?

- "like" "same" "unlike" (in a limited number of categories)
- "separate", "joined", "part", "discrete", "integrity"
- "joined", "touching", overlapping, merging, forming
larger things things beside things
- "contained", "ranked", "concentric" things inside things
- merging vs. emerging discrete, elementary, autonomous
- combining, recombining
- separating vs. merging

I think a behavior is done have meaning
when you look first, you look to all of the "rules" the rules
of the set, then you can go on to see what he did in
conjunction with

Apr. 21

Reading Hall: Hidden Dimensions

p64 --- the visual field expands as you move toward something and contracts as you move away from it.

[look at word fields in that way? emerging from distance?]

Digressing is a form of cannibalism

Rattle is ^{undifferentiated} meaningless sound (start first level of articulation)

"Whistles" are next step up in sport language - meaning on a level like music.

Melody in music is like iconography ??

"Style" can be seen in "rehearsing"
"practicing"
"mistakes"

stylistic
iconographic
iconic
formal

M.H.
kinds of art analysis

"Skill" consists in assurance that everything is done on purpose (won come down), so that a "play" on the rules does have meaning.

[Black & Overlap :: does have meaning.

When you look first, you look to see if he "knew the rules".

If he did, then you can go on to see what he did in changing them.

Iconic representation:

- is linked to (built on) iconographic. Could become pure design but would have lost life and meaning
The second level would not have meaning if the first level were not --- (cf. process)
- is generalized rather than specific
particular
(in each case I do this = we always do this)

- may refer to conduct (line = action = conduct)

- new ^{shapes} symbols form, taking on new meanings
(ovoid, salmon trout head, flicker feather)
they speak in same generalized terms

(All the parts are doing something, expressing something
- of Raven which is just there -

- message is in the parts more than the whole
and it is also in the parts of all other drawings in same style

- it deals with "primary process" - No longer means one thing
No longer 1:1 with a
"natural" form (iconography), it is an open metaphor
for all possible isomorphic things (including secondary
iconographies of "prints", etc)

image
metaphor

iconographic form is drawn "rhetorically"
iconic " " " " "expressively"

- it is idealized, hence expresses values as well as premises

Innovation

If the 'style' contains the iconic meanings of the culture, what is meant by the purposeful changes of style (innovations) of one man?

First assumption is that the style itself had been mastered by skill, so that it sank into ^{became "second nature"} unconsciousness. Then his conscious mind can be concerned with building-on new meanings. A true innovation is not play or novelty only, it is made by one who controls the medium.

Second assumption is that it is conscious at the second level of discourse; i.e. iconic not iconographic. He is changing not the iconographic statement but the iconic statement. [especially since the black innovation does not contribute to the iconography] but not necessarily working only on iconic aspect, he is still trying to create iconography.

Look at segmentation process for rules
(How is detotalization done?)
for red-black box

When does iconography
call and iconic
meaning begin?

Iconic & Iconographic

Iconographic is "icon-drawing", image-making. It makes an image that signifies one thing

eg "Laven" - a concept one step removed from nature recognizably iconographic with nature

When it is named, the name pins down the one thing it signifies

It imposes one interpretation on you

Iconic is metaphoric. It doesn't represent one thing,

but signifies all "like" things. It is open-ended

When it gets a name, it is a metaphoric "herringbone" name. ("skate-spot" "fucker feather") which it does not represent

It has 2 aspects:

a) Presentational

(i) Entire design as "structure", signifying all like structures

(ii) Parts as ^{iconic} images, signifying all 'things' of like shape
ie ovoid fields ie ovoid ie salmon trout

It is free of one mundane signification and is free to take on whatever cosmic signification man wants

b) Discursive or (Linear)

(i) Actions, conduct, behavior, expression

(formline junctions, quality of line & curve)

(ii) base of force

(strawing up)

It permits you to find in it all congealed interpretations

(if you want specific interpretations) or it lets you

read in "primary-process" ^{non-specific} meanings, like music

You can read them at any level of consciousness

(^{generality} specificity) you want

it can be iconographic with behavior, conduct (and that is human behavior)

Icomorphism gives Meaning

a) specific (icomographic)

focuses on one meaning

b) metaphoric (iconic)

spreads meaning as wide
as possible

All visual art depends for its meaning on icomorphism between the visible shape and something signified by it. The meaning can be specific: an image of something of ^{the} natural world (icomorphic with a shared perceptual concept of nature) - this is icomography. It identifies itself directly, openly, specifically, unequivocally.

Image signifies ^{one} Concept of a natural form

Concept may symbolize many things (crown etc) but those meanings are not present in the image

The meaning can be metaphoric, nonspecific (ICONIC)

it signifies and symbolizes at the same time

it is icomorphic with everything it "means"

ovoid: signifies all like things

uses icomorphism to the full

- Everything got rendered in metaphoric terms - to the point that the primary image itself got lost as in (T) diagram. Was he trying to create a metaphoric icomography?

Apr 22

Iconic aspect:

- the faces and eyes are metaphoric too
the little extroverted faces, sexless expressions
generic, get put in many places — and sometimes drag
a 'body' in with them — there is a compelling urge to
make faces, more faces than really needed in the
iconography.


Are there also metaphors in a different sense:
face = person = entity (an overdetermined symbol)
as alternate signs in an area, saying "this refers to
an entity of its own"

The face becomes a symbol like salmon trout head, ^{is a sign}
thing of the iconic realm (just as out of place on the iconographic
realm as a flicker feather on a whale)

One thing about a face is that it can be both frontal and
profile. Frontal face always belongs on center line, and
also occurs on any field conceived as frontal

It is a cul de sac of expressive drawing — it has
been trapped into being a symbol, and loses its isomorphism
with its "signified". It has become literal, a different mental
process with a referent back to language

Same with "rear faces" and "upside down faces"
They become ambiguous symbols playing with the primary
iconography: face - not face (wag. dot.)
right side up - upside down
(usual down mood) (happy grin)

- Everything got rendered in metaphoric terms — to the
point that the primary iconography got lost, as on
 dishes. Was he trying to create a metaphoric
iconography?

Back to the discursive approach; where the entity is represented by the element and its behavior rather than by a symbol. It is isomorphic of limited qualities (size, rank, strength) of the entity, and of its conduct.

It is not "mere decoration". Decoration loses the aim of representing, ^{loses} the discipline of isomorphism, i.e. loses "meaning".

This is a more dynamic mode. With it you can explore behavior ^{and relationships} more.

With an art like this, exploring so thoroughly the potentialities of isomorphism, everything has to be precise and "on purpose".

* sharp and
knife

It has to be controlled, and "mannered", and so skilled that every perceptible variation has meaning.

That is, for a conscious exploration of human relationships, this is the best mode to use. Hence — the heavy black and red innovation.

Maybe that is what he is exploring on [] dishes — for the time being he seems to be concerned with primary iconography — it is an exercise in relationships (maybe sometimes purely formal — you have to do that to explore full potential — but it is not just decoration, he is exploring patterns of behavior and relationships).

But as he explores the medium, he is also exploring the premises it deals with (the messages). When his mind turns ^{back} from medium to meanings, he embarks on "heavy black" series. Now the meanings are as conscious as they can ever be, and focus on a specific problem. The art becomes specific again, in a very different way.

Don't make an image of the whole white man, make an iconic exploration of his most relevant qualities and behaviors and relationships with us. Then see how our design can be worked out.

leaves
iconography
behind
is more but not
iconographic
or decorative

The innovations are in a couple of different series:

1. Heavy red formline

- no overlapping

It is a reversal of primary-secondary, with additional gross and meaningless strength of the red.

Is it - nouveaux riche?

- half bred whites?

- the white man himself?

2. Heavy black formline with or without overlap

Manipulation of primary power role by invader, relegating us to secondary

- but look - we can overlap!, we can fill the whole field anyway! we can use his grossness as ground.

His great power is also his weakness, because he doesn't know how to use it in my field. I can make him work for me and contribute to my design.

The "message" in art lies in its isomorphism with other things. It can show (communicate) how things "are" (structured, conceived) and how things "should be" or "best" (ideally) are. The artist orders experience and conveys it in his art. He is a "structure-breaker", an "orderer of experience".

He can do this at two levels:

symbol

1. Let A stand for some specific thing, which in turn has all sorts of symbolic meanings

sign

2. Let B stand for all things isomorphic with it, including cosmic things and abstract concepts (onomatopoeic)

A has to be a complete image, an icon, a thing of nature

- is presentational, static, explicit, named with an explicit word which is also its meaning
- artist's immediate problem is identification.

noun

B is more versatile (allowing artist to philosophize)

- it can be a partial image or a complete one
- in either case its meaning is metaphoric rather than specific - it means "all like" things
- it can deal with - entities

with their relationships and behavioral

: the entities are images, but not anchored to specific natural meanings: they are given metaphoric names and "mean" all like things

: the "conduct" is "implicit action" - the metaphoric actions of metaphorical beings (like myths)

conduct as repetitions ∴ generalized (This is how we always...)

conduct is idealized (This is how it should be done)

conduct implies premises about how things are values " " " should be

Art is outside of time. Although it deals with behaviors, it does not deal with them in sequence or in patterned series. All behaviors are ^{synchronous} happening at the same time. In this sense it is "presentational", not discursive.

Unlike myths, where you can deal with events in sequence, negatives as well as positives, consequences of wrong behaviors. Myth is "sequential", ^{new conceptual time} art does not show wrong behaviors, only right ones. Art has no "negatives" (except "upside down"?)

Art does not juxtapose wrong & right, shades of ^{contrast} correctness. One aspect of style is consistency (concretely "right")

Any sequences are sequences of relationships, not of time

Music uses time, in subtle and powerful ways (tempo, rhythm, pause, etc) ^{physiological} uses real time.

Music anchors in - physiological time - returns
- musical scale of social culture

It takes "meaning" by playing sequences of sounds in time

There are not isomorphic with anything in nature
is not "iconographic" (exc. Beethoven's "Thunderstorm", which is secondary iconography)

There are first and foremost iconic; isomorphic with moods, feelings, experience at the ^{non-specific} general level of primary process

Music addresses the problem, not of how we deal with sound, but of how we feel, think, and experience things

Art is not really about how we "see" nature (although Europe's artists took this limited task as theirs for a couple of centuries), but how man apprehends the social and natural world, and orders it

European artists ^{became} ~~were~~ more concerned with the medium than the message. They thought the artist's task was to show how man sees. Actually, it is to show how man conceptualizes, orders, thinks. European art became more purely iconographic, imitative of nature, the specific real world and how man's sense of vision works. They forgot that at its potentially "verbal philosophy", they have lost that path and got tied up in detours.

The quest for writing had been won, and carried off that part of the task, anchored to language. That part of art budded off, taking a lot of the "meaning" component with it. The trouble with writing is that it cannot transcend the limitations of speech; which is a 'specific' rather than 'primary process' medium. It precludes forms of wisdom that do not rest on speech (hence Castoneda's quandary). 'Non-literate' peoples retained in their art this more generalized wisdom.

With writing ^{available} to mirror thought, European artists used 'art' to mirror "nature", and "sight". But that meant losing the ability of verbal art to represent philosophy.

Before man had speech he had music?
" " " writing " " art
" " " science " " myth, magic

In ordering experience in more and more precise ways, he lost some of the wisdom of the older syntheses.

23 April Sunday

Metaphor - the language of iconics

A work of art is one explicit statement wrapped in a multitude of ^{implied, unnumbered} metaphorical statements.

It has meaning at two levels

the second cannot express itself independently of the first because its meanings arise from ^{a play upon the meaning of the} play with the first just as:

- the language of poetry as a play upon the underlying language of speech prose
- musical phrases take their shape and meaning because of their play upon our shared, unconscious premises of tempo and scale
- the ^{metaphoric} meaning of a proverb depends on the foundation of the actual meanings of the words: "A stitch in time saves nine" "Cut away, once play"
- the meanings of Hamlet character on the base bones of a plot line involving a Danish prince

The language of visual meaning is isomorphism: things and relationships in the picture somehow have the same shape as outside things and relationships of concern to the artist and the viewer. In keeping with the two levels of meaning above, the isomorphism is of two levels of explicitness:

- a) iconographic - a whole image shaped like an object of nature (or like the shared image of a concept shared by a people). Explicit, static, unambiguous, *gotalt*
- b) iconic - images or partial images suggestive of the shapes of other things: concepts

depiction

suggestion
(metaphor)

open metaphors with partly unconscious relations.

These second meanings operate at a handicap because they cannot use the most powerful form of visual statement: the image. That is pre-empted by the primary iconographic level. If I am drawing a picture of a raven I can't have it cluttered all over with little crocodiles or apple trees.

* The parts must ^{retain} have a certain iconographic congruence with the whole.

It is probably in the nature of human ^{visual} perception, as it has evolved, that the most urgent business is to search ^{out} for the image and its ^{ready} immediate meanings.

But this means that the further meanings have to be built on more subtle and less immediately conscious aspects of visual perception. (In the art we are now dealing with, the 'image' - iconographic level - has been systematically dismembered, subordinated, and submerged, as the 'other aspects' conveying other meanings have been built up, strengthened, amplified - to the point that the iconography is only gaudily partially permitted to show through).

How to explain the submergence of the iconography? It is not that the artists were incapable of showing the image. Contemporary works of great 'realism' do exist, and symbols were on hand to identify Beavers, etc. It is rather that they were concentrating the meaning in the other aspect.

What is the medium capable of?

What are these other methods of reveal isomorphism?

Lines: move - path - quality
: reveal forces - mediate
- contain
: have relationships

Shapes: have structure (analogous to other structures)
: have structuring (relationships)

New, non-iconographic shapes have inner lines of force, can be metaphoric to cosmic shapes.

Looking at ^{Hardy} ~~our~~ art, we see that all lines are iconic lines. No line is drawn obedient to or copied from a shape in nature. All lines are obedient to the control of culture. All shapes are iconic shapes. The iconography is subdued, and expressed wholly within iconic terms. (This is true of all art, but a quantum step more true with this one) The 'message' is only grudgingly allowed to come through; most of the meaning is in the medium. All the shapes say "This is the proper way of doing these things (and yes you can even use these ways to depict a Raven)

How far did the process go?

At least that is how it got its start: building nuance on to the iconography. An expressive nuance here, a suggestion that a part is also something else, an expressive line — and so on.

It never went all the way of pulling completely free of iconography and becoming "writing", because if it had done so it would have had to attach to another foundation (^{speech} language) to give it "grammar". It retained the grammar of iconography, where everything has two meanings playing against each other ("point of wing" and "ovoid structure"), where one "stands for" its greater counterpart.

The "standing-for" is not a 1:1 thing at the iconographic level. It is not joint: ovoid, because ovoids are used elsewhere than in joints. The 1:1 relationship is between ovoid: (greater meanings), and the "joint" provides only the weak iconographic excuse for placing it there.

The iconography is only a line to hang the iconic symbols on. At the top level of meaning, it stands mute, allowing the ovoids, etc (iconic symbols) to be the "signifier" to a larger "signified".

It is not a case of:
"feather" (iconographic) : something "signified"
signifier signified

It is a case of
"flicker feather" (iconic) standing for
a) a feather or tail (back to iconog. level)
and b) metaphoric signifieds

The only ^{surviving} remaining iconographic elements are
- beaks - leg, claw
- structure: "head body wing tail foot"
(but all are rendered in iconic terms)

The main thing is that the entire ^{design} thing has been translated into iconic elements

"vocabulary" { line curve formline U
ooid salmon trout flicker feather

grammar | breakdown of silhouette to emphasize parts

then this iconic vocabulary is used as "signifier" both ways

- to express or contain the iconography
- to express the wider metaphorical meanings

Why say "metaphorical"? Why not conceive of very specific meanings at this new level? eg

"I am the whole design. My nephews are emerging parts, now playing only supporting roles. All social behaviour must be controlled in this way -- etc"

The iconic elements have become, ^{semantic units} like words; they can "mean" at least one thing - the iconographic meaning - ("of which one of the meanings is the iconographic") but are capable - because of the metaphorical habit of thought - of meaning more abstract and cosmic things:

wing becomes "wing"
line "container of force"

head → "head"

A "language" capable of metaphoric use, has been created. Where formerly, an element had one fixed meaning; now, that is only one of its possible meanings. In the process, an ambiguity has been ^{introduced} entered (are flicker-feathers only feathers?), but it has been a necessary ambiguity to open up the range of meaning from "feather" (signifier) $\xrightarrow{\text{means}}$ (arbitrary signified) to "spl. V" (signifier) \rightarrow all like things, incl. feather.

It has turned each element from a symbol (meaning only one thing as signifier, and capable of only one arbitrary symbolic meaning) to a sign ^{iconic} signifying something - or all things - of similar shape. It is a sign embodying one of two aspects of a word. A word is an arbitrary assemblage of meaningless sounds which by agreement is the symbol for a particular thing: eg. "wing". There is no ambiguity about that step. But "wing" can take on added iconic-metaphoric meanings because of analogy from its characteristics (eg. the wing of a political party, etc). It is semantic extension.

An expressive cultural system has been interposed between the natural thing and its cultural concept (as must always be done in art). But instead of having this system be satisfied with conveying one meaning, the Harida have made it of a sort that carries other meanings as well - Why not?

In a sense, the commission to draw a crest design gave the Harida artist an opportunity to use