RM: is obvious. Though why it is a masterpiece -- neither of those concerns can lead you
iconography. But in the case of modern art, everybody knows who painted what. And
it is a wrong methodology for what we need now. . . You know it is partly. . . a lot of art
to the "thirties" and "forties" when there was a small audience, self-selected, that
but when it used to, there would be people who didn't hear the music very well or who
people who do see very clearly, and they are who one lives with, and who one paints
version of each artist's individual vision. In a way, that suggests the communality I am
Window, Collioure (1914)" had "been continued to actual abstraction," he might have
and airiness and darkness and massiveness and solidity and etherealism and
sculpture, all music, all words, all singing, one feels the human hand, the human eye,
moving them in and out and so on in a way that if one made a plastic mold of it, it
terms of feeling/seeing: that they use the eye simply practically to, you know, to see
people trying to make it readable in the sense that Norman Rockwell is constantly
BFC: visit universities, or musical conservatories or real art schools like the Boston
And so he is at home in one of the languages; absolutely blind in another one of the
RM: language of images. I repeat. . . a system is a system in a way . . .
But, . . . each of them as a sort of a language of images that underlie the paintings of
artists and that are consistent over long periods of time.
In a way, one could say that the basic images in modern art are . . . images that recur
in different spaces . . . the ones that stand and why, and the ones, attractive as they are,
really look: especially in the past five years at the same pictures in different countries,
say an "expressionist," loves Vermeer, and tries to do a contemporary version of
artist, I think hardly any modern artist, ends up with the style that he thought when he
prefer not the final version, but a state that was less finished. You thought that the
in turning it into paint so transforms it, it is basically unrecognizable from the original
At the time the image surprised me, the painting characteristics not. The title came
doesn't look anything like it. It is very different. It becomes very clear that the
it is really "subjective." I mean, Renaissance perspective is a more subjective thing
now is written by a historian.
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