Andrei GORNYKH, DSc (Philos.), Prof.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8191-5514
e-mail: andrei.gornykh@ehu.lt
European Humanities University, Vilnius, Lithuania

LINEAR PERSPECTIVE AS AESTHETIC FORM

B a c k g r o u n d *. The article provides a theoretical reconstruction of the linear perspective functioning as more than just an artistic technique that emerged and became an attribute of paintings starting with the Italian Trecento, in particular, in the works of Giotto. The purpose of the article is to reveal the heuristic potential of aesthetic form not in reflecting the consequences of the economic landscape transformation, but in anticipating its transformation and directing the efforts of the subject in its reorganization. The research's methodology is focused on the dynamics of cultural forms through the optics of art history and aesthetic theory, as well as on socio-historical reconstruction of the context without trying to prevent vulgar sociological reductionism and economic determinism. This approach reveals the relationship between the aesthetic text and the context, and the former's potential in clarifying the subtext by articulating the serial principle's aesthetic value and promoting the modern historical type of cultural production and consumption.*

M e t h o d s *. This artistic guideline transformed not only the order of the signifiers of the painting (in particular, it replaced the golden background, which had been mostly filled with geometric shapes, humanized the illusory space, and saturated it with mathematically verified figures and objects) but also the order of signifies in the logic of the "picture of the world" (rehabilitation of sensory perception, declaration of the infallibility eye, autonomization of vision, dominance of pictorial space, compression of time to the moment of now, unification of the status of a separate thing in the general order, legitimization of holistic anti-metaphysical programs).*

R e s u l t s *. The article reveals the connection between the antimetaphysical program of linear perspective in the artistic dimension and the Cartesian homology of space in the theoretical dimension. It also emphasizes the architectonic principle of linear perspective: the rhythmicity of geometric shapes, a stable balance of nodal points, and dynamics of basic forms' reproductions and repetitions.*

C o n c l u s i o n s *. Conducted research substantiates the understanding of linear perspective not as a method of legitimizing the correct vision of things, but as a representation of the valid order and scale of the world through a clear coordinate system, aimed at unification of the system of things and equivalent exchange within it.*

K e y w o r d s : *linear perspective, historical form, cultural landscape, principle of seriality, anti-metaphysical program, aesthetic theory.*

Background

The article provides a theoretical reconstruction of the linear perspective functioning as more than just an artistic technique that emerged and became an attribute of paintings starting with the Italian Trecento, in particular, in the works of Giotto. The purpose of the article is to reveal the heuristic potential of aesthetic form not in reflecting the consequences of the economic landscape transformation, but in anticipating its transformation and directing the efforts of the subject in its reorganization. The research's methodology is focused on the dynamics of cultural forms through the optics of art history and aesthetic theory, as well as on socio-historical reconstruction of the context without trying to prevent vulgar sociological reductionism and economic determinism. This approach reveals the relationship between the aesthetic text and the context, and the former's potential in clarifying the subtext by articulating the serial principle's aesthetic value and promoting the modern historical type of cultural production and consumption.

Methods

This artistic guideline transformed not only the order of the signifiers of the painting (in particular, it replaced the golden background, which had been mostly filled with geometric shapes, humanized the illusory space, and saturated it with mathematically verified figures and objects) but also the order of signifies in the logic of the "picture of the world" (rehabilitation of sensory perception, declaration of the infallibility eye, autonomization of vision, dominance of pictorial space, compression of time to the moment of now, unification of the status of a separate thing in the general order, legitimization of holistic anti-metaphysical programs).

Results
Form

Two empty chapels painted by Giotto in the early 14th century in the Scrovegni Chapel in Padua stand as a milestone in the history of Western art. This *trompe l'oeil* in all its illusory void seems to be a scotoma in the figurative density of the late Middle Ages imagery space.

There exist various interpretations of Giotto's innovation represented, particularly, in these mysterious little chapels: from the search for sacral meaning in its non-deciphered symbolism to the treatment of them as a meaningless formal element of the composition, a rhythmic pause between picturesque scenes of the Holy Scripture (See, for example: White, 1967, Ch. 24; Longhi, 1973, Ch. 1; Brown, 2004).

But most of them assume that their new figure emerges in these – the space itself. It is supposed that Giotto intuitively discovered some basic elements of a wholly new system of aesthetic representation – that of realism of linear perspective.

The pictorial landscape of painters contemporaneous with Giotto might seem cluttered up, choked with chaotical details (compare with Giotto, for example, Cimabue's work, painted two decades earlier. The astonishment at the pure space of nascent aesthetic form finds its in different terms: Italian spaciousness, pure architectural illusionism, space without a figure, internal opening, spatial void, spatial cubature (spaziosità italiana, puro illusionismo architettonico, spazio senza figura, calibratura spaziosa, un vano spaziale, cubatura spaziale) (Bellosi, 1980, p. 6–39).

The essential feature of the Renaissance imaginary space, thus, turns out to be not so much its objectivity or realism, but the very spatiality: spaciousness, volume, transversal depth. The old impenetrable golden background of medieval icons, as it were, bursts open and our view goes further and further from one inner depth to

another (from the interior of the painted chapels themselves to the exterior beyond their windows). The dominant typological characteristic of traditional painting, which makes it sharply opposed to the system of direct perspective, was the system of shallow depth of field.

The flatness of the traditional painting creates the impression that a vertical press squeezes the foreground figures into the background. The foreground and background planes are almost flattened. The figures seem to be literally encrusted in the background. And ultimate symbolism of this background – golden color and circles – refers to the divine substance of eternity.

Painter and theoretician of art Lev Zhegin, one of the most scrupulous scholars of reverse perspective (or Byzantine perspective), reveals semantic fields of the meticulously described space of the icon. In his fundamental work "The Language of the Work of Art: Conventionality of Ancient Art" (1970) (Shegin, 1982) he interconnects two formal peculiar principles of the icon: figures-background and figures-frame relations. The space between foreground and background is not spacious, it is rather disappearing. The space outside of the frame is unimaginable at all. One cannot extend the depicted beyond the frame, which functions as an ontological limit. The Being manifests itself as a whole in the symbolism of the icon. The icon, in other words, is a "space-time unity". Figures in the picture are represented by a summation of all moments of time (like a photo with infinite exposure).

There are various formal techniques for achieving that: from superimposing different points of view within the spatial system of the icon to the shadowless light of "eternal midday" in the picture. Thus, the things are represented as substantially occupying their proper place in the universe like a gem inserted in the crown. The temporality of such things is determined by the correspondence of every moment of its existence with eternity. That was the formal code of the man's position in traditional culture.

For a man in Christian history doesn't move in an empty time linearly as if in the shell of the present moment only indirectly correlating with the past and future that exist in some indeterminate distance. Each moment of time for him was characterized by a vertical, direct correlation with eternity – the Christian Scripture, apocalyptical narrative – pulsating in the present (so that when the Virgin Mary is portrayed as the daughter of a Tuscan feudal lord, this is not perceived as a modernization of the old plot).

"For example, – writes Erich Auerbach, – if an occurrence like the sacrifice of Isaac is interpreted as prefiguring the sacrifice of Christ, so that in the former the latter is as it were announced and promised, and the latter "fulfills" the former, then a connection is established between two events which are linked neither temporally nor causally – a connection which it is impossible to establish by reason in the horizontal dimension (…). It can be established only if both occurrences are vertically linked to Divine Providence… The here and now is no longer a mere link in an earthly chain of events, it is simultaneously something which has always been, and which will be fulfilled in the future…" (Auerbach, 2003. p. 73–74).

Traditional time is a network of allusions, repetitions, fulfillment of vows, and the return of the past in the very core of the present. Time has a firm limit in the form of the circle of Eternity. The gaze of the medieval man rests against this wall-like apocalyptical horizon. The future is not an empty space open for any kind of maneuvers, where there is nothing, except some imaginary grid for possibilities. Future is always-already now, it serves as a background that allows us to see things in the first place. It means to discern 'figures', the sense of every present moment in the perspective of salvation. As Marc Bloch puts it: "In spite of everything, an irresistible vitality fermented in men, but as soon as they gave themselves up to meditation, nothing was farther from their thoughts than the prospect of a long future for a young and vigorous human race. If humanity as a whole seemed to be moving rapidly towards its end, so much the more did this sensation of being 'on the way' apply to each individual life" (Bloch, 1989, p. 85-86).

Thus, the future is a function of the return of the Past, which is always there, so that a man lives in everyday life on the retreating edge of the abyss (or gates of paradise). His thoughts and actions are determined by this horizon of salvation. He directly relates them to a dimension that is supra-individual and radically different from here-and-now. It is this "vertical" structure of the traditional time that is supplanted by the new experience of "homogeneous, empty time" (W. Benjamin), the first visual representation of which was linear perspective. Since the Renaissance, according to Zhegin, the time scope of the painting has permanently been reduced – up to the aesthetics of the "moment" in impressionism. Painting becomes only a spatial composition. Renaissance for the first time produced the effect of a leakage of the pictural content outside the picture frame. Impressionism made the spaces inside and outside of the frame a kind of communicating vessels: "the vast ocean of air, infinite space... not being contained by any borders, passively spreads in all directions" (Shegin, 1982, p. 66).

In the meantime, a century after Giotto, in the first third of the 15th century, what what had appeared as a random deviation, the "mutation" on a traditional pictorial surface was formalized formalized into a system of linear perspective. The "secret chapels" expand to the scale of buildings, cities, the whole world of architectural illusionism. Space that was glimpsing on the surface of Giotto's frescoes begins to be filled out with things. In the middle of the 15th century the question – that Masaccio confronted one of the first – was how to populate the "desert and cold" space (Roberto Longhi).

Attempts to populate the discovered "illusionistic" space were undertaken by Giotto himself and other representatives of the Italian Trecento. But these attempts rather masked and deformed this space by disproportionate and unrealistic figures. And the space itself was elaborated gradually, in a not systematical way.

One can populate the space in "a right", "realistic" way based on trust in the human eye and the natural vision. It was Leonardo da Vinci who declared a whole anti-metaphysical program by arguing that the eye is less mistaken than the mind in his philosophy of painting (Leonardo da Vinci, 2005). From the time of Plato, Western-European thought treated the body, the senses, with the deepest distrust as the source of all sorts of errors. Why does the eye suddenly turn out to be infallible? Because, Da Vinci argues, it sees only along the straight lines that form the pyramid, whose base is the visible surface of the object.

Vision becomes autonomous in relation from other senses, elevated to the rank of intellectual ability. First of all, because of this straightness of perspective lines, which continuation beyond the base of the visual pyramid we can easily imagine). By linear perspective vision not only detects the object at an exact distance, in the right place and even this is unattainable, for instance, for the sense of smell. Not limited to touching of the surface of the object

(like taste or touch), it goes deeper into the thing, which exists inside itself along the same perspective axes.

It is no accident that architectural structures and interiors "inhabit" Renaissance paintings, become a common background, and even "characters" in their own right. The thing within a linear perspective is an architectural object in the first place. Seeing the internal construction of the architectural object, knowing how it is drawn along the perspective lines is a sort of ontological knowledge of its mode of being, of its truth. The being of the object consists in its architectonics, in the system of lines of force, nodal points, dynamism of immanent balances, and geometric seriality of elements' repetition.

The story of Brunelleschi's veduta is an exemplary illustration of this magic of the perspective as a "penetration" into the way of being of things. In creating a perspective image, a thing appears as if from air, from imaginary lines that make up geometric volume of objects. First, we draw perspective lines going to their vanishing point, then the whole perspective grid of the surface (chess pattern) that is going to be the ground, and then perpendicular lines from the nodal points of the grid, thus constructing the regular space of linear perspective.

Out of these pure spatial rhythms, miraculously 'real' things arise. They are materialized around the nodal points of the spatial framework and occupy their places in the picture.

The marvelous impression of the second birth of a thing – not just an unbelievable likelihood, to which the effect of Brunelleschi is often reduced – is the essence of the Florentine artist's creation. The viewer looks from behind the veduta through the little hole in a certain place of the picture (vanishing point). The mirror placed right opposite the veduta reflects the depicted object (Baptistery in Florence). But the main thing is that there is a real Baptistery behind the mirror (in the right distance). When the mirror is removed the real object substitutes for its pictorial representation and …viewer sees no difference. This is an ontological demonstration: the artist, as it were, did not copy the real thing, but created it, knowing its internal principle of being.

Knowledge of a thing's architectonic truth leads to the ability not only to reproduce it but also to enjoy its beauty. The beauty of "simple lines" is visible as a frame through the outer shell of the body.

For the concrete objects to be born on canvas the primal Object – architectonical Space – should already be there. Before Renaissance, Panofsky notes, even in the closest to linear perspective pictorial tradition – Hellenistic realistic painting – space "was conceived as an aggregate or composite of solids and voids, both finite, and not as a homogeneous system within which every point, regardless of whether it happens to be located in a solid or in a void, is uniquely determined by three co-ordinates perpendicular to each other and extending in infinitum from a given 'point of origin'" (Panofsky, 1960, p. 122–123).

Perspective introduces space as a universal "invisible" field of commensurability, the field of equivalence that pervades the inert mass of things. Linear perspective bounds together both things and voids by a common milieu. This means that it forms a system of places where things can be substituted for one another, according to general rule, in other words, things become proportional. It is not things that make up a unique place, adapt it for themselves, but the place that molds various things.

Compare the two ways of depicting the figure of Christ in the manger. According to Arnheim the converging lines of linear perspective visually appear to be wedged into the infant Christ, while in another drawing the infant is conveniently framed by the divergent edges of the cubic manger (See: Arnheim, 1986). The place turns out to be comfortable surroundings for the figure. The figure fills it completely, 'spiritualizes' it. If a thing moves from its place, then the place itself ceases to be the same, its meaning and very form is changed. Of course, this means that the perspective interconnectedness of all places that forms the space is impossible here. In the system of reverse perspective, each thing is associated with its place as the signifier corresponds to the signified in non-arbitrary sign (Ferdinand de Saussure). And, conversely, the semiotic space of linear perspective consists of arbitrary signs, which possess no 'natural' link between the form (place) and the content (thing). Here the ontological places turn into autonomous system of correlative positions that acquire its 'value' from their mutual proportionality.

In the absence of a coherent, invisible, predetermined system of places, the things seem to chaotically (or dreamily) 'flow' in relation to each other. For example, the boat with people in the anonymous pre-Brunelleschian veduta sails in the non-geometrical 'flows' of traditional space just like along the river Arno's waves as an ice floe, broken away from the homogeneous structure of ice (from exact, 'crystal' spatial structure of linear perspective).

Perspective is a common spatial framework, a system of universal interconnectedness of positions in a pictorial space. A prospective vision is not so much a "correct" vision of things, of their appearances, but 'vision-through' things as objects, a penetration in the internal construction of things. Not through individual things, but through all possible things in the field of vision, so that one can see that common architectonic construction in which each individual thing is first of all one more spatial cell, equivalent to all others. Space is that Thing for which a perspective eye is created. To see this Thing is to see through it. Perspectiva is a Latin word that means looking through something (or Durchsehung as Albrecht Durer put it).

To draw linear perspective, one needs to define the coordinate system, the scale of the depicted world. This fundamental operation was carried out by Leon Battista Alberti in his treatise "Della pittura" ("On painting", 1435). Regular (chess) pattern of the floor is the first step in a new visible world. It connects freely and interrelated drifting "islands" of places into a reliable soil underfoot: "When entering the world of Duccio and Giotto we feel as if we were stepping off a boat and setting foot on firm land. The architectural settings (…) give an impression of coherence and stability unmatched in all earlier painting including the Hellenistic and the Roman".

But where this firm ground did come from? Was it happily found by a genius or some necessity engendered it?

History

"Evidently, – writes Panofsky, – something very significant was to happen between 1250-1550", so that a system of formal innovations of Renaissance painting could take place. He believes that a direct perspective is not just an artistic device, discovered by a free play of imagination, but a "symbolic form", the meaning of which becomes clear if we place it in a broader historical context.

The method of "correct construction" (costruzione legittima) depicts things in the right scale and proportions. It geometrically structures the world and thereby combines the pictorial thing and space, which previously was an unreflected condition for accidental juxtaposition or superimposition of things. It was a heterogeneous set of voids. As such, the method of linear perspective, according to Panofsky, is an evident homology of the Cartesian

philosophy, which constructs the same space, but not in the aesthetic, but in the theoretical dimension.

The geometrical system of coordinates stands as a logical form of the aesthetics of perspective. In another place, Panofsky sees an analogy between linear perspective and the modern idea of history: both are based on the principle of a fixed distance between the "eye" (of the viewer or historian) and its objects. This distance is a precondition of correct, objective, consistent reconstruction of the "object".

It seems to be not difficult to see in the modern idea of history or in Cartesian geometry the scientific "big brother" of linear perspective. We can grasp some perceptible identity underlining all these manifestations. But manifestations of what? Zeitgeist, mentality, the inexorable pace of scientific-technological progress with its Heideggerian extremes of Gestell, of transformation of the world of real things into pictures, passive objects for technological manipulations?

Let's admit, after E. Panofsky and H. Damish that Giotto, Brunelleschi, Alberti, and da Vinci had made "the modern systematic concept of space" visible in the aesthetic realm even before the abstract knowledge of natural sciences articulate the same idea mathematically (Damisch, 1995, p. 82–83). But is there not left something crucial of the underlying identity of all these cultural forms, something else that would characterize not so much the relation of Man to Nature as the relationship of concrete men to each other as an inescapable content of any historical 'symbolic form'?

One might add that "something very significant" that occurred between 1250–1550 is the beginning of systematical commodity-money relations. The 'ascent of money' (Niall Ferguson) gave rise to the dramatic transformation of the whole social fabric – rationalization of all aspects of everyday life, unprecedented social dynamism, along with the disintegration of former communities, the crisis of the value system, etc. But how this could help to understand the dynamics of cultural forms? How to avoid the trap of vulgar sociologism and economic determinism facing the irreducible charm of fine arts?

Perhaps, the inversion of the question "how the comprehension of art is possible through the optics of socio-economic realities?" would be helpful here. So: is it possible to enhance understanding of socio-economic processes through the looking-glass of art that seemingly only returns to the individual sublime images of himself?

The optics in this case is the formal features of the linear perspective described above. Through this magical crystal of aesthetical form, we are going to look both at essential socio-economic moments and at that social logic that is 'invisible' in the present social life itself. Fredric Jameson describes the situation when the aesthetical text not just reflects its historical context but articulates it as 'paradox of subtext' (or always-already textualized context): "cultural object, as though for the first time, brings into being that very situation to which it is also, at one and the same time, a reaction» (Jameson, 1981, p. 82).

The first thing here is that linear perspective can be seen as a visual prototype of serial production, something like its historical a priori. The machine production of serial commodities has not really made up a system, but articulated serial principle as an aesthetic value has already worked in the core of the Renaissance imaginary (the only serial things by that time were printed books – by the year 1500 there were produced about 20 million copies).

Jean Baudrillard in his "The System of Objects" (1968) describes consumerist desire as rooted in the "system" that

might be said to be originating in the era of linear perspective: "An object no longer specified by its function is defined by the subject, but in the passionate abstractness of possession all objects are equivalent. And just one object no longer suffices: the fulfilment of the project of possession always means a succession or even a complete series of objects. This is why owning absolutely any object is always so satisfying and so disappointing at the same time: a whole series lies behind any single object, and makes it into a source of anxiety" (Baudrillard, 2002, p. 86).

In linear perspective a new attitude to the thing as not an autonomous object of a series is staged. That what in consumerist practices will manifest itself as a halo of anxiety (lack of satisfaction) around each commodity, genealogically, in the aesthetic dimension comes to being as an object of hedonistic contemplation.

Serial production deepens the alienation of man from things, the impossibility of experiencing "intimacy" with them, and radically transforms the symbolical space of interactions of men and things: "Traditional tools, by contrast, belonged to a field of practical mediation between the material to be transformed and the person doing the transforming. We have thus moved from the depth of a vertical field to the extension of a horizontal one. … In place of the continuous (but finite) space that gestures create for their purposes around the traditional object, the technical object institutes discontinuous and unlimited extension" (Baudrillard, 2002, p. 51). Does not the Renaissance space contain a code of this experience of horizontal "unlimited extension", empty scene on which something else must be played?

Claude-Gilbert Dubois develops the idea that the aesthetic pleasure from the new space is an analogue of the production and technical reproduction of serial objects. It is rhythmic reproduction of the same elements – columns, arches, decorative details, etc. – that emphasizes the perspective decrease of objects in size and creates the very illusion of distance. The series of formal elements produce the systematical space like later the economic system will produce serial objects (Dubois, 1985, p. 60–61).

The invention and popularity of linear perspective can also be interpreted in the light of the aesthetics of everyday commercial activity (in which most of the customers and viewers of paintings of that time were involved).

"It is an important fact of art history, – emphasizes Michael Baxandall, – those commodities have come regularly in standard-sized containers only since the nineteenth century: previously a container – the barrel, sack or bale – was unique, and calculating its volume quickly and accurately was a condition of business" (Baxandall, 1972, p. 86).

Due to its everyday habits this 'mercantile eye' was predisposed to see in complex forms a combination of simple geometric bodies, the proportionality, the series. Merchants were constantly practiced in equating and gauging things with different parameters (volumes, weights, values). This was the most common and frequent part of commercial activity.

And linear perspective corresponded to the visual and mental habits of its audience. The 'mercantile eye' easily and gladly recognized the calculative activity of the same nature in the very construction of the painted objects. The painting aestheticized the commercial way of life even if it did not portray merchants themselves but depicted scenes of Holy Scripture. The artistic techniques tended to coincide with commercial skills: "Piero della Francesca had the same equipment for a barter deal as fo the subtle play of intervals in his pictures, and it is interesting that it should

be in relation to the commercial rather than the pictorial use that he expounds it" (Baxandall, 1972, p. 97).

But couldn't we take a step further and assume that homology between ascending merchant activity and the evolution of artistic techniques can be dialectically elaborated? Baxandall himself points out the historical reality that not just could serve as an original to be reproduced in artistic form with some hedonistic effects, but was a problem, an unsolvable problem that appealed for the resolution that could be only imaginary in those circumstances.

Fifteenth-century Italy was largely traditional society with a few peculiar zones of modern economic activity (Florence, Venice, Genova, etc.) that later would be called enclaves of capitalism (Arrighi, 1994).

Such enclaves had their own currency and even system of weights and measures (let alone the territories with which they have trade relations). So, there were physical borders that could be crossed more or less easily and symbolic barriers that one could not overcome at any cost. Namely systematical embarrassment as to standards of weights and measures, and more importantly with currency transference and exchange rates. Money wasn't a full-fledged universal equivalent. There was no firm ground for belief in money that plays pivotal role in commodity fetishism, this perpetuum mobile of capital.

The formal features of the space of linear perspective make up exactly the strict and universal system of interchangeable positions that could be occupied by any objects. Any position – 'chess square', spatial cell of perspective – that defines the 'value' of an object (its size and angle), is in determined proportion with any other position. Any object can be substituted in perspective space for any other one by clear rational rules that defines corresponding changes in appearance. In short, linear perspective is the system of universal equivalence.

Discussion and conclusions

It is compensatory space with regard to the real late medieval economic landscape of autonomously 'drifting', disconnected places of natural economy and artisans' products not bound by exchange value relations as "the system of objects". This ideal economical 'landscape', a synchronous image of an unlimited commodity exchange process, emerges on the surface of artistic form. It doesn't so much just reflect economic realities, as anticipates its inner logic – or, according to Jameson (See: Jameson, 1981; Jameson, 1992), cultural texts are, at the same time, form and history because of their context. Thus, the form (the aesthetic) reveals its retroactive causality in relation to the history (the socio-economical). Being a reaction to scattered sprouts of capitalism linear perspective serves as a magical artifact that is capable of bringing forth a dormant force from the abyss of nonbeing, or making capitalism to come to being as a dominant system.

References

Arnheim R. (1986). *New Essays on the Psychology of Art*. University of California Press.

Arrighi G. (1994). T*he long twentieth century: money, power, and the origins of our times*. Verso.

Auerbach E. (2003). *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton University Press.

Baudrillard J. (2002). *The System of Objects.* Verso.

Baxandall M. (1972). *Painting and Experience in fifteenth century Italy*. Oxford University Press.

Bellosi L. (1980). *La rappresentazione dello spazio. Storia dell'arte italiana*. Parte prima. Materiali e problemi. Volume quatro. Ricerche e tecnologie. Giulio Einaudi.

Bloch M. (1989). *Feudal Society*. Vol 1: The Growth and Ties of Dependence. Routledge.

Brown J. H. (2004). *Unscrambling Giotto's Space*. Paper of a presentation at the (Re)Discovering Aesthetics conference at University College, Cork on July 10. http://faculty.philosophy.umd.edu/jhbrown/Giotto/index.htm

Damisch H. (1995). *The Origin of Perspective*. MIT Press.

Dubois C.-J. (1985). *L'imaginaire de la renaissance*. Presses Universitaires de France.

Jameson F. (1992). *Signatures of the visible*. Routledge.

Jameson F. (1981). *The Political Unconscious. Narrative As a Socially Symbolic Act*. Cornell University Press.

Leonardo da Vinci. (2005). *A Treatise on Painting*. Dover Publications.

Longhi R. Da. (1973). *Cimabue a Morandi, Saggi di storia della pittura italiana scelti e ordinati da Gianfranco Contini*. Mondadori.

Panofsky E. (1960). *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*. Almqvist & Wiksell.

Shegin L. F. (1982). *Die Sprache des Bildes. Form und Konvention in der alten Kunst*. Verlag der Kunst.

White J. (1967). *Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space*. Faber and Faber.

Андрій ГОРНИХ, д-р філос. наук, проф.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8191-5514
e-mail: andrei.gornykh@ehu.lt
Європейський гуманітарний університет, Вільнюс, Литва

ЛІНІЙНА ПЕРСПЕКТИВА ЯК ЕСТЕТИЧНА ФОРМА

В с т у п . *У статті теоретично реконструйовано функціювання лінійної перспективи не лише як художнього прийому, що виникає та стає атрибутом живописних творів, починаючи з італійського Тренченто Italian Tricento, зокрема робіт Джотто, а і як настанови, що формує порядок означників "часу картини світу". Метою статті є розкриття евристичного потенціал естетичної форми, що зорієнтована радше не на віддзеркалення наслідків трансформації економічного ландшафту, а на передбачення його трансформації та спрямування зусиль суб'єкта на його реорганізацію. Методологічні настанови роботи зорієнтовані на порівняння динаміки культурних форм крізь оптику мистецтвознавства та естетичної теорії, а також соціально-історичну реконструкцію контексту поза спробою запобігання вульгарно-соціологічному редукціонізму та економічному детермінізму. Такий ракурс дозволяє не лише прояснити співвідношення естетичного тексту і контексту, а й виявити потенціал першого в прояснення підтексту крізь артикулювання серійного принципу як естетичної цінності та просуванні модерної настанови історичної форми культурного виробництва та споживання.*

М е т о д и . *Аналізована художня настанова трансформувала не лише порядок означників живописного полотна (зокрема витіснила золоте тло, переважно наповнене геометричними фігурами, здійснила олюднення ілюзорного простору, насити його математично вивіреними фігурами та предметами), а й порядок означуваних у логіці "картини світу" (реабілітація чуттєвого сприйняття, оголошення непогрішності infallible ока, автономізація бачення, домінування живописного простору, стискання часу до моменту тепер, уніфікація статусу окремої речі в загальному порядку, легітимація цілісних анти-метафізичних програм).*

Р е з у л ь т а т и . *Доведено зв'язок між антиметафізичною програмою лінійної перспективи в художньому вимірі та картезіанською гомологією простору в теоретичному. Підкреслено архітектонічний принцип лінійної перспективи: ритмічність геометричних фігур, стабільний баланс вузлових точок, nodal points, динаміка відтворень та повторень базових форм.*

В и с н о в к и . *Автор дійшов висновку, що лінійна перспектива є не прийомом легітимації правильного бачення речей, а прийомом вочевиднення правильного порядку та масштабу світу в чіткій системі координат, зорієнтованим на уніфікацію та еквівалентний обмін у системі речей.*

К л ю ч о в і   с л о в а : *лінійна перспектива, історична форма, культурний ландшафт, принцип серійності, антиметафізична програма, естетична теорія.*