

## 2015 Salek Minc Lecture

Delivered by Dr Jutta Vinzent

Recorded on 7 August 2015 at the Lawrence Wilson Art Gallery, UWA

Jutta: Thank you very much for having invited me. I'm delighted to be here, and again, thank you for the introduction and I'm humbled and I hope I can deliver.

This lecture is indeed held in honor of Salek Minc, a medical practitioner who also published a series of articles on the relationship between medicine and culture. Being a cardiologist, he felt that unresolved emotions suppressed by normed behavior induced tensions, which may form medical problems such as heart disease. For him, contemplation and immersion in art could help resolve such tensions. His view may have been influenced by his own life experiences.

Similarly, to many of those mentioned today, he was a Jewish émigré from the 1930s. According to Sally Quinn, who curated and wrote the catalog for the exhibition Bauhaus on the Swan: Elise Blumann, An Émigré Artist in Western Australia, 1938-1948, Minc also knew Elise Blumann personally in the 1940s through émigré gatherings in Paris.

Born in the Russian town of Siedlce, which is today in Poland, in 1905 ... I've brought you a picture of Salek Minc, which is unfortunately small. Minc also knew Elise personally. He was born in 1905, as you can see. Minc started medicine in Italy, graduating in 1925 to become a specialist physician.

In 1935, the same year in which National Socialist Germany introduced the so-called Nuremberg Laws defining Jews by ways and not belief, he left for the UK, [00:02:00] where he then joined a tourist vessel as a ship surgeon. Arriving in Perth in 1940, there he continued his passion from the 1920s, namely collecting and promoting the arts.

It is thanks to him and the kind invitation of Sally Quinn that I have been able to travel from Germany to Perth to be here today and speak about Space, Place and Migration in Modern Art. That's the exhibition and exhibition catalog for this exhibition in which we are placed, and this is what I'm going to talk about.

During the 1930s, thousands of refugees left Nazi Germany. Many went to Britain, so that London became a haven for modern art. It was also in London that "Circle: An International Survey of Constructive Art" was published, a key book on modern art with contributions from leading avant-garde artists. Edited by Naum Gabo, Ben Nicholson and Leslie Martin, the publication dealt foremost with the topic of space, namely in sculpture, painting, architecture and also in design.

This paper will consider these conceptions of space in the 1930s and asks how such interest was reflective of migrants' experiences of changing places and expanding spaces. It will argue that space was a feature relevant beyond a mere formalist analysis that may stretch to the formulation as I offer to you, which I have termed provisionally as spatial art history.

I would also like to say that it is wonderful to be actually able to [help 00:03:44] this paper in the gallery space, so what you can experience here is not only Elise Blumann's visual work but also might be reminded of her [00:04:00] accent, because obviously she came from Germany and therefore might have had a similar kind of accent.

I'm trying to speak slowly so you can all understand me. Therefore you have not just only a visually enjoyable work, but probably also a reminder in terms of the [orality 00:04:17] that is usually and sometimes forgotten when you think about émigrés.

New media and global experiences have arguably brought discussions on spatial conceptions to the fore. These have even led to creating a sub-discipline of sociology known as the sociology of space and its beginnings to Henri Lefebvre's seminal book, "The Social Production of Space," which is cited as being fundamental for the so-called spatial turn in the 1990s, when the geographer Edward Soja revived Lefebvre.

What followed was a generation of academics who conceived of space as neither simply natural geography nor an empty container filled by history, but being produced by subjects. Furthermore, they believed that space, whether mathematical, mental or physical, is never devoid of social relations.

This fundamental change toward space has brought forward further theories. In history, the different approach to space found its expression in transfer-oriented reflections of multi-perspective transnational history writing, as this reproduced an a-priori understanding of the object of research. They became known as "transfergeschichte" by Michel

Espagne, "histoire croisée" by Benedicte Zimmerman and Michael Werner, and "entangled history."

In artistry, space has mainly been considered as a topic in artworks and less as a method of or with space, though there seems to be an increasing interest. After having agreed on speaking today, [00:06:00] which was I think in April, an advertisement of the Art Association of Australia and New Zealand reached me through the global network ArtHist.Net, announcing that the forthcoming and annual conference at Brisbane, Queensland on the 24th and 25th of October 2015 will be held on the topic of image, space, body.

Hence, I feel that this topic is not only timely as is that of migration and art in the 1930s when considering not only the Elise Blumann show here, but also two exhibitions currently held in London, namely The Retrospective of Barbara Hepworth at the Tate Britain and the centenary exhibition of the Ben Uri gallery, the Jewish gallery which had a close relationship with émigrés from Continental Europe during its existence.

Furthermore, as will come to light in this paper, spatial conceptions were already developed by artists in the interwar years. Inspired by recent literature on space, I will suggest and question as to whether these historical spatial conceptions, particularly the most influential one of the so-called open and closed space, proposed by Naum Gabo, can be developed into a method with which to approach any art object, which I provisionally labeled spatial art history.

Conceptions of space also played a vital role in the interwar years, as I've just mentioned. One of the most influential ones in 1930s Britain was that of Naum Gabo, who distinguished a so-called open from a closed form of space. This distinction seems to go beyond a mere reference to space as a topic or formalist element, implying a fundamental difference in how to view the world.

Although Gabo may well be one of the first to do so, he was not the only one. His conception of closed and open space [00:08:00] is similar to the distinction made in theories related to the spatial turn, which speaks of container versus absolute space. One can also find non-essentialist and essentialist approaches as a distinction of open and closed forms.

Even the Oxford English Dictionary defines space in these two ways, namely as a continuous extension viewed with or without reference to the existence of objects within it or as the interval between points or objects viewed as having one, two or three dimensions.

Hence, while I'm far from claiming that Gabo is the only one who saw this distinction, his explanation underpinned by a model is most helpful in understanding the differentiation, possibly because being an artist, he visualizes the differences in several sculptures that I will introduce to you.

Naum Gabo has become known as the author of the so-called Realistic Manifesto published in 1920. This manifesto was co-signed by his painter brother [Nikolaus 00:09:06] Pevsner and is widely considered the key text for constructivism, a modern art movement for which space plays a central role.

Conventionally, constructivism has been divided into realists using real space and the idealists using ideated space. The latter is being identified with Gabo as well as his brother Pevsner, Russian artists who lived and propagated constructivism in the West, while the former refers to Vladimir Tatlin and his constructivist colleagues who stayed in Russia after it became the Soviet Union, under which their art became more utilitarian, supporting Stalin's Marxism/Leninism.

While space already plays a dominant role in this manifesto, Gabo continued working on the topic so that it became the main focus of his paper, translated as "The Problems of Space and Time and Their Falsification," [00:10:00] written five years after the Realistic Manifesto in 1925. Most likely, being influenced by living in Berlin at the time, Gabo draws attention to the meaning of the term "raum" or "space" in German.

I quote, "There is space to designate the cosmos and space as a closed room or a cell viewed from within. It is obvious that these two concepts have been confused with one another, at least in so far as the second concept is more familiar." For Gabo, both interior design and architecture belong to the latter concept, a space of shaping space. Gabo, however, wants to create space and understand space as conceptually open.

What he means becomes clearer in his first theoretical statement in English, published in *The Listener* in 1936 and entitled "Constructive Art." Gabo argues that the vocation of the art of our epoch is not to reproduce nature but to create and enrich it. In other words, or in my words, art should create nature not by reproduction but by producing something new that enriches nature, which might well be understood as reality or life as such.

Essentially different in kind, he uses nature as a model for art. Art should create as nature can create at the same time. While here, nature seems a rather vague term, Gabo's essay entitled "Sculpture: Carving and

Constructing in Space" clarifies the meaning of his open form best because it is introducing the comparison to closed form.

This article appeared in the book mentioned before, namely in "Circle," a book edited by him, Leslie Martin and Ben Nicholson and published in 1937. Preceded by [00:12:00] a reproduction of Two Cubes, Gabo refers to them in his essay as illustrating a new principle that should be inserted into sculpture, the so-called, and I quote, the so-called "Construction in the space, which kills the whole essential basis of sculpture as being the art of solid masses."

Furthermore, these cubes today in the Tate collection helps distinguish what Gabo called open and closed forms of space and what others defined as space as container or essentialist space as different from absolute and non-essentialist forms from space.

In Gabo's own words, the illustration distinguishes between the two kinds of representation of the same object. The first cube represents a volume of mass, and this is to your left. The second, the one on your right, represents- I have also this lovely pointer, which I hope will work, so here. There are two kinds of representation of the same object. The first cube represents volume of mass. The second represents the space in which the mass exists made visible.

We consider space from an entirely different point of view. We consider it as an absolute sculptural element released from any closed volume and we represent it from inside with its own specific properties. Gabo interprets space as material, as an absolute sculptural element. In order to be able to comprehend space in this way, he must assume that the artist constructs space, which was previously the inexistent or existent only as absolute.

Referring to this in "Circle" as a transcendental idea, he uses a term conventionally associated with the writings of Kant, who received a revival particularly from the 1860s in what has become known as Neo-Kantianism. [00:14:00] I have at a different place shown actually the relationship between Neo-Kantianism and Gabo's concept of space.

Gabo was not the only artist thinking along these lines of an open concept of space. Apart from Barbara Hepworth and Ben Nicholson, artists considering these idea from the 1930s and under the influence of Gabo, and I will refer to them later, it was particularly the Bauhaus artists, including Laszlo Moholy-Nagy and Marcel Breuer, who had similar approaches.

As examples I'm showing you here, Laszlo-Moholy-Nagy's light-space modulator, which he completed in 1930, using light in the attempt to create space, and his spirals, which is called spirals, concave and convex forms made of plexiglass in the 1940s, materials which were also used by Gabo.

There are constructivist artists such as the aforementioned Vladimir Tatlin, who designed the so-called Monument to the Third International in 1919-1920, a model which is lost but has been recreated for exhibitions. I'm showing you here the recreation on the top right.

Tatlin also designed clothes for the stage. That's probably not so much known, a fact indeed which is not so much known, as shown to you on the right, but demonstrates what I have mentioned before, namely the utilitarian approach of constructivism under Stalinism.

Indeed, if the focus lies on construction, spatial conceptions run the danger of being misused because space is undetermined. It is no wonder, therefore, that spatial conceptions developed in the 1920s were also used by totalitarian governments.

Apart from constructivism, which was instrumentalized under Stalinism, the National Socialists justified Jewish persecution and expansionist politics as the idea of [00:16:00] "lebensraum," of living space, while the Italian fascists named it "spazio vitale," conceptions of space which, however, rely on a closed, if not enclosed, conceptions of space.

The interest in space in the interwar years has got a number of ramifications for migration, the meaning of place and taking together with recent developments of spatial theories for a methodology based on space.

Space and migration. One might think that the experience of moving and living in different countries because of being forced out of Nazi Germany may have initiated conceptualizations of space. However, this is clearly not the case. In other words, expansion of place does not initiate necessarily thinking about space.

However, by adopting and continuing what émigrés such as Gabo and the Bauhaus artists had developed about space in Weimar Germany, migration caused a dissemination that might have otherwise taken longer and might have not been as intensive as in the case of the string sculptures, to which I will turn in a minute.

This chance omission of migration is not only in light of distance and politics. In other words, the further away from Europe, the more unlikely it would have been for continental modernism to get quickly disbursed and experienced what Sally Quinn called [a thirst in 00:17:32] knowledge of modernism, particularly if there were no political alliances in the form of colonial hegemony or, in even other words, émigré from Nazi Germany such as Elise Blumann brought a kind of Bauhaus style to Perth, which might have otherwise taken much longer.

Furthermore, modernism changed through the Nazis, so even in cases of refugees migrating to nation states closer to [00:18:00] Germany, such as Gabo, Moholy-Nagy and many others who've been to the UK, the modernism of the Weimar Republic was pushed into the underground or completely destroyed in Nazi Germany.

In other words, it is thanks to the émigrés that modernism and conceptions of space developed in Weimar Republic thrived and continued to develop in freedom and without the pressures typical for art under totalitarian governments.

In this sense, artworks and exhibitions that honor émigrés' work do more than only offering an aesthetic contribution to modernism; they are carrying further the ideas and ideals of an art that may have otherwise not survived, being thus cultural archaeologists who trace and preserve modernism.

If migration is the experience of place-changing and expansion, then one can see that space is not to be misunderstood as place. Indeed, it is conventionally seen as the concretion of space that is [wild 00:19:06] about an idea.

This may also explain that despite that the book "Circle" included a list of exhibitions, some with installation photographs, and had an exhibition on the occasion of the book publication in 1937, none of the contributors to "Circle" reflected on exhibition display issues or location as part of the concepts of space, understanding the exhibition as a place and space where they can investigate what they develop for their artworks.

This is partly surprising, as artists at the same time did consider exhibition display, most famously El Lissitzky in his design of the 1930 exhibition hall in [Hanover 00:19:49], where Gabo also exhibited.

This has destroyed what has been reconstructed, and you can see the reconstruction on the right. The images what I'm referring to is that the

[00:20:00] images as such, they had, as you can see this is the [Mondrian 00:20:03] image on the top right, here, the display as such was created so that it was not just what one can call a white cube display but actually reflected the works as such, and therefore one could consider this as not just only a consideration of display but also of designing really the space.

What migration and the reflection on space supports is what Anthony Giddens concluded, namely that modernity increasingly tears space away from place. In other words, artists less represent place and rather present space.

Indeed, the inclusion of a list of exhibition on abstract and constructive art, these installation photographs may be an indication that despite not consciously reflecting on exhibition space as place, it does show that space and place are growing apart.

Analyzing the artwork seems to be not only an iconography of space, in other words, using space as a topic in the art, because they themselves wrote about it, but amounts into a methodological reflection of the spatial conceptions.

It takes its starting point from Gabo's distinction of open and closed space, as outlined in the following. Of course, Gabo's distinction undoubtedly has its limitations for an application to a method. Therefore, the following also draws upon more recent theories, as mentioned above, which also use similar distinctions, though providing different names for them, such as the aforementioned container developed in social science.

In fact, as a retrospective method, open and closed concepts have been distinguished from each other under the terminology of non-essentialist and essentialist [00:22:00] approaches towards general jurisprudence, for example by Brian Tamanaha.

In the following, I will provide some examples which should also help distinguish the difference between open and closed forms. I will start with Gabo, and then move on to Hepworth and more artists who played with open and closed approaches, and therefore try to practice my methodology of a proposed spatial art history.

To be precise, Gabo is only interested in using open forms of space, whether these are his stereometric figures of the 1910s, which you can see here, and I'm showing you also an image of the model which is exhibited at the Tate so you get a feeling of the size, whether these are his



stereometric figures of the 1910s or his string sculptures of the 1930s and 1940s.

The stereometric figures [called 00:23:08] after stereometry, a process in physics to determine the volume and dimensions of solids, are built similar to the cube, I think that should come now, to the cube, representing the open form of space. It has a center that opens up, making visible space as open, and thus disproving volume as only consisting of solids.

Gabo's string sculptures offer the possibility to distinguish between open and closed forms of space in representation, because it was not only him but also Barbara Hepworth who produced such string sculptures. I'm showing you here how the sculpture is colored deep blue and red, which is also included in the current exhibition at the Tate.

While Gabo exploited the strings in a way that opens up, [00:24:00] particularly through the center that is left open, and I'm referring to this center, Hepworth uses strings in order to make visible, you can see that, Hepworth uses strings in order to make visible the inner side of the sculpture, this here. There is no hole. Therefore, in other words, she shows the volume of space, and similar to the cube, represents it as closed. Thus, despite very similar artworks, the spatial concept behind is different and leads thus to a different interpretation.

Hepworth's sculpture offer an excellent example to demonstrate the concept of open and closed space. While in the sculpture just shown, she used space as closed, other works demonstrate an open concept of space.

According to Hepworth's biographer, the artist's Pierced Form was a significant breakthrough. Indeed, the sculptress herself reports in 1952 that she, and I quote, "pierced the stone in order to make an abstract form of space."

Intriguingly, she refers here to form and space as two equivalents. Wilkinson is quite right in arguing that Hepworth has made what he called "holes" before Pierced Form. She had carved, and I quote him, "She had carved through the stone, but these opened-out areas simply defined the naturalistic space between the arms and the body."

The difference to Pierced Form is that the so-called hole in Pierced Form is part of an abstract piece and is such an integral part of the sculpture. The term "hole" is a description that assumes that the sculpture has taken away mass, creating a hole [00:26:00] into the mass.

This is different to space as material used to create a feature of the sculpture. The latter assumes that space is material and can be used similarly to any other material. Therefore the hole in Pierced Form is a wrong description and might be better described as an open form in order to show that Hepworth, like Gabo, interpreted space as material.

Gabo, different from Hepworth, who attaches the same value to mass on space, however, Gabo conceives of space as an absolute sculptural element and that a construction [which plays as 00:26:45] material changes the essential idea of sculpture. A sculpture is no longer solid, not made of mass, but space is the material of which mass is made.

Here I'm showing you this example because as a comparison with Henry Moore, where space is produced, is actually part in order, here, to indicate actually that this is the [arm 00:27:09] whereas this is obviously not. This means that these concepts of space are different from any other understandings of space.

They are not, as has been claimed by Wilkinson for Hepworth, [conserved as 00:27:22] negative space, another form of space of which the most prominent artist is the [contemporary 00:27:27] Rachel Whiteread. Here's where you call it open or a hole, and I would stress that you call that actually rather open than a hole.

This is the artwork by Rachel Whiteread, Untitled, Six Spaces, that is usually associated with negative space because it actually shows it consists of resin, with which she shows the spaces underneath six chairs, making visible the space left out by the chairs. As you can see here, [00:28:00] the chairs would be here on top, so that's the left-out space or negative space. Open space is not the same as negative space.

As shown above, spatial art history, we consider how an artwork conceptualizes space. This cannot only be applied to artists who mention the topic of space but to any artwork. Space, according to Kant, is an a-priori category. Thus, everything has a spatial aspect.

Such an approach reflects the assumption that space is not just given but constructed, and thus, this would include the assumption that space can be conceptualized in different ways. Space treated as a topic has been done before, such as, for example, in the contributions to a catalog which was entitled *Topos Raum*, "Topos Space," which I also have mentioned earlier.

However, just looking at the topic would not constitute a methodology. What needs to be revealed is the respective conceptions of space and its drivers, and thus, to make conceptions of space into a cultural history of space.

In terms of pictures and open approach of [several 00:29:08] layers of possibilities, on the one hand, such an approach could consider a picture like a sculpture, namely as a three-dimensional art object, may this be a painting, a drawing or any in-reality constructed image.

On the other, it also creates an imaginative space by transforming a two-dimensional canvas or a piece of paper, and I'm showing you just as an example The School of Athens, into the illusion of being a three-dimensional space through the invention of perspective. Here you can see the vanishing points that refer actually, that go back to Plato and Aristotle in the middle. This is through the vanishing point producing actually an illusion of a three-dimensional space.

Erwin Panofsky has considered the perspective not only as [00:30:00] a medium which enables the construction of an imaginative three-dimensional space but as a cultural phenomenon of wider significance. Perspective can either demonstrate how space was considered, namely from the perception of one eye, which is yours looking there, and this would be based on the assumption of Euclidean geometry.

It further signals a point in history which divided the body from space. Perspective is only possible if the body, and with it, the eye, are outside the imagined space of a picture in which the perspective takes place, a topic which I will outline further down.

A spatial approach would reside in [writing 00:30:44] a different kind of artistry. Similar to the essays in space in this book of 2007, a book which [develops 00:30:52] spatial methodologies for a number of disciplines, but not for artistry, but not in the way as I do, one can consider modern art as challenging the conceptions of a container space or closed space.

As prevalent since around 1600, that's the invention of perspective, and getting disputed particular during the 20th century, art techniques such as montage, collage and assemblage draw attention to the fragmentation of a closed space understanding.

Artworks of the second half of the 20th century, such as the massive installation by Richard Serra or land art by Robert Smithson, are suggestions of an expansion of the closed space and attempts to break

away [via 00:31:41] net art, exploiting hyper space regarding hyperlinks or its equivalent, the hyper image. Apps and social networks, to name a few, mobilize a complete new way of realizing open space.

I'm showing you here an example of one of the first artists [00:32:00] who produced such net art, which is Tomoko Takahashi, and her work is visible on [ww.e2org](http://ww.e2org), which is one of the first associations that made available such net art on a longer basis.

Open and closed forms of space define the perspective, namely how humans situate themselves in view of objects. This is also the reason why theories related to the spatial turn have been developed particularly in sociology. It also indicates the difference to formalism, which is only concerned with space as a formal aspect, but not in a relation to any human being.

Thus, I'm interested primarily in two questions when I draft the spatial art history: Who acts, and how are these "actors," in inverted commas, represented in relation to the artworks?

What Gabo has only vaguely thought out, namely the proximity of art and life, is developed more clearly in spatial methods on the body and embodiment. The body, meaning here the artist, can be seen as the actor or the mediator regarding space. As actor, the artist creates the space by being an artist. As mediator, the object becomes the subject that creates the space.

This would mean that the artist is not an artist per se but only through creating art object is the person becoming an artist, so what you do is defining you rather than the other way around. Thus, in an open space approach, the focus moves from the person to the object as the subject and actor of constructing space.

Outlining the second question as to how body and space relate in artworks, let me begin by analyzing a painting [00:34:00] by one of the artists who were influenced by Naum Gabo, namely Ben Nicholson, in order to explain how the body and embodiment can be explored in a spatial art history.

Ben Nicholson, an abstract English painter, was in close contact with Gabo. In fact, it was him who helped Gabo immigrate to Britain and it was also he who edited "Circle" in 1937. Being influenced, he re-interpreted his work *Au Chat Botté*, the one I'm showing you here, painted in Dieppe in France in 1932, as a representation of a shop on planes in 1941.

Despite having it painted in 1932, he actually changed its interpretation, and that's the one I'm going to cite. The name of the shop was Au Chat Botté. The words themselves had also an abstract quality, but what was important was that this name was printed in very lovely red lettering on the glass window, giving one plane ...

I should probably show you this. Here, Au Chat Botté on the glass window, giving one plane, and in this window were reflections of what was behind me as I looked in, giving a second space, and that's what there is, while through the window objects on a table were performing a kind of ballet and forming the eye or life point of the painting, giving a third plane, and that's also there.

These three planes and all the subsidiary planes, they're interchangeable, so that you could not tell which was real and which was unreal, what was reflected and what was un-reflected, and this created, as I see now, some kind of space or an imaginative world in which one could live.

Nicholson's experience is fundamentally a spatial one, an [00:36:00] experience of [depths 00:36:01] through the layering and intersecting of different planes. It is very similar to the cubist ideal of space for whom all space is composed of infinite planes which intersect in all directions.

However, different from this, Nicholson experienced himself in between as part of the space by including the reflection behind him. To explain that, you have the shop window, you have, so to speak, what is in that shop window, but you also have the reflection what is in front.

However, different from this, Nicholson experienced himself in between as part of the space by including the reflection behind him. In this sense, his so-called space construction, that's what he wrote about in 1941, is different from cubism and from Gabo, for whom space is constructed by the artist but does not really let the artist be part of his construction of space apart from creating it.

Hence, Nicholson's work cleverly overcomes the split between represented space and body by including the viewer, spectator or person in front of the work. However, as the spectator or artist who stands in the painting is actually not made visible in the work, so you don't see Nicholson, the artist, he is neither painted as, for example, is the [couple 00:37:26] represented in the mirror ... sorry, that was the wrong ... is not made visible in the work.

He is neither painted as for example is the [couple 00:37:40] represented in the mirror and thus assumed, here, that one, and thus assumed here to stand in front of the painting in Velazquez' famous painting Las Meninas of 1656, nor in any way reflected as, for example, [00:38:00] post-modern works do with mirrors that play on self-reflexivity, making each spectator the artist, as in the work here by Anish Kapoor.

While these works represent the body within the space of the artwork, though in very different ways, Nicholson leaves the viewer or spectator imagined. Including the spectator in paintings or sculptures is simulating what can be experienced in architecture, but also by modern architectural design such as the [Merzbau 00:38:29] by Schwitters, described by Werner Hofmann in his contribution to "Space," it's a book called "Orte Der Kunst," "Space: Places of Art," as a [inaudible 00:38:42], namely as a walk-in structure of concave and convex forms which let the body be part of the artwork.

Regarding the spectator, you have to distinguish between the one imagined and painted and the one standing in front of the objects, like you looking at this. If created, in other words, if assuming in open space, the viewer would stand outside in the space. He or she would create that space. In this sense, the viewer/spectator is recognized in the same way as artists themselves, namely as creator or producer of spaces or space.

Applying the suggested spatial method to Blumann, we find a treatment of space in view of the spectator different from Nicholson, and this is also to try out my theory. Hepworth excludes the spectator. That's different from Ben Nicholson. That was the [Merzbau 00:39:38], as I mentioned before, and here, this is an image which you can see in the next room.

Applying the suggested spatial method to Blumann, we find a treatment of space in view of the spectator different from Nicholson. Hepworth excludes the spectator. In both her landscape painting and portraits, the spectator is outside the painting space.

Blumann [00:40:00] constructs layers of space in the painting by representing different planes, usually consisting either of a selection of the following or all, namely sky, mountains, water, or sea, lake, river and land, beach, riverside, such as in the portrait of Phyllis Krantz in which the [sitter 00:40:17] is set against the Swan River, the portrait being the artist's first representation of the Austrian landscape, according to Sally Quinn.

She does, however, play, that means Blumann, play with the scale of these planes in order to achieve a kind of perspective and to put emphasis

on the portrait, whether this is a figure or a tree in her landscape painting, which is the painting over there. When you turn your head, you can see the original.

She does play this, whether this is a figure or a tree in her landscape painting. Hence, her landscapes seem to be actually portraits of trees, [painterly 00:40:59] treating nature in the same way as a human being.

Regarding space, she constructs a space in which the spectator is outside the painted spaces, and thus creates with the artist a container space different from that by Nicholson. However, the dominance of the painted figure and trees, back over there, seems as if the figures would pop out of the painted space, seemingly blowing up the space in order to be experienced as immediate.

To summarize, by providing an analysis of selected artworks, I have attempted to describe a constructive framework of a proposed spatial art history based on an open conception of space. It would analyze space as a topic, if applicable, a reflection of the positioning of the figure regarding space in artworks and by interpreting the imagination of the spectator, use space to define a cultural history.

What this paper wants to demonstrate is that space is not [00:42:00] only a central topic today but has also been so in the 20th century in art and art history.

Moreover, combining contemporary theories of space with historical ones developed by artists such as Naum Gabo can lead to a different approach to art that one might be able to distinguish as a method different from other art historical methods, such as semiotics, feminism, [inaudible 00:42:23] and formalism, by focusing not only on the topic of space in art but also by revealing the conceptions of art behind the artwork, and as a third point, explore how spaces are constituted by embodiment.

As mentioned at the beginning, the concept of closed and open space has found a number of developments in other disciplines under differing names. Indeed, if one were to use such a method for art, as I have tried to show you, one would not only be able to claim this [inaudible 00:42:54] that space is a fundamental topic in modern art, but also that modernity introduced and challenged the concept of container space, the latter particularly in writings of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Modern art, conventionally beginning with impressionism, might then be described as the struggle for breaking down space as container and the

search for new conceptions of space such as the one described in this paper, and not only as contesting the representation or better reconstruction of reality or simply filling the canvas.

Defining modernity as the period of the struggle with a closed concept of space also corresponds with Hartmut Rosa's understanding of modernity as the time for which acceleration was characteristic, which I would also suggest is based on a container understanding of time, but he has this theory that modernity is the time of which acceleration was characteristic.

I can give you an easy example. [00:44:00] If Blumann took, I think, four to six weeks in the 1930s to come to Perth, it took me about 13 hours to fly. This is part what Hartmut Rosa has called a typical characteristic of modernity, this kind of acceleration, and he posed that in different areas.

Going beyond post-modernism's condition, which proclaims simultaneity, [inaudible 00:44:23] for example, and thus emphasizing rather temporal than spatial issues, one might describe the period after modernity, or post-modernism, as one in which space concepts, particularly open space concepts, have become the dominant feature that also allowed forming new relationships with approaches than one might consider are historical.

Discussions with specialists on the Medieval philosopher Meister Eckhart, who was born in Erfurt where I'm holding my fellowship at the moment, and there's a research center at the Max Weber Center, and discussing that with the Medieval philosopher Meister Eckhart, sorry, with the specialists for Meister Eckhart, have indicated to me that Eckhart's writing is underpinned by a [known 00:45:12] category of concepts of space.

In other words, during the Middle Ages, they have different concepts of space that is more a kind of open one that I suggest. This kind of discussion actually motivated us to organize an exhibition titled Performing Space that will show contemporary [video 00:45:32] art which interprets space and time in Meister Eckhart's contemporary art gallery called [inaudible 00:45:38] from January to March in 2016.

Assuming that modernity can be understood as [plural 00:45:45], historically not bound to a certain time period or to a specific geographical location, one would need to do further research as to how specific and characteristic such a container understanding of space as a [00:46:00] characteristic of modernity might be.



Thank you very much for being able to present this to you, and I would be pleased to get any kind of questions or to challenge what I have tried to show you, namely Space, Place and Migration in Modern Art.