

Monique Brunet-Weinmann, *Medium: Photocopy*. Montreal, Editions NBJ, 1987, 144 pp., 70 black-and-white illus., 16 colour plates, \$35.00 (cloth)

Virgil Hammock

Volume 17, Number 1, 1990

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1073160ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073160ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (print)

1918-4778 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Hammock, V. (1990). Review of [Monique Brunet-Weinmann, *Medium: Photocopy*. Montreal, Editions NBJ, 1987, 144 pp., 70 black-and-white illus., 16 colour plates, \$35.00 (cloth)]. *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, 17(1), 78–80. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073160ar>

is ascribed in the fabric accounts to the fall of a clerestory window; yet it is difficult to see why the failure of a window arch, as Murray puts it (p. 35), would bring down the entire upper elevation. Even so, might not the collapse of a window arch be the result of a larger failure elsewhere in the upper structure? Murray does not speculate about the mechanism of the failure.

With regard to one other aspect of the design, I again wished for a fuller discussion. In his consideration of the façade design, Murray does not present any comparisons with other Late Gothic façades, or with earlier examples of the same general type. He correctly, and justifiably, praises the ingenuity of Martin Chambiges's three-bay design—narrower than the five aisles behind it, but deeper than any nave bay—as solving the dilemma resulting from having buttressed the west end of the new nave against the old pre-Gothic west tower, without specifically noting that the “Parisian” master did not resort to the solution of Notre Dame for a five-aisled nave: massive towers, two aisle bays wide and two aisle bays deep. In his reconstruction of the earlier design of the Reims master, Bleuet, Murray suggests the transept façades of St. Denis as a prototype, or precedent, for the tower placed in the line of the external aisles. But surely the façade of Bourges Cathedral is a more relevant structure, since the transept of St. Denis, which one should think of as having four towers, is a unique case.

The above scarcely constitute major issues or criticisms, and neither do the following reservations about certain instances of description, perception, or choice of words. I found the use of “visions” to describe the seven major campaigns of questionable wisdom and utility. In this context, it is too suggestive of mysticism for what was an essentially rational process that had to be planned out and laboriously executed. I think “idea” or “concept” (of the building or of the contemporary style) would have been preferable. Then too, on several occasions, Murray comments on the element of wit or amusement in the design or on the part of the designer. Here I felt it would have been of benefit for him to have spelled out his assessment for the benefit of the reader (I, for one, while not, I hope, lacking a sense of humour, did not grasp the wit of particular design details). As for the work of Anthoine Colas (fig. 85), I do not quite see this particular instance as fairly characterized as a “*mess* of interpenetrating mouldings” (p. 73). Again, in terms of visual perception, I would not characterize mid-thirteenth-century or Rayonnant façades as flat or two-dimensional (pp. 96, 102). The façades of Amiens or Reims, however stylistically categorized, hardly strike me as flat. That of Notre Dame may well be (and rather exceptionally at that), but would one call it a Rayonnant design?

Structurally, the book is difficult to use. The notes are grouped at the rear of the book, and the plates towards the middle of the text section. With fingers in two places, the problem is compounded by the references to the texts of the fabric accounts in Appendix B, placed between text and notes. Furthermore, the photographs do not have even an approximate relationship to the order to which they are referred in the text. Their organization—exterior before interior, general views before details, west to east, north to south—while logical on its own terms, actually contradicts the constructional history of the building, and in following the text

causes the reader to skip around a great deal. Furthermore, I must admit I found the numbering of the bays from west to east instead of east to west, following the sequence of construction, continually annoying. Admittedly, by entering at the west, visits to most buildings are conducted backwards, historically speaking: at Troyes, with its remarkably extended building history, the trip from the west entrance to east end is longer than most.

Murray's transcription and translation of the fabric accounts, his photographic documentation, and his execution of the considerable number of detail drawings for this book as a whole demonstrates the wide range of his enviable capabilities and qualifications. He is to be congratulated for bringing his Herculean labours over Troyes to a successful, fruitful, useful, and handsome conclusion.

J. PHILIP MCALEER

Technical University of Nova Scotia

MONIQUE BRUNET-WEINMANN *Medium: Photocopy*. Montreal, Editions NBJ, 1987, 144 pp., 70 black-and-white illus., 16 colour plates, \$35.00 (cloth).

Medium: Photocopy is essentially a set of bilingual texts in French and German with an English translation that was meant to accompany an exhibition of photocopy art at Montreal's Saidye Bronfman Centre in the fall of 1987. The exhibition was unique for two reasons: (1) exhibitions of photocopy art are still a rarity, and (2) this was the first exhibition to feature German art at the Bronfman Centre.

What is photocopy art? In the context of this book and the resulting exhibition, photocopy art refers to art produced by photomechanical means. The best known of these processes is Xerox or Xerography, but this is a trademark of a particular process and the term is jealously guarded by its creators. There are, of course, other processes by other manufacturers, but the idea and the results are much the same. Author Brunet-Weinmann valiantly attempts to find a term that covers all of the bases and comes up with *copygraphy*, which, she says in the English translation of her original French text, “has the advantage of sounding right phonetically” (p. 33). This may well be the case with the resulting French term, but I find the English translation awkward. She admits, however, that even this term has its problems as there is the danger of confusing the term *copy*, in the definition of the process, with a lack of originality in the art of the artists who use a copy machine, or process, in their work.

The idea of artists using a mechanical process in making art is not new, a point not missed by Brunet-Weinmann, but new technologies open new vistas to those creative people who have the talent and vision to use them. Contrary to popular belief, artists tend to be quite conservative when it comes to using new materials or processes in their work. The reason for using older processes in printmaking was, and is, that they offer the capability to reproduce a multiple image. This is not always, or even principally, the goal of the copy artist,

who often seeks a unique object. Certainly the point of this exhibition (as emphasized by its curator, the German Canadian artist Georg Muhleck, in the foreword to Brunet-Weinmann's text) is "to show a type of Copy Art which can meet all possible requirements of originality and authenticity. Regardless of the contents, creation and stylistic considerations, the present works have one thing in common: they are unique" (p. 11). If I assume Muhleck's quotation to be true, then it is very interesting that Brunet-Weinmann, early in her text, invokes Walter Benjamin's classic article "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." The title of Benjamin's article might be apt in regard to the general subject of copy art (since photocopies are mechanical reproductions), but certainly he had a very different idea about the use of mechanical reproduction from those of the artists in this exhibition. Benjamin was a leading Marxist critic who, in this article, was mainly comparing cinema to painting. His concern was with how a group, or mass audience, views a film and how a similar group (and certainly the proletariat) is much more limited in its viewing of a painting. It was with cinema (the 1935 article predated television) that Benjamin saw the promise of a truly progressive art. Even though the artists in *Medium: Photocopy* use a new technology, he would have viewed this exhibition of unique objects, presented in the conventional framework of an art gallery, as at best counter-revolutionary and possibly even reactionary. I see this exhibition more in terms of its use of technology in the making of conventional "Capitalist" art and I do not have a problem with that concept.

The work of some two dozen Canadian and German artists is highlighted in this book. Copy art's history in the hierarchy of the visual art media is a short one. Canadian artists have a head start over their European colleagues in this new medium. This may be because the modern photocopy machine is a North American invention or because our artists were able to gain access to the equipment more easily and sooner. Even so, Brunet-Weinmann points out that the first modern copy artwork was shown in Canada only in 1972, approximately 10 years after copy art was first shown in the United States. *Medium: Photocopy* states that the two principal centres for this new art in Canada are Montréal and Toronto, which makes sense as they are our largest cities and the major centres for French and English artists in the country. Although this medium is not limited to artists in the two centres, they make up the lion's share of the Canadian artists represented in the book. Only two of the Canadian artists listed in the biographies at the end of the book are from neither city. The author is aware of this problem, but the resultant central Canadian focus to the Canadian section of the exhibition is nonetheless unfortunate.

Nearly half of the 11 German artists featured in this book are from Stuttgart. This is not surprising as curator Georg Muhleck works there as well as in Montréal. The German artists' work is, in general, more political than that of their Canadian counterparts, which I think results in a more interesting art. This may be due to the nature of the photocopy medium, which lends itself to the reproduction of certain kinds of visual materials such as advertisements and photographs from popular magazines. Another reason is that the German

artists using this medium are more political than North American artists, who are only now coming out of a long period of formalist modernism with its art-for-art's-sake anti-political bias. In particular, I am drawn to the strong imagery of Boris Nieslony and the pseudonymous Abrecht/d, both of whom show a strong sense of irony in their work.

The use of the photocopy machine raises many aesthetic questions, some of which are addressed in the book and some not. Some are the same sorts of problems that are endemic to more conventional modes of printmaking such as *intaglio*, lithography, and silkscreen. When is a print an original and when is it not? How can you limit the number in an edition of a print? One answer is to adopt a code of ethics as some groups of printmakers and dealers have done, but even this is problematic as it only serves to keep up a market value price and does not answer more fundamental questions about the nature of mechanically reproduced art.

Although *Medium: Photocopy* addresses the issue of comparing copy art to more traditional printmaking, it does not raise in enough detail other questions about the nature of art. The book takes for granted the idea that unique objects—and I would include limited-edition prints in this category—are somehow superior to mass-produced items. Thus the works in this exhibition, because they are unique pieces, are *real* art just like painting and sculpture. This totally misses the point of what copy art might be. Why should art items be limited or unique? What if there were thousands or even millions of copies (if "copies" is the correct term) of a copy art work? What about recorded music? What would have happened if there was only one "copy" of a Rolling Stones album, or perhaps a dozen or so owned by a few individuals? If we were lucky, an owner would donate the record to an institution, if such a place existed, and we could listen to it. Would popular music have had the same impact on our culture had it been handled like this? Unfortunately the stuff of current mass culture may not be as uplifting as "fine" artists wish it to be, but it is the nature of the product of the fine artist that is the problem and perhaps a medium like copy art could be an answer.

Ultimately, *Medium: Photocopy* is an important addition to the literature on this new medium. Monique Brunet-Weinmann is a sensitive spokesperson about its many possibilities; however, she is poorly served by the less than adequate English translation that reduces a basically good text to an awkward one. The layout, which utilizes a parallel trilingual format, is very confusing. I would have preferred a separate section for the text of each of the three languages, but this format is probably the inheritance from legions of parallel bilingual texts that have been the bane of Canadian art publications for years.

Marshall McLuhan's famous conclusion of the 1960s was that the medium was the message; unfortunately he was probably correct, but until the medium is regarded only as a means to an end, and not the end itself, contemporary visual "fine" art will continue to be generally irrelevant to much of contemporary society. Copy art opens new possibilities for artists willing to take chances with the very nature of art and maybe fundamentally changes the way in which art functions in our society. If this book and exhibition can start some of this happen-

ing, then indeed we will have the beginnings of an art revolution.

VIRGIL HAMMOCK
Department of Art
Mount Allison University

RICHARD KUHN'S *Psychoanalytic Theory of Art: A Philosophy of Art on Developmental Principles*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1983.

For someone interested primarily in a theoretical work on the visual arts (painting, sculpture, and architecture) the title of Kuhn's book may at first seem deceptive. When concrete examples are cited to support philosophical abstractions, subjects from literature, rather than painting or sculpture, are generally chosen. The philosopher, Richard Kuhns, sees art history as accessible and open to his largely Freudian psychoanalytic theory of art. Kuhns writes in his final chapter ("Theory and Art History"): "Art history, I maintain, has an important contribution to make to the theory of psychic life." Kuhns feels that psychoanalytic theory and art history are complementary and support or "reinforce" one another. In general, of course, art historians do not feel this way at all, and psychoanalysts, while seldom exhibiting the same negative reaction, and sometimes acknowledging the importance of art therapy, rarely exhibit any great interest in art history. Therefore, on the whole, the link between psychoanalysis and the humanities has been left to philosophers to establish. Traditional aesthetic questions never seemed very compelling, but the questions philosophers are now asking might eventually challenge some firmly-established ideas about the meaning of style and the limitations of some of the conclusions associated with iconography and iconology.

The developmental approach, which includes the use of historical sequence, is an important issue in Kuhns' work. The term "developmental" is not restricted to the growth and maturation of the individual but is also used for the history of art objects. This may at first sound like *Principles of Art History*, but Wöflin it is not. The importance Kuhns gives history in his study of the development of art is particularly relevant to his theory of "enactments." The medium, the material quality of the work of art ("cultural objects"), is seen as essential to the development of a psychoanalytic theory of art.

Just as there are stages in the history of works of art, there are stages in the life of the artist. Kuhns sees the task of the philosopher of art as one which concerns the "theoretical justification of such affinities." For him, works of art, like theatre and literature, offer substitute gratification for the artist and a related sense of fulfilment for the participant or audience, and all can be reduced to forms of interpersonal acts with developmental histories. These lasting cultural symbols, which have recognized value and exert a meaningful and affective force in society, have been termed "enactments."

Kuhns' developmental theory is essentially based on the work of Freud and Freudian ego psychology. In

general, Kuhns is more interested in Freud's psychoanalytic theory of culture (*Totem and Taboo* and *Moses and Monotheism*) rather than the studies more directly associated with art (*Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood* and *The Moses of Michelangelo*). In *Totem and Taboo* and *Moses and Monotheism*, Kuhns finds methods of interpretation similar to analytic methods used in philosophy.

Kuhns reminds us that there are changes in art which have no more significance than annual variations in fashion, while there are other less frequent changes in style and content that can be associated with "revolutionary theory" marking profound reorientations in society. For example, the transformations that took place in nineteenth-century art, especially in the romantic period, are hardly superficial or the kind of "surface change" which Kuhns associates with the never ending parade of styles and theories. Whether or not Freud can be related to the pantheon of "revolutionary theorists" (Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Kant, and Hegel) is perhaps a philosophical problem rather than an art historical one. Philosophers have a different perspective and a different sense of proportion than art historians. In art history we sometimes lose sight of the fact that there were great and revolutionary thinkers who exerted a considerable influence on their epoch. We sometimes mistake a subtle change in style and subject matter for a radical change in thought.

The work carried out by Freud at the beginning of this century still offers a structure for further changes in the way art is assessed and understood. On the whole, however, the tradition of psychoanalytic interpretation has had a tendency to become doctrinaire and repetitive. Therefore, one of the most ambitious aspects of Kuhns' study is his desire "to enlarge the philosophical themes—sometimes latent—in Freud's own thought, and to search out contributions, by both philosophers and psychoanalysts, that will help psychoanalytic theory realize all of which it is capable." More attention must be given to the interaction of manifest and latent thought in the creation and understanding of the work of art. The way that visual messages are formulated, transmitted, received, and understood, as well as the ongoing need to preserve and reinterpret them, is a fascinating and complex process that challenges the interpretive skills of the art historian.

While we are quite aware of the fact that works of art are responded to differently at different periods in history, we generally attribute this phenomenon to changes in taste rather than to multidimensional interactions between persons and works of art. In fact, at times, rather than consider the complexity of these interrelationships, art historians have often seen individuals and works of art as having separate histories. Kuhns observes that Freud "concentrated on the history of the individual" and that the "art historian concentrates on the history of the object," and moreover Kuhns idealistically believes that a balanced study involving the two approaches is possible. If this marvelous amalgamation were possible, "individual and object" would be seen together under a "clarified and expanded psychoanalytic model of explanation."

Even though both psychoanalysis and art history therefore address the process of maturation, growth, and development, the former has been primarily con-