

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 08.04.24

Om leksikonet: https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf

Ut pictura poesis

Også skrevet “ut pictura poesis”. Latin for “som i bildekunsten, likeens i ordkunsten” eller “slik som i bildekunsten er det også i diktningen”. Denne sentensen stammer fra et langt læredikt av den romerske dikteren Horats, *Ars Poetica* fra ca. år 17 f.Kr. Her er noen linjer fra diktet (oversatt fra Pochats tyske oversettelse; 1986 s. 78):

“Med diktet er det som med bildet: det ene griper oss mer på nært hold, der andre mer på avstand; det ene kommer mest til sin rett i halvmørke, det andre krever mer lys og trenger ikke å sky bedømmerens skarpe blikk.”

Begrepet gjelder likheter eller paralleller mellom to kunstarter. Opp gjennom kunst- og litteraturhistorien har begrepet blitt definert og brukt på måter som det er vanskelig å si at er direkte utledet av Horats sammenligning.

Bilder og litterære tekster krever ulik tilnærming fra kunstnere og forfattere. I ettertid ble sentensen “ut pictura poesis” forstått slik at kunstnere har et felles grunnlag på tvers av kunstartene. I kunsthistorien ble sentensen gjennom historien brukt om svært forskjellig tematikk knyttet til forholdet mellom diktning og bildekunst.

“Renaissance artists and critics recognized the importance of the relationship between poetry and painting and were able to use this relationship to elevate painting to the honor of a liberal art. They used the antique treatises on poetry of Aristotle’s *Poetics* and Horace’s *Ars Poetica* as a basis for their ideologies. From this comparison evolved the art theory *ut pictura poesis*: as is painting so is poetry. Although the theory’s application began in the Renaissance, the relationship between poetry and painting remains prevalent into at least the twentieth century, mainly in the shared inspiration, scholarship, and subject matter of the two arts.” (Shannon O’Donoghue i https://www.urj.ucf.edu/docs/URJmanuscript_O’Donoghue_080509.pdf; lesedato 16.09.16)

“The Latin phrase *Ut pictura poesis* is an analogy that Horace introduced in his *Ars Poetica* to tentatively compare the art of painting with that of poetry. Translated literally, “as is painting, so is poetry,” the ensuing centuries have yielded many varied theories focused around this argument [...] In context, Horace employs the idiom to afford to literature the same broad analysis that painting requires in order to provide viewers aesthetic pleasure. Just as paintings can be enjoyed with a close viewing while others necessitate greater distance, so too should one approach a poem with a close reading or with a broader eye to the piece as a whole. [...] Leonardo da Vinci recognized the imitation of nature in both arts but, not surprisingly, affirmed painting as the more noble art. [...] The supremacy of painting that da Vinci claimed was a crucial discussion in Italy, and one that gained substantial followers. In 16th Century Italy the dialogue concerning painting and poetry was divided into two distinct camps. Florentines employed the relationship to contrast painting to poetry while the Venetian debate centered on the unity of the two arts. Concentrating on what painters might learn from poets and vice versa, both camps agreed that the imitation of nature was a key issue addressed by both arts.” (Judith Harvey i <http://humstatic.uchicago.edu/faculty/wjtm/glossary2004/utpicturapoesis.htm>; lesedato 03.10.16)

“Throughout history, discussions of the interrelations between media types have shifted between the tradition of pointing out the benefits of the merging of artforms and the tradition, which warns about such merging. Different terms have been used in different periods, beginning with the Roman writer Horace’s (65-8 BC) idea of *ut pictura poesis* (the literal meaning is ‘as in painting, so in poetry’), which means that what can be accomplished and admired in painting can be accomplished and admired in literature, too. This was refuted, centuries later, in German Enlightenment writer G. E. Lessing’s (1729-81) essay called ‘Laocoon: On the limits of painting and poetry’. Lessing’s interrogation inspired some problematic but often repeated dogmas of aesthetic theory concerning the relations between the arts. Lessing’s essay offers an interesting discussion of fundamental intermedial insights, namely that the same event has to be represented differently in different media. However, one does not necessarily have to come to the same normative conclusion, namely that literature should deal with and represent time and narrative subjects, whereas painting should stick to spatial, or non-temporal, presentation, for instance, of the landscape. Lessing’s treatise has inspired numerous positions that have circled around the idea of medium specificity” (Jørgen Bruhn og Beate Schirmmacher i <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/oavedit/10.4324/9781003174288-1/intermedial-studies-j%C3%B8rgen-bruhn-beate-schirmmacher>; lesedato 20.03.24).

“Charles-Alphonse du Fresnoy’s poem, *De arte graphica* (1668), proved seminal in expanding the discussion of *Ut pictura poesis* beyond Italy. His opening passage, “*Ut pictura poesis erit; similisque poesi/sit pictura...*” inspired both arguments and commentary as well as new avenues of exploration. English poet John Dryden translated the poem into English in 1695, with an introductory essay “A parallel

betwixt painting and poetry.” A wider audience for discussion of the Horatian ideology also meant more criticism of the concept. Abbe Jean-Baptiste Dubos, making a distinction between the natural act of seeing and the arbitrary signs necessary for reading, argued for the primacy of painting. [...] Much more critical than those who simply argued for the supremacy of one art over another, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s *Laocoön*, originally published in 1766 and aptly subtitled “An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry,” attacked the very theoretical core of *Ut pictura poesis*. Lessing considers poetry and art of time and painting an art of space; poetry addresses the ear and is played out successively in time while painting speaks to the eye and everything is laid out in one space. To transgress the border between time and space too frequently is dangerous, Lessing asserts, and leads to confusion of media. Instead painting and poetry should be “as two equitable and friendly neighbors,” trying to avoid each other, knowing that small transgressions are unavoidable, and at the boundaries making small concessions if absolutely necessary. [...] The dialectic between painting and poetry evidenced in *Ut pictura poesis* reveals what I see as an inability for humans to create using only one sense. The question of which sense is more ‘natural’ and less arbitrary is an endless one, yielding often predictable results. A more pressing and provocative problem is that of the vibrations between poetry and painting, indeed between our senses themselves.” (Judith Harvey i <http://humstatic.uchicago.edu/faculty/wjtm/glossary2004/utpicturapoesis.htm>; lesedato 03.10.16)

Den engelske 1600-tallsdikteren og kritikeren John Dryden skrev i “sin introduktion till översättningen av du Fresnoys *De arte graphica*. Den poetiska diktionen – med det avser han vers, metaforer och liknelser – sägs svara mot färgen på en tavla, medan intrig och fabel korresponderar med tavlans uppbyggnad. Diktion liksom färg är sålunda något som lagts på i ett sent skede som ornament. [...] föreställningen har också ett tydligt terminologiskt samband med den latinska retoriktraditionen, i vilken ordet “colores”, färger, metaforiskt brukats för att beteckna retoriska figurer och stilprydnader. Det tragiska dramat kommer enligt Dryden nära det heroiska måleriet, och han har själv omsatt tesen i handling i sin version av Antonius och Cleopatra-motivet. Detta drama, *All for Love*, från 1677 har karakteriserats som “ett galleri av heroiska poser.” (Jonsson 1983 s. 103-104)

En gruppe greske skulptører lagde i ca. år 100 f.Kr. den såkalte Laokoon-gruppen i marmor, som viser en trojansk prest og hans to sønner som blir drept av slanger eller sjøormer. Laokoon og hans unge sønner vrir seg i smerte og fortvilelse mens de blir drept. I 1766 publiserte tyskeren Gotthold Ephraim Lessing verket *Laokoon eller om maleriets og poesiens grenser*. Lessing tviler på verdien av Horats’ sammenligning eller sammenstilling av bilde- og ordkunst, for det er ifølge Lessing en vesensforskjell mellom figurativ kunst og språkets abstrakte tegn. Når kunstnere arbeider med ulike medier (dvs. forskjellige tegnsystemer), fører det nødvendigvis til ulike framstillingsprinsipper. I diktetekunsten følger ordene lineært på en tidsakse etter hverandre, mens bildekunstneren plasserer former og farger romlig ved siden av hverandre.

“In the *Fall of Troy*, or the so called Posthomerica from the 4th century by Quintus Smyrnaeus, Laocoon is described in ghastly terms as trembling with horror: “round his head horror of darkness poured; a sharp pang thrilled his eyelids; swam his eyes beneath his brows; his eyeballs, stabbed with bitter anguish, throbbed even from the roots, and rolled in frenzy of pain. Clear through his brain the bitter torment pierced even to the filmy inner veil thereof; now bloodshot were his eyes, now ghastly green; anon with rheum they ran, as pours a stream down from a rugged crag, with thawing snow made turbid.” The physiological details of this text give witness to what is at stake here: a description of ultimate pain. This is what is being transmitted in the tradition of Laocoon-interpretations, whether in visual arts or literature. Virgil is also very graphic as he depicts the death of Laocoon in book II of *The Aenid*: the snakes tower, they are large and terrifying, and they always do things doubly, strangle two boys, roll around the waist and around the throat. The father gasps, Virgil says, then he roars. This is a both horrifying and enigmatic: how can he roar after gasping? And why does he roar, over pain, over the sons?” (Cecilia Sjöholm i <http://www.ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/nja/article/14180>; lesedato 12.08.16)

“In 1506 the sculpture group Laocoon was found under the palace of Titan. It was made by sculptures from Rhodes and placed in the Belvedere court in what is now the museum of the Vatican in the 16th century. Michelangelo was involved in the discovery. The garden of sculptures at the Belvedere court was created during the 16th century and is an early example of how art was consciously, architecturally displayed. The garden was created not just for the display of art. It was also created as an academic arena, gathering musicians, poets and artists alike, where poetry was declared and music composed and the works themselves made the object of imitation. Poetry was composed to the sculptures, just like the sculptures were imitated by training artists. As Peter Gillgren has put it, the sculptures were regarded as performative forces that produced a cooperation between the arts in different medias such as drawings, paintings, poetry and music.” (Cecilia Sjöholm i <http://www.ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/nja/article/14180>; lesedato 12.08.16) I renessansen var tendensen at ut pictura poesis ble oppfattet som at lyrikken burde ha maleriske kvaliteter (<http://wortwuchs.net/ut-pictura-poesis/>; lesedato 19.09.16).

“U.p.p. offered a formula – the success of which “one can hardly deny,” René Wellek remarked – for analyzing the relationship of poetry and painting (and other arts). However successful, the Horatian formula proved useful – at least was used – on many occasions as a precept to guide artistic endeavor, as an incitement to aesthetic argument, and as a basic element in several theories of poetry and the arts. Alone and with many accretions, modifications, and transformations, u.p.p. inspired a number of meaningful comments about the arts and poetry and even contributed to the (actual) work and theory of several painters, most notably, “learned Poussin.” Moreover, like other commonplaces of criticism, the Horatian formula stimulated and attracted to itself a variety of views of poetry and painting

that are hard to relate to the original statement.” (<http://www.writing.upenn.edu/~afilreis/88/utpict.html>; lesedato 08.10.15)

“Treatises on art and literature written between the middle of the sixteenth and middle of the eighteenth century nearly always remark on the close relationship between painting and poetry. The sister arts as they were generally called – and Lomazzo observes that they arrived at a single birth – differed, it was acknowledged, in means and manner of expression, but were considered almost identical in fundamental nature, in content, and in purpose. The saying attributed by Plutarch to Simonides that painting is mute poetry, poetry a speaking picture, was quoted frequently and with enthusiasm; and Horace’s famous simile *ut pictura poesis* – as is painting so is poetry – which the writers on art expected one to read “as is poetry so is painting,” was invoked more and more as final sanction for a much closer relationship between the sister arts than Horace himself would probably have approved. So deeply rooted, in fact, was the association of painting with poetry that it is not unusual to find the critics referring in a way that startles the modern reader to poets as painters; and if they do not with equal bluntness call painters poets, at least they are almost unanimous in asserting that painting merits serious consideration as a liberal art only by virtue of its likeness to poetry.” (Rensselaer W. Lee i <http://www.collegeart.org/pdf/>; lesedato 29.04.16)

“Few expressions of aesthetic criticism have led to more comment over a period of several centuries than u.p.p., “as is painting so is poetry” (Horace, *Ars Poetica*). [...] The notion that poetry and painting are alike had had some currency even before Horace, who probably knew – even if he may not have assumed that his audience would recall – the more explicit earlier statement of Simonides of Keos (first recorded by Plutarch, *De gloria Atheniensium*, 3.347a, more than a century after *Ars Poetica*): “Poema pictura loquens, pictura poema silens” (poetry is a speaking picture, painting a silent [mute] poetry). The views of Aristotle – especially that poetry and painting as arts of imitation should use the same principal element of composition (structure), namely, plot in tragedy and design (outline) in painting (see his *Poetics*, 6.19-21) furnished additional authority for Renaissance and later attempts to measure the degree and the nature of the kinship of the arts (the “parallel” of the arts) and to determine the order of precedence among them (the “paragone” of the arts). [...] The Horatian simile, however interpreted, asserted the likeness, if not the identity, of painting and poetry; and from so small a kernel came an extensive body of aesthetic speculation and, in particular, an impressive theory of art which prevailed in the 16th, 17th, and most of the 18th centuries. While a few poets assented to the proposition that painting surpasses poetry in imitating human nature in action as well as in showing a Neoplatonic Ideal Beauty above nature, more of them raided the province of painting for the greater glory of poetry and announced that the preeminent painters are the poets.” (<http://www.writing.upenn.edu/~afilreis/88/utpict.html>; lesedato 16.06.14)

I *Laokoon* prøver Lessing å definere poesien sin rolle og bildets rolle i relasjon til hverandre. Mens et bilde og en skulptur må ta hensyn til rommets dimensjoner, og derfor må velge ut de mest ekspressive øyeblikk av en hendelse, har poesien som oppgave å beskrive hendelsen organisk i temporal sekvens. Poesiens kjerne er ikke beskrivelse, men å representere et dynamisk forløp. Lessing er dessuten svært oppmerksom på konvensjoner som er historisk forankret. Det ble krevd av enhver gresk billedkunstner at han skulle framstille noe skjønt i sin kunst. Når det gjaldt litteraturen, var situasjonen annerledes. Homers krigere kunne skrike ville og høyst uskjønne bebreidelser til hverandre. Slik pasjon ble oppfattet som berettiget i litteraturen og i teatret, men "heslig" i bildekunsten. Ulike kunstarter er altså underlagt ulike premisser både ved sitt arbeidsmateriale og ved sin historie.

Lessing forholder seg til tre tekstkorpus som eksempler på diktekunst som tangerer Laokoon-gruppen: Homer, de greske tragediene (av Aiskylos, Sofokles og Evripides) og den romerske dikteren Vergils epos *Aeneiden*. Dessuten omtaler han andre kunstteoretikere. Den tyske kunsthistorikeren Winckelmann oppfattet Laokoon-skulpturen som estetisk harmoniserende og dermed som uttrykk for grekernes indre moralske storhet og selvbeherskelse, også overfor sterk lidelse (Pochat 1986 s. 403). Lessing satte spørsmålsteget ved Winckelmanns tolkning av det edle ved Laokoon-gruppen. Skulpturen viser tvert imot både sjelelig og kroppslig smerte, men Lessing ser likevel en viss skjønnhet i denne lidelsen, en skjønnhet han mener på langt nær finnes i samme grad i f.eks. de greske tragediene. Betrakterne av Laokoon-gruppen blir seg dermed ifølge Lessing bevisste at figurativ kunst lyder andre lover enn dramaet, der forfatteren kan la følelser og smerte få fullstendig overtaket. Bilder og skulpturer krever derimot avklaring, distanse, harmonisering, estetisering (Lessing gjengitt fra Pochat 1986 s. 409-410).

"The school of descriptive poetry that arose in the first half of the eighteenth century as a result of the growing interest in external nature and found in Thomson's *Seasons* its finest and most influential example, showed a new capacity on the part of the poets for writing with their eyes on the object, rather than on literary models, although even the best of them are never free from the influences of poetical diction. This school was quick to enlist under the banner of *ut pictura poesis* in order to justify its own kind of poetical pictures: descriptions, often exhaustive, of landscape, rustic life, still-life including farm equipment, etc.; and it was against this school, strongly represented in Germany by Brockes, Haller, and Kleist, that Lessing revolted both as a humanist and as an aesthete, believing as he did that the medium of poetry is fundamentally adapted to the rendering of human action, not to description; for words that follow one another in time can only produce, in the successive addition of details in a description, a blurred and confused image, whereas the painter can render these details as they coexist in space and produce a clear image that can be apprehended in a single moment of time (*Laokoön*, xvi-xx)." (Rensselaer W. Lee i <http://www.collegeart.org/pdf/lesedato> 29.04.16)

“Classical antiquity gave us the notion of the arts as sisters, and Renaissance Italy the drama of their sibling rivalry. In the “republic of taste” of eighteenth-century Britain, poetry, painting, and sculpture were companionable sisters, so long as the family of genres reflected the social order: pastoral verse and flower painting were classified as feminine pastimes suitable for lady amateurs; and epic poetry and history painting as masculine genres for gentlemen with a classical education or professional training. While sculpture provided ideal forms for both painting and poetry, its practice was also considered the most masculine of occupations, requiring the skills of a workman and the study of human anatomy. Like their Romantic predecessors, Victorian women poets capitalized on the signs of cultivation and distinction reflected in the poetics of *ut pictura poesis* (“as a painting, so a poem”) and used it to distinguish feminine amateurism from masculine artistry. [...] poets actively engaged with the concept of a rivalry among the arts. Robert Browning, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and a host of other male poets responded in kind. [...] Feminist critics have drawn attention to the way in which nineteenth-century “poetesses” transformed *ut pictura poesis* into *ut sculptura poeta* (“as a sculpture, so a poet”). The visual and poetic representations of Sappho and Staël’s *Corinne* in the early nineteenth century offered “both the lyric voice and the sacrificial body of the paradigmatic poetess for consumption as an aestheticized object.” ” (Michele Martinez i <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/52397/summary>; lesedato 28.09.16)

Den tyske forfatteren Ludwig Tiecks kunstnerroman *Franz Sternbalds vandringer* (1798) “prisade allegorin som ett medel för målaren att tävla med diktaren.” (Jonsson 1983 s. 138)

“[F]rom late in the 19th century the kinship of poetry and painting appeared in a more favorable light in connection with the arts of the East – in generalizations about the “poetic feeling” of Oriental painting and the pictorial characteristics of Chinese and Japanese poetry and, with the ever-increasing knowledge of Eastern art, in historical and critical studies setting forth the close relationships between Oriental poetry and painting. In China poets were often painters; and critics, particularly in the 11th and 12th centuries, stated the parallelism of poetry and painting in language close to that of Simonides and Horace. According to Chou Sun, “Painting and writing are one and the same art.” Writing implied calligraphy, which linked painting with poetry. Thus, a poet might “paint poetry,” and a painter wrote “soundless poems.” These Eastern views led a number of poets in Europe and America to follow Japanese rules for poems and Chinese canons of painting and even to write-paint “Oriental” poems – “images” directly presented to the eye, “free” impressions in a few strokes of syllables and lines, evocations of mood, lyrical epigrams, and representations rather than reproductions of nature. Yet the poems reflecting the Eastern tendency to regard poetry and painting as “two sides of the same thing” were experimental and specialized works that included only a few of the resources of the two arts. Moreover, the critical analysis of “the same thing,” with its “two sides” of painting and poetry, remains at least as difficult as

the explanation of the Horatian observation, “as is painting so is poetry.” ” (<http://www.writing.upenn.edu/~afilreis/88/utpict.html>; lesedato 16.06.14)

“Mario Praz is quite justified in calling *ut pictura poesis* “the golden rule . . . of nineteenth-century narrative literature” (*The Hero*, p. 29). [...] Not even the most ardent Victorian advocates of empirical observation, however, recommended limitless description in art. Lessing’s attack upon the excessively pictorial verse of the mid-eighteenth century made a mark in nineteenth-century England, where his distinction between poetry and painting was well known. G. H. Lewes, for example, criticized poetry that is merely “*an animated catalogue of things*,” and Coleridge complained of “modern poems (34/35), where all is so dutchified . . . by the most minute touches, that the reader naturally asks why words, and not painting, are used?” P. G. Hamerton, a hard-line Lessingite, argued that “it is not possible to produce, with an elaborate word-picture, that single-stroke effect which makes the power of an elaborate colour-picture” (II, 251). Clearly *ut pictura poesis*, never a simple doctrine, had acquired more ramifications than ever by the time [den britiske forfatteren] George Eliot inherited it. Eliot’s own version of the theory unites empiricist psychology with the traditional rhetorical notion of *enargeia*: the power of verbal visual imagery to set objects, persons, or scenes before an audience” (Hugh Witemeyer i <http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/eliot/hw/4.1.html>; lesedato 11.08.15).

“Images and vision are central, in George Eliot’s thought, to both the creation of literature and its effect upon its audience. An important corollary of her emphasis upon vision is the high value she placed upon pictorial description. But her pictorialism was qualified by an awareness derived from Lessing of the limitations of such description and the importance of supplementing it with other modes of representation. [...] George Eliot similarly spoke of “the picture-writing of the mind, which it carries on concurrently with the more subtle symbolism of language” (*Essays*, p. 267). Imaging, because it is anchored in direct experience, helps the mind to avoid abstractions, the unreality of “verbal fallacies and meaningless phrases” to which the sign system of language is inherently susceptible (p. 190). [...] Certainly she did not read the *Laokoön* as a purist attack upon verbal painting per se. Rather she found in Lessing a useful reminder of the limitations of such painting, and a justification of her conviction that literature is, after all, superior to the visual arts as a mode of representing human experience. “Every reader of Lessing’s ‘Laokoön,’ ” she wrote in the 1856 *Westminster Review*, “remembers his masterly distinction between the methods of presentation in poetry and the plastic arts the acumen and aptness of illustration with which he shows how the difference in the material wherewith the poet and painter or sculptor respectively work, and the difference in their mode of appeal to the mind, properly involve a difference in their treatment of a given subject.” In particular, Eliot notes, the literary artist would be mistaken “if he adopted all the symbolism and detail of the painter and sculptor, since he has at his command the media of speech and action” (“*Belles Lettres*,” 566). Literary description must, in other words, give way

at some point to narrative and drama. The novelist must use “the media of speech and action” to represent the invisible and temporal aspects of human experience which painting, according to Lessing, cannot truly embody.” (Hugh Witemeyer i <http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/eliot/hw/4.1.html>; lesedato 11.08.15)

“Paragone: painting or sculpture? Which of the arts is best equipped to rival nature – painting or sculpture? Such a debate would probably be of little interest to a modern audience. While some of us might prefer one more than the other, most would accept that each has its inherent individual qualities. But during the Renaissance the debate regarding the merits of painting versus those of sculpture as to which could emulate the forms of nature most successfully, became a hotly contentious issue for many artists and early theorists. [...] For Leonardo, demonstrating the supremacy of painting over sculpture was of the greatest urgency. After all, painting was a universal truth capable of recreating the forms of nature perfectly. In a series of eloquent arguments, he extended the comparison between painting and sculpture into the realms of poetry and music to argue that painting was the most noble and superior of all the arts, in what was an unprecedented, all-encompassing approach to the subject. Leonardo’s defence of painting comprises the opening section of the *Trattato della pittura*, or “Treatise on painting”, which was compiled from his notes after his death. [...] The eye was “the window to the soul” and the “primary way in which the sensory receptacle of the brain may more fully and magnificently contemplate the infinite works of nature”. The ear came second, “gaining nobility through the recounting of things which the eye had seen”. Arts dependent on hearing such as poetry and music were therefore inferior to painting.” (Martin Kemp m.fl. i <http://www.universalleonardo.org/essays.php?id=575>; lesedato 10.11.16)

“During the Renaissance, poetry was perceived in quite a different way to the way in which it is perceived today. It dealt not only with imaginative and emotional expression, but expounded great philosophical ideals. In the mode of Virgil, Ovid and Homer, the poet was a narrator of great moral truths. The Florentine Chancellor Leonardo Bruni praised Dante’s poetry as the product of universal knowledge and evidence of his bookish learning in the realms of philosophy, theology, astrology, arithmetic and history. To formulate his argument for the supremacy of painting over poetry, Leonardo cleverly invokes the special relationship between time and visual harmony. Poetry is transmitted to the brain more slowly than “the eye transmits with the highest fidelity the true surfaces and shapes of whatever is presented outside”. From these is born “proportionality called harmony”. Proportionality in painting was of course born from linear perspective, which provided the scientific basis of painting. Leonardo also saw perspective as an embellishment of painting – an artifice that “ornaments painting with copious variety that delights all viewers”. Just as the poet could embellish his art with endless details and verbal ornament, so too could the painter through his powers of ingenio (creative talent) represent all things truthfully. “What long and tedious work”, Leonardo asks, “it would be for the poet to describe all the movements of

the fighters in a battle and the actions of their limbs and their ornaments”. The final blow for poetry was the fact that it depended on language and on words, which were “the work of man”. Language could never be truly universal. Painting on the other hand represents the work of nature, which can be understood by all of mankind.” (Martin Kemp m.fl. i <http://www.universalleonardo.org/essays.php?id=575>; lesedato 10.11.16)

“By claiming a place for painting among the liberal arts, Leonardo’s paragone can be seen as part of the struggle on the part of some artists to achieve intellectual status during the Renaissance. Since ancient times, creative pursuits were divided into two categories known as the “Liberal” and “Mechanical” arts. The Liberal arts were those considered to be fitting pursuits for free and noble citizens, being above the labour of handicrafts. Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy and Music represented the scientific Liberal arts because they were based on mathematics. Grammar, Dialectic and Rhetoric represented the rational side because they dealt with language. Both painting and sculpture on the other hand were classed among the mechanical arts because they required manual labour. According to Leonardo, “With justifiable complaints painting laments that it has been dismissed from the number of the liberal arts, since she is the legitimate daughter of nature and acts through the noblest sense. Thus it is wrong, O writers, to have omitted her from the number of the liberal arts, since she embraces not only the works of nature but also infinite things which nature never created”. Only in painting could science and fantasia find their perfect and eternal union.” (Martin Kemp m.fl. i <http://www.universalleonardo.org/essays.php?id=575>; lesedato 10.11.16)

Den amerikanske kunstkritikeren Clement Greenbergs “surge towards abstract expressionism came in the 1940s with “Towards a Newer Laocoon”, where he sought to develop Lessing’s thought that each genre within the arts develops as a consequence of its own medium, and that abstract expressionism, therefore, is a proper form for modernism in painting: “It is by virtue of its medium that each art is unique and strictly itself [...] For the visual arts the medium is discovered to be physical; hence pure painting and pure sculpture seek above all to affect the spectator physically.” ” (Cecilia Sjöholm i <http://www.ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/nja/article/14180>; lesedato 12.08.16)

I en artikkel om maleren, roman- og novelleforfatteren Cora Sandel skriver Kristin Bliksrud at “[t]ekstenes beskrivelser av omverdenen søker å overføre billedstrukturer og billedkvaliteter til et verbalt språk” (*Samtiden* nr. 3 i 1992).

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>