

Readymades, Abstract Paintings and the Paradigm Shift That Revolutionized Representational Landscape Paintings Into Abstract and Conceptual Landscapes

María Eugenia Rabadán, Universidad de Guanajuato, México

The European Conference on Arts & Humanities 2026
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Landscape is a Renaissance phenomenon that has continued to contemporary art, although between 1907 and 1914 the artistic community shifted the formal visual gestalt into a completely new conception of art, consubstantial with the landscape, even though it remained relatively esoteric in its visual enquiries. To understand them, we study art history, particularly landscape art, and its avant-garde conception, analyzing Land, Earth, Environmental. However, we restructured this theoretical and visual conception by assimilating the structuralism of scientific revolutions, according to Thomas Kuhn, who, by contrast, perceives revolutionary – non-cumulative – change, which ceases to add knowledge of the known, like art in this case, and distinguishes it from the normal – accumulative – change, which adds knowledge to the new conception. Evidently Readymades, such as Duchamp's *Air de Paris*, 1919, and abstract painting, such as Mondrian's *Composition 10 in Black and White*, 1915, appear as landscapes that no longer represent the real, since they are the real. In Jan and Hubert van Eyck's *Adoration of the Lamb*, 1432, Kenneth Clark (1991) sees the constituent elements of the landscape that remain relevant today: "there is a remarkable sense of our being in the landscape – of our being able to proceed smoothly from foreground to distance." (1991, p. 35) Such is Dan Graham's *March 31, 1966*, 1966, mathematically exploring a line of sight from the retinal wall to the edge of the known universe. Five centuries apart, the landscape component of both works is still observable even though they stem from conceptually and visually incompatible.

Keywords: landscape, post-landscape, Thomas Kuhn, paradigm shift, visual gestalt change

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

This paper is part of a researching line on landscape painting, stemming from an epistemological and paradigm change in the visual arts, charting its revolutionary phase, which began in the early twentieth century, and its normalization in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Between 1906 and 1914, the conception of art underwent sweeping changes, manifested in formal visual gestalts contrary to earlier paradigm. As we know, these transformations were largely conceptual and abstract, incompatible with the evolution of painting as a representation of the natural or supernatural, as landscape had been deemed since the Renaissance.

In that modernist moment, works by Pablo Picasso, Wassily Kandinsky, Marcel Duchamp, Piet Mondrian, and Kasimir Malevich, among artistic communities in Paris, Munich and Moscow, utterly changed the visual paradigm. Their works were so different from their previous creations than in a collection of notes entitled *À l'Infinitif*, Marcel Duchamp mused, “Can one make works which aren’t works of ‘art’?” (1913, p. 74). It wasn’t a change from one avant-garde to the next, say, from the blue period to Cubism, from impressionism to abstraction, Cubism to dadaism or suprematism, as they appear in the table of contents of academic texts on the avant-garde conception of history of art that we’ve learned. Rather, we are speaking of a distinctive stage that we shall refer to as *noncumulative*, drawing on Thomas Kuhn (1962, Chapter VII, Chapter VIII). In this way, we’ll see the *cumulative stage*, in which knowledge is added to artworks accepted by the artistic community after the revolutionary stage.

In this paper context, we will examine four works by Marcel Duchamp as a means of incorporating them into a model of landscapes –from the noncumulative period– that have continued to be seen as esoteric in light of art history’s notion of the avant-garde. On the one hand, the importance of these works derives from the fact that they underpin the epistemological and paradigm shift in the Western art community. The artist’s works created between 1914–1919 *Pharmacy*, 1914, *Handmade Stereopticon Slide*, 1918–1919, *Unhappy Readymade*, 1919; *Air de Paris*, are works that quickly integrated conceptual knowledge into landscape, and turned into *Readymades*, which were those works which weren’t works of “art.” Meanwhile Picasso, Kandinsky, Malevich and Mondrian were shifting towards abstract landscape paintings.

On the other hand, the avant-garde conception of history of art, also visualizes land art, earth art, and environmental art as the mayor movements that have taken up landscape, or “nature” as it later became fashionable to call it. This vision makes us to think that this conception lacks a profound restructuring of visual perception that would enable theorization not only of the revolutionary change in landscape that is the focus of this paper, but also of the normal or cumulative stage entitled by the articulation of a paradigm shift. William Malpas in his book *Andy Goldsworthy Touching Nature* –as an example– introduces him as a “land,” “earth,” “nature” or “environment” artist who works with nature, uses natural materials in natural shapes and forms, in natural and urban contexts (2013, p. 22).

Avant-gardes such as land art, earth art, environmental art, and working nature tendencies are part of a paradigm we could call in an extended category Post-Landscape, alongside Yves Klein’s *Cosmologies*, 1960; Michael Heizer’s *North, East, South, West*, 1967; Robert Barry’s *Inert Gas Series*, 1969; Giovanni Anselmo’s *Classifying the One Thousand Longest Rivers in the World*, 1979/73; John Cage, *Atlas Eclipticalis*, 1961–1962; Gerhard Richter’s *Alster*, 1963; Anselm Kiefer’s *The Burning of the Rural District of Buchen*, 1975; Tacita Dean’s *The Russian*

Ending, 2001; Olafur Eliason's *The Glacier Melt Series*, 1999/2019, among many others. Most of these artworks are not considered by the indicated avant-gardes, even when they show a remarkable sense of being in the landscape, of being able to proceed smoothly from foreground to distance, as Kenneth Clark (1991) defined the constituent elements of the landscape above-mentioned, as we suppose is relevant in the contemporary art condition.

For artists working at the beginning of the twentieth century, say, Umberto Boccioni (n.d.) or Ilya Zdanevich & Mikhail Larionov (1913) it was possible to research the act of *touching nature* just as Duchamp's revolutionary artworks *Unhappy Readymade* and *Air de Paris*. That said, since those artworks were unprecedented in Western art history, it would have been impossible for artists working before twentieth century Duchamp's *Bicycle Wheel*, 1913, impressionist and post-impressionist landscape painters to recognize this phenomenon. If we were in a time wrap, we could teleport to observe Paul Gauguin and Paul Cézanne as they stand before these *readymades*, as they'd have no theory for visualizing those objects as works of art. Camille Pissarro and Vincent van Gogh needed a canvas to paint. Cézanne, who used to climb Mont Sante Victoire every day, could not have possibly understood the act of walking as a work of art, as Richard Long's *A Walk for four Hours and Four Circles*, 1972; and Hamish Fulton's *A Six-Day Seventh-Mile Walk on Baffin Island Canada Summer 1976*, and specially Fulton's text *INTO A WALK INTO NATURE*, 2001. These are walks than can be recognized as a work of art, and the photographs, drawings, writings we comprehend as landscapes are fundamentally based on the act of walking.

The change that took place in the visual arts between 1906 and 1914 is somewhat comparable to the sort of noncumulative episode inherent to paradigm shifts as discussed in Kuhn's theory, as we shall soon see. *Unhappy Readymade* and *Air de Paris*, do not add any knowledge to landscape painting before the revolutionary period. When Duchamp wondered if there could be works that weren't works of art, the shift had already taken place, and even Duchamp's own paintings, such as *Landscape at Blainville*, 1902; *Church at Blainville*, 1902; and *Laundry Barge*, 1910, had been left behind in the previous paradigm.

Literature Review

The main problem in this inquiry—which leads us to assume there was already a paradigm shift that revolutionized visual arts in the early twentieth century— is an idea that has not been addressed in the literature.

This lacuna has led us to revisit anthologies of manifestos and annotated documents on historical and more recent avant-gardes. We referred to publications like those of Marchan Fiz (2001); González, A., Calvo, S., & Marchan, S. (2009); and Michelli De (2008). These invaluable sources have recovered several lost documents and made them available for study. Chipp et al. (1968); Stiles and Selz (1996); and Harrison, Ch., & Wood, P. (2002) are also summaries on the topic. However, when these texts mention a revolutionary change from the early twentieth century, they are not referring to a paradigm shift as a noncumulative episode in the same way as Kuhn.

Curatorial research catalogues have not visualized the paradigm shift in art; noncumulative change arises as a phenomenon that not only seems to lack any explanation but that is also not raised as an issue. The exhibition *Piet Mondrian and The Hague School of Landscape Painting* (1969), at the Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery, in Regina, and the Edmonton Art Gallery, in Edmonton, both in Canada, did not feature Mondrian's abstract work. Employing a different

approach, Haags Gemeentemuseum, National Gallery of Art, The Museum of Modern Art, New York; opened the exhibition *Piet Mondrian: 1872–1994*, 1994–1995, which focused exclusively on the artist's cubist experiments, pure abstraction, and neo-plasticism. MOMA is currently organizing the exhibition *Mondrian Boogie Woogie*, set to open in 2027.

Simon Schama wrote “The True Grid” (1995), an extraordinary review that addresses events both inside and out of the museum, such as tendencies in Clement Greenberg's critiques, while examining restructuring the perception of Mondrian regarding abstraction. Schama comments on the vanitas paintings the artist carried out as part his Calvinist education, his impressionist work on sand dunes in Zeeland, and his knowledge on Van Gogh. This writer took an interest in Mondrian's cubist work and what stands out is the lucid way he analysed the change in perception that the artist experienced in Zeeland in 1914, in addition to the abstractionist variations that led him to neo-plasticism. From our perspective, it is important how, unlike others, he does point out Mondrian's visual restructuring “It's impossible to imagine a more powerful document of this conversion from perception to vision than the ‘Pier and Ocean’ series of 1914-15” (Shama, 1995).

The second volume of the *Catalogue Raisonné of the Work of 1911–1944* edited by Joop M. Joosten and documenting Mondrian's production, takes up the revolutionary lapse (1998). Pierre Daix and Joan Rosselet's *Picasso: Catalogue Raisonné of the Painted Works of Pablo Picasso* covers 1907 to 1916 (1979). By providing most complete linear corpus of an artist's production, this sort of literature contributes to delimiting possible shifts in an image system. Because it is a catalogue raisonné, its function may not be to analyze change in an artistic community such as the present case of modernity and after-modernity, but we can assume the cataloguing fits within a paradigm that does not consider change as a research problem. The Duchamp catalogue raisonné published by The Museum of Modern Art, New York, and the Philadelphia Museum of Art, within an introduction by Anne d'Harnoncourt, is a complete sequence of the artist's oeuvre, accompanied by a series of thematic essays (1989). John Tancock's “The Influence of Marcel Duchamp” specifically stands out for the present discussion. The essayist examines Duchamp's importance to work by coeval artists such as Francis Picabia and Man Ray, alongside modern artist including Richard Hamilton and landscape artist John Cage, Robert Morris, Walter de Maria and Joseph Beuys (1973, pp. 159–178).

Methodology

In the research “La estructura de las revoluciones científicas según Thomas Kuhn en el análisis de la historia del arte” (Rabadán Villalpando, 2017), we examined Kuhn's approach to the study of art, particularly through the Ernst Gombrich thought, to whom Kuhn repeatedly mentions in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). There is also a fundamental analysis by Kuhn “Comment on the Relations of Science and Art,” which he presented in 1966 at a conference in Ann Arbor, and published in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, and later in *Essential Tension*, in which he debates similarities and differences between science and art, alongside fellow academics James S. Ackerman, George Kubler, and E. M. Hafner. Presenting the text is of interest for its extensive references to Kuhn's observations about studying paradigms in artistic phenomena, specifically, using images instead of styles, such as the avant-garde in the present case. In this regard, we propose to analyze the following body of artworks to examine the revolutionary paradigm shift we mentioned. In this comment, Kuhn declare the following speech:

I take the special importance of those concepts to be that they permit a fuller understanding of the oddly noncumulative character of events like the discovery of oxygen, of X-rays, or of the planet Uranus. More important, paradigms are not to be entirely equated with theories. Most fundamentally, they are accepted concrete examples of scientific achievement, actual problem solutions which scientists' study with care and upon which they model their own work. If the notion of paradigm can be useful to the art historian, it will be pictures not styles that serve as paradigms... Both 'style' and 'theory' are terms used when describing a group of works which are recognizably similar. (They are 'in the same style' or 'applications of the same theory.' In both cases it proves difficult—I think ultimately impossible—to specify the nature of the shared elements which distinguish a given style or a given theory from another. My response to such difficulties has been to suggest that scientists can learn from paradigms or accepted models without any process like the abstraction of elements that could constitute a theory. Could something of the same sort be said of the manner in which artists learn by scrutinizing particular works of art? (Kuhn, 1966, pp. 350–351)

George Kubler's *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*, published at the same time as Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, explores the Indigenous experience of vision, which started from zero when native peoples had to build churches after the Spanish conquest of Mexico. In the Mexican paradigm, everything instantly changed for them (1962). However, according to Kuhn, this would not be a paradigm change. It represents no change in Western art paradigms, and we could also say none in the works of pre-Columbian cultures.

This research project starts off by studying a corpus of modern and after-modern art works, from which we seek to construct a theory of landscape that differs from the conception of the avant-garde in art history, largely defined in line with land art, earth art, and environmental art. We see landscape in works by these neo-vanguards, such as Robert Smithson's *Spiral Jetty*, 1970; and Michael Heizer's *Double Negative*, 1967; but we also see landscape in Picasso's *The Harvesters*, 1907; Duchamp's *Air de Paris*; Umberto Boccioni's futurist manifesto *Against Landscape and the Old Aesthetics* (2004); Giovanni Anselmo's *Entering the Work* 1971; Roy Lichtenstein's *Ten Landscapes*, 1967; John Cage's *Atlas Eclipticalis*, 1961–62; Anselm Kieffer's *The Land of the Two Rivers*, 1989; David Hockney's *First Edit for TV Screen*, 2012; and that artist's current exhibition in London, *A Year in Normandie and Some Other Thoughts About Painting*, 2026.

In these we see the phenomenon of Renaissance origins in modern and after-modern art, in line with Kenneth Clark's definition of landscape, inspired by Jan and Huber van Eyck's *Adoration of the Lamb*, 1432, Clark landscape's constituent elements, still relevant today, as we proceed smoothly from foreground to distance, even in Dan Graham's *March 31, 1966*, mathematically exploring a line of sight from the retinal wall to the edge of the known universe.

In short, our hypothesis is that the landscape component does not disappear in a paradigm change. The Van Eyck's *Adoration of the Lam*, 1432, is as much a landscape as is Mondrian's *Pier and Ocean I–VI*, 1914–1915, but in a different formal visual gestalt, as we also studied in Rabadán Villalpando (2015). In these instances, however, viewers must restructure their perceptions if they are to discern landscape in both image systems. In the book *Natural Reality and Abstract Reality An Essay in Trialogue Form*, Mondrian offered his theoretical explanation of abstract painting that he had undertaken in 1914; he also demonstrates a proclivity for landscape painting. It is a theatrical work in which a painting enthusiast (Y), a naturalist painter (X), and an abstract realist painter (Z)—the embodiment of

Mondrian's position—sustain a dialogue about problems that weighed on him at that time.

Y. So nature moves you too?

Z. If it didn't, I wouldn't be a painter.

Y. Since you no longer depict nature, I thought nature no longer meant anything to you.

Z. On the contrary. Nature moves me deeply. I just paint it differently.

X. I sometimes call your compositions 'symphonies.' I can see music in them, but nature no.

Z. Music can just as well be discerned in naturalistic painting. Naturalistic painting, too, has its rhythm, even if it not as noticeable as an abstract-real painting. (1919, p. 19)

The painting enthusiast must learn how to see the new abstract landscapes, rendered in another formal visual gestalt. Mondrian also reveals that by using structuralism, it's possible to understand shared paradigms since it is also possible to create abstract-realist painting. This is comparable to the competing-schools phase in place before the scientific community's acceptance of a new paradigm.

Results and Discussion

In 1960, before Kuhn published *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Ernst Gombrich had recognized in *Art and Illusion* that this early-twentieth-century revolutionary change was a permanent achievement that "swept across Europe" and assumed the importance it has for freeing art from antiquated aesthetics.

Aesthetics, in other words, has surrendered its claim to be concerned with the problem of convincing representation, the problem of illusion in art. In certain respects, this is indeed a liberation, and nobody would wish to revert to the old confusion. (1960, p. 5)

Kuhn must have studied this text because *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* takes on the question of emerging conceptions of perfection in artistic representation, as well as his interest in restructuring perceptions related to revolutionary changes. "... at times of revolution, when the normal-scientific tradition changes," Kuhn affirms, "the scientist's perception of his environment must be re-educated—in some familiar situations, he must learn to see a new gestalt" (1962, p. 110).

In their analysis from the second half of the twentieth century, historians like González, Calvo, Marchan Fiz (2009); Peter Selz, and Joshua C. Taylor referred to Cubism as the most important visual arts revolution since the Renaissance. We understand that Cubism was a conceptual and epistemic basement to move forward conceptual art, to which the contemporary condition of landscape is strongly paradigmatic.

However, British thinkers including Ernst Gombrich, John Golding, as mentioned, and John Berger (1969, 3), have worked more fully on justifying a notion of revolutionary change. Golding has formulated a notably complete idea—quite close to the idea of paradigm change—about Cubism's revolutionary characteristics as they relate to the High Renaissance. From a visual point of view, he concludes that Impressionism is closer to the High Renaissance than it is to Cubism (1959, p. 15). That said, this reasoning does not theorize a paradigm shift, at most, a stylistic one.

We tried to analyze a paradigm change based on a group of images from the artistic community. In line with Kuhn, they were articulated according to two types of change, revolutionary and normal, which mutually support each other and are noncumulative or naturally cumulative, respectively. The revolutionary shift of this paradigm takes place approximately between 1906 and 1914, and although paradigm changes are holistic, we considered the pentimento of the portrait *Gertrude Stein*, 1906, by Pablo Picasso, and *Pier and Ocean I–VI*, 1914–1915, by Piet Mondrian to define the revolutionary lapse core of the paradigm shift, including in the model *Painting with circle*, 1911, Vasily Kandinsky, *Air de Paris*, by Marcel Duchamp, *Black Square*, 1913, by Kazimir Malevich. At that point the formal visual gestalt changed so much that the artworks could not be visually deciphered until new artistic conceptions were understood. Picasso's *Spanish Village*, 1900, differs greatly from *Landscape*, 1907; Mondrian's *Farm at Duivendrecht*, 1906–1907, and *Pier and Ocean I–VI*, 1914–1915, are dissimilar; Kandinsky's *Red Church*, 1901, does not resemble *Picture with a Circle*, 1911; the same can be said when we compare Duchamp's *Laundry Barge*, 1911, to *Air de Paris*. Each artist was in the process of restructuring his perceptions in line with the articulation of a new conception of art as contrary to or incompatible with what came before. Once more we emphasize Duchamp's question if it was possible to produce works that were not works of art.

In these artists' work we find evidence that revolutionary change is not centered around Cubism. That movement is part of a more extensive revolutionary articulation that involves artworks that are more radically conceptual and abstract, as was the case with Duchamp. "I was finished with Cubism and with movement—at least movement mixed up with oil painting," he said, "I went back to a form of expression entirely divorced from absolute realism" (1964, p. 195). As Mondrian declared,

Gradually I became aware that Cubism did not accept the logical consequences of its own discoveries; it was not developing abstraction toward its ultimate goal, the expression of pure reality. I felt that this reality can only be established through *purely plastic*. (1941, p. 338)

Duchamp worked on four other pieces that could possibly be considered the first readymade landscapes. Each is listed in the catalogue raisonné published by MoMA and the Philadelphia Museum of Art. In his book *Looking through Duchamp's Door: Art and Perspective in the Work of Duchamp*. Sugimoto. Jeff Wall, Hans Belting (2009) has also studied all the artworks as a function of his study on perspective, specifically, *Pharmacy*, *Handmade Stereopticon Slide*, *Unhappy Readymade*, and *Air de Paris*.

Pharmacy is an anonymous, untitled landscape that Duchamp found, to which he added two brushstrokes in complementary colors, to associate the painting with the word "Pharmacie" and to "sign" the work. The brushstrokes refer to his studies of stereoscopy that address binocular vision. You could say the title is not a title per se, but rather a kind of relationship between thought and image, according to Duchampian conceptions. In "Apropos of Readymades," the artist described his famed artwork, in a way that we are left on the relationship between. "A few months later I bought a cheap reproduction of a winter evening landscape, which I called 'Pharmacy' after adding two small dots, one red and one yellow, in the horizon" (1961, p. 141).

We previously analysed how between 1906 and 1914, some artists changed the notion of art so completely that it was even hard for them to know if what they'd created was still art. It would have been impossible to attribute the works from a new paradigm to their creators. This fully

justifies Duchamp's act of buying another painter's cheap reproduction to turn it into a readymade, and sign it, since what was fundamental was not the painting's physicality but rather placing it at the service of the mind, as we'll soon see. At the very moment he created *Pharmacy*, he was no longer a landscape painter; he no longer fit into the paradigm, but rather into another, in which he could relate the image to thought. In the interview with James Johnson Sweeney *The Great Trouble with Art in This Country* Duchamp explains

I wanted to get away from the physical aspect of painting. I was much more interested in recreating ideas in painting. For me the title was very important. I was interested in making painting serve my purpose, and in getting away from the physicality of painting—not merely in visual products. I wanted to put painting once again at the service of the mind. (1946, p. 125)

He would do something similar in other found images, such as *Handmade Stereopticon Slide*. On top of these images, he would contrast the illustration of prisms in perspective, floating over the stereoscope of a marine landscape. For centuries, perspective had been a pictorial convention that Cubism had begun to deconstruct. The Philadelphia Museum of Art catalogue raisonné quotes Duchamp explanation on *Air de Paris*, as follows:

Despite his contempt for 'retinal' painting which appealed only to the eye, Duchamp displayed a lifelong fascination with the phenomena of vision. This handmade slide is the first of a series of experiments with the illusion of depth obtainable through stereoscopy. (D'Harnoncourt & McShine, 1989, p. 291)

The artist's 1919 New York-Buenos Aires-Paris tour provided Duchamp with the occasion to create other readymades. He completed *Unhappy Readymade* in Argentina, from where he sent instructions to his sister Suzanne, in Paris, asking her to tie a book on perspective to a balcony and expose it to the wind until its pages blew away. It's important to point out that this is not an image-based representation of the wind; it's the element itself that will blow away the pages in a book on perspective, a pictorial convention that had been portrayed in the West for five centuries.

Finally, we come to *Air de Paris*, an artwork whose title clearly presents the idea behind it, without a trace of the painterly, thus turning the piece over to the service of the mind, just as Duchamp had intended. The artist describes the work as follows:

At the end of... 1919 I left again for America, and wanting to bring back a present to my friends the Arensbergs, I asked a Parisian pharmacist to empty a glass container full of serum and to seal it again. This is the precious ampoule of fifty cubic centimeters of *Air of Paris*, I brought back to the Arensbergs in 1919. (D'Harnoncourt & McShine, 1989, p. 291)

It's hard to know if he had the idea for that work in mind when he produced the 1914 readymade, he called *Pharmacy*.

The following note, written in 1913 by Marcel Duchamp, included in *A L'infinitif*, written while he was going into an entirely new paradigm, as describing a kind of landscape that is not the representational landscape painting any more, but the revolutionary foundations of its future normal stage.

A geographic 'landscapism'
 'in the manner' of geographic maps
 The landscapist from the height of an aeroplane-
 Then the field trip (400 km.)
 Notes taken i.e. for example number of houses in each village,
 or then again number of Louis XV chairs in each house-
 The geographic landscape (with perspective; or without perspective, seen from
 above like maps) could record all kinds of things, have a caption, take
 on a statistical look.-
 There is also 'geological landscapism': Different formations, different
 colors-A mine of information!
 Meteorological landscapism (Barometry, thermometry, etc.) (1914, p. 78–79)

Conclusion

In this study on the paradigm shift that took place in the visual arts between 1906 and 1914, when the readymade and the abstract painting burst onto the scene of painting as representation, we analysed the contemporary situation of landscape, considering its Renaissance origin. Kenneth Clark (1991) saw its constituent element in Jan and Hubert van Eyck's *Adoration of the Lamb*, 1432, as we learned above the sense of our being in the landscape and our way of seeing from foreground to distance that, according to our analysis, still remains relevant today in works such as Dan Graham's *March 31, 1966*, mathematically exploring a line of sight from the retinal wall to the edge of the known universe. In other words, it is not the landscape component that changes, but rather the paradigm, understood as a shift in the notion of art and consequently of the normal visual gestalt.

In this regard, we examined this episode from a transdisciplinary perspective, drawing on Thomas Kuhn's structure of scientific revolutions, which analysed changes in the visual gestalt related to transformations in the scientific world. Thus, we could see more clearly how artists between 1906 and 1914 radically revolutionised the development of the visual arts. This transformation was not merely a progression from one avant-garde movement to another. Instead, it was a more fundamental epistemological shift that led to abstract and conceptual visual perceptions, artistically rendered in new media and in a range of possible combinations that also encompassed naturalistic works.

Then we witnessed the articulation of a paradigmatic shift in the work of Pablo Picasso, Wassily Kandinsky, Marcel Duchamp, Kasimir Malevich, and Piet Mondrian, an episode characterised by its noncumulative (i.e., sudden) nature, also drawing on Kuhn's model, which meant that they did not gradually add knowledge to what was already known as art, but they initiated a new stage, contrary to and incompatible with what preceded it. In fact, the change was of such magnitude that even Marcel Duchamp questioned the possibility of making works that were not art.

Consequently, we included in this study the analysis of four Duchamp landscape works that disrupted two-dimensional drawing in perspective that had been employed to depict space since the Renaissance. His *Pharmacy*, *Handmade Stereopticon Slide*, *Unhappy Readymade* and *Air de Paris*, are works that essentially leapt into the fourth dimension. These landscapes were, ultimately, air, space, and wind, thereby breaking the hegemony of landscape as representation. These works suddenly integrated conceptual knowledge into landscape and were adopted as

models by arte povera, land art, and German neo-expressionism, among other movements in the after modern era.

Therefore, this study implies the possibility of historicising landscape in a way allowing us to recognise the remarkable sense of our being in the landscape – of our being able to proceed smoothly from foreground to distance that, as we have demonstrated, is expressed in abstract, conceptual, and naturalistic works, as well as in their possible combinations.

This new perspective offering a different way of seeing the landscapes discussed in terms of this paradigm is a way of ensuring that they not be overlooked in light of new studies of art.

Acknowledgements

I specially thank Debra Nagao who, as professional and native speaker, translated this text from Spanish Language to English Language.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

I did not used any AI-generation or AI-assistive technology in writing, improving, or proofreading this manuscript.

References

- Belting, H. (2009). *Looking through Duchamp's Door: Art and Perspective in the Work of Duchamp. Sugimoto. Jeff Wall* (1st ed.). Verlag der Buchhandlung. Walther König.
- Berger, J. (1969). The Moment of Cubism. In *The Moment of Cubism and other essays* (pp. 1–32). Pantheon Books.
- Boccioni, U. (n. d.). Contra el paisaje y la vieja estética [Against the landscape and the old aesthetic]. In Boccioni, U. *Estética y arte futuristas (Futurist Aesthetics and Art)* (pp. 16–25). Acantilado.
- Boettger, S. (2002). *Earthworks. Art and the Landscape of the Sixties* (1st ed). University of California Press.
- Bois, Y., & Janssen, H. (1994). *Piet Mondrian 1872 – 1944* (1st ed.) Gemeentemuseum, The Hague; National Gallery of Art, Washington; The Museum of Modern Art, New York; Bulfinch Press Book, Brown and Company.
- Chipp, H. B., Selz, P., & Taylor, J. C. (1968). *Theories of Modern Art: A Source Book by Artists and Critics*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Christov-Bakargiev, C. (1999). *Arte Povera* (1st ed.). Phaidon.
- Clark, K. (1991). *Landscape Into Art* (1st ed.). Icon Editions.
- Daix, P., & Rosselet, J. (1979). *El cubismo de Picasso. Catálogo razonado de la obra pintada, 1907–1916* [Picasso's Cubism. Catalogue Raisonné of His Painted Works, 1907–1916] (1^a ed.). Blume.
- D'Harnoncourt, A., & McShine, K. (1989). *Marcel Duchamp* (2nd ed). The Museum of Modern Art, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Prestel.
- Dillow, N. (1969). *Piet Mondrian and The Hague School of Landscape Painting* (1st ed.). Norman Mackenzie Art Gallery, Edmonton Art Gallery.
- Duchamp, M. (1913). A L'Infinitif. In M. Sanouillet, & E. Peterson (Eds.), *The Essential Writings on Marcel Duchamp*. (pp. 74–101). Thames & Hudson.
- Duchamp, M. (1961). Apropos of "Readymades". In M. Sanouillet, & E. Peterson (Eds.), *The Essential Writings on Marcel Duchamp* (pp. 141–142). Thames & Hudson.
- Duchamp, M., & Sweeney, J. J. (1946). The Great Trouble with Art in This Country. In M. Sanouillet, & E. Peterson (Eds.), *The Essential Writings on Marcel Duchamp* (pp. 123–126). Thames & Hudson.
- Elger, D. (Ed.) (1998). *Gerhard Richter. Landscapes* (1st ed.). Cantz.
- Fuchs, R. (1986). *Richard Long* (1st ed.). Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, Thames and Hudson.

- Fulton, H. (2001). Into a Walk Into a Nature. In H. Fulton, *Walking Artist. Hamish Fulton* (pp. 7–12). Richter Verlag.
- Golding, J. (1959). *Cubism: A history and an analysis, 1907–1914*. George Wittenborg.
- Gombrich, E. H. (1960). *Art and illusion; a study in the psychology of pictorial representation* (1st ed.). Phaidon Press LTD, Pantheon Books.
- Gonzalez, A., Calvo, S., & Marchán, S. (2009). *Escritos de arte de vanguardia 1900/1945* [Avant-garde Art Writings 1900/1945] (3^a ed.). Istmo.
- Guasch, A. (2002). *El arte último del siglo XX. Del posminimalismo a lo multicultural* [Late 20th-Century Art: From Post-Minimalism to Multiculturalism] (3^a ed.). Alianza Editorial.
- Harrison, Ch., & Wood, P. (2002). *Art in Theory 1900–2000. An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Joosten, J. (1998). *II Catalogue Raisonné of the Work of 1911–1944* (1st ed.). Harry N. Abrahams, Inc.
- Kastner, J., & Wallis, B. (1998). *Land and Environmental Art* (1st ed.). Phaidon.
- Kubler, G. (1962). *The Shape of Time. Remarks on the History of Things* (1st ed.). Yale University Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1st ed.). The University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1966). Comment on the Relations of Science and Art. In Kuhn, T. S. *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change* (pp. 340–351). University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Malpas, W. (2013). *Andy Goldsworthy: Touching Nature* (5th ed.). Crescent Moon.
- Marchan, F. (2001). *Del arte objetual al arte de concepto (1960–1974) Epílogo sobre la sensibilidad <posmoderna>. Antología de textos y manifiestos*. [From Object Art to Conceptual Art (1960–1974) Epilogue on “Postmodern” Sensibility. An Anthology of Texts and Manifestos]. (8^a ed.). Akal.
- Michelli, M. (2008). *Las vanguardias artísticas del siglo XX* [The Artistic Avant-gardes of the 20th Century] (20^a ed.). Alianza Editorial.
- Mondrian, P. (1919). Natural Reality and Abstract Reality. An Essay in Trialogue Form. In P. Mondrian, *Natural Reality and Abstract Reality: An Essay in Trialogue Form (1999–1920)* (pp. 19–116). George Braziller.
- Mondrian, P. (1941). Toward the True Vision of Reality. In H. Holtzman & M. S. James (Eds.), *The New Art–The New Life. The Collected Writings of Piet Mondrian*. (pp. 338–341). G. K. Hall & Co.

- Rabadán Villalpando, M. E. (2015). Contrapunto de teorías de conocimiento en la obra de Piet Mondrian [A Counterpoint of Theories of Knowledge in the Work of Piet Mondrian]. En T. Torres (Ed.) *Estado del arte. Aproximaciones al quehacer y conceptualización del arte contemporáneo desde la interdisciplina* (pp. 87–108). Universidad de Guanajuato, Montea.
- Rabadán Villalpando, M. E. (2017). La estructura de las revoluciones científicas según Thomas Kuhn en el análisis de la historia del arte [The Structure of the Scientific Revolutions according to Thomas Kuhn in the analysis of history of art]. *ARBOR*, 193 (783): a372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/arbor.2017.783n1003>
- Schama, S. (1995). *Landscape and Memory* (1st ed.). Vintage Books.
- Schama, S. (1995). The True Grid. *The New Yorker*.
<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1995/10/09/true-grid>
- Tancock, J. (1973). The influence of Marcel Duchamp. In A. D'Harnoncourt, & K. McShine (Eds.), (1989). *Marcel Duchamp* (pp. 159–178), The Museum of Modern Art, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Prestel.
- Zdanevich, I., & Larionov, M. (1913). Why We Paint Ourselves: A Futurist Manifesto. In J. E. Bowlt (Ed.), *Russian Art of the Avant-Garde Theory and Criticism 1902–1934* (pp. 79–83). Thames & Hudson.

Contact email: marurabadan@gmail.com