

Wow, according to the internet there really are lots of types and eras of art. I was expecting maybe ten eras. Ten? A good looking number, something artists should appreciate. Apparently not. Let's count how many styles are listed on a Wikipedia page. 182? (Roughly - I'm only human). What kind of number is that? Maybe that's where Blink 182 got their name from. They're a pop punk band though, not art rock or whatever. How pretentious are you? And the most eras fell under the modern art category - the worst kind of art. Very annoying. I certainly wasn't expecting the 'Les Nabis' era, and stuff like that. What the HELL is that? For the sake of your curiosity, it seems like the era when children took over. Was that by force? Maybe. Even fully grown artists are known for being very passive. Ever heard of an artist bouncer? Me neither. Let's just break things down into the era where lots of men had massive heads and babies had tiny heads (I'm thinking some medieval art); the more realistic era; the era that REALLY wasn't realistic (i.e. cubism), etc., etc. Could be fun, could make me look like an idiot. Again. Let's be brave and goooo!!!!

Prehistoric art

Caveman art is unsurprisingly pretty basic, but at least the proportions of the animals, etc. are reasonably realistic for the most part. As just pointed out, something would go seriously wrong in the Medieval period. And respect should go out to the hunter gathers for not drawing penises all the time. Things would take a turn for the worst in 21st century schools. Making things even worse, the things were never drawn to scale, showing a further decline in standards. :S :O

Ancient Art

Ancient Greek sculptures are actually very good. Are the marble penises artistic or immature, though? Maybe no one knows. I guess they COULD have been made by teenagers in an early form of rebellion, but that is mere speculation. Don't repeat what I've said, because if I'm wrong, you'll go down in flames.

Medieval art

So, what's wrong with the heads? Is painting the things really that complicated? It's like an artist being able to paint everything in proportion, but for some reason he can't draw feet and shoes properly. Basically he just draws what look like tiny toes connected to the ankles. Or everyone has massive clown feet. Very strange when in a battle scene.

Renaissance art

Here we go. Me criticising this era would make me look SO arrogant. HOWEVER... what's with countless people saying the Mona Lisa smile is so enigmatic? Looks like an ordinary smile to me. When I see the painting, I don't think to myself 'Hmm... What's she thinking?', again I just see a smile. Mystery over. She's happy. She's surely not about to punch someone, and she's not about to freak out on anyone, so you're wasting your time thinking about her so much. What if you're in an art gallery and someone DOES go mental on you? Stare at him, instead.

Neoclassicism

Having done some Googling of paintings, it seems this form of art is like the former, just more detailed and basically better. I could read an article about the style to make me more knowledgeable, but looking at the art is quicker. A picture says a thousand words. It's just lots of naked people.

Romanticism

The idealised era, as the name suggests. Judging by the stuff I've found on the internet, it seems to me the painters of the time REALLY wished landscapes/scenes in general were fuzzier than in real life. Either that, or they smudged their projects by accident. But I doubt that. To be clear, I guess they really liked mist, or maybe they had a mild form of shortsightedness. Actually, maybe romanticism referred to people being romantic, i.e. 'You have a nice smile. It's very enigmatic' and 'Thank you! Actually I'm just happy.' What's romantic about fog?

Impressionism

Are you blind?? The world doesn't look like that to you, does it? Claude Monet has produced some very blurry pieces of work. I wonder what his art was like when his vision deteriorated further. Wow, apparently the elderly Claude did a painting which he called 'A Lovely Sunny Day', which is nothing but a canvas painted entirely black. It's believed to be the first modern art piece. No, only joking.

Cubism

The idea of cubism does SOUND cool. Surely having different angles of an object or person in one piece of art would create a really cool 3D effect. OMG, no. It's a complete mess. You know who would have loved the style, though? Leonardo da Vinci. If he painted the Mona Lisa with the cubism method, THAT would create a pretty damn enigmatic smile. Or rather an enigmatic frown, as no one wants to be made to look like they've been shot in the head.

Modern Art

And what the hell has gone wrong, here?? To be clear once more, I was joking earlier when I said Monet did a purely black painting. That kind of stuff actually caught on in the mid 20th century or whatever. And unmade beds? Even simple cavemen would have thought painting a bed would be stupid, otherwise they would have drew one. (Or at least a rug). If such a person left a rug in his cave to be admired by his fellow tribe as a profound form of self-expression, he would have become an outcast. Such a silly person isn't to be trusted when hunting dangerous animals.

Ok! That was nine or ten eras of (apparently) art! I suppose creating minimalist patterns or whatever is art as paints are used in a methodical way, but throwing paint over someone ISN'T art, modern or otherwise. You can try calling it art if you think you can beat the justice system, and you can try calling speeding in a car art as well, but that sounds like contempt of court to me. I'm no lawyer, but I'm sure that would annoy a lot of people. I guess if you crash your car it could look like cubism, but

again, far from worth it. Obey the law and don't trust Tracey Emin or Picasso. You can trust the ancient Greeks though, as they were pretty realistic. Just a bit pervy. Bye!