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Modernism is now so closely identified with formalism that a fundamental constituent of the Modernist movement since the late nineteenth century, its new social awareness, is often forgotten. This new social concern engendered an appreciation of popular—more generally of unsophisticated—culture in all its manifestations. The thoroughness with which Modernism rejected traditional cultural values and the intimacy of the association it established between that rejection and social reform were unprecedented since the coming of Christianity. The association had a long prehistory, however, to which the Modern movement was greatly indebted but which we tend to overlook. We think of the development of culture instead in Darwinian terms, as an evolutionary progress toward, if not necessarily improvement, then at least increased sophistication and facility. The exceptions to the Darwinian principle are just that, exceptions: cases in which, owing to special circumstances, supposedly primitive or subnormal cultural forms are preserved accidentally, as in certain "remote" corners of the globe; or persevere incidentally within the domain of high culture in certain extra-, preter-, or non-cultural contexts, as in the art of the untutored (popular and folk art, including graffiti), of children, of the insane—what I have elsewhere called "art without history." Without presuming to challenge the biological theory of evolution as such, I view the matter in art historical terms quite differently. I would argue that an "unartistic" heritage persists, whether recognized or not, alongside and notwithstanding all developments to the contrary. The sophisticated and the naïve are always present as alternatives—in every society, even primitive ones—exerting opposing and, I venture to say, equal force in the development of culture. They may appear to exist and function independently, but in fact they are perennial alter egos, which at times interact directly. Like Beauty and the Beast, they go hand in hand.

A striking and surprising instance is offered by a series of mosaic pavements found in large and lavishly decorated houses at Olynthus in Greece dating from the early fourth century B.C. Here the figural compositions with concentric borders display all the order and discipline we normally associate with Greek thought (Fig. 1). Traces of this rationality are discernible in certain of the floors where large geometric motifs are placed in the center, above finely lettered augural inscriptions, such as “Good Fortune,” “Good Fortune is beautiful,” “Aphrodite is beautiful,” while various crudely drawn apotropaic symbols—circles, spirals, swastikas, zigzags—appear here and there in the background (Fig. 2, Fig. 3). Finally, the entire composition may be dissolved in an amorphous chaos from which the magical signs shine forth mysteriously helter-skelter, like stars in the firmament—the random arrangement is as deliberate and significant as the signs themselves (Fig. 4). The entire gamut of expressive form and meaningful thought seems here encapsulated, at the very apogee of the classical period in Greece, when the great tradition of European High Art was inaugurated. The
Olynthus mosaics reveal the common ground—the sense of the supernatural—that lies between the extremes of sophistication and naïveté to which we give terms like mythology and superstition.

The subsequent development of Greco-Roman art also abounds in various kinds and phases of radical retrospection—Neo-Attic, Archaistic, Egyptianizing—in which the naturalistic ideals of classical style were thoroughly expunged. Virtuoso performances by artists of exquisite taste and refined technique recaptured the awkward grace and innocent charm of a distant and venerable past. The retrospective mode might even be adopted in direct apposition to the classical style, as in the reliefs of a late-fourth-century altar from Epidaurus, where the archaistic design of the figure on the side contrasts with the contemporary forms of those on the front (Fig. 5, Fig. 6).

A conspicuous and historically crucial instance of such a coincidence of artistic opposites occurred at the end of classical antiquity, in the arch built by the emperor Constantine in Rome to celebrate his victory over Maxentius in A.D. 312. Parts of earlier monuments celebrating the emperors Trajan, Hadrian, and Marcus Aurelius were incorporated in the sculptural decorations of the arch, along with contemporary reliefs portraying the actions of Constantine himself (Fig. 7; compare the rondels with the narrative frieze below them). The former display all the nobility and grace of the classical tradition; the latter seem rigid, rough, and ungainly, culturally impoverished. It used to be thought that the arch was a monument of decadence, a mere pastiche in which Constantine's craftsmen salvaged what they could of the high style art of their predecessors, using their own inadequate handiwork only when necessary. In fact, there is ample evidence that the juxtaposition was deliberate, intended to illustrate Constantine's wish to associate the grandeur of the empire at the height of its power with the humble spirituality of the new, Christian ideal of dominion. The latter mode may be understood partly as an elevation to the highest level of imperial patronage of vulgar forms, whether Roman or provincial. It has been suggested, however, that the vulgar style, which was destined to play a seminal role in the development of medieval art, was also a conscious evocation of Rome's archaic past, when simplicity, austerity, and self-sacrifice had first laid the foundation of a new world order.

An analogous phenomenon has been observed in medieval art itself, at the height of the Romanesque period. Many churches of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, including some of the most illustrious, display more or less isolated reliefs executed in a crude, "infantile," manner and illustrating grotesque or uncouth subjects (Fig. 8). Formerly dismissed as reused "debris" from a much earlier period, such works have recently been shown to be contemporary with, often part of the very fabric of, the buildings they adorn. They might even proudly display the inscribed signature of the sculptor, and the bold suggestion has been made that the same artist may have been responsible for the more familiar and sophisticated parts of the decoration. Such stylistic and thematic interjections must be meaningful, especially since they inevitably recall the real spolia, bits and pieces of ancient monuments, with which many medieval churches are replete. These deliberately retrieved fragments incorporated, often discordantly, into the new masonry, bore physical witness to the supersession of paganism by Christianity. Perhaps the substandard Romanesque reliefs express a similar idea.
Despite the many such antecedents, something new happened in the Renaissance. The classical ideals of naturalism and high culture were not only retrieved, but also revived, refined, regularized, and embedded in a theoretical framework. This philosophical, mathematical, even theological structure, which culminated toward the end of the sixteenth century in a treatise by Gian Paolo Lomazzo with the significant title *L'idea del tempio della pittura* (1590), explained and justified the classical values themselves and raised their practitioners to the level of liberal, and therefore noble, artists. The classical ideals were thus enshrined in a code of visual behavior that had the force of—and indeed was often linked to—a code of personal behavior. One alternative to this unprecedented idea of a pure high art associated with a corresponding level of social values was the caricature, a "low" art form that we still today think of as peculiarly modern. The subject of this essay may thus be viewed as an episode, a particularly significant one, in the history of cultural extremes that sometimes touch.

My purpose is to illuminate, if not actually to map, the common ground as well as the great gulf that lies between the two disparate and deceptively simple drawings reproduced in *Fig. 9* and *Fig. 95*. One is a caricature of Pope Innocent XI made by Bernini in the 1670’s, the other a caricature of a bull made by Picasso in 1946. Both are revolutionary works, breaking radically with reigning conventions and establishing in turn precedents that other artists would be quick to follow. The common ground I want to illuminate is not their novelty, however, but the achievement of novelty in both cases through deliberate and explicit references to earlier traditions—exactly the process we normally see in the history of art, except that in this case the references were to the flip side of what we normally think of as art, and ultimately challenged the hallowed notion of tradition itself. We normally admire the accomplished performance of the graceful and sophisticated Dr. Jekyll, here the crude and unruly Mr. Hyde steps out of the wings and onto center stage.

Bernini was seventy-eight and had only four years to live when Benedetto Odescalchi was elected pope at age sixty-five in 1676; the caricature of Innocent is one of the few remaining traces of Bernini's handiwork from the artist's last years. As a work of art it is slight enough—a few tremulous, if devastating, pen lines sketched in a moment of diversion on a wisp of torn paper measuring barely 4½ x 7 inches. Despite its modest pretensions—in part because of them, as we shall see—it represents a major turning point in the history of art because it is the first satirical drawing of its kind that has come down to us of so exalted a personage as a pope. Innocent XI is reduced to an insect-like creature that seems to embody all the astringent crankiness for which he was famous, or rather, infamous. Signifying as it does that no one is beyond ridicule, the drawing marks a critical step in the development of a new form of visual expression in which the noblest traditions of European art and society are called into question.

By and large, before Bernini there were two methods of ridiculing people in a work of art. The artist might poke fun at a particular individual without indicating any setting or ideological context; in these cases the victim occupied a relatively modest station in life. Such were the informal comic sketches of friends and relatives by Agostino and Annibale Carracci, which they called *ritrattini carichi*, "little charged portraits." Described in the sources but now lost, these were certainly among the primary inspirations for Bernini's caricatures (*Fig. 10*). If the victim was important he would be
represented in a context that reflected his position in society. The artists of the Reformation had made almost a specialty of satirizing the popes as representatives of a hated institution and its vices (Fig. 11). In the first mode the individuality of the victim was important, but he was not; in the second, the opposite was true.  

The differences between Bernini's drawing and these antecedents have to do, on the one hand, with the form of the work, a particular kind of drawing that we immediately recognize and refer to as a caricature; and, on the other hand, with its content, the peculiar appearance and character of a specific individual who might even be the supreme pontiff of the Roman Catholic church.  

Much of what I shall say on both these counts was already said by Bernini's early biographers, who were fully aware of his achievement. Filippo Baldinucci observes that Bernini's boldness of touch [franchezza di tocco] in drawing was truly miraculous, and I could not say who in his time was his equal in this ability. An effect of this boldness was his singular work in the kind of drawing we call caricature, or exaggerated sketches, wittily malicious deformations of people's appearance, which do not destroy their resemblance or dignity, though often they were great princes who enjoyed the joke with him, even regarding their own faces, and showed the drawings to others of equal rank.  

Domenico Bernini, the artist's son, gives the following formulation: 

at that time [under Urban VIII] and afterwards he worked singularly in the kind of drawing commonly referred to as caricature. This was a singular effect of his spirit, in which as a joke he deformed some natural defect in people's appearance, without destroying the resemblance, recording them on paper as they were in substance, although in part obviously altered. The invention was rarely practiced by other artists, it being no easy matter to derive beauty from the deformed, symmetry from the ill-proportioned. He made many such drawings, and he mostly took pleasure in exaggerating the features of princes and important personages, since they in turn enjoyed recognizing themselves and others, admiring the great inventiveness of the artist and enjoying the game.  

These passages focus on the peculiar mimetic nature of caricature, defining it as a comic exaggeration of the natural defects of the sitter's features. The element of deformation reflects the origin of the word in the verb caricare: to load, as with a gun, or a brush, or a cart. It is essential, however, that an individual be represented, preferably one of high rank, and that the distortion not obscure that individual's identity. The formal qualities are expressed implicitly: the drawings were independent works of art, conceived as ends in themselves and appreciated as such; they were also true or pure portraits in that they depicted a single individual, isolated from any setting or narrative context; and they were graphically distinctive, in that they were drawn in a singular manner (reflecting Bernini's franchezza di tocco), specifically adapted to their purpose.
On all these counts Bernini's drawings are sharply distinguished from the one tradition to which they are most often referred: I mean the Renaissance scientific, or pseudo-scientific, investigation of ideal physical types as they relate to moral and psychological categories. The chief cases in point are Leonardo's studies of grotesque heads as expressions of the aesthetic notion of perfect or beautiful ugliness (Fig. 12), and Giambattista della Porta's 1586 physiognomical treatise assimilating human facial traits to those of various animal species to bring out the supposed characterological similarities (Fig. 13). But such illustrations, though Bernini certainly learned from them the association between exaggeration and character analysis, never portrayed specific individuals, were never drawn in any special style of their own, and were never sufficient unto themselves as works of art.

It is well known that in the course of the sixteenth century drawing did achieve the status of an independent art—that is, serving neither as an exercise, nor a documentary record, nor a preparatory study—in a limited variety of forms. One was what may be called the presentation drawing, which the artist prepared expressly for a given person or occasion. Michelangelo's drawings for his friend Tommaso Cavalieri are among the earliest such works that have come down to us (Fig. 14). Another category was the portrait drawing, which by Bernini's time had also become a genre unto itself. In the early seventeenth century Ottavio Leoni, a specialist in this field in Rome, recorded many notables, including the young Bernini (Fig. 15). Bernini also made portrait drawings of this type. Commonly such works were highly finished, and the draftsman adopted special devices—the distinctive stippling and rubbing of Michelangelo, a mixture of colored chalks by Leoni and Bernini—that distinguished them from other kinds of drawings. They are carefully executed, rich in detail, and complex in technique. The artist, in one way or another, created a separate formal domain midway between a sketch and a painting or sculpture.

Bernini's caricatures incorporate two interrelated innovations from this prior history of drawing-as-an-end-in-itself. They are the first such independent drawings in which the technique is purely graphic—that is, the medium is exclusively pen and ink, the forms being outlined without internal modeling; and in them the rapidity, freshness, and spontaneity usually associated with the informal sketch become an essential feature of the final work of art. The distinctive graphic style of Bernini's caricatures marks them as caricatures quite apart from what they represent. The elaborate paraphernalia of representation, hatching and shading, have been eliminated in favor of an extreme, even exaggerated, simplicity. The lines are also often patently inept, suggesting either bold muscle-bound attacks on the paper or a tremulous hesitancy. In other words, Bernini adopted (or rather created) a lowbrow or everyman's graphic mode in which traditional methods of sophisticated draftsmanship are travestied along with the sitters themselves.

If one speculates on possible antecedents of Bernini's caricature technique, two art forms—if they can be called that—immediately spring to mind, in which the inept and untutored form part of the timeless and anonymous heritage of human creativity: children's drawings and graffiti. It is not altogether farfetched to imagine that Bernini might have taken such things seriously in making his comic drawings, for he would...
Albrecht Dürer drew a deliberately crude and childish sketch of a woman with scraggly hair and a prominent nose in a letter he wrote from Venice in 1506 to his friend Willibald Pirckheimer (Fig. 16, Fig. 17). The drawing illustrates an incisive passage in which Dürer describes the Italians' favorable reaction to his Rosenkranz Madonna. He reports that the new picture had silenced all the painters who admired his graphic work but said he could not handle colors. The clumsy-looking sketch is thus an ironic response to his critics, as if to say, "Here is my Madonna, reduced to the form these fools can appreciate."

Something similar appears in certain manuscripts of Dürer's friend and admirer, Erasmus of Rotterdam. Here and there he introduced sketches—one might almost call them doodles, except they are much too self-conscious—that include repeated portrayals of himself with exaggerated features in what Panofsky described as the sharply observant, humorous spirit that animated the Praise of Folly (Fig. 18). The crude style of the drawings visually parallels Erasmus's ironic exaltation of ignorance in that work. Although Erasmus was an amateur, it should not be assumed that his sketches are simply inept. He did know better, for he had practiced painting in his youth, and he had an art-historical eye discriminating enough to appreciate the "rustic" style he associated with early medieval art.

On the back of a Leonardesque drawing from this same period, in a deliberate graphic antithesis, a wildly expressive profile head is redrawn as a witty schoolboyish persiflage (Fig. 19). Around the middle of the sixteenth century a child's drawing plays a leading role in a portrait by the Veronese painter Caroto (Fig. 20). Perhaps the drawing, which includes a full figure, a fragmentary head-nose, and a profile eye, is the work of the young man who shows it to the spectator. He seems rather too old, however, and the eye (the eye of the painter?) seems much more correctly drawn than the other elements on the sheet.

The knowing smile and glance with which the youth confronts the viewer certainly suggest an awareness of the ironic contrast between the drawing and the painting itself.

Graffiti have a particular relevance to our context because while their stylistic naivete may be constant, the things they represent are not. Historically speaking, portrait graffiti are far rarer than one might suppose. The Roman passion for portraiture has a comic aspect in the many graffiti depicting individuals, often identified by inscriptions, that decorate the walls of buildings in the capital, at Pompeii, and elsewhere (Fig. 21). I feel sure Bernini was aware of such drawings, if only because we know he was acutely aware of the wall as a graphic field. It was his habit, he said, to stroll about his house while excogitating a project, tracing his first ideas upon the wall with charcoal.

The term graffito, of course, refers etymologically to the technique of incised drawing. The beginning of its modern association with popular satirical representations can be traced to the Renaissance, notably to Vasari's time when it described a kind of mural decoration practiced, it was thought, in antiquity; these designs often included grotesque and chimeric forms with amusing distortions and transformations of nature. It is also in the Renaissance that we begin to find allusions to popular mural art by sophisticated artists. Michelangelo, who often made reference, serious as well as ironic, to the relations among various kinds of art, was a key figure in the
development. By way of illustrating the master's prodigious visual memory, Vasari describes an occasion when young Michelangelo was dining with some of his colleagues. They held an informal contest to see who could "best" draw a figure without design, awkward, Vasari says, as the doll-like creatures (fantocci) made by the ignorant who deface the walls of buildings. Michelangelo won the game by reproducing as if it were still before him such a scrawl (gofferia) he had seen long before. Vasari's comment, that this was a difficult achievement for one of discriminating taste and steeped in design, shows that he was well aware of the significance of such an interplay between high and low styles. Juxtapositions of this kind may actually be seen among the spectacular series of charcoal sketches attributed to Michelangelo and his assistants that were discovered a few years ago on the walls of the chancel behind the altar and chambers beneath the Medici chapel in Florence. In one particularly mordant transformation, an elaborate and pompous plumed helmet is rescribed and deflated into a cockscomb (Fig. 22, center top and bottom).

An even more pointed instance, and as it happens almost exactly contemporary with the Dürer letter, involves one of Michelangelo's early sonnets (Fig. 23). In the sonnet Michelangelo parodies his own work on the Sistine ceiling, the gist being that the agonizing physical conditions of the work impair his judgment (giudizio), that is, the noblest part of art, so that he is not a true painter and begs indulgence:

```
My belly's pushed by force beneath my chin.
My brush, above my face continually,
Makes it a splendid floor by dripping down.
And I am bending like a Syrian bow.

And judgment, borne in mind,
Hence must grow peculiar and untrue;
You cannot shoot straight when the gun's askew.

John, come to the rescue
Of my dead painting now, and of my honor;
I'm not in a good place, and I'm no painter."
```

In the margin of the manuscript page Michelangelo drew a sketch depicting his twisted body as the bow, his right arm holding the brush as the arrow, and a figure on the ceiling as the target. (The text and illustration give the lie, incidentally, to the popular notion that Michelangelo painted the vault while lying comfortably on his back.) Of particular interest in our context is the striking contrast in style between the two parts of the sketch: the figure of the artist is contorted but elegantly drawn; that on the ceiling is grotesquely deformed and drawn with amateurish, even child-like, crudity. Michelangelo transforms the Sistine ceiling itself into a graffito to satirize high art—in this case his own. I suspect that the grotesque figure on the vault alludes to
God the Father in the Creation of the Sun and Moon, more precisely to the rough black underdrawing of that figure in its "primitive" state. If so, Michelangelo's thought may reach further still: the graffito style would express the artist's sense of both inadequacy in portraying the Supreme Creator and unworthiness in the traditional analogy between the artist's creation and God's.

A final example from Rome brings us to Bernini's own time. This is a drawing by Pieter van Laar, nicknamed Il Bamboccio, the leader of a notorious group of Flemish painters in Rome in the seventeenth century called I Bamboccianti, "the painters of dolls," a contemporary term that refers derisively to their awkward figures and lowlife subject matter. The members of the group formed a loose-knit organization, the Bentvogel, and were notorious for living unruly lives that made a mockery of the noble Renaissance ideal of the gentleman artist. The drawing (Fig. 24) shows the interior of a tavern filled with carousing patrons; the back wall is covered with all manner of crude and grotesque designs, including a caricatural head shown in profile. Many works by the Bamboccianti are reflections on the theory and practice of art, and van Laar's drawing is also an ironic exaltation of the satirical and popular art held in contempt by the grand and often grandiloquent humanist tradition. We are invited to contemplate this irony by the figures who draw attention to the word Bamboccio scrawled beneath a doll-like figure seen from behind and the profile head.

One point emerges clearly from the prehistory of Bernini's deliberate and explicit exploitation of aesthetic vulgarity. The artists who displayed this unexpected sensibility to the visually underprivileged did so to make some statement about art or their profession. The statements were, in the end, deeply personal and had to do with the relation between ordinary or common creativity and what is usually called art. No doubt there is an art-theoretical, or even art-philosophical element in Bernini's attitude as well, but with him the emphasis shifts. His everyman's style is not a vehicle for comment about art or being an artist, but about people, or rather being a person. His visual lampoons are strictly ad hominem, and for this reason, I think, in the case of Bernini one can speak for the first time of caricature drawing not only as art but as an art of social satire.

Bernini's invention was a great success, and he himself introduced the concept and the example to Louis XIV, who was greatly amused, during his visit to the French court in 1665. To be sure, there is no evidence that Bernini ever intended to publish his persiflages in the form of prints; we owe the caricature as a public instrument of social reform to eighteenth-century England. Yet, the modest little drawings sprang from a deep well within, and they were far from mere trifles to him. Both points emerge, along with Bernini's clear awareness of what he was about, from a charming letter he wrote to a friend named Bonaventura (meaning "Good Fortune" in Italian) accompanying two such sketches, now lost:
As a cavaliere, I swear I’ll never send you any more drawings because having these two portraits you can say you have all that bumbler Bernini can do. But since I doubt your dim wit can recognize them I’ll tell you the longer one is Don Giberti and the shorter one is Bona Ventura. Believe me, you’ve had Good Fortune, because I’ve never had greater satisfaction than in these two caricatures, and I’ve made them with my heart. When I visit you I’ll see if you appreciate them.

Your True Friend
G. L. Bern.
Rome 15 Mar. 1652

This is, incidentally, the first time the word *caricature* is used as we use it today, as the name for a class of drawings. The ignoble here achieves the status of an independent visual and intellectual concept.

It might be said that with the invention of caricature, visual illiteracy for the first time became self-conscious and articulate. An alternative art form was established that helped pave a permanent and ever-widening inroad into the classical tradition as it had been defined by the theoreticians of the Renaissance. Beauty had begun to accept the Beast and the future of their relationship was assured. Almost by definition, however, caricature, like the parallel efflorescence of quotations of children’s art and graffiti in more sophisticated works, is strictly *ad hoc*, bound irrevocably to a particular person, situation, or context, and therefore also to a moment in time—bound, that is, in history. And however important and seminal these retrospective developments were in transforming cultural values, something radically new happened with the Modern movement. There took place what amounted to a repetition in reverse of the historical revolution of the Renaissance, which had given justification and elaboration to the classical tradition, thereby arousing the sleeping Beast in the first place. The simple and unsophisticated came to be exalted *in principle* as the norm to which truly modern man, in his communal spirit, must return or aspire in order to achieve a *summum bonum* both timeless and universal. The various forms of art-without-history came to be appreciated not simply as aberrations from, alternatives to, or primitive stages of sophisticated culture, but as ends in themselves, worthy of emulation even to the point of supplanting sophisticated culture altogether. What was perceived, ultimately, was the protean substance of which all these seemingly unselfconscious forms of expression are made, precisely their a-historicity, the glimpse they provided of a distant but attainable ideal of innocence and authenticity. Historicism self-destructs.

* * *

On November 2, 1945, when Picasso entered the lithographic workshop of Fernand Mourlot in the Rue de Chabrol in Paris, he took up a medium he had practiced before only rarely, and never assiduously. On that day as if to celebrate the liberation of Paris and the end of the war—Picasso began a veritable paroxysm of lithographic creativity that lasted four months. He worked at least twelve-hour days, almost without interruption; the hectic activity was described by one of the craftsmen who participated:
We gave him a stone and two minutes later he was at work with crayon and brush. And there was no stopping him. As lithographers we were astounded by him. When you make a lithograph, the stone has been prepared, and if you have to make a correction the stone has to be re-touched ... Right. We run off twelve to fifteen proofs for him and return the stone to him in good order. Then he makes his second state. On a stone like that, normally, when it has been retouched twice, the original preparation becomes somewhat spoilt... And he would scrape and add ink and crayon and change everything! After this sort of treatment the design generally becomes indecipherable and is destroyed. But, with him! Each time it would turn out very well. Why? That's a mystery... Picasso is a real hard worker. We used to leave at 8:00 at night and he would be there at 8:30 in the morning. Sometimes I would suggest that we should call it a day... He would look at the stone, light up a Gauloise and give me one, and then we were off again... and in the morning we would start again."

We know everything he did during that period and we can follow his progress day by day. The chief results of this frenzied activity were four series of images, two female heads, a pair of nudes, and a bull (Fig. 25, Fig. 26, Fig. 27, Fig. 28, Fig. 29, Fig. 30, Fig. 37, Fig. 38, Fig. 39, Fig. 40, Fig. 41, Fig. 42 and Fig. 85, Fig. 86, Fig. 87, Fig. 88, Fig. 89, Fig. 90, Fig. 91, Fig. 92, Fig. 93, Fig. 94, Fig. 95). Picasso took up the themes in that order, producing respectively six, ten, eighteen, and eleven versions; of every variant a number of prints—I hesitate to say proofs—were pulled, reserved for the artist. In each case the suite was made not from separate lithographic stones but from successive reworkings of the same stone.35

The description confirms the evidence of the actual prints, that what possessed Picasso was the process itself, the sequence of states and their cumulative effect as a series. Indeed, Picasso seems to have put into practice here an idea he had expressed a few months earlier when speaking of one of his paintings: "If it were possible, I would leave it as it is, while I began over and carried it to a more advanced state on another canvas. Then I would do the same thing with that one. There would never be a 'finished' canvas, but just the different 'states' of a single painting, which normally disappear in the course of work."36

As far as I can discover, nothing quite like it had ever been seen before. There was certainly nothing new about works in series on a single theme—Monet's church facades and haystacks spring to mind; and there was certainly nothing new about multiple states of a single print—Impressionist print makers achieved varied effects comparable to Monet's through multiple modifications of the same plate (Fig. 31, Fig. 32, Fig. 33).37 Picasso had subjected some of his own etched plates to thirty or more re-workings (Fig. 34, Fig. 35, Fig. 36).38 Three main points, taken together, distinguish the lithographic series. First, the states acquire a new self-sufficiency, with the separate reworkings treated quite differently. Instead of pulling a small number of trial proofs before a much larger run from the final version, Picasso ordered a fixed and usually large number of prints—eighteen or nineteen—to be made from each state, including the last, which was then given an additional, final, run of its own. In the case of the bull, several sketches and a watercolor; a number of intermediate states, of which only single proofs were taken; and independent lithographs made concurrently indicate that Picasso actually studied the solutions he would then commit to the tortured stone.
Neither the states nor the multiple prints made from them were trials in the ordinary sense; they were conceived as a unified, if not wholly predetermined, series and were meant to be compared with one another. Second, the designs were not simply variations but consistently progressive transformations of a basic theme; it is as if Picasso had set out to tell a story, a heroic narrative that recounted the life history of a work of art. Third, the formal and conceptual sequence moved in the opposite direction from that of earlier suites. Normally, the successive states of prints, including Picasso's own (see Fig. 34, Fig. 35, Fig. 36), become richer and more complex. The bull started out that way; with the second state darker and weightier than the first. Thereafter, however, the compositions became ever more simple and schematic—more “abstract,” if that word has any sense in this context (Fig. 37, Fig. 38, Fig. 39, Fig. 40, Fig. 41, Fig. 42 and Fig. 85, Fig. 86, Fig. 87, Fig. 88, Fig. 89, Fig. 90, Fig. 91, Fig. 92, Fig. 93, Fig. 94, Fig. 95).

While they might seem coincidental, I believe these innovations were interdependent and complementary; if so, the lithographs could even be conscious, programmatic illustrations of the trenchant self-revelations Picasso made in an interview with Christian Zervos in 1935.

"In the old days,” he said, “pictures went forward toward completion by stages. Every day brought something new. A picture used to be a sum of additions. In my case a picture is a sum of destructions. I do a picture—then I destroy it. In the end, though, nothing is lost... It would be very interesting to preserve photographically, not the stages, but the metamorphoses of a picture. Possibly one might then discover the path followed by the brain in materializing a dream. But there is one very odd thing—to notice that basically a picture doesn't change, that the first 'vision' remains almost intact, in spite of appearances."**

**  **  **

**A PRELIMINARY DIGRESSION WITH BALZAC**

Two preliminary, interrelated considerations, personal as well and artistic, are necessary for a full understanding of the genesis and motivation of Picasso’s monumental lithographic project—monumental, despite the relatively small scale of the images (29 x 42 cm), in terms of the power of the images themselves, the time and energy Picasso devoted to them, and the scale of their implications. The first is that the whole undertaking was profoundly personal, autobiographical and metaphorical. The bull, the principle animal that inhabited Picasso’s vast menagerie throughout his life as his truly mystical self-representation, was an ancient, indeed pre-historic symbol of power and masculinity, sometimes overwhelmed by *forces majeures*. Picasso undertook his lithographic outpouring at a moment of tumultuous transition between two women, from Dora Maar to Françoise Gilot, to both of whom he was passionately and intimately attached. The women were also his models, and the images were thus interconnected in life, as they were in execution and in their formal evolution. The way they behave visually is thus a transposition into art of a fundamental understanding of the nature of the human psyche.

The second consideration is that, although the fact has been scarcely noted, Picasso’s formulation of his own artistic *raison d'être* as a process of creative destruction was derived from Balzac’s famous 1847 novella *Le Chef-d’œuvre*
inconnu, itself an iconic symbol of the lonely predicament of the aspiring artist that had inspired or been confronted by many artists before Picasso, most notably Cezanne. The story takes place in the historical past, the early seventeenth century—a rarity in Balzac's work, apart from antiquity itself; it is thus, in essence, about the history of art. The plot revolves about the decade-long struggle of the aged, hermetic, and obsessive painter Frenhofer to achieve absolute perfection in his portrait of his beautiful model, Catherine Lescault. Frenhofer finally yields to the curiosity of the painters Porbus (1569-1622) and Poussin (1594-1665), allowing a comparison between the living beauty of Poussin's mistress Gillette, and his hidden masterpiece, which—in his apparent delusion—he regards as far superior. The artists' names are clearly significant: Frenhofer is imaginary and may therefore be taken as the aspiring artist generally; Porbus, whom Poussin is known to have admired, was the leading representative in Paris of the Flemish tradition of super-detailed realism, especially in portraiture, while Poussin was the paragon of French ideal classicism. The comparison these aesthetic alter egos make proves catastrophic, and the story ends when Frenhofer, finding his innovative genius misunderstood by his younger colleagues, destroys his great work and commits suicide. The crucial moment of revelation in Balzac's tragic and ironic tale occurs when, upon inspecting the picture, the visitors fail to perceive the portrait of which Frenhofer was so proud. Frenhofer exclaims,

"Ah! You did not anticipate such perfection! You are in the presence of a woman and you are looking for a picture. ... Where is art? Lost, vanished! Those are the outlines of a real young woman."

Poussin says,

"I can see nothing there but colors piled upon one another in confusion, and held in restraint by a multitude of curious lines which form a wall of painting."

"We are mistaken," said Porbus, "look!"

On drawing nearer, they spied in one corner of the canvas the end of a bare foot standing forth from that chaos of colors, of tones, of uncertain shades, that sort of shapeless mist; but a lovely foot, a living foot! They stood fairly petrified with admiration before that fragment, which had escaped that most incredible, gradual, progressive destruction (italics mine!). That foot appeared there as the trunk of a Parian marble Venus would appear among the ruins of a burned city.

Picasso's attitude toward Balzac's disturbing tale was nurtured by the example of Cezanne, who had identified personally with Frenhofer and pursued a life-long engagement with the novella. 44 It has been aptly suggested that Cezanne was responding to Balzac's story with his repeated "destructions" of Manet's notorious, crassly contemporary reformulation of the classical nude in his "portrait" of the prostitute Olympia: two small, crudely and violently executed oil sketches—the second of which included a self-portrait as a voyeur—that were ironically and provocatively titled _Une moderne Olympia_ (Fig. 96, Fig. 97). 45 As early as 1901, Picasso had himself parodied the _Olympia_, showing the heroine as a negress, himself as a nude observer-patron,
his friend Junyer, also nude, in place of the black female attendant, and adding a dog to the famous black cat (Fig. 98).

In Cézanne’s ironic degradation of Manet’s Olympia the traditional classical theme of the female nude as the embodiment of ideal beauty became a quasi-metaphor for Frenhofer’s destructive quest for an ideal beauty more real and more universal than the original. And Picasso no doubt had Cézanne’s multiple and multifaceted example in mind in 1927 when he was commissioned by Amboise Vollard to execute a series of etchings for an edition of the Balzac’s novel, not published until 1931. Picasso is often said to have been fascinated by Le Chef-d’oeuvre inconnu, but it seems clear to me that Balzac’s account of Frenhofer’s destructive process is reflected not only in Picasso’s etchings that accompany the story, but also Picasso’s 1935 account of his own labors of creative destruction and redemption of the past, that is, the classical tradition of art as an idealization of nature; and the epic drama of progressive, single-stone lithographic suites he enacted at Mourlot’s studio a decade later.

It is a notorious fact that Picasso’s etchings do not illustrate the narrative in a conventional or coherent way; the relationship seems so inescapable that it has even been questioned whether he had read the story when he made the original twelve etchings at Vollard’s request in 1927 (Fig. 43, Fig. 44, Fig. 45, Fig. 46, Fig. 47, Fig. 48, Fig. 49, Fig. 50, Fig. 51, Fig. 52, Fig. 53, Fig. 54). When it came to the publication in 1931 he added a thirteenth etching as a kind of visual table of contents with abbreviated sketches of the illustrations numbered sequentially (Fig. 55). In the book itself, however, Vollard changed the sequence, for the purpose, as he explained in a note to the binder, of providing more satisfactory arrangements in the layout of the pages. He certainly would not have done so without the permission of Picasso, who was evidently concerned to record his own sequence but not with any specific relationship between his illustrations and the narrative of the text. In fact he said explicitly that although sometimes there were coincidental correspondences, he never really “illustrated” anything, and specifically not in the case of the Vollard edition of Balzac. A generic relationship may be discerned in the fact that the images are mainly concerned to describe a sort of representational dialogue between the artist, his beautiful, classical, mostly nude models, and the variously distorted and abstracted images he creates; and that no steady progression, stylistic or thematic, can be discerned. What Picasso seems to be doing, or so I believe, is not at all to follow the narrative, but rather in his own imagination to follow—as Balzac does not—the meanderings of Frenhofer’s mind through the long, solitary years in which he sought to realize his dream of a perfect, ideal beauty.

An extreme of abstraction appears in the most famous of the etchings, where a mature, clothed “model”—at whom the artist stares intently—sits knitting, while he fills the surface of his canvas like a graffito wall, with a filigree of looping and intersecting lines that ironically replicates the intricate linear convolutions of the sitter’s own manipulated creation (Picasso no. IV, Fig. 46). Picasso placed this scene in the midst of his series; Vollard placed it at the end of the book, corresponding to the final destruction with which the story concludes. In this case, at least, Vollard constructed a narrative, illustrative relationship between image and text that Picasso did not intend. For Picasso, instead, this image was the heart of the matter, as if to say that the design created by the artist on the canvas is not a representation of the woman, but a
"sign" of the model's reality, just as the knitting is the reality of the image fabricated by the sitter of the portrait.

In this way, and only in this way, I think, can be understood the astonishing fact that Picasso inserted before Balzac's text by way of introduction (EN MANIÈRE D'INTRODUCTION) sixteen, separately lettered pages with no less than fifty-five equally astonishing, purely abstract designs consisting of small dots connected by straight and curved lines. He did so deliberately, at the very outset of the project, transferring for reproduction to Vollard in June and October 1928 the notebook containing the designs that he had created at Juan-les-Pins in the summer of 1924 (Fig. 56). These more or less complex patterns have a remarkable multivalent history that sheds light on Picasso's way of understanding the text. They have three main permutations in Picasso's work during this period, musical, spatial, and linguistic. They strongly suggest the graphic signs—notes, clefs, staves, measures—used to represent sounds in musical notation, as well as the shapes of fretted string instruments. In fact, the first use Picasso made of these drawings was for a similar project of "illustration," not of a text but of a musical composition by Picasso's composer friend, Francis Poulenc. One of the drawings appeared on the cover of a volume of songs by Poulenc on poems by Ronsard, published in January 1925 (Fig. 57); subsequently they illustrated the program for the "bal de la grande Ours" of the Union of Russian Artists in Paris, May 8, 1925. The design Picasso chose for Poulenc is prima facie appropriate, since it resembles a guitar, a veritable icon in Picasso's work, especially at this period. But the line and dot designs have a larger significance in the musical context, since they are evidently intended to "reproduce" sound in visual form. "Reproduce" is the operative word here: Picasso did not intend to "illustrate" Poulenc's score, but rather to introduce it with a graphic equivalent of the qualities of rhythm, interval, arrangement, and intensity, that are the essence of what is conveyed by musical notation. Picasso offered the visual music he had created, in homage to Poulenc's creative act in composing the scores.

A statement by Picasso himself suggests the second domain in which he created the drawings, which might be called "cosmological." In 1955 it was reported that Picasso denied the drawings had anything to do with the "automatic" creative technique the Surrealists had perceived in them, but instead were based on the graphic system used in astronomical maps of the constellations.

You can imagine how intolerable to me are all those people who ape my art, my work, even my ways. One day some clever young men of the Surrealiste school came upon some sketches and pen-drawings consisting only of points and lines in my sketch-book. The fact is that I admire astronomical charts very much. They seem to me to be beautiful apart from their ideological signification. So, one fine day, I set out to make a drawing of a number of points joined by lines, and of spots that seemed to be hung in the heavens. I meant to use it later on, introducing the subject as a purely graphical element in my
compositions. But those Surrealists! oh, they are clever. They decided that these drawings corresponded exactly to their abstract ideas.  

The point is strikingly confirmed by comparison with contemporary astronomical charts and suggests that Picasso’s musical allusion may in turn have resonated with a still grander vision of a graphic language that would express the age-old concept of the harmony of the universe (Fig. 58). In a context that relates the drawings to Balzac in another way, the lines have mutated into wire networks and the dots have expanded into circles surrounded by ellipses that suggest the planet Saturn, which became the head of a writer or artist seated working at a table, as if assimilated to the planetary deity that holds sway over all artistic creativity (Fig. 59). The larger implication is evident when he actually drew stars instead of dots connecting the lines (Fig. 60), and the spatial-celestial dimension of the drawings ultimately emerged in Picasso’s project for a monument to his poet friend Apollinaire, of whom he had earlier promised to make an “apotheosis,” no doubt understanding the concept in the ancient sense of raising the spirit of the deceased to the status of a star in the empyrean (Fig. 61, Fig. 62).  

In 1926 Picasso’s search for a pure linear expressive vocabulary took a third, radically new turn, now at the intersection between description and representation, that emerged in the key image of the Balzac illustrations commissioned the following year, and ultimately in the linear denouement of the Bull series nearly a decade later. In two monumental, quasi-pendant paintings, the short, straight and curved lines of the dot-line drawings have become continuous looping and interweaving convolutions that involve the entire surface. In the Milliner’s Workshop, begun in January, inspired by a shop visible from Picasso’s studio, the intersecting convolutions define monochrome black, grey and white compartments, the whole recalling the patterns laid out like jig-saw puzzles, used by the designers and makers of such garments (Fig. 63). In the Painter and his Model of the same year the looping and intersecting lines are isolated and become, in effect, Picasso’s picture of the painter (who remains as a demonically squint-eyed face, with a hand holding a brush to a palette) painting his model (who remains as a pitifully tiny face and hand, and an enormous foot—which inevitably recalls the remaining foot in Frenhofer’s mysterious masterpiece portrait of his model), and the painting the painter has painted (Fig. 64). Finally, in the “star” sketchbook, which bears the dates 21 March and 20 June 1926 and includes drawings for the Milliner’s Workshop, Picasso planned a group of radically novel collages, called Guitars, in which the straight lines also become continuous and looping, in the form of strings that seem to penetrate and re-emerge, as if woven into the surface (a cardboard panel), to which pieces of cloth are attached. In one case Picasso made the manipulatory metaphor explicit by attaching to the surface a long knitting needle that passes beneath and emerges beyond the edges of the flat piece of canvas nailed to the support (Fig. 65). The Balzac etchings include several images of the painter portraying a model, but only in the centerpiece is the sitter shown knitting while the image on the canvas consists of a continuously moving interweaving...
line that seems to follow the abstract design traced by the creator's yarn—like a modern-day, matronly Penelope who endlessly fabricates her garment to fend off persistent suitors while she awaits the return of her wandering husband Ulysses. The reference may not seem so far-fetched when we note that the knitter wears what is clearly a traditional Greek costume (Fig. 66), and recall William Rubin's proposal that the beautiful turbaned woman who appears in many of Picasso’s works in the summer of 1923 and after, referred to the American heiress Sarah Murphy. Sarah and her husband Gerald Murphy were good friends of Picasso, in whose company they spent that summer at Antibes. Sarah wears a turban in photographs taken at the beach, in one of which she is shown standing arm-in-arm with Picasso in bathing trunks while she wears a long, loose-fitting flower-bedecked shift (Fig. 67, Fig. 68). Picasso obviously admired Sara, of whom he did several portraits, and Rubin suggests they may have had a liaison that August, while Gerald was away; but also that Sarah’s character was such that she might have demurred. Turbans were then fashionable, to be sure, but in the summer of 1926 at Juan-les-Pins, where the Murphys were again in residence nearby, there was a veritable florescence of drawings that included turbaned women wearing traditional Greek costumes, along with figures in ancient Greek garments. Some of these drawings were reproduced in the Balzac volume along with the numbered etchings in which the same headgear and costumes appear (Fig. 43, Fig. 46, Fig. 47, Fig. 48, Fig. 49 the hem ornamented with a Greek fret). As both Rubin and Richardson emphasize, the period is the apogee of Picasso’s classicism, which might here be described more generically as “Grecian.”

The intrigue of knitted and drawn lines in Picasso’s central Balzac image is a metaphorical equivalent to the multitude of curious lines that Poussin observed holding in restraint the piled up confusion of colors in Frenhofer’s masterpiece. The observation is curiously consistent with Frenhofer’s declaration that “Nature provides a succession of rounded outlines which run into one another. Strictly speaking, drawing does not exist!” Indeed, much of Picasso’s work in the years preceding Vollard’s commission seem to embody an almost mystical feeling—which he shared with Matisse, as we shall see—for the evocative power of pure line drawing.

What Picasso invented in the summer of 1924 was a sort of universal, polysemantic sign language, consisting initially of the simplest of all graphic traces, dots and lines, capable of giving visual expression to virtually all forms of human thought. Speaking of a visit to Picasso in 1946 Anatole Jakovski quotes a statement of Picasso making precisely this point.

Picasso first shows me a series of crayon drawings, female heads which, starting with an almost naturalistic sketch, arrive at a few intense and expressive lines, preserve the essence and nothing but the essence of the person. ... Specifically recalls the genesis of last winter’s lithographical bull which also, after a thousand metamorphoses, left its photographic image to become pure magic. ... “Plastic means! I don’t know them. Painting is nothing but sign. So the thing signified is what counts, not the procedure. Yet there is a great difference between the sign and the word. The word ‘chair’ signifies nothing, But a painting of a ‘chair’ is itself a sign. Interpreting it becomes infinite.”
A particular point of relevance concerns the fact that in Balzac’s account, in the end, a fragment of the original subject remains in the otherwise totally incomprehensible painting. Still to be seen in the corner of the canvas is a beautiful foot of the nude female model, which the consternated and uncomprehending visitors, Porbus and Poussin, greatly admire. This essential legacy of the original is exactly the “very odd thing” that remained from Picasso’s destruction, as he emphasized at the end of his remark (the trace of a circular face is discernable in the skein of lines that portray the knitting sitter in Picasso’s etching). Balzac goes on to compare Frenhofer’s foot to the torso of some Venus of Parian marble appearing among the ruins of a burned city. I believe that this classical metaphor is also pertinent to an understanding of the genesis of Picasso’s first sum of destructions, Les Demoiselles d’Avignon, in relation to the classical canon of beauty Picasso sought to supersede, and in particular to a famous ancient fragmentary sculpture in the Louvre, the Venus of Arles, the echo of which, as I have suggested elsewhere, resonates in that painting (Fig. 69, Fig. 70). Indeed, Picasso may have encountered Balzac’s story in connection with the Demoiselles, the first recorded name for which, “Le bordel philosophique,” suggested by Apollinaire, was reported in 1912. Both terms of Apollinaire’s phrase recall Balzac’s novella: Le Chef-d’oeuvre inconnu was included in the section of his La comédie humaine called “Études philosophiques”; and in the original version of the story Balzac had described Catherine Lescault, as “une célèbre courtisane appelée la Belle-Noiseuse” (the annoying beauty). It is interesting to note that Balzac removed all references to her nickname and profession in the second edition of 1847, perhaps because he realized that they contradicted Frenhofer’s anticipation of “the triumph that the beauty of his own (painted) virgin would gain over that of a real young girl” (“la triomphe que la beauté de sa vierge allait remporter sur celle d’une vraie jeune fille”). Vollard returned to the original version.

What seems clear from all this is that Picasso was profoundly aware of Balzac’s conception of the destructive and salvific nature of the painter’s struggle to distill abstract, perfect beauty from reality. The etchings embody that struggle in three ways: the vast majority—nine—depict artists with a variety of distortions, obfuscations, and abstractions of their, mostly, nude models (Picasso nos. I, II, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII; Fig. 43, Fig. 44, Fig. 46, Fig. 47, Fig. 48, Fig. 49, Fig. 50, Fig. 53, Fig. 54, Fig. 55); two images include confrontations of the bull and the horse, alluding to the corrida (Picasso nos. III, X; Fig. 45, Fig. 52); one refers to the traditional, irritating emblem of classical beauty, the Three Graces (IX; Fig. 51). The etchings are thus mainly concerned with the relationship between the artist, his mostly beautiful, classical, nude models, and the variously distorted and abstracted images he creates; and that, in Picasso’s conception of Frenhofer’s explorations, no steady progression, stylistic or thematic, can be discerned. Picasso’s later statement to Zervos reflects a fundamental shift in emphasis, focusing now explicitly on the slow and progressive nature of Balzac’s destruction, and transforming Frenhofer’s sadly redeeming remainder into a sum. When Picasso entered Mourlot’s studio in 1945, his association with Balzac and identification with Frenhofer were embodied, as it were, in the fact that he was living, proudly, in the very building at 7, Rue des Grands-Augustins where the events recounted in Le Chef-d’oeuvre inconnu begin. In her account of her first visit to Picasso’s studio in May 1943, Françoise Gilot recorded Picasso’s words as he
proudly guided his visitors through the place. “That covered spiral stairway you walked up to get here,” he said, “is the one the young painter in Balzac’s Le Chef-d’oeuvre inconnu climbed when he came to see old Pourbus, the friend of Poussin who painted the pictures nobody understood (italics mine). Oh, the whole place is full of historical and literary ghosts.” Gilot provides Picasso’s own testimony to the fact that he understood the gist of Balzac’s story in a way radically different, indeed opposite way to the commonly accepted interpretation: Frenhofer’s desperate end resulted not from his failure to succeed in his struggle to find perfection, but on his visitors’ failure to comprehend what he had achieved. And now, eighteen months later, living with the ghost of Balzac, Picasso’s ferocious struggle to make a permanent, step-by-step record of his destructive creation of a new Beauty, began in earnest.

* * *

A striking parallel and contrast with Picasso’s lithographic series is offered by Matisse, who often used photographs to record the evolution of his paintings, often toward greater abstraction (Fig. 71, Fig. 72, Fig. 73, Fig. 74). The purpose was not to document the process as such, however, but to enable him to judge the progress of the work: “The photos taken in the course of execution of the work permit me to know if the last conception conforms more [to his mental conception] than the preceding ones; whether I have advanced or regressed.” Matisse referred to the succeeding conceptions as “stages” (étaps), a notion which, in his statement to Brassai, Picasso specifically rejected. Similarly, Matisse described the multiple permutations portrayed in his Themes and Variations suite of drawings (Fig. 75, Fig. 76, Fig. 77) as “a motion picture film of the feelings of an artist”. The cinema metaphor expressed the variation, however, not a consistent formal progression of the different motifs; in fact, while some of the themes start with a shaded drawing, all the other sketches are purely linear and betray no tendency toward abstraction. The same may be said of the recently published series of twenty-one drawings executed by Matisse on the same day, which he described as “the birth of a tree in the mind of an artist.” He inscribed the sheets with the date, “25/8 41,” and numbered them in sequence. The studies may be said to progress toward abstraction in the “iconographical” sense that the series starts with a tree having a trunk, branches, and leaves, and ends with leaves only (Fig. 79); but “formally” the drawings are all purely linear. In sum, notwithstanding the analogies and the constant interaction between the two artists, there is nothing in all of Matisse’s oeuvre, with respect either to purpose or to formal transformation, remotely like the relentless, systematic, and brutal destruction to which Picasso subjected his lithographic Bull.

In engraving and etching the normal sequence of states, from relative simplicity to relative complexity, is consonant with the technique, since it is extremely difficult to expunge the marks in a metal plate. Erasures are much easier in lithography, though Picasso now also pushed this medium much farther than the experts thought possible. Whence the plot of the creation drama enacted in Mourlot’s workshop begins to emerge. Only on the lithographic stone was it possible to tell the particular kind of story Picasso had in mind—the retrogressive destruction of a single work of art...
back to its original state; or, what amounts to the same thing, the progressive evolution of a single work to its ideal state.

Needless to say, the process of simplification and abstraction had been inherent in the Cubist enterprise, and on occasion had approached a sort of quasi-seriality. A case in point, which Picasso certainly knew, is Matisse's sequentially abstracting variations of the same sculpture (Fig. 80, Fig. 81, Fig. 82, Fig. 83). It is doubtful if the sculptures were conceived as series, however, since he made them only intermittently, sometimes at intervals of many years, and almost never exhibited them together.77 Moreover, the progression consists in reorganizing, rather than eliminating modeled form. Modeled form is progressively eliminated in another case, which I suspect Picasso also knew, a sequence of cows by the Dutch De Stijl painter Theo van Doesburg, who published a selection in a treatise on aesthetics in 1925 (Fig. 84);78 they are not variations of the same work, however, but begin with a photograph and pass through a number of preparatory drawings to a final, completely nonobjective painting. In Picasso's lithographs, the process becomes coherent, unified, objectified, and the subject of an object lesson, not in art theory but in art history. The lesson, moreover, is conceived in a special way, which can best be learned from the history of the bull.

Several factors suggest that the bull was, in fact, the main offspring of Picasso's lithographic orgy (Fig. 85, Fig. 86, Fig. 87, Fig. 88, Fig. 89, Fig. 90, Fig. 91, Fig. 92, Fig. 93, Fig. 94, Fig. 95). (See the Synoptic Table, Fig. 140) Here, as elsewhere in Picasso's work, the bull was a kind of self-image, as well as a symbol of bestiality in general, and the bull is literally as well as metaphorically the centerpiece of the work. Picasso started the bull series after the other three, but then worked on it with particular intensity. For a time, he even dropped everything else to pursue the bull to its end, or should one say its beginning? In personal terms, Picasso is surrounded by his women-models. The bull also has a special place in the participants' recollections of the time at Mourlot's:

One day...he started work on the famous bull. It was a superb, well-rounded bull. I thought myself that that was that. But not at all. A second state and a third, still well-rounded, followed. And so it went on. But the bull was no longer the same. It began to diminish, to lose weight... Picasso was taking away rather than adding to his composition... He was carving away slices of his bull at the same time. And after each change we pulled a proof. He could see that we were puzzled. He made a joke, he went on working, and then he produced another bull. And each time less and less of the bull remained. He used to look at me and laugh. 'Look,' he would say, 'we ought to give this bit to the butcher. The housewife could say: I want that piece or this one...' In the end, the bull's head was like that of an ant. At the last proof there remained only a few lines. I had watched him at work, reducing, always reducing. I still remembered the first bull and I said to myself: What I don't understand is that he has ended up where really he should have started! But he, Picasso, was seeking his own bull. And to achieve his one line bull he had gone in successive stages through all the other bulls. And when you look at that line you cannot imagine how much work it had involved...79

Picasso's joke about the butcher and the housewife reveals part of what he had in mind: to reduce the bull to its constituent parts, to recover the disjecta membra of his dream-bull—bred of pure lines to an elemental, disembodied, quintessential...
Another insight is suggested by one of the most striking aspects of the animal's transformation—duly observed, at least in part, by the perspicacious craftsman—the progressive diminution in the relative size of the head until it becomes barely perceptible as a totally impersonal zero, and the progressive diminution of the genitalia to a minuscule appendage. These reductions are evidently metaphors for rationality and brutishness, and what Picasso was headed for was a preternatural state of illuminated absent-mindedness and incorporeality, before the bull acquired the bulky accretions of sophisticated European culture.

To be sure, references to sophisticated European culture are both numerous and essential to the import of Picasso's image. The animal's obvious mythological and sporting associations, the Minotaur and the corrida, had long been part of the fauna of Picasso's visionary landscape, and in this tradition the suite is certainly related to Goya's famous etched cycle of floating dream-bulls (Fig. 108). Since the middle ages, when St. Luke, who painted the first portrait of Christ and the Virgin, became the patron of the artists' guilds and the early academies of art, the evangelist's symbolic ox had been the very emblem of the art of painting. As such, the ox often served to introduce books of instruction on academic drawing (Fig. 109), a genre of publication which, as we shall see presently, held special significance for Picasso. Even Picasso's joke about the butcher is relevant here, since his remark, and the intermediate stages of the design itself, inevitably bring to mind those sectioned images of bovine anatomy that adorn the walls of butcher shops and the chapters on "meat" in elementary cookbooks (Fig. 110).

Picasso also must have found comfort for his urge toward "primitive" segmentation and abstraction of nature in Albrecht Dürer's famous woodcut depiction of a rhinoceros, the first seen in Europe since antiquity, as a sort of wondrous, exotic, primitive monster (Fig. 111); we shall see presently that he had long before similarly coopted Dürer's proportional and geometric studies of the human body in his drawings for the figures in the Demoiselles d'Avignon.

Apart from such serio-comic references to traditional and familiar themes, the underlying process of Picasso's thought might be defined as a kind of genetic historicism in which, to borrow a pair of biological concepts, ontogeny repeats phylogeny—that is, the history of the individual recapitulates the history of the species. Picasso's bull really does have a binary genealogy. The grandiose, primordial beasts of paleolithic art must also have figured vividly in Picasso's imagination. The final state of the lithographic bull has, in fact, been aptly likened to such Ice Age depictions. Indeed, the whole series seems to echo the great, thundering procession of weightless, elegant, and delicately painted animals at Lascaux, the noblest of all prehistoric bull-pens (Fig. 112); or, more specifically perhaps, the Black and White Chamber at Niaux (Fig. 113), where the monochrome figures are shown in varying degrees of articulation, from modeled form to outlined shape.

Picasso defined his attitude to this kind of art in two remarkable statements, one made quite spontaneously to his secretary Jaime Sabartés, who reported it as follows:
"I cannot recall why nor on what occasion (Picasso) decided to pass on to me, as if he were tired of thinking, this idea which he seems to have been meditating for the longest time: 'Primitive sculpture has never been surpassed. Have you noticed the precision of the lines engraved in the caverns?... You have seen reproductions... The Assyrian bas-reliefs still keep a similar purity of expression.' 'How do you explain to yourself,' I asked, 'the disappearance of this marvelous simplicity?' 'This is due to the fact that man ceased to be simple. He wanted to see farther and so he lost the faculty of understanding that which he had within reach of his vision.... The same happens with a watch: it will go more or less well; but if it goes at all it is not so bad. The worst begins the moment it falls into the hands of a watchmaker... His manipulations will rob it of its purity, and this will never return. It may preserve the same external appearance, just as the idea of art subsists; but we already know what has been done to it by the schools... Its essence has evaporated, and I make you a present of what remains'."\textsuperscript{83}

The pristine purity of expression emphasized here had particular meaning for Picasso, meaning so deep that it motivated the explanation he gave André Malraux of the underlying difference between his own early interest and that of Matisse and Braque in African sculpture—"les Nègres," "the Blacks," to use his term. The Blacks, he said, were not primitive, as Egyptian and Chaldean sculpture were, and his interest was not, as was Matisse's and Braque's, merely formal, as if they were just like any other good sculptures. He realized instead that the Blacks were magic things, intercessors, mediators, fetishes, weapons, and he described the \textit{Demoiselles d'Avignon} as his first exorcism painting. This link between what he called "the spirit," "the unconscious," "emotion," and the exorcism of the accumulated legacy of western tradition, is the phylogenetic aspect of Picasso's enterprise.\textsuperscript{84}

One might say with equal aptness that as Picasso's lithographic bulls become increasingly simple and simple-minded, they also seem to become increasingly childish. This is the ontogenetic aspect of the enterprise. It is best understood from another of Picasso's notorious pronouncements, that in his youth he could draw like Raphael, and it took him many years to learn to draw like a child. This dictum itself has a remarkable history. The first part alone was printed in an anonymous article in the London Times of October 25, 1956, on the occasion of Picasso's seventy-fifth birthday. It was reported that on visiting an exhibition of children's art Picasso had remarked that at their age he could draw like Raphael. The writer comments that such personal arrogance would be worthy only of a man of Picasso's greatness.\textsuperscript{85} Two days later Herbert Read, the great English art critic, wrote a corrective letter to the editor of the Times explaining that the remark, which he now quoted in full, was made to him during a visit he and the artist made to the exhibition. Taking the comment metaphorically, Read thought that, on the contrary, it showed the humility that is a characteristic of all true genius.\textsuperscript{86} In my view, the observation was neither arrogant nor humble nor metaphorical, but a simple—if perhaps somewhat rueful—statement of fact.

In another context, discussing the drawings by a young boy which he greatly admired, Picasso spoke of what he called "the genius of childhood":

\textit{"I}
"Contrary to what sometimes happens in music, miracle children do not exist in painting. What might be taken for a precocious genius is the genius of childhood. When the child grows up, it disappears without a trace...As for me, I didn't have this genius. My first drawings could never be exhibited in an exposition of children's drawings. The awkwardness and naïveté of childhood were almost absent from them. I outgrew that period of marvelous vision very rapidly. At that boy's age I was making drawings that were completely academic. Their minuteness, their exactitude, frightens me. My father was a professor of drawing, and it was probably he who pushed me prematurely in that direction." 87

For Picasso the genius of childhood was extremely fragile and could even be subverted in the name of freedom. On still another occasion, he said,

"They tell you that you have to give children freedom. In reality they make them do children's drawings. They teach them to do it. They have even taught them to do children's drawings which are abstract...

In reality, as usual, on the pretext of giving them complete freedom and above all not tying them down, they shut them up in their own special style, with all their chains.

An odd thing is that I have never done children's drawings. Never. Even when I was very small. I remember one of my first drawings. I was perhaps six, or even less. In my father's house there was a statue of Hercules with his club in the corridor, and I drew Hercules. But it wasn't a child's drawing. It was a real drawing representing Hercules with his club." 88

This drawing of Hercules is actually preserved (Fig. 114), inscribed with Picasso's signature and the date November 1890, when he was nine years old; it shows that he was telling the truth. In fact, we have many drawings by Picasso from this early period—they are often playful and deliberately crude, but they are never really childish (Fig. 115). 89 In complete contrast to the childhood works are the astonishing counterfeits of children's drawings and cut-outs made by Picasso for his daughter, Maia, about 1937-40 (Fig. 116, Fig. 117); uncannily, some of these even seem like childish versions of Picasso's own early (ca. 1890) "art-toys" (Fig. 118, Fig. 119). 90 In any case, it may not be coincidental that the children's exhibition mentioned in the Times, which had been arranged by Herbert Read himself, was shown in Paris in 1945, shortly before the lithographic series began (Fig. 120). 91

What the lithographic process enabled Picasso to do was to merge, in the evolution of a single work, two conceptions of the history of man—one cultural and rooted in a prerationalistic spiritual state of society, the other psychological and rooted in the pre-sophisticated mental state of the child. In a way, Picasso was taking up an old theme that had been illustrated a century before, for example, by the American painter, Thomas Cole, significantly in one of a set of five historical paintings representing the Course of Empire from the Savage State through the Consummation of Empire to the final Desolation. 92 The second, Arcadian or Pastoral State, includes the invention of the practical and the fine arts, and here Cole shows the invention of painting as a young boy drawing a childish stick figure on a stone, which, incidentally, bears Cole's own initials (Fig. 121, Fig. 122). The difference from Cole, of course, is that Picasso was not
motivated by an antiquarian historicism but by the search for a new and universally valid expressive idiom.

In a curious way, however, Cole's image focuses on the tertium quid that conjoins the phylogenetic and ontogenetic aspects of the history of the bull(s), namely, the ideal of a kind of timeless graphic naïveté. This concept is most sharply perceived in the affinity Picasso felt for popular graffiti, an affinity that formed an essential basis for his friendship with the photographer Brassaï. Brassaï later (1960) published a famous book on graffiti, which he was preparing during the very period that concerns us, and the subject was one of the leitmotifs of their conversations (Fig. 123). From these disparate remarks it is clear that Picasso was deeply affected by graffiti,

"A wall is a wonderful thing, isn't it? I've always paid close attention to what happens on them. When I was young, I often used to copy the graffiti I saw."

and engaged in the practice himself:

"I left lots of them on the walls of Montmartre."

He recognized the potentiality as works of art, both of his own graffiti—he told of a banker who had one removed from the wall of a building under renovation and installed it on the wall of his apartment—and those of others:

"They are really astonishing. What fantastic inventions you sometimes find in them."
"absolutely splendid graffiti. They are little masterpieces."

He applied the technique to his own work:

"...now I myself am making graffiti. But they are engraved in cement, instead of on a wall...enlarged, and cut out with electric chisels...for a building in Barcelona...each of them...two to three stories high."

and saw the influence of graffiti on other artists:

"This is a Rouault! "That one is a Klee!"

Although Picasso recognized local and regional "styles" of graffiti,

"...Italian and Spanish graffiti—I know them very well—do not resemble the Parisian graffiti. The phallic symbols you see on the walls of Rome, for instance, are specifically Italian. Rome is very rich in graffiti, as a matter of fact..."

he grasped their universality, even in the physical sense.

"Graffiti belong to everyone and no one..."

Most important in our context is that Picasso associated graffiti with both the art of children,
"I always stop when I see children drawing in the street, or on the sidewalk or on a wall. It's surprising—the things that come from their hands. They often teach me something."

and with primitive art,

"That (head) is as rich as the façade of a cathedral!...Your book links art with the primitive arts."

and his comments on them show that he found in graffiti evidence of an ultimate, abstract graphic distillation of reality:

"To arrive at abstraction, it is always necessary to begin with a concrete reality...I have often done faces like this myself. The people who scratch them out like this naturally gravitate to symbols. Art is a language of symbols. Two holes—that's the symbol of the face, enough to evoke it without representing it...But isn't it strange that it can be done through such simple means? Two holes; that's enough if you consider the complexity of man...Whatever is most abstract may perhaps be the summit of reality...abstract art is not far removed from the random brushstrokes or carvings in a wall. No matter what anyone says, we always imitate something, even when we don't know we are doing it."

The history of art thus leads to an art without history that seeks to exorcise the past and discover the magic, the fetish—the will-o-the-wisp, if you will—of man's common humanity.

Finally, it must be said that in its deliberateness and coherence the lithographic series seems distinctly pedagogical; the prints have the consequential, demonstrative quality of scholastic exercises. Picasso was not just finding implicit meaning, but also, as I suggested earlier, imparting that meaning in an explicit lesson; a lesson not only in genetic history but also in formal as well as graphic method. Indeed, the series strikes me as ironic but serious shift into reverse of two of the classic vehicles of European visual sophistication, with which Picasso must have been all too familiar in his youth. One of these preeminently academic systems was theoretical, the other practical, and both involved specific correlations between nature and abstraction. The study of harmonic proportions and geometric figure construction was a subject that had preoccupied artists since the fifteenth century, who sought to retrieve the classical ideal of demonstrably perfect form. Only recently has the fact emerged—of crucial importance for our understanding of the genesis of modern art—that this same subject also preoccupied Picasso when, at the birth of Cubism, he actually recalled the theoretical investigations of Albrecht Dürer in creating a new, measured canon of beauty based on "primitive" sculpture. Picasso made these studies in the spring of 1907, while working on the Demoiselles d'Avignon. He was inspired by Dürer's famous Dresden sketchbook, which had recently been published for the first time (Fig. 124, Fig. 125). The German artist's effort to reconcile the sometimes crass realism of his native tradition to the norms of antiquity, must have seemed singularly appropriate to Picasso's own search in the opposite direction for an un-, or rather a proto-classical ideal.
In the domain of practical pedagogy the drawing manual, the academic course in draughtsmanship was intended, through a series of increasingly complex states, to change the simple and perhaps mystified neophyte into the divine Raphael. Publications illustrating the method begin with Odoardo Fialetti's Il vero modo et ordine per disegnare tutte le parti et membra del corpo humano, Venice 1608 (Fig. 126), and in the mid-eighteenth century Picasso's reversal of the sequence was anticipated by William Hogarth in one of the plates of his Analysis of Beauty, 1753 (see nos. 97-105 in Fig. 127, Fig. 128). To be sure, Hogarth's purpose—an irony in itself—was not to undermine the system but to exalt it by starting from an antique head admired by Raphael (No. 97) and showing "the reverse in several degrees, down to the most contemptible meanness that lines can be formed into...composed merely of such plain lines as children make" (No. 105). By the mid-nineteenth century in France there was a veritable collision of childishness, caricature and the academic tradition, with political overtones, in a journalistic cartoon from a mock "Exhibition of Fine Arts" (Fig. 129). The image portrays the cultural state of the "anonymous Republic" in the "noble genre." The armored personification of Marianne, enthroned on her lion, holds a lance and a tablet displaying the rudiments draftsmanship, a nose, an eye, and a whole figure drawn with evident ineptitude.

The lampoon is symptomatic of the fact that from the mid-nineteenth century on, with the development and dissemination of art education as a means of elevating popular culture, drawing manuals achieved immense symbolical as well as practical importance. Van Gogh taught himself to draw by copying no less than three times the schematized examplars in a famous series of albums published by Charles Bargue in 1868-71 (Fig. 130, Fig. 131). One of Picasso's early art school drawings (1891-2) shows him following precisely the same method, progressing from abstraction to illusion, from simplicity to sophistication (Fig. 132, Fig. 133). Indeed, the sheet is also copied from one of Bargue's plates, as is another of Picasso's youthful drawings of a seated nude (1893) (Fig. 134, Fig. 135). Lithography—which facilitated, especially through the technique of stumping, demonstration of the transition from line to modeling—was the process of choice for illustrating such publications; perhaps it was this very association that motivated Picasso's disdain for the lithographic medium, before the period with Mourlot.

The academic system in general comprised three basic elements, all of which have counterparts in Picasso's attitude. The method progressed in stages with respect to form, technique and subject: 1) from simple, geometric shapes to complex curved and undulating surfaces; 2) from linear definition to interior modeling and cross-hatching; 3) from parts or fragments of the anatomy to the complete body. Picasso's bull progresses in exactly the same contexts, but it moves in exactly the opposite way and arrives at a coherent and unified design of a new, whole figure.

Seen in this light, the specific nature of Picasso's graphic method in the lithographs becomes crucial: it is not merely a matter of progressive simplification and abstraction; in each series contour tends increasingly to predominate, until the ferocious bull is ultimately subdued by one, continuous outline of quite enchanting grace. The modeling of brute form is metamorphosed into the delineation of pure spirit—there is no other way to describe the simultaneous degeneration of the bull and regeneration of this ethereal and apocalyptic beast. By his ironically serious reversal
of tradition and evocation of "artlessness," Picasso seems to have given shape at last to that mystical ideal of Disegno Interno (Inner Design) of which artists had been dreaming since the Renaissance.

These considerations, in turn, help to illuminate specific aspects of Picasso's art-historical bullfight. I believe he conceived the series as a kind of graphic corrida, with the lithographic stone as the locale, witnessed, as it were, by the women who surround and subdue the beast in him. Thematically, in fact, the historical narrative recounted in reverse by the bull series was surely inspired by Goya's suite of thirty-three etchings, the Tauromaquia, which trace the epic history of the bullfight from the ancient Iberian hunting of the bull in the open (Fig. 136), to the modern arena sport and the gory spectacle of a contemporary matador's death in the ring (Fig. 137). Picasso's graphological confrontation at first progresses in the traditional way, with the forms becoming denser and more richly modeled, while the bull becomes heavier and more aggressive (see Fig. 85, Fig. 86). Then Picasso begins his attack: the forms coagulate and break into gruff, rhinoceros-like sections (see Fig. 87). On one momentous day, Picasso made two crucial "passes": in a sort of sketch-lithograph he drew a delicate, purely linear bull, along with a menagerie of much less intimidating animals—rams, a cow, and doves (see Fig. 100); in the main bull itself he introduced a network of lines that delimit its constituent parts and change its dumb, brutish expression into an almost caricatured scowl (see Fig. 88). The dual principle implicit in these parallel works continues thereafter. In the monumental, isolated bull the preponderance of dark and modeled areas tends to diminish step by step in a relentless process of decimation and dismemberment (Fig. 89, Fig. 90, Fig. 91, Fig. 92, Fig. 93, Fig. 94). In a number of drawings and collateral lithographic "spin-offs," on the other hand, the bull is already conceived as a purely linear wraith, not in grandiose isolation but in small, multiple guises (Fig. 102, Fig. 103, Fig. 105, Fig. 106, Fig. 107). Here the bull's awesome power is "exorcised" in a humorous and playful game of hide and seek. The once threatening enemy becomes Picasso's pet, executing a repertory of witty tricks and permutations like a tame circus animal commanded by its handler. Only in the eleventh and final state are the lessons learned in the practice-pen, as it were, applied unflinchingly in the main arena. The coup-de-grâce to the earthly, academic bull is elegantly delivered by the reduction of his entire body to a simple, continuous outline.

Even within the context of his own working procedure, therefore, Picasso transferred the qualities achieved in an informal, spontaneous domain of creativity, to the realm of "high" art. It can hardly be coincidental that during the same period Picasso also produced lithographs of bulls and actual corrida scenes (Fig. 138, Fig. 139), for which he invented a radical collage technique employing crudely cut-out paper figures like those he had made as a child and for his infant daughter some years before (cf. Fig. 118, Fig. 119).

If this view of Picasso's lithographic series is correct then it implies a kind of absolute historicism from whose all-encompassing scrutiny nothing escapes, not even the artist himself. I believe it is in this context that one of the most salient manifestations of Picasso's conception of his own work may be understood.
I refer to his practice—obsession, one is tempted to say—from his earliest childhood to sign and even more frequently to date his works, however slight and ephemeral, to the very day they were executed; when several versions of the same work were done on the same day, he would often number them in sequence. The world has nothing even remotely approaching such a complete record of a single artist's production. It might be tempting to regard this preoccupation with time and extreme self-awareness simply as a kind of megalomaniacal egotism; no doubt pride did play a role, and certainly in this way Picasso fixed his own place in history with unprecedented precision. Much more to the point, in my view, is the implicit identification, through the historical process, of the individual self with human nature at large—it seems to me that this is the ultimate meaning of Picasso's extraordinary notion, quoted earlier, that the record of the metamorphoses of a work of art might help to "discover the path followed by the brain in materializing a dream." Picasso made this point explicit on one occasion when he explained his reason for dating his work, paradoxically linking—through the history of art, particularly his own—human creativity and science, subjectivity and objectivity, personal and collective awareness:

"Why do you think I date everything I do? Because it is not sufficient to know an artist's works—it is also necessary to know when he did them, why, how, under what circumstances...Some day there will undoubtedly be a science—it may be called the science of man—which will seek to learn more about man in general through the study of the creative man. I often think about such a science, and I want to leave to posterity a documentation that will be as complete as possible...That's why I put a date on everything I do..."104

Fig. 140 APPENDIX. Synoptic Table of Picasso's Bulls (December 5, 1945 to January 18, 1946)

POSTSCRIPT: PICASSO'S BULLS IN AMERICAN RETROSPECT
JOHN CAGE, JASPER JOHNS AND ROY LICHTENSTEIN

It is remarkable, though in the end not surprising, that Picasso's experiments with art historical pedagogy in serial imagery acquired new relevance in the 1960's with the reaction that set in against the pure formalism of Abstract Expressionism. Particularly problematic were the radical lack of restraint and non-objectivity of that movement during its hegemony in the aftermath of World War II. On the one hand, artists like Frank Stella and Donald Judd produced works of extreme geometric precision and measured rhythms; on the other, there was a return to figuration, often accompanied in the case of Pop art by heavy measures of irony and social criticism. In both these domains, there was a substratum of historicism that echoed Picasso's experiments with repetition and seriality. Among the many such reactions I want to consider here briefly three instances in which the lessons offered by Picasso's experiments with mimetic and eidetic representation.
John Cage
The dot-line drawings Picasso created during the summer of 1924, emerged from his
work for the stage sets of the production of Leonide Massine's ten-minute ballet
Mercure, with music by Picasso’s great friend, the corrosive anti-establishment
modernist composer Erik Satie, performed in Paris on June 15 of that year. The
integration of music, image and dance was a central concept in the event. The
characters of the ballet, which lasted eight minutes, featured Apollo, the sun, and the
planetary gods Mercury and Venus. The dancers, in static “poses plastiques,” their
movements limited by costumes of partly rigid materials, appeared briefly, sometimes
twenty or thirty seconds, like flickering fixed stars in the firmament. The dot-line
conflation of musical notation and celestial maps is already evident in Picasso’s studies
for the Night scene showing in transparent perspective a reclining figure, perhaps
inspired by the Michelangelo’s figure of Night on the tomb of Giuliano de’Medici in the
Medici chapel—playing a guitar!—with the stars distributed here and there through the
firmament (Fig. 141); the constellations themselves appeared in another scene. The
drawings Picasso made later that summer further isolated and reduced the means of
visual expression to the absolute minimum, the elemental binomial signs, the dot and
the line, from which any visual form of expression can be developed—like the syllabic
alphabet with which any language can be written. With these most rudimental graphic
marks, he created a vast panoply of formations that have quite rightly been said to
evoke the perfect harmonies of the Pythagorean “music of the spheres.”

Picasso may have been inspired in this trajectory by the radically disjunctive musical
ideas of Satie, who in his seminal innovative work of 1914, Sports & Divertissements,
had sought in his own way to integrate music and image. Satie had been asked to
compose music and words to accompany a number of whimsical drawings by Charles
Martin illustrating popular sports and pastimes. In the preface Satie describes his
notion of the integration:

This publication is made up of two artistic elements: drawing, music. The drawing part
is figurated by lines—lines of wit; the musical part is represented by dots—black dots.
These two parts unified—in a single volume—form a whole.

Satie’s work was reissued in a lavish edition at the end of 1923, just months before
work on Mercure began; and the wit, the dots, the lines, all seem echoed in
Picasso’s drawings.

Satie’s statement was reported, in significantly altered form, by John Cage in 1985,
describing the genesis of his own seminal composition Atlas Eclipticalis (1961), in
which the twin principles of his musical philosophy, chance and indeterminacy, took
new shape.
It was while I was a Fellow in the Center for Advanced Studies at Wesleyan University in Connecticut (1960-1961) that Pierre Mercure for the Montreal Festivals Society asked me to write a piece for orchestra. Having in mind a remark by Erik Satie to the effect that written music is nothing but points and lines, and knowing from experience with magnetic tape (that Satie had not had) that so much space equals so much time (the lines are no longer necessary, just the points), I left my room in the Center and walked a short distance the last part slightly uphill to the observatory where there was an astronomical library. There I looked at many star maps, finally choosing to work with some Czechoslovakian ones bound as a book having the title *Atlas Eclipticalis*, map of the great circle around the Sun.\(^1\)

Cage’s “to the effect that” transposes Satie’s relationship between drawing as figuration and dots as musical notes, to musical notation as such, reducing musical form and content to their minimal graphic equivalents. With Satie’s remark in mind Cage based the work on the “chance” distribution of stars in the well-known map of the great circle around the sun, the *Atlas Eclipticalis* (1958), by the Czech astronomer Antonín Bečvář (Fig. 142).\(^2\) A transparent sheet marked with the lines of the musical stave was laid over the points of the star map which were then connected by lines to create the score. The title of he work is, in effect, a metaphor for a new “music of the spheres” (Fig. 143).\(^3\) Cage often referred to certain marks on his scores as constellations. The “point-line” system reached an apogee of simplification, abstraction and universality—like Picasso’s ultimate, ethereal lithographic bull—in *Variations II* (1961). Eleven transparent sheets were used (curious coincidence with Picasso’s eleven lithographic bulls!), five square with a single dot in the center, six long rectangles with a single line in the center of the long axis (Fig. 144). By superimposing at will the lines on the dots and taking appropriate measurements, the system can accommodate “any piece of music that could possibly be created.”\(^4\) Cage’s title page of *Variations II* in fact articulates this astonishing achievement: “Variations II for any number of players and any sound producing means.” The idea is exactly equivalent to the endlessly various evocations of Picasso’s dot-line drawings: music, musical instruments, planets, constellations, allegorical figures. Cage was also an accomplished graphic artist, close to Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg, and included drawings by Thoreaux in place of dots in his scores.\(^5\) For both artists, melding the graphology of musical notation and star maps created a new visual vocabulary—lines and dots, the least possible means of visual expression, to achieve supreme evocations of chance, indeterminacy, and a cosmic universality.
Jasper Johns began making isolated, iconic images of numbers in the mid 1950's in a series of works representing the digits that bore the title "Figure" (always in the singular), a punning, ironic, self-referential allusion to the tradition of figural representation and to the name traditionally given to the visual notation of an abstract mathematical concept (Fig. 145). The Figure series continued intermittently through the 1970's, while Johns also pursued a series of works he called "Numbers," always in the plural and always for images that included in order the ten digits of the decimal system, beginning with zero. Here the numerals no longer have the singular quality of isolated icons, but form part of a uniform grid that itself acquires the quality of an icon, embodying the notion of infinite extensibility (Fig. 146). In a grid composition the sequentiality of the numbers is essential because together they create a numinous, pulsating field of orderly progressions in all directions that evokes the notion of infinite extensibility. All these austerely cerebral works, executed in a variety of media, display a richly painterly style that reflects the deeply personal, "Baroque" brushwork of the Abstract Expressionists. (Johns' debt to de Kooning is obvious, but the primal force was de Kooning's compatriot Frans Hals.) In another group, variously called "0-9," "Ten Numbers," or "Numerals," the numbers are again isolated, but now retained in sequence (Fig. 147, Fig. 148, Fig. 149, Fig. 150, Fig. 151, Fig. 152, Fig. 153, Fig. 154, Fig. 155, Fig. 156). These emblematic number series insistently recall the suite of monumental numbers Picasso had drawn with a brush on the faces of a long narrow sheet folded in accordion pleats into a minuscule sketchbook that he had given as a birthday present to his friend Marcel Duhamel in 1957; Duhamel published the work in a private edition in 1965 (Fig. 157, Fig. 158, Fig. 159, Fig. 160, Fig. 161, Fig. 162).

In one notable project of this kind Johns took up the principle of genetic metamorphosis that Picasso had exploited in the Bulls. Johns executed three suites of ten color lithographs, each depicting single suites of the decimal numbers "0 through 9," displaying the ten integers (digits), each evolving from state to state, plus an eleventh giving its number in the sequence, all printed on the same lithographic stone (Fig. 163, Fig. 164, Fig. 165, Fig. 166, Fig. 167, Fig. 168, Fig. 169, Fig. 170, Fig. 171, Fig. 172). The series becomes, like Picasso's bulls, an arrative, a quasi-metamorphosis, this time not of a "living" subject object but of visual signs designating the equally integral, successive permutations of an abstract concept that is the essence of seriality, number. Taken together the series records the progressive transformations embodied in the creation of a single work of art. In this context, in which the numbers are not repeated, without explaining why, I asked a mathematician colleague at the Institute for Advanced Study to recite the ten figures in numerical order. He responded immediately by counting the numbers from 0 to 9. When I asked him why he had began his recitation with 0, he replied that any mathematician would have done the same, because 0 is the simplest, the most primitive, and the most powerful of the numbers in its capacity, merely through its location, to augment any number ten-fold. In fact, the zero is simply a place keeper in the decimal system, by definition infinite and infinitesimal, void, empty; and it has not always been conceived as a proper number. It is a cipher which Leonardo Fibonacci, who brought the Arabic numerals to the west in the thirteenth century, called "zephyr," to distinguish it from the other nine "figures"; and which, as he said, contains nothing in itself but by virtue of which one could write any number (Fig. 173). It is interesting, considering the reversibility of the
sequence inherent in Johns’s title, that Fibonacci follows the direction of Arabic script aligning the figures in ascending order from right to left, opposite to the way European languages are written.

Finally, Johns produced a series of images that constitute a kind of summa of his litho-numerical meditations. Superimposing the integers on the same stone he created the conundrum of a flat perspective view from here to infinity and back again, labeled “0 through 9.” The literally transparent, perspicacious vision invoked by Johns’s punning title provides a glimpse through the most complex of the ordinal numbers to the infinite void of the zero. Remarkably, Johns achieved this ultimate synthesis of the numerals theme by designing them as linear, outline shapes in a black-on-white lithograph that recalls the final iteration of Picasso’s bull (Fig. 174). Picasso recounted an anti-art-historical narrative sequentially by progressive, distinct diminutions of a single, solid form to an absolute minimum. By aligning or superimposing distinct images of differing conceptual but equal, “empty” formal value, Johns’s history proceeds simultaneously in opposite directions, alternating between the absolute maximum and the absolute minimum of rationality.

Johns’s world of disembodied, abstract, and mutating numbers is reminiscent of Picasso’s notational permutations of graphic acrobatic bulls (Fig. 103), and the punning titles that identify Johns’s often elusive images are also witty and playful. At the same time the rigorous organization and blank objectivity of the subject matter belie the poetic spirit and emotional range that brought forth these profoundly evocative images. The key to the paradox lies in Johns’s confessional declaration that “When something is new to us, we treat it as an experience. We feel that all our senses are awake and clear. We are alive.”

The numbers are, in fact, mirrors of Johns’s own emphatically unrevealing twin “self-portraits,” illuminated by a flashlight beam reflected from a mirror on the dead-pan, stony-faced icon of the artist, reclaimed like an archaeological artifact from a timeless past (Fig. 175, Fig. 176). The simulacra, both seen both front and back, dead and alive, are a theater of emptiness, and the haloed face is a mask that unmistakably recalls that ultimate artful dodger of self-revelation, Buster Keaton, whose professional inscrutability plumbed the unfathomable middle between the classical masks of Tragedy and Comedy (Fig. 177).

Roy Lichtenstein
The second cooptation of Picasso’s lithographic demonstration was Roy Lichtenstein’s lithographic series of six bulls progressively diminishing from naturalism toward abstraction (1973); (Fig. 178, Fig. 179, Fig. 180, Fig. 181, Fig. 182, Fig. 183). Lichtenstein had earlier (1969) recapitulated the same chain of precedents that had marked Picasso’s path: paintings that followed Monet’s paintings of church facades (Fig. 184, Fig. 185, Fig. 186, Fig. 187, Fig. 188, Fig. 189) and haystacks, and Pissarro’s prints of wheat fields and haystacks (Fig. 190, Fig. 191, Fig. 192, Fig. 193, Fig. 194, Fig. 195, Fig. 196) in the rain; and later (1974), Van Doesburg’s theoretical cow illustration (cf. Fig. 84, Fig. 197, Fig. 198, Fig. 199). Where Monet made paintings, Lichtenstein made lithographic prints; where Van Doesburg published [in black and white] a composite image consisting of a photograph of a real cow, with two drawings and a painting that progress to an arrangement of purely abstract rectangles and squares, Lichtenstein made a triptych of three paintings in which an abstractly rendered scene of a cow in the landscape is broken up and rearranged in interlocking sections, and finally deprived of all curved shapes, to leave a “simple” arrangement of straight black lines demarcating patches of black, yellow, and blue, and striped black and white parallel “hatching.”
Lichtenstein thus recapitulated the narratives of Picasso’s achievement, in two conceptual domains, chronological and historical. Chronologically, he recapitulated Picasso’s own genealogical trajectory of a single image; and historically he retraced the trajectory represented by Picasso’s predecessors. At the same time, Lichtenstein also recapitulated the two great formal trajectories of modernism, from natural form through the objective abstraction of cubism to the pure non-objectivity of Minimalism and Abstract Expressionism; and from the elusive coloristic and atmospheric effects of Impressionism to a kind of mechanical, comic strip version of Pointillism appropriated from a popular, low-cost printing technique known as Benday dots (uniform size, spacing, and color). Lichtenstein’s landscapes also embody a progression of time, in that the series pass from a bright palette suggestive of early morning, through the vicissitudes of a variable day (including the blurred effects of rain in Pissarro’s wheat fields), to end in the somber tones of evening and night. Just as with Monet and Pissarro, Lichtenstein’s church facades and haystacks do not become more or less of anything, they simply change colors and hence atmosphere and mood. In his rendition of Picasso’s bull lithographs, instead of successive prints from the same matrix, Lichtenstein’s images are separate and distinct works, each with its own, numerical title; instead of progressing from monochrome, painterly modeling to a linear distillation of the original form, the images are consistently flat and brilliantly colored, and the end result is a complex patchwork arrangement of abstract lines and shapes.

Even so, with all their differences, two fundamental principles or modes of thought link Johns and Lichtenstein to Picasso: through all the peregrinations represented in their work, something of the “original” remains. Johns’s numbers are always discernible as such, Lichtenstein’s bulls and cows never quite lose their animal nature. They thus succeeded in retrieving, sometimes ironically but always sympathetically, the values of ancient tradition within the framework of distinctively modern idioms that respect the First Commandment of all modernism’s claim to universality—no illusions. They also incorporate the essence of Picasso’s method: to demonstrate, through the rhetorical devices of repetition and seriality, an inner, necessary logic linking seemingly antithetical extremes of visual order. It has been sad that Lichtenstein reversed the traditional “how to draw” method of moving from the simple and abstract toward sophisticated modeling and naturalism. We have seen that this was exactly the case with the bulls of Picasso, whose didactic (or rather anti-didactic) intent Lichtenstein certainly grasped.

Their modes of demonstration, however, were diametrically opposed. Lichtenstein completely eschewed Johns’s painterly technique and passion for the appearance of handiwork, in favor of an anonymous, impersonal, enamel-like effect. Johns couched his rigorously “intellectual” themes in a rich, painterly and very personal idiom that preserves the values of traditional painting; Lichtenstein couches traditional “naturalistic” themes in a cold, uniform, anonymous idiom that appears “manufactured.” “I want my work to look impersonal but I don’t believe I’m being impersonal while I do it.” Each method paradoxically evokes its opposite, the world of thought and feeling that lies between nothing and infinity, the reality that lies behind human artifice. Nor did the sublime art-witticism of Picasso’s bulls escape Johns and Lichtenstein. The clever, ironic, provocative titles and themes that constitute the ideological signatures of both artists and are essential to their underlying message, testify that they fully grasped the import of the long, laborious path Picasso traced to disencumber the past and reach his starkly artless and slightly ludicrous sylphid line-bull. The systematic sequentiality and self-conscious art-historicism that lay at the heart of Picasso’s didactic, minimalizing, mono-lithographic Bull series, became a leitmotif of the Post-Modern return to figuration. After all, it’s only a game, the end of which is much ado about precious little in the titanic effort to find a coincidence among the opposing dictates of mimetic and eidetic representation.
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Endnotes

1 There is a substantial bibliography on primitivism, beginning with the classic work of Lovejoy and Boas 1935; more recent literature on primitivism in art generally will be found in Encyclopedia, 1959-87, XI, cols. 704-17, to which should be added Gombrich 1985, and, for the modern period, Rubin ed. 1985; Connelly 1987; Leighten 1990. Other domains of art-without-history and their relations to sophisticated art have yet to receive a comprehensive treatment. The development of interest in the art of the insane, in particular, has now been studied in an exemplary fashion by MacGregor 1989.

2 On the Olynthus mosaics, see Salzmann 1982, 100ff.

3 Cited by Hadzi in Lehman 1982, 312.

4 This last is the insightful suggestion of Tronzo 1986. The idea had been explored with respect to classical literary style by Gombrich 1966.

5 These works have been the subject of a study by Schmitt (1980) whose fundamental importance for our understanding of medieval art has yet to be fully grasped.

6 For a description and bibliography, see Lavin ed. 1981, no. 99, 336-37. The paper has been cut, and traces of further drawing appear at the upper right. In this case, perhaps, the sheet was not devoted exclusively to the caricature, which Bernini may have drawn for his personal satisfaction and kept for himself. Twenty-five caricatures are mentioned in a 1706 inventory of Bernini's household; Fraschetti 1900, 247.

7 For a general account of social criticism in postmedieval art, see Shikes 1969. A good analysis of the Carraccis' ritratti carichi, with the attribution to Annibale of the drawing reproduced in Fig. 10, will be found in Posner 1971, 65-70, fig. 59 (c.f. fig. 60, certainly cut from a larger sheet); but see also Bohlin 1979, 48, 67 nn. 83-84. So far as can be determined, the Carracci drawings displayed neither the social content nor the distinctive draftsman ship of Bernini's caricatures, nor is it clear that they were autonomous sheets. On the papal satires of the Reformation, see Grisar and Heege 1921-23; Koepplin and Falk 1974-76, II, 498-522.
For caricature generally, and bibliography, see *Encyclopedia* 1959-68, III, cols. 734-35. For a useful survey of caricature since the Renaissance, see *Caricature* 1971. On the development in Italy, the fundamental treatment is that of Juynboll 1934; important observations will be found in an essay by Kris (with E. H. Gombrich) in Kris 1952, 189-203. The pages on Bernini's caricatures in Brauer and Wittkower 1931, 180-84, remain unsurpassed, but see also Boeck 1949. Harris (1975, 158, and 1977, p. xviii, nos. 40, 41) has questioned whether the caricatures in the Vatican Library and the Gabinetto Nazionale delle Stampe in Rome, attributed to Bernini by Brauer and Wittkower, are autographs or close copies; the issue, however, does not affect the general argument presented here. Caricature drawings attributed to Bernini other than those noted by Brauer and Wittkower and by Harris (1977) will be found in Cooke 1955; Sotheby 1963, lot 18; Stampfle and Bean 1967, 54f.

9 In Bernini's drawings, "si scorge simmetria maravigliosa, maestà grande, e una tal franchezza di tocco, che è propriamente un miracolo; ed io non saprei dire chi mai nel suo tempo gli fusse stato eguale in tal facoltà. Effetto di questa franchezza è stato l'aver egli operato singolarmente in quella sorte di disegno, che noi diciamo caricatura o di colpi caricati, deformando per ischerzo a mal modo l'effigie altrui, senza toglier loro la somiglianza, e la maestà, se talvolta eran principi grandi, come bene spesso accadvea per lo gusto, che avevano tali personaggi di sollazzarsi con lui in si fatto trattenimento, anche intorno a' propri volti, dando poi a vedere i disegni ad altri di non minore affare" (Baldinucci 1948, 140).

10 "Ne devesi passar sotto silenzio l'havere ei in quel tempo & appresso ancora, singolarmente operato in quella sorte di Disegno, che comunemente chiamasi col nome di Caricatura. Fù questo un'effetto singolare del suo spirito, poichè in essi veniva a deformare, come per ischerzo, l'altrui effigie in quelle parti però, dove la natura haveva in qualche modo difettato, e senza toglier loro la somiglianza, li rendeva sù le Carte similissimi, e quali in sostanza essi erano, benche se ne scorgesse notabilmente alterata, e caricata una parte; Invenzione rare volte praticata da altri Artefici, non essendo giuoco da tutti, ricavare il bello dal deforme, e dalla sproporzione la simetria. Ne fece egli dunque parecchi, e per lo più si dilettava di caricare l'effigie de' Principi, e Personaggi grandi, per lo gusto, che essi poi ne ricevevono in rimirarsi que' medesimi, pur d'essi, e non essi, ammirando egli in un tempo l'Ingegno grande dell'Artefice, e solazzandosi con si fatto trattenimento" (Bernini, 1713, 28).

11 For the foregoing, see Lavin 1970, 144 n. 75.

13 For portrait drawing generally see Meder 1978, 335ff; for drawings by Leoni, see Kruft 1969.

14 It is interesting that in both cases contemporaries were already aware of the distinctive techniques used in these drawings (Barocchi ed. 1962-72, I, 118, 121f., and IV, 1898ff.; Baglione 1935, 321).

15 There was one class of sixteenth-century works, incidentally, in which the loose sketch might become a sort of presentation drawing, namely the German autograph album (album amicorum, or Stammbuch); see, for example, Thöne 1940, 55f., figs. 17-19; Drawings 1964, 23, nos. 33, 35.

16 Bernini employed a comparable technique when he portrayed nature in what might be called a primitive or formless state, as in the sketches for fireworks (Lavin ed. 1981, nos. 56-58, 219-27) or a project for a fountain with a great display of gushing water (Brauer and Wittkower 1931, pl. 101a; cf. Harris 1977, p. xxi, no. 70).

17 Cf. Rupprich 1956-69, I, 54f. "Item: Know that my picture says it would give a ducat for you to see it; it is good and beautifully coloured. I have earned great praise for it, but little profit. I could well have earned 200 ducats in the time and have refused much work, so that I may come home. I have also silenced all the painters who said I was good at engraving, but that in painting I did not know how to handle colours. Now they all say they have never seen more beautiful colours."

Dürer made the drawing immediately before he wrote this passage, which surrounds the figure. Lange and Fuhse 1893, 35 n. 1, noted that the sketch must refer to this, rather than the preceding portion of the letter.


19 Erasmus speaks of marveling and laughing at the extreme crudity of artists a century or two earlier: "admiraberis et ridebis nimiam artificum rusticitatem." On this point, see Panofsky (1969, 200, 202f.) who also discusses Erasmus's early interest in and practice of painting and drawing.


21 Franco Fiorio 1971, 47f., 100; for a suggestive analysis of the painting, see Almgren 1971, 71-73.

22 On the eye of painting, see Posner 1967, 201ff.
What may be a deliberately crude head appears among the test drawings and scratches on the back of one of Annibale Carracci's engraved plates; Posner 1971, 70, fig. 68; Bohlin 1979, 437.

Ancient graffiti are often considered in the literature on comic art (e.g., Champfleury 1865, 57-65, 186-203), but I am not aware that they have hitherto been treated seriously as specific progenitors of the modern caricature. For ancient graffiti generally, see Encyclopaedia 1958-66, III, 995f. For a survey of the figural graffiti at Pompeii, see Cèbe 1966, 375f.; for graffiti on the Palatine in Rome, see Väänänen ed. 1966, and 1970.

"Il m'a dit qu'à Rome il en avait une [a gallery] dans sa maison, laquelle est presque toute pareille; que c'est là qu'il fait, en se promenant, la plupart de ses compositions; qu'il marquait sur la muraille, avec du charbon, les idées des choses à mesure qu'elles lui venaient dans l'esprit" (Chantelou 1885 19, June 6, 1665). The idea recalls the ancient tales of the invention of painting by tracing shadows cast on the wall; cf. Kris and Kurz 1979, 74 and n. 10.

The association between sgraffiti and grotteschi is clear from Vasari's description and account of their invention: Vasari, 1966--, I, Testo, 142-45, Commento, 212, IV, Testo, 517-23; cf. Maclehose and Brown 1960, 243-45, 298-303. On sgraffiti and grotteschi, see Thiem and Thiem 1964; Dacos 1969. On the grotesque in general, interesting material and observations will be found in Harpham 1982.

"E stato Michelagnolo di una tenace e profonda memoria, che nel vedere le cose altrui una sol volta l'ha ritenute si fattamente e servitosene in una maniera che nessuno se n'è mai quasi accorto; né ha mai fatto cosa nessuna delle sue che riscontri l'una con l'altra, perché si ricordava di tutto quello che aveva fatto. Nella sua gioventù, sendo con gli amici sua pittori, giuncorno una cena a chi faceva una figura che non avessi niente di disegno, che fussi goffa, simile a que' fantocci che fanno coloro che non sanno e imbrattano le mura. Qui si valse della memoria; perché, ricordatosi aver visto in un muro una di queste gofferie, la fece come se l'avessi avuta dinanzi du tutto punto, e superò tutti que' pittori: cosa difficile in uno uomo tanto pieno di disegno, avvezzo a cose scelte, che no potessi uscir netto" (Barocchi ed. 1962-72, I, 124; see also IV, 2074f).

Dal Poggetto 1979, 267, no. 71, and 272, nos. 154, 156. Sketches attributed to Mino da Fiesole, discovered on a wall in his house in Florence, constitute a striking precedent for the Medici chapel drawings; see Sciolla 1970, 113, with bibliography.

Tolnay (1975-80, vol. 1, p. 126) also notes the disjunction between the two parts of the drawing.
30 For this drawing, see Janeck 1968, 122f., and Levine 1987. The figure shown from the back on the wall recurs among other graffiti in a painting attributed to van Laar in Munich; Janeck 1968, 137f.; see also Kren 1980, 68. On the Bamboccianti see now Levine and Mai, eds. 1991.

31 Caricatures are mentioned in two sharp and revealing passages in the diary of Bernini's visit kept by Chantelou (who uses the phrase attributed to the Carracci, "charged portraits"). During an audience with the king, "...le Cavalier a dit en riant: 'Ces messieurs-ci ont le Roi à leur gré toute la journée et ne veulent pas me le laisser seulement une demi-heure; je suis tenté d'en faire de quelqu'un le portrait chargé.' Personne n'entendait cela; j'ai dit au Roi que c'étaient des portraits que l'on faisait ressembler dans le laid et le ridicule. L'abbé Butti a pris la parole et a dit que le Cavalier était admirable dans ces sortes de portraits, qu'il faudrait en faire voir quelqu'un à Sa Majesté, et comme l'on a parlé de quelqu'un de femme, le Cavalier a dit que Non bisognava caricar le donne che da notte." Subsequently, Butti was himself the victim: "...quelqu'un parlant d'un portrait chargé, le Cavalier a dit qu'il avait fait celui de l'abbé Butti, lequel il a cherché pour le faire voir à Sa Majesté, et, ne l'ayant pas trouvé, il a demandé du crayon et du papier et l'a refait en trois coups devant le Roi, qui a pris plaisir à le voir, comme a fait aussi Monsieur et les autres, tant ceux qui étaient entrés que ceux qui étaient à la porte" (Chantelou 1885, 106, 151).

32 ... mio sig.re

Da chavaliere vi giuro di non mandarvi più disegni perchè avendo voi quest dui ritratti potete dire d' avere tutto quel the può fare quel baldino di bernino, ma perché dubito che il Vostro corto ingegno non sapia conoscerli per non vi fare arrossire vi dico the quel più lungo è Don Giberti e quel più basso è Bona Ventura. Credetemi che a voi è toccato aver la buona Ventura perchè mai mi sono più sodisfatto che in queste due caricature e lo fatte di cuore. Quando verrò costi vedrò se ne tenete conto.

Roma li 15 Marzo 1652

Vero amico

G. L. Bern.

Ozzola 1906, 205; Lavin 1970, 144 n. 75.

The addressee is not named, but Ozzola guessed from the letter itself that it might have been intended for someone called Bonaventura. I have no doubt
that the fortunate recipient was the Bolognese painter and Franciscan friar Bonventura Bisi. Bisi was a friend and correspondent of Guercino, who also made a caricature of him, datable 1657-9, with an inscription punning on his last name (see Galleni 1975; Lavin 1990, 45 n. 76).

The basic catalogue of Picasso's lithographs is that of Mourlot 1970.

Brief but illuminating comments on the bull series may be found in two relatively rare publications: Picasso: The Bull, n.d.; Deuchler 1974 (an unpaginated, partial catalogue of the collection of Marie-Thérèse Walter, including three intermediate states and two reverse impressions of the bull not listed by Mourlot, of which only single trial proofs were made). Deuchler notes [24 n. 8] that Picasso produced only twenty-seven lithographs from 1919 to 1930 and none thereafter until the series with Mourlot. Indeed, Picasso seems previously to have disliked lithography; see p. 33 and n. 100 below.

Picasso's work at Mourlot's was vividly described by Hélène Parmelin in her introduction (unpaginated) to Mourlot's catalogue, from which the passage given here, quoting the printer Jean Célestin, is taken [p. 3]:

‘On lui donnait une pierre, et deux minutes après, avec le crayon et le pinceau, il partait. Et ça n'arrêtait plus... Il nous a épatés au point de vue litho. Vous faites une litho. Si vous avez une correction à faire, la pierre a subi une préparation, ou une dépréparation... Bon. On lui tire douze ou quinze épreuves. On lui remet la pierre comme il faut. Lui, il faisait son deuxième état. Sur une pierre comme ça, en principe, quand on l'a dépréparée deux fois, ça abîme un peu la préparation... Et lui il grattait, et vas-y donc, et il ajoutait de l'encre, et du crayon! il transformait tout! Après on commence à mal voir. Et puis on abîme. Mais lui, en bien! à chaque fois ça venait très bien. Pourquoi? Mystère...' Célestin dit de Picasso que c'est un gars qui est 'au boulot'. Travailleur à ne pas y croire. 'Tous les grands patrons que j'ai connus, c'étaient des travailleurs énormes. Lui, il gratte... On partait le soir à 8 heures, le matin à 8 heures et demie il était là. Quelquefois je disais: on pourrait peut-être s'arrêter là... Lui, il regardait sa pierre, il allumait sa gauloise, il m'en donnait une et hop! ça partait... Et puis chez lui dans la nuit, il faisait une litho sur papier report sur sa cuisinière et le matin ça recommençait.'

Mourlot himself gave an account in his Gravés dans ma mémoire 1979, 11-37 (quoted in part in n. 79 below); see also the preface by Sabartès to vol. 1 of...
the first edition of Mourlot's *Picasso lithographe* 1947-64; Gilot and Lake 1964, 88ff.; Mourlot 1973, 104ff. All convey Picasso's passionate involvement with the lithographic process and his revolutionary breaks with the traditional limitations of the medium.


36 Brassaï 1966, 182 (July 10, 1945); *idem* 1964, 224:

S'il m'était possible, je la laisserais telle quelle, quitte à recommencer et l'amener à un état plus avancé sur une autre toile. Puis j'agirais de même avec celle-ci... Il n'y aurait jamais une toile 'achevée', mais les différents 'états' d'un même tableau qui disparaissent d'habitude au cours du travail...

37 There is no comprehensive study of the development of seriality in modern art, but see generally, Coplans 1968, 7-30, and the introductory chapters of Seiberling's study of the series paintings of Monet 1981, 1-38; on the latter, see further Tucker 1989. Deuchler 1974, also emphasized the novelty of Picasso's lithographic series, contrasting them with Monet's cathedrals, where only the color changes, not the forms, and with Mondrian's trees, where the forms become completely abstract. (Further to this point below, p. 18).

38 For Picasso's graphic works generally, see Geiser 1933-96; Block 1968.

39 Zervos 1932-78, XIV, nos. 130, 132, 133, 136; Mourlot 1970, nos. 21, 27, 28; Deuchler 1974, nos. 49, 50, 55, 58, 61. A synopsis of the series of lithographic bulls and these parerga will be found in the Appendix, Fig. 140.

40 Barr 1939, 13f.; Zervos 1935, 173: "Auparavant les tableaux s'acheminaient vers leur fin par progression. Chaque jour apportait quelque chose de nouveau. Un tableau était une somme d'additions. Chez moi, un tableau est une somme de destructions. Je fais un tableau, ensuite je le détruis. Mais à la fin du compte rien n'est perdu... Il serait très curieux de fixer photographiquement, non pas les étapes d'un tableau, mais ses métamorphoses. On s'apercevrait peut-être par quel chemin un cerveau s'achemine vers la concrétisation de son rêve. Mais ce qui est vraiment très curieux, c'est d'observer que le tableau ne change pas au fond, que la vision initiale reste presque intacte malgré les apparences."

The development of the bull would seem to contradict Picasso's criticism of Matisse's serial drawings: "Matisse fait un dessin, puis il le recopie...Il le recopie cinque fois, dix fois, toujours en épurant son trait... Il est persuadé que le dernier, le plus dépouillé, est le meilleur, le plus pur, le définitif; or, le plus souvent, c'était le premier... En matière de dessin, rien n'est meilleur que le premier jet" (Brassaï

41 According to Françoise Gilot 1964, 85, the two nudes represented her and Dora Maar; cf. on this point Steinberg 1972, 105ff. One waking the other sleeping, in Picasso’s mind each evokes the presence of the other.

42 I came to suspect that Picasso may have derived his formulation about destruction from Balzac when I discovered, long after this essay was first published, that the passage had been quoted, without comment, as the epigram of an anonymous publication of the Mercier Callery collection of the Mourlot lithographs exhibited at the Museum of Modern Art in New York (Picasso 1947). In this modest publication all the lithographs were interspersed through the text of an English translation of Balzac’s novella.

In her fine book on the importance of Balzac’s story Dore Ashton 1980, 92, links Picasso’s understanding of the “unknown masterpiece” to his sum of destructions, but not to Balzac’s phrase or to the lithographic series. In an epilogue to the 1966 edition of the novella with Picasso’s etchings the anonymous author speaks of Picasso’s destruction as the inverse of Frenhofer’s (Balzac 1966, 82f.). I have now discovered that Hans Belting also related Picasso’s “sum of destructions” to his illustrations of the Balzac story (2001, 266-8), but not to its basic theme, to the Bull sequence, or to Balzac’s own terminology of destruction.

43 Picasso 1947, 80, 82; Balzac 1979, 435, 436 :

Ah! ah! s'écria-t-il, vous ne vous attendiez pas à tant de perfection! Vous êtes devant une femme et vous cherchez un tableau. ... Où est l'art? perdu, disparu!
Voilà les formes mêmes d'une jeune fille.
...

Je ne vois là que des couleurs confusément amassées et contenues par une multitude de lignes bizarres qui forment une muraille de peinture.
- Nous nous trompons, voyez!... répond Porbus.
En s'approchant, ils aperçurent dans un coin de la toile le bout d'un pied nu qui sortait de ce chaos de couleurs, de tons, de nuances indécises, espèce de brouillard sans forme; mais un pied délicieux, un pied vivant! Ils restèrent pétrifiés d'admiration devant ce fragment échappé à une incroyable, à une lente et progressive destruction. Ce pied apparaissait là comme un torse de quelque Vénus en marbre de Paros qui surgirait parmi les décombres d'une ville incendiée.
Cezanne’s engagement with Balzac has been extensively discussed by Ashton 1980.

To my knowledge, the first to relate Cezanne’s modern Olympias to Balzac’s novella was Mary Louise Krumrine (1989, 85); see now Kear 2006.


Picasso’s assertion (see the following note) that the did not illustrate books in the usual sense is confirmed by Vollard’s instruction to the binder revising Picasso’s ordering. Vollard’s “Avis au relieur” was actually printed at the end of the book (p. 95), immediately before Picasso’s own, visualized arrangement, presumably because the unnumbered etchings, conceived independently of the textual sequence, were to be available unbound (as is the case with the copy in the Princeton University library). It is difficult to image that Vollard would have thus publicly rearranged the sequence indicated in Picasso’s thirteenth etching without the artist’s acquiescence. In his Avis Vollard explains his and Picasso’s own arrangement in purely formal terms: “On s’étonnera peut-être que la table figurée des eaux-fortes ne suit pas l’ordre qui a présidé à leur distribution dans le volume. Celles-ci ont été réparties en vue du meilleur effet d’équilibre. De même dans la composition de la table l’artiste avant tout a cherché à obtenir un effet d’harmonie.” The distributions are laid out in a table in Sircoulomb-Müller 2002, 56; p. 61 for print-run particulars.

This unpublished information from the Vollard archive, provided by Brigitte Baer, was reported by Léal 1996, II, 28 n. 10.

To my knowledge, the first to relate these drawings to music was Boggs 1992, 208. The first publications were noted by Chabanne 1985, 110, who also notes that some of the designs were reproduced in the January 5, 1925, issue of La Révolution Surréaliste, pp. 16f.

Poulenc 1925

Vous pouvez facilement imaginer combien me sont insupportables tous ces gens qui singent mon art, mes travaux et jusqu’à mes tics. Quelques adeptes de l’école surréaliste ont surpris dans mon album des croquis et des dessins à la plume, où il n’y avait que des points et des lignes. Le fait est que j’admire beaucoup les cartes d’astronomie. Elles me semblent belles en dehors de leur signification idéologique. Donc, un
beau jour, je me suis mis à dessiner un tas de points, réunis par des lignes et des taches qui semblaient suspendues dans le ciel. J'avais l'idée de m'en servir plus tard, en les introduisant, comme un élément purement graphique, dans mes compositions. Mais voyez ces surréalistes! Comme ils sont malins! Ils ont trouvé que ces dessins répondaient exactement à leurs idées abstraites!


52 Berget 1923, 143, fig. 117 (Northern Hemisphere). This perspicacious observation was one of many to be found in the wide-ranging dissertation of Gasman 1981, 805-8.


55 Perceptive observations by Irene Small on the relationship between these drawings and the Balzac illustrations will be found in Greenberg Fisher ed. 2009, 104-11.

56 Rubin ed. 1996, 61-3, 105-6, nn. 83-5; the date is provided by Daix 1993, 192.

57 Richardson 2007, 305.

58 Spies 2000, 145, 1146, 397 No. 65G.

59 Rubin 1994b; also Rubin ed. 1996.

60 Rubin 1994b, fig. 4, p. 140.
Much more on Picasso and the Murphys will be found in Richardson 07 (Index s.v.). While acknowledging their close friendship, and the admiration evident in Picasso’s known portraits of her, Richardson rejects Rubin’s suggestion, insisting that Sara would have resisted Picasso’s advances (223f.). On Sara and Picasso see also Daix 93, 182-4, 186, and now the essay by Deborah Rothschild in Rothschild ed. 2007, 11-87. For the portraits see Rubin ed. 1996, 53-7.

Zervos 1932-78 , VII nos. 42-50, 53.


Picasso 1947, 44. Balzac 1979, 424: La nature comporte une suite de rondeurs qui s'enveloppent les unes dans les autres. Rigoureusement parlant, le dessin n'existe pas!

“Picasso me montre tout d'abord une série de dessins au crayon, têtes féminines qui, partans d'une esquisse presque naturaliste, aboutissent à quelques lignes intenses e espressives, gardant l'essentiel et rien que l'essentiel de l'être. . . . Cela rappelle tout à fait la genèse de ce taureau lithographique de l'hiver dernier qui, lui aussi, après mille métamorphoses quittait son image photographique pour devenir une épure magique. . . ."Moyens plastiques!" Connais pas. Tout n'est que signe dans la peinture. Donc, c'est la chose signifiée qui compte et non le procédé. Il y a pourtant une grande différence entre le signe et le mot. Le mot 'chaise' ne signifie rien. Mais une 'chaise' peinte est déjà un signe. Son interprétation peut aller à l'infini.”

See my essay on Picasso’s debt to the Provençal tradition in the Demoiselles, Lavin 2002 and 2007.


Balzac 1979, 432, 434, 1408, 1424, 1425.

Picasso’s “seduction” by the associations of the house, which he rented at first sight in 1937, is described by Brassaï 1964, 65 (Brassaï is actually confused: the studio at Grands-Augustins was Porbus’; Frenhofer’s was near Pont Saint-Michel):
Une autre séduction de cette maison: Balzac y avait situé son Chef-d'oeuvre inconnu. C'est dans cette demeure - l'hôtel de Savoie-Carignan avant la Révolution - qu'il faisait rencontrer le maître Frenhofer avec François Porbus et Nicolas Poussin; c'est là que le héros de son roman, dans sa soif d'absolu s'éloignant de plus en plus de la représentation de la nature, créa et détruisit son chef-d'oeuvre et mourut... La description que Balzac donne de cette maison, de l'escalier raide et sombre, est d'ailleurs d'une ressemblance assez frappante. Ému et stimulé à l'idée de prendre la place de l'illustre ombre de Frenhofer, Picasso loua aussitôt l'atelier. C'était en 1937. Et sur le lieu du Chef-d'oeuvre inconnu il avait peint le “chef-d'oeuvre bien connu”: Guernica.

70 Gilot and Lake 1964, 18.

71 After completing this study I discovered, through the blessed serendipity of Google, a remarkable article by Kevin Bongiorni who, approaching the Chef d'oeuvre inconnu from the point of view of literary theory, reaches the same conclusion I do here—that the “failure” in Balzac’s story lay not with Frenhofer but with the tradition-bound painters Porbus and Poussin who could not comprehend that Frenhofer sought not to imitate nature but to create an ideal, therefore necessarily abstract image of beauty. Taking his cue at several points from Michel Serres (1995), Bongiorni considers the novella a reversal of the ancient Horatian literary conceit of ut pictura poesis, poetry is like painting, in that Frenhofer, to whom Poussin refers as “plus poèt que peintre,” “conceives marks, lines and colors on the canvas as tantamount to the expressions of a language.” Bongiorni concludes that ultimately the unknown masterpiece of Balzac’s story is the novella itself. We have seen that Picasso also conceived of his art as a form of expressive “signing.” His commitment to poetry was passionate and enduring. “Art and poetry,” he said, “were one and the same; one can write a painting in words, just as one can paint sensations in a poem”; “if he were Chinese he would not be a painter but a writer, he would write his paintings” (an allusion to Chinese calligraphy). His intensive labors as a poet were devoted precisely to the exploration of the expressive possibilities of words as abstract language, often in the form of sheets inscribed with poetry and treated pictorially as works of art in themselves. (See now the brilliant study of Picasso’s poetry by Michaël 2008, from whom, p. 19, I have borrowed the remarks just quoted; and the stimulating essays in Fisher ed., 2009). Bongiorni’s understanding of the novella is surely correct, and I believe that Picasso understood it in the same way, from the painter’s point of view. The best that can be said of the Balzac etchings is that Picasso vested his unknown masterpiece in the knitter’s hands.
A notable contribution to our comprehension of this “linguistic” aspect of the novella was Michel Serres’ focus (1995, 12f.) on the nickname of Frenhofer’s “perfectly” beautiful model Catherine Lescault, La Belle Noiseuse, “noiseuse” carrying the implication, not only in the usual sense of quarrelsome, but also the notion of bruit (“noise” in English) as auditory confusion. In this sense, Frenhofer’s picture really does represent his model, and Balzac himself explores the polysemantic common ground of word-sound-vision-meaning.

For a suggestion concerning the derivation of Frenhofer’s name, see Conner 1954.

After my initial essay appeared (Lavin 1993a), Yve-Alain Bois commented briefly on my discussion of Matisse’s photographs of works-in-progress in relation to Picasso’s bull series (Bois 1998, 180, 184, 253 n. 322). He quite wrongly and misleadingly alleges that I denied any connection between the two; on the contrary, although I emphasize the differences, the very fact that I considered them together—for the first time, so far as I know—testifies to my regard for their relevance. Similarly, Bois asserts that I seem “to be considering Matisse’s photographs as documents made for a purely private use, unaware that some of them were published as early as 1935, and very often after that.” In fact, as we have seen, Matisse specifically stated that he made the photographs for his own purpose, to gauge his progress, and this is confirmed by Delectorskaya’s account of his method of using them:

Sur les photographies des étapes successives, reniées, du tableau, il pouvait reconsidérer le chemin parcouru, le développement de l’oeuvre, vérifier la justesse de sa démarche ou bien les erreurs commises, et juger de visu si, dans sa volonté de parfaire, il avait détruit, par ailleurs, quelque chose d’essentiel ou bien si, au contraire, il avait fait un pas en avant dans ses recherches. (Delectorskaya 1986, 23)

The fact that he also published them in no way contradicts or qualifies his express intention, but rather suggests that his purpose in deciding to display the photographs (at first they were kept private, see Monod-Fontaine 1989, 93) was to demonstrate his laborious preparations and dispel the “apparent facility” of his work (as noted by Monod-Fontaine, and by Bois himself, 2001, 184). These are Matisse’s own words, in a letter to the curator published in the catalogue of an exhibition in Philadelphia.
in 1948—not by accident chosen by Delectorskaya as the title of her book devoted to the photographs:

To Henry Clifford

Vence, le 14 février 1948

Cher Monsieur Clifford,
J'espère que mon exposition sera digne de tous les efforts qu'elle vous coûte, efforts qui me touchent profondément.

Cependant, en considérant les grandes répercussions qu'elle peut avoir, en voyant les importants préparatifs qu'elle nécessite, je me demande si son étendue n'aura pas une influence plus au moins néfaste sur les jeunes peintres. Comment vont-ils interpréter l'impression d'apparente facilité qu'ils auront après un rapide, voire superficiel regard d'ensemble jeté sur mes toiles et mes dessins.

J'ai toujours essayé de dissimuler mes efforts, j'ai toujours souhaité que mes œuvres aient la légereté et la gaieté du printemps qui ne laisse jamais soupçonner le travail qu'il a coûté. Je crains donc que les jeunes, en ne voyant que l'apparente facilité et les négligences du dessin, se servent de cela comme d'une excuse pour se dispenser de certains efforts que je juge nécessaires. (The letter was republished by Delectorskaya 1986, 85f.)

Bois also points out that Picasso began his Bull series on the same day (actually, two days before) a Matisse exhibition opened in Paris in which many such photographs were exhibited (on this exhibition at the Galerie Maeght December 7-29, 1945, see especially Monod-Fontaine 1989, 93-4, Bois 2001, 184); Bois seems not to notice that Picasso had already begun his lithographic series with progressively abstracting female heads and nudes three weeks before. Moreover, lithographs, each independent, of equal value, and, by definition, made expressly for publication, are very different from photographs made in stages to assay the progress of a work. Finally, I did not maintain or imply, as Bois suggests, that Picasso’s lithographs represent the artist’s working process, as do Matisse’s photographs. (Monod-Fontaine, in her introduction to Delectorskaya 1986, 9f., describes the process revealed by the photographs of the paintings-in-progress as follows: “Pourtant la limpidité de l'ample arabesque vers laquelle tendent chacun des efforts du peintre, chaque état de l’oeuvre, paraît plus proche en août qu’en septembre: ces différents moments photographiés ne marquent pas une progression linéaire, mais font penser plutôt au désordre d'une croissance organique, avec des
éclosions, des trouvailles fulgurantes, puis des passages ingrats, où le tableau
entrevu semble s'éloigner, presque se perdre. Cette observation vaut pour
l'ensemble, comme pour les détails . . ..") Rather, the bulls embody the nature and
significance of Picasso's art as he conceived it. More pertinent in this respect, in
fact, are Matisse's trees; but these drawings were sent in a letter to a friend nearly
two years after they were made, and not published until nearly fifty years after the
artist’s death.

73 Cf. Fourcade 1972, index, s.v. étaps.

74 Matisse 1943. Cf. letter to Pierre Matisse, February, 1945, ibid. 165, n. 13; Barr
1951, 268. See the perceptive observations on Matisse's temporal sequences by
Schneider 1984, 374-8, 578-80, who also describes in this connection the artist's
habit of superimposing drawings on a single sheet. Matisse's method of
photographing his works-in-progress, and his Thèmes et Variations suite, are
discussed in a fine essay by Flam 1989, who also notes that Matisse often made
pairs (not sequential series) of images, the first reflecting the "shock of recognition
of nature," the second a more abstracted interpretation.

75 Finsen 2001, 269-73, and 2005, 70-76.

76 On this point, with respect to the states of the lithograph after Lucas Cranach's
David and Bathsheba, see Castleman 1972, 170.

77 The five Jeanette heads (1910-13) were shown as a complete series only in 1950,
the four Backs were never exhibited together in Matisse's lifetime. This point, and
the nature of Matisse's sculpture as "a private medium of study," are emphasized by
Mezzatesta 1984, 14.

78 Van Doesburg 1925, 18, figs. 5-8; cf. McNamee 1968, 12-20; Doig 1986, 15-17.
So far as I know, Picasso's Bulls and Van Doesburg's Cows were first mentioned
together by Cowart 1981, 64; Cowart further regards Lichtenstein's Bull series as a
reversal of "How to Draw" books, a relationship which, as will be seen, I believe
also applies to Picasso's concept.

79 Mourlot 1970, [4]:

'Un jour, dit Célestin, il commence donc ce fameux taureau.
Un taureau superbe. Bien dodu. Moi je trouvais que ça y
était. Pas du tout. Deuxième état. Troisième. Toujours
dodu. Et ça continue. Mais le taureau n'est plus le même...Il
se met à diminuer, à diminuer de poids...' [Henri] Deschamp
[another craftsman who worked for Mourlot] me dira que ce
jour-là, Picasso 'enlevait plutôt qu'il ne rajoutait... Il découpaît son taureau en même temps. Il faisait des découpages dedans. Et chaque fois on tirait une épreuve. Il voyait bien qu'on était un peu perplexe. Il plaisantait. Et il travaillait. Et un autre taureau. Et il en restait de moins en moins. Il riait en me regardant. Il disait: 'Regarde, Henri. C'est ça qu'on devrait donner au boucher. La ménagère pourrait dire: je veux ce bout-là, ou celui-là'. 'A la fin, la tête était comme une fourmi'. Et Célestin conclut l'histoire du taureau. 'A la dernière épreuve, il ne restait juste que quelques lignes. Je le regardais travailler. Il enlevait. Il enlevait. Moi je pensais au premier taureau. Et je ne pouvais pas m'empêcher de me dire: ce que je ne comprends pas, c'est qu'il finit par où normalement il aurait dû commencer!... Mais lui, il cherchait son taureau. Et pour arriver à son taureau d'une ligne, eh bien! il s'était fait passer par tous ces taureaux-là. Et dans cette ligne-là, quand on la voit, on ne peut pas s'imaginer le travail qu'elle lui a demandé...'

The enchanting history of the bull, as recounted by Mourlot himself, is worth quoting in extenso 1979, 26-9:

Mais, en décembre, il y avait eu l'histoire du taureau, là il nous a tous possédés...

L'opération a duré quinze jours. Le 5 décembre, un mois après son arrivée rue de Chabrol, Picasso a dessiné au lavis un taureau. Un taureau magnifique, très bien fait, gentil même. Et puis on lui a donné l'épreuve; nous en avons tiré à peine deux ou trois, ce qui fait que ce taureau est extrêmement rare. Une semaine après, il revient et il demande une nouvelle pierre; il reprend son taureau au lavis et à la plume; il recommence le 18. Troisième état, le taureau est repris au grattage à plat, puis à la plume en accentuant fortement les volumes; le taureau est devenu un animal terrible avec des cornes et des yeux effroyables. Bon, ça n'allait pas, Picasso exécute un quatrième état, le 22 décembre, et un cinquième, le 24; à chaque fois il simplifie le dessin qui devient de plus en plus géométrique avec des aplats noirs.

Sixième et septième états, les 26 et 28 décembre, puis, après le retour de Picasso, quatre autres états, onze en
tout, les 5, 10 et 17 janvier. Le taureau est réduit à sa plus simple expression; quelques traits d'une maîtrise exceptionnelle qui symbolisent comme un jeu de signes ce malheureux taureau avec sa petite tête d'épingle et ses cornes ridicules en forme d'antenne. Les ouvriers se désolaient d'avoir vu un taureau aussi magnifique transformé en une espèce de fourmi. L'un d'eux m'a dit:

- Il découpaït son taureau, et chaque fois on tirait une épreuve.

Picasso voyait bien que les ouvriers étaient un peu perplexes, c'est ça sans doute qui l'excitait. A un moment il a dit à Deschamps, l'un de nos meilleurs chromistes:

- Regarde, Henri, c'est ça qu'on devrait donner au boucher. La ménagère dirait: 'Moi, je veux ce bout-là. Ou celui-là.'

C'est Célestin qui a trouvé le mot de la fin:

- Picasso, il a fini par là où, normalement, il aurait dû commencer.

C'est vrai, seulement pour arriver à son taureau d'une seule ligne, il a fallu au il passe par tous les taureaux précédents. Et quand on voit ce onzième taureau on ne peut s'imager le travail qu'il lui a demandé.

Chacun de ces onze états a été tiré à dix-huit épreuves réservées à l'artiste, le onzième et dernier l'a été en outre à cinquante épreuves numérotées et signées.

Ah, Picasso, quel homme! Il nous épatait. Jamais je n'ai vu personne travailler comme lui, mais il est très difficile d'expliquer la technique qu'il suivait. Il avait beaucoup regardé les dessinateurs, les imprimeurs. Il avait un oeil qui voyait tout. Devant la pierre il n'a pas été étonné comme beaucoup d'artistes qui sont toujours un peu désémparés, comme gelés devant une si belle matière lisse. Il commençait à travailler avec son crayon, ça n'allait pas, il prenait un pinceau qu'il trempait dans l'encre et le voilà qui continuait. A un moment donné il s'arrêtait et il disait au
reporteur -- le reporteur est l'homme qui prépare les pierres -- il lui disait: 'Eh bien, mon vieux, allez-y! Donnez-moi une épreuve de ça!' On lui donnait une épreuve, ça ne le satisfaisait pas. Il demandait: 'Redonnez-moi la pierre.' On encaissait la pierre, on la lui rendait, et à l'aide d'un grattoir ou d'un couteau il grattait dans sa pierre, il rajoutait des taches de noir, et quand il pensait que c'était terminé: 'Allez encore, enlevez-moi ça!' et on recommençait l'opération, mais cela durait plusieurs jours et certaines séries comme Le Taureau, il les a travaillées pendant plus d'un mois.

81 Inevitable, that is, at least to Professor William Jordy, to whom I am indebted for adding this splendid "connection" to my collection.
82 The Bull seems first to have been referred to paleolithic painting in a brief essay by Palau i Fabre 1978, who also perceived the relevance of Picasso's interest in children's art. Since the first publication of this essay, several important contributions have appeared dealing with the role of children’s art in the early development of modernism, by Fineberg 1997 (120-37 on Picasso), and 1998, and by Pernoud, who was evidently unaware of my work, 2003 (186-212 on Matisse and Picasso; more recently on Picasso, Pernoud 2005).
83 Sabartés 1948, 213f. The Spanish original was published later in Sabartés 1953, 235:

No requerdo por qué causa ni en qué ocasión, aunque eso, en realidad, tiene poca importancia, como si lo hubiera estado mascullando en su cerebro durante algún tiempo, cansado de pensar, se decidió a pasarme la idea para quitársela de encima, diciendo:

- Nunca se ha hecho nada mejor que la escultura primitiva. ¿Te has fijado alguna vez en la precisión de las líneas grabadas en las cavernas?... Has visto reproducciones. Los bajos relieves asirios aún tienen esa pureza de expresión...

- ¿Cómo te explicas -- pregunto -- que haya podido perderse esa maravillosa simplicidad?
Porque el hombre dejó de ser simple. Quiso ver más allá y perdió la facultad de comprender lo que tiene al alcance de la vista. Cuando uno reflexiona, se detiene. No quiero decir que se pare en el camino, si está andando, sino que toda su maquinaria se atasca y, una vez atacado de ese mal, ya no te curas. Si te abalanzas sobre un precipicio, te despeñas... Lo mismo pasa con un reloj: marchará más o menos bien; pero si marcha, no está tan mal como parece. Lo peor comienza al caer en manos del relojero remendón... El manoseo le roba la pureza, y ésta no vuelve más. Conserva la misma apariencia exterior, así como subsiste la idea del arte; pero ya sabemos lo que la Escuela ha hecho con ella. Por de pronto, la esencia se ha evaporado, y lo que queda ya, te lo regalo...

- Malraux 1974, 17-19:

indépendants. Les esprits, l'inconscient (on n'en parlait pas
encore beaucoup), l'émotion, c'est la même chose. J'ai
compris pourquoi j'étais peintre. Tout seul dans ce musée
haffreux, avec des masques, des poupées peaux-rouges, des
mannequins poussiéreux. Les Demoiselles d'Avignon ont dû
arriver ce jour-là mais pas du tout à cause des formes: parce
que c'était ma première toile d'exorcisme, oui!...C'est aussi ça
qui m'a séparé de Braque. Il aimait les Nègres, mais, je vous
ai dit: Parce qu'ils étaient des bonnes sculptures. Il n'en a
jamais eu un peu peur.

85 Page 11:

Perhaps more than any other living artist, Pablo Picasso, who
celebrates to-day his seventy-fifth birthday, has become a
legend. It is reported of him that he was once taken to an
exhibition of children's art, and asked his opinion. He swept
the gallery with eyes as brown and deep and wise as those of
one of his own pet owls, and murmured 'À son âge, moi, je
dessinais comme Raphael.' The personal arrogance implied
in such a remark would be worthy only of a man who has for
half a century been the undisputed dictator of artistic fashion,
who has baffled prediction so often and yet so easily retained
his influence at every turn that he has been accused --
primarily by such as could not stand the pace -- of that
cardinal sin, a lack of high seriousness. And yet that claim to
equality with the prince of draughtsmen while he was yet a
child would only be a slight exaggeration of fact. Whatever
the final rating of posterity may be on the significance and
value of his life's work, that one supreme gift will never be
denied him. Picasso is among the greatest draughtsmen to
have appeared in the history of European art.

86 Page 27:

Since the remark you attribute to Picasso in your leading
article to-day was made in my presence, and since it has
gained currency in several distorted forms, perhaps you
would allow me to put on record what Picasso actually did
say. I had been showing him round an exhibition of
children's drawings sent to Paris by the British Council. He
looked at them very carefully, and when he had finished he
turned to me and said (I will not pretend to remember the
French words he used): 'When I was the age of these children I could draw like Raphael: it took me many years to learn how to draw like these children.'

It will be seen that, far from implying 'personal arrogance,' as your leading article suggests, the remark shows rather the humility that is a characteristic of all true genius.

Read's letter is referred to by Penrose 1973, 315f.

87 Brassaï 1966, 86 (Nov. 17, 1943); idem 1964, 106f.:  

Contrairement à la musique, les enfants miracles n'existent pas en peinture... Ce qu'on prendrait pour un génie précoce était le génie de l'enfance... Il disparaît sans trace, l'âge venu. Il se peut que cet enfant devienne un jour un vrai peintre, ou même, un grand peintre. Mais il lui faudra alors tout recommencer à zéro... Quant à moi, je n'ai pas eu ce génie... Mes tout premiers dessins n'auraient jamais pu figurer dans une exposition de dessins d'enfants... La gaucherie enfantine, sa naïveté, en étaient presque absentes... J'ai très rapidement dépassé le stade de cette merveilleuse vision... A l'âge de ce gosse, je faisais des dessins académiques... Leur minutie, leur exactitude m'effraient... Mon père était professeur de dessin et c'est probablement lui qui m'a poussé prématurément dans cette direction...

88 Parmelin 

Picasso Says... 1966, 73; idem, Picasso dit... 1966, 86:

'On vous explique au'il faut laisser la liberté aux enfants. En réalité on leur impose de faire des dessins d'enfants. On leur apprend à en faire. On leur a même appris à faire des dessins d'enfants qui sont abstraits...

En réalité, comme d'habitude, sous prétexte de leur laisser la liberté, de ne surtout pas les entraver, on les enferme dans leur genre, avec leurs chaînes.'

'Une chose et curieuse,' ajoute-t-il, 'c'est que mois je n'ai jamais fait de dessins d'enfant. Jamais. Même quand j'étais tout petit. J'avais peut-être six ans, ou moins. Dans la maison de mon père, il y avait dans le couloir un Hercule avec sa massue. Eh bien! je me suis mis là dans le couloir, et j'ai dessiné l'Hercule. Mais ce n'était pas un dessin d'enfant.
C'était un vrai dessin, qui représentait Hercule avec sa massue.'

89 Picasso's early drawings may be studied in Zervos 1932-78, VI; Cirlot 1972; Palau i Fabre 1981; Museo Picasso [1986]. For a recent, very stimulating discussion, see Staller 1986, 80-91.

90 The later drawings and paper cut-outs are reproduced in Deuchler 1973, and in Palau i Fabre 1978; for the early cut-outs, see Museo Picasso [1986], 33, with references. It is significant that Matisse also began using cut-outs in the 1930's, but never with the child-like intent or in a reproductive process (see below), as did Picasso; cf. Cowart et al. 1977, and Flam 1989.

91 A catalogue, with Preface by Herbert Read, was printed, see Read 1945. (Ms. Barbara Put of the Fine Arts Department of the British Council, London, was kind enough to provide me with a copy of this rare publication, for which I am most grateful). The exhibition was briefly reviewed in Le Monde, April 12, 1945, 2. Picasso saw the exhibition again later that summer at Antibes, cf. O'Brian 1976, 385; also Musée Picasso 1972, unpaginated but cf. p. 1 (kindly supplied by M. Danièle Giraudy).

92 American Landscape 1982, I, 192-203. Cole's series has been the subject of a fine unpublished dissertation by Parry III 1970; for the nascent artist, see 93ff.

93 Brassaï 1961 (German edition 1960). The citations in the text (Brassaï 1966) are extracted from the following passages in Brassaï 1964:

Je sors de ma serviette mes derniers graffiti. Il me les arrache:

PICASSO: Le mur est quelque chose de merveilleux, n'est-ce pas? J'ai toujours prêté une grande attention à ce qui s'y passe. Quand j'étais jeune, souvent j'ai même copié les graffiti... Et combien de fois ai-je été tenté de m'arrêter devant un beau mur et d'y graver quelque chose... Ce qui m'a retenu, c'est que...

MOI: ...vous ne pouviez pas l'emporter...

PICASSO, rit: ...mais oui, qu'il faut le laisser là, l'abandonner à son sort... Les graffiti sont à tout le monde et à personne... Mais un jour pourquoi n'irions-nous pas nous promener ensemble, moi portant un canif et vous, votre
appareil? Je gratterais les murs et vous, vous photographieriez mes graffiti...

MOI: Il ne vous est jamais arrivé de graver sur un mur?

PICASSO: Mais si. J’en ai laissé beaucoup sur les murs de la Butte... Un jour, à Paris, j’attendais dans une banque. On était en train de la rénover. Alors, entre les échafaudages, sur un pan de mur condamné, j’ai fait un graffiti... Les travaux achevés, il avait disparu... Quelques années après, à la faveur de je ne sais quel remaniement, mon graffiti est réapparu. On l’a trouvé curieux et on a appris qu’il était de... Picasso. Le directeur de la banque a arrêté les travaux, a fait découper ma gravure comme une fresque avec tout le mur autour pour l’incruster dans le mur de son appartement. Je serais heureux si vous pouviez le photographier un jour... 1966, 184f. (July 10, 1945); 1964, 226f.

Comme il me la réclame depuis longtemps, je lui ai apporté la dernière série de mes graffiti.

PICASSO: Ils sont vraiment étonnants, ces graffiti! Quelle invention prodigieuse on y trouve parfois... Quand je vois dessiner les gosses dans la rue, sur l’asphalte ou sur le mur, je m’arrête toujours... On est surpris de ce qui sort de leurs mains... Ils m’apprennent souvent quelque chose...

MOI: Croyez-vous qu’il y ait des 'styles' de graffiti différents pour chaque pays? Cette question me préoccupe...

PICASSO: J’en suis sûr... Les graffiti italiens et espagnols -- je les connais bien -- ne ressemblent pas aux graffiti parisiens... Par example, les phallus qu’on voit sur les murs de Rome sont spécifiquement italiens... Rome est d’ailleurs très riche en graffiti et vous devriez vous amuser à les recueillir...

[The inmate of a prison at Gisors] a pu aussi remplir les murs de sa cellule de graffiti absolument
splendides... Il faudrait que vous les photographiez un jour... Ce sont des petits chefs-d'oeuvre! 1966, 202ff. (November 27, 1946); 1964, 247f.

Picasso tombe dans l'album sur le chapitre 'Le langage du mur'. Les grands coups de pinceau qui effacent les inscriptions du mur le surprennent.

PICASSO: Vous avez bien fait d'avoir photographié ça... Car cela montre bien la nature et les limites de l'art abstrait... Ces coups de pinceau sont très beaux... Mais c'est une beauté naturelle... Des traits de pinceau qui n'ont aucune signification ne feront jamais un tableau. Moi aussi, je donne des coups de pinceau et parfois on dirait même que c'est de l'abstrait... Mais ils signifient toujours quelque chose: un taureau, une arène, la mer, la montagne, la foule... Pour arriver à l'abstraction, il faut toujours commencer par une réalité concrète...

Il arrive au chapitre 'Naissance du visage' où j'ai groupé les visages faits de deux ou de trois trous.

PICASSO: De semblables visages, j'en ai fait souvent moi-même. Ceux qui les gravent vont d'emblée aux signes. L'art est le langage des signes. Quand je prononce 'homme', j'évoque l'homme; ce mot est devenu le signe de l'homme. Il ne le représente pas comme pourrait le faire la photographie. Deux trous, c'est le signe du visage, suffisant pour l'évoquer sans le représenter... Mais n'est-il pas étrange qu'on puisse le faire par des moyens aussi simples? Deux trous, c'est bien abstrait si l'on songe à la complexité de l'homme... Ce qui est le plus abstrait est peut-être le comble de la réalité...

Au chapitre 'Masques et visages', il s'exclame: 'Ceci est un Rouault!', 'Cela, un Klee.'

Au chapitre 'Images primitives', une tête 'aztèque' attire particulièrement son attention, et il s'écrie:

—Ça, c'est aussi riche que la façade d'une cathédrale!... Votre livre relie l'art avec les arts primitifs... Il montre aussi -- et c'est important -- que l'art abstrait n'est pas
loin des coups de pinceau ou des structures du mur... Quoi que l'on pense ou dise, on imite toujours quelque chose à son insu même... Et quand on abandonne les modèles nus à tant de francs heure, on fait 'poser' bien d'autres choses... Ne trouvez-vous pas? Vous serez peut-être content d'apprendre qu'en ce moment, moi aussi, je fais des graffitis... Mais au lieu du mur, ils sont gravés dans le ciment... L'invention d'un artiste norvégien. Mes graffitis sont agrandis et incisés à l'aide de ciseaux électriques... Destinés à un immeuble à Barcelone, chacun d'eux prendra la hauteur de deux ou trois étages... 1966, 241f. (May 18, 1960); 1964, 290f.

94 Bruck 1905. The relationship to Dürer was first observed by Spies ed. 1981, 27ff. (I have chosen slightly different examples; all the relevant sketches are reproduced in Les demoiselles 1988, I, 94, 184, 224.) Spies's contribution was brought to my attention by Brigitte Baer, who made the same observation independently and is preparing a detailed study of the subject. We must now take seriously the striking analogies between the faceted forms Picasso adopted in the subsequent phase of Cubism, and the prismatic shapes Dürer often employed in his theoretical studies (compare especially the 1909 heads of Fernande with those in the Dresden sketchbook, Panofsky 1955, 201ff., fig. 312; also 260ff. on Dürer's theory of proportions). Significantly, Dürer's "cubist" studies also have a sculptural corollary, in the characteristically faceted forms of contemporary wood sculpture in an unfinished state (cf. Huth 1977, figs. 6, 9).

95 The classic study of the academic system of drawing instruction is van Peteghem 1868. Notable recent contributions are, for the early period: Gombrich 1972, 156-72; Rosand 1970; Kemp 1979; Olszewski 1981, 2-7; Amornpichetkul 1984, 108-18; Bolten 1985. The nature and development of the academic method in nineteenth-century France were the subject of a remarkable thesis by Harlé, unfortunately unpublished, which includes a valuable catalogue of instruction manuals preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, see Harlé 1975. Important further studies: Boime 1977; idem 1985; Wagner 1986, 29-62; Nesbit 1987. Boime and Nesbit, in particular, view the simplification and abstraction employed in these pedagogical works as germane to the development of Cubism -- quite different from Picasso's explicit, ironic and historical reversal of academic principles.

96 Hogarth 1753, 123f.

97 The cartoon, from Le pamphlet 1848, p. 4, is published in Chaudonneret 1987, 97, fig. 122

Zervos 1932-78, VI, nos. 10, 13. So far as I know, the relation of Picasso's drawings to Bargue's plates has not been noted heretofore.

As reported by Gilot 1964, 86.

Though less explicitly, Deuchler perceived this metaphorical aspect of the bull series (1974, [15]). A very informative and stimulating discussion of the many innovative techniques Picasso explored in creating the bull series will be found in Clinton Adams's essay on the lithographs in Fryberger *et al.* 1998, 40-55; from which it is evident that Picasso conceived of the execution as well as the formal process represented in the series, as the heroic struggle of a corrida against sheer matter. Baer refers to the bull as a toro di corrida, and makes the perspicacious suggestion that the first state represents a novilllo, and the second a full-grown miura toro (1983, 132); in that case the series might be ontogenetic also in the physiological sense as representing the process of aging and progressive corporeal desiccation. In 1945 Picasso was sixty-four.

On the historicism of the suite see recently the fine essay by Schulz 2008.

Mourlot 1970, Nos. 10, 11 (December 5, 1945), 24 (December 20, 1945), 25, 26 (January 7, 1946); also No. 29 (January 13, 1946). The technique is described by Gilot 1964, 86.

Brassaï 1966, 100 (December 6, 1943); 1964, 123:

> Pourquoi croyez-vous que je date tout ce que je fais? C'est qu'il ne suffit pas de connaître les œuvres d'un artiste. Il faut aussi savoir quand il les faisait, pourquoi, comment, dans quelle circonstance. Sans doute existera-t-il un jour une science, que l'on appellera peut-être 'la science de l'homme', qui cherchera à pénétrer plus avant l'homme à travers l'homme-créateur... Je pense souvent à cette science et je tiens à laisser à la postérité une documentation aussi complète que possible... Voici pourquoi je date tout ce que je fais...

In the passage that follows Brassaï recognizes the seriousness and deliberateness of Picasso's custom, but perceives the egotism, not the universality, of the motive:
Un jour, quand nous parlions avec Sabartés de cette habitude de Picasso de dater ses moindres œuvres ou écrits en indiquant non seulement l'année, le mois et le jour, mais parfois aussi l'heure, Sabartés haussa les épaules : 'A quoi ça rime? me dit-il. C'est une pure fantaisie, une manie... En quoi cela peut intéresser quelqu'un si Picasso a exécuté tel ou tel dessin à dix heures au à onze heures du soir?' Mais, d'après ce que vient de me révéler Picasso, la minutie de ses datations n'est ni caprice, ni manie, mais un acte prémédité, réfléchi. Il veut conférer à tous ses faits et gestes une valeur historique dans son histoire d'homme-créateur, les insérer lui-même -- avant les autres -- dans les grandes annales de sa prodigieuse vie...

Picasso associated prehistoric art with his passion for chronology, in a remarkable statement concerning his own "ages of stone," i.e., engraved pebbles, the "style" of which, it was noted, changed; *ibid.*, 238 (November 26, 1946):

Mais on change tout le temps... Vous n'avez qu'à regarder le changement de mon signature... Ce sont mes différents 'âges de pierre'. Il faudrait publier tout ça dans l'album. J'aime les œuvres complètes... On ne peut vraiment suivre l'acte créateur qu'à travers la série de toutes les variations.

---


107 We owe this felicitous observation to Richardson 2007, 272

108 Cette publication est constituée de deux éléments artistiques: dessin, musique. La partie dessin est figurée par des traits - des traits d'esprit; la partie musicale est représentée par des points - des points noirs. Ces deux parties réunies - en un seul volume - forment un tout: un album. (Satie 1977)

109 On the complex history of this famous work see Volta 1987, 41-53; p. 44 for the date of the 1923 publication.
I am greatly indebted to Alan Gillmor, author of an important biography of Satie (Gillmor 1988) for his help in my effort to identify the source of Satie’s remark, in particular for guiding me to Ornella Volta, doyenne of Satie studies, who recognized it at the first instant!

The text continues:

I had already written *Winter Music* (for 1-20 pianos) for which the composing means used I-Ching chance operations together with imperfections in the paper upon which I was writing. In the case of *Atlas Eclipticalis* I would continue the use of chance operations but in relation to the traced position of stars. I made the staves on my transparent paper so that there was equal space for each of the twelve tones. Lines representing major thirds were farther apart than those representing minor thirds. This brought about a microtonal music, pitches between the conventional ones were to be microtonally flat or sharp to the extent that they appeared to be.

A master score was made not for a conductor but to clarify the compositional process. It tells what instruments are involved in which stars, each star thus becoming, one might say, a constellation.

Where in *Winter Music* there is a single staff having two clef signs, one above the staff and one below it, and two numbers above each aggregate totaling the number of tones in the aggregate, the first telling how many of the tones are in the upper clef, the second telling how many are in the lower, there is in each part of *Atlas Eclipticalis* also a single staff, but only one clef sign, though there are as in *Winter Music* two numbers above each aggregate, the first telling how many tones of the aggregate are as short as possible, the second telling how many tones of the aggregate have duration, even if only slight, though, where there is time, they can be very long.

Both *Atlas Eclipticalis* and *Winter Music* have been played with and, as in the present recording, without electronics.

The character of *Atlas Eclipticalis* is best pronounced, it seems to me, by extreme differences between soft and loud and extreme differences between short and long.
I know of only three complete performances of *Atlas Eclipticalis*. One of these was complete with respect to both instruments and the four pages of each part. Though it was beautifully conducted by Richard Dufallo, and included in addition to *Winter Music* a beautiful performance of *Solo 45* from *Songbooks* by Joan La Barbara, it was, unfortunately, not taken seriously by all members of the orchestra. The other two performances of all four pages were by smaller groups but in each case of excellent musicians. One of these was in Finland; the other, which is here recorded, was at the Cornish School in Seattle. I am glad that this recording exists, though, as I have frequently stated, I, myself, do not use records. I just listen to the sounds around wherever I happen to be. ©John Cage, New York City, October 1985

The text was printed in the program notes of the CD Cage 2007, 7-8


113 The development of Cage’s notational systems is the subject of a magisterial study by James Pritchett (Pritchett 1988).

114 Pritchett 2000, 4. (http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting_research/digitized_collections/davidtudor/pdf/pritchett.pdf)

115 Pritchett 1988, s.v.

116 Indispensable for the study of Johns’s Numbers are Bernstein and Foster 2003 (I have largely followed Bernstein’s typology here); Rondeau and Druick 2007; and the superb catalogue of Johns’s prints by Field 1994.

117 Duhamel 1964; Goeppert 1983, 312, No. 129; Michaël and Guastavino 1999, 82; Michaël 2008, 128, 404 n. 18, ills. 118-22. The “squiggles” that introduce Picasso’s number drawing strikingly anticipate the “W”-shaped brushstroke that came to be a signature marker of Johns’s technique, taken up as a sort of homage to Johns in the work of Mel Bochner (Varnedoe 1996, 104. 115 n. 19; Foster in Bernstein and Foster 2003, 37, 38; Pascale 2007, 111). The similarities in motif and numerical context may in this case be coincidental, but it is hard to lend credence to Johns’s denial that he had “any knowledge of Picasso’s great lithographic sequences in the late-1940s (Bulls, for example) prior to undertaking his 0-9 portfolios in 1960-63” (reported by Pascale 2007, 119). The ubiquity of
Picasso prints by that time may be gauged from the extensive bibliography assembled in Geiser 1955, 174f.


119 Cited after Bernstein in Bernstein and Foster 2003, p. 29.

120 Field 1994, Introduction, unpaginated, but p. 3; “Johns' prints involve witty but serious language games - puns, riddles, diagrams, labels, good grammar/bad syntax, perfect meaning/illegal grammar, and countless types of linguistic overlappings.”

121 For what follows here I am most indebted to the astute observations by Cowart 1981 and the magisterial catalogue of Lichtenstein prints by Corlett 2002, with Introduction by Ruth E. Fine. A helpful account by Chris Bruce of the production of Lichtenstein’s prints will be found in Roy Lichtenstein 2005, 11-15, and very substantial technical information is provided in the captions to the illustrations in Fine 1984, 127-30.

122 Cowart 1981, 64

123 From an interview with Lichtenstein reported in Lippard 1966, 86; cited by Geldzahler 1988, unpaginated.
Antichristi.

Die geystlichen seint alle konnige vnd das bezeyge die platten vffsin kopff. dux 12 q. 1.

Der Bapst mag gleich weder krysser reytten vnd der krysser ist seyn ebrabant vff das bischofflicher wurdé gehalte nicht genüt bert werdc. c. constantium 10. c. 6. dis.

Der Bapst ist allen volcken und rechten vorgesagt er vasp sig gutes Johannis 22.
IO. BAPTISTE PORTAE

Fig. 13

DE HVM. PHYSIOG. LIB. II.

galinacei, perdices, & coturnices; quæ fere similem nasum habent. Cum enim feminae ovis incubant, mares dimicant pugnamque inter se conferunt, quos coeliba vocant; qui victus in pugna fuerit, victoris Venerem patitur, nec nisi a suo victore lubigatur, ex Aristotele: & multis amicos cognoscentiam modi nasci præditos, huic enormi luxuria generi obnoxios. Fingunt Poëtae Iouem aquila formam Ganymedem rapuissent, sub talis figmento id fortasse innuentes. Elianus etiam ichneumonem huic turpitudini obnoxium dixit. Tali nasci Satyri & Sileni ab antiquis effigiati sunt, & tali nasci Socratès ipse præditus huc nam Xenophon Socratæ Silenis similem tuisse, & præsilinaribus, scribit.

Latus in medio nasu.

Nasus in medio latus, declining ad summam, demonstrat mendacem & verborum. Aristoteles ad Alexandrum.

Si huius nasum inspexerimus, & hominem similem effigeauerimus, non ab hae qua hie cervitum figura, longe abeatis, ita affabre incipe crafins deducitur.
Viam solitum regiam. Regiam publicam ac
vestibulum varum, aliusque interum ad coram, f
v litterae) interdum israel. Armo pauper
nus ibi et agit, nec periculum, nec ibemus
aquis, sed punctum, sed puncta, sed punctum
mv ad deskam, mov ad limitem, desinere
dum transierunt terminos nos.

L'abbaia al cielo ella memoria serro. In sullo specchio e se ebbe sperme sopra l'uso tuta l'edita melga geciendo il richio passimento.

E' tro di entrati mio nella pecchia e sub del cor p'estrappo groppa e passi se na ghechi m'appare framo di inizi misalita lachorteca e pregarsi adietro starsagroppe e tedorno Canarcho geniamo.

Il Falsace e strano freggi il tumulto e la mura serro e mal si e p'orsodana torna lombia penturam non. De' Fed di carna giovani el mio amore non sedo figo bo neo pectone.
Poèmes de Ronsard
Ästhetische Transfiguration eines Gegenstandes

Abb. 5: Photographische Darstellung. Abb. 6: Formgebundene Akzentuierung von Verhältnissen. Abb. 7: Aufhebung der Form. Abb. 8: Bild
Het tweede deel.
Abrahamus Bloemaert inventor.
Nach Christi Geburt 1513 hieß man des großmächtigsten Königs Emanuel von Portugal gen Lyabona aus Indien pracht
ain solch lebendig Thier das nennen sie Rhinocerus/Das ist hie mit all seiner getreilen Beschaffenheit. Es hat ein zart wie ein gepfretter Schilbfresser und ist von dicken Schädeln überlegt sehr fest und ist in der großer als der Selbststand, aber in der Breite von Bayern und sehr wehrhaftig es hat ein Schädelzacke Horn vorn aus der Pfaffen/daß dieses zu wagen den es beyer fest ist, das das ein Sieg Thier ist des Selbststands Todestunde. Der Selbststand früher fast viel, den wo es ihm antreffe so laufft ihm das Thier mit dem kopf zwischen die forben bany und raßt den Selbststanden unter am bauch auff und er würget ihn, das mag er sich nicht erwachen dann das Thier ist auch gewappnet das ihm der Selbststand nichts Thun kann. Sie sagen auch das der Rhinocerus Schnell, stetig, und auch Lauffig / sey.

Rhinocerus
Fig. 124
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### Appendix

**Synoptic Table of Picasso’s Bulls (December 5, 1945 to January 18, 1946)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Drawings</th>
<th>Collateral Lithos</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Db</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Dec. 5</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Dec. 12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Dec. 12</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Dec. 22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z XIV 130</td>
<td>Dec. 22</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Dec. 24-26</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dec. 26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 28</td>
<td>NS†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 2</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 5</td>
<td>Christie's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Dec. 2, 1980</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 9, 10</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Jan. 10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Jan. 11, 17</td>
<td>NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 17</td>
<td>NS†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations**

- **B** Baer (privately)
- **M** Mourlot, 1947–64
- **Da** Deuchler, 1973
- **Db** Deuchler, 1974
- **MP** Musée Picasso
- **NGA** National Gallery of Art
- **NS** Norton Simon Museum
- **Z** Zervos, 1932–78

*Signed on back by Marie-Thérèse Walter
†Signed on front by Marie-Thérèse Walter
1K500 × 2 600
2 64
3 49
560.24 6

3 4
0 0 0
1 0 0
4 9 0 0 0
9 3 4 3 0 0

4500 24
3 4 1 0 6 3
+ 1 0 6 3
6 9 1 0 7 5
\[
\frac{1,000 + 3}{3,000 + 0.000} = \frac{3,000}{3,000} + \frac{3}{3.93} = 3 + 0.7692307692307692 \approx 3.76923
\]
The nine Indian figures are:

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

With these nine figures, and with the sign O which the Arabs call zephir any number whatsoever is written, as is demonstrated below.
Fig. 181