



Post-Modernism and Pop Art

Painting Printing 1960-70

'Reciprocal Depiction' is understood as the mutual sampling of the abstract and the concrete and as a rival style to full abstraction in Late Modernism. But as 'Reciprocal Depiction' is pursued, the sample undergoes a crucial change. Where work adopts certain themes or objects as a measure of 'traction' in materials, or 'interruption' of completeness, what is reciprocated is not so much the abstract against the concrete, but painting against printing. This change is usually identified with the movement Pop Art and is here part of a more sweeping change, to a period of Post-Modernism. In the case of key figures such as Americans Roy Lichtenstein (1923-1997) and Andy Warhol (1928-87) this change is relatively easy to trace and familiar to accounts of Pop Art. Lichtenstein initially proceeds under the influence of de Kooning and perhaps Rivers, and deals in 'interruption' or incompleteness, set against stock themes or objects. Yet Lichtenstein raises the stakes by combining a spontaneous and gestural approach with the comic strip characters of Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck. De Kooning had dealt with an archetypal woman; Rivers with a famous historical episode and studio tableaux, both had shown how 'interruption' can bring new insight to painting and a new equivocation to clichés, be at once abstract and concrete: a 'Reciprocal Depiction'. Yet what would happen if the object were as humble or as trivial as a comic strip character? Would 'interruption' be mocked, or Mickey Mouse accorded new dignity?

By turning to print for a more familiar theme or a bigger cliché, painting is tested somewhat differently. The gap perhaps ultimately proved too great, or technically, the exercise eluded Lichtenstein, in any case the artist soon became dissatisfied with the unlikely confrontation and out of idle curiosity decided to paint a 'straight'

version of a single comic strip frame. The result revealed an unsuspected expressive dimension to painting devoid of ‘interruption’, of its doubts, mistakes and confusion. Quite the opposite attitudes were now suggested. In fact, set against a comic strip character, such as *Popeye* (1961) (Figure 41) the ‘straight’ treatment assumes a kind of deadpan reserve, with a distinctly passive/aggressive undertone, akin to the Flaneur’s insolence, or the hipster’s cool. Nor was the comic strip frame merely transcribed in the exercise, or a completely ‘straight’ version in any case. Rather, its isolation as a single frame and dramatic enlargement magnified the comic’s narrative ‘layout’ into absurd and amusing oversimplifications. It abstracted the comic strip up to a point, highlighted ‘formal’ values, but cheapened or trivialised these into the bargain.

Warhol on the other hand was initially drawn to the work of Johns, and to his use of conspicuously modified material matched to template-like objects. But Warhol chose standard line illustrations to similarly confine or channel ‘traction’ in material and technique. His insight lay in realising the picture plane need not be restricted to the orthogonal or to ‘two-dimensional objects’ in order to function as such a template. A suitably simple and familiar style of depiction would suffice. He too thus adopts comic strip characters such as Superman and Popeye, while applying not so much a distinctive paste, but a much-diluted pigment, encouraging transparency to colour and tone and frequent drips and dribbles. But he too was soon dissatisfied with the results and experimented with a ‘straight’ version, concentrating on framing of the illustration and with standard consistency of paint. In fact we can compare two versions of *Storm Window* (1960 Figure 42a on the left, and 1961 Figure 42b on the right) to see how a simple line illustration for a window fitting is transformed through framing and the elimination of surrounding text, and a little of how it too acquires a more unsettling attitude through the absence of ‘painterly’ display.

Both artists thus arrive at virtually the same style at the same time, but from slightly different directions.²²¹ What emerges is a version of ‘Reciprocal Depiction’ in which

²²¹ The account of Lichtenstein’s development is based on John Coplans, ‘An Interview with Roy Lichtenstein’, *Artforum* 2. No 4 October 1963, reprinted in *Roy Lichtenstein*, New York, John Coplans (ed.) 1972, pp. 51-52. The account of Warhol’s change is based on Andy Warhol and Pat Hackett, *Popism: The Warhol ‘60s*, New York, 1980, and essays by Kynaston McShine,

painting now starkly defines itself in relation to depictive styles of printing. Painting cannot of course strictly sample printing as for example a collage might, but rather, where confined to only those stylistic features often and easily associated with printing, highlights crucial differences between painting and printing. Printing grants painting this new and critical role, painting's means, such as 'layout', 'traction' and 'interruption' now determine which properties of printing may be sampled and how. The sample reciprocally sorts styles for painting and printing. Painting does not, to be sure, immediately look to etchings or woodcuts or to the forms of printing traditionally pursued in art, quite the contrary. It looks to the commonest and cheapest forms of line and tone illustration. The objective is not so much the popular, the revered or preferred, but the pedestrian and mundane, against which to measure overlooked or unexpected properties of printing through painting and vice versa.²²²

So painting gains a new deadpan reserve in this sampling while the re-framing and selection of formal elements give even printing's most prosaic illustrations a new dignity and rigour. The printing style 'reciprocally' points to unexpected and potent properties for painting. This arises because even if painting were to do no more than merely enlarge a print, (which it cannot do, without begging the question of its context or framing) the enlargement does not preserve all the properties of the print, such as the resolution of the inking or the texture, colour or ageing of the paper and inks, much less possible accidents such as staining, creasing and other distress to a given instance, although conceivably it might. In fact it isolates just the lines and colours, even the Benday dots (a kind of half-tone screen), in the case of Lichtenstein's work, as a seemingly disembodied design for a given printing process. The absence of these other properties then serves to point to the supporting canvas

Benjamin Buchloh and Marco Livingstone in *Andy Warhol: a Retrospective*, Kynaston McShine (editor) New York/Boston, 1989. For Lichtenstein see also Diane Waldeman, *Roy Lichtenstein*, (catalogue) New York, 1993 and Currentartpics 89. While not denying that preceding commercial designs for wrapping paper using rubber stamps, such as *Bow Pattern* (1959) - reproduced in Andreas Brown, *Andy Warhol: his Early Works 1947-59* (catalogue) New York, 1971, p.72 - already set in place many of the features of his mature work, the account here offers a rationale for his adoption of the loosely brushed approach to single motifs, and the Johns-like short hatching strokes of pencil that often demarcate edges in works of this period.

²²² On Pop Art, see Marco Livingstone, *Pop Art: A continuing history*, London, 1990, John Russell and Suzi Gablik (eds.) *Pop Art Redefined*, London, 1969, Sylvia Harrison, *Pop Art and the origins of post-modernism*, Cambridge/ New York, 2001. For broader iconological treatment, see Sidra Stich, *Made In U.S.A. The Americanisation in Modern Art, the 50s and 60s*, Berkeley/London, 1987.

in a special way, emphasising its weight, scale or size of weave in relation to the immaculate lines and single colours, just as the absence of brushwork to the lines and colours also sample a certain kind of self-effacement or reticence on the part of painting, a literal flatness to its three-dimensionality or material presence, an expressive or metaphoric wryness.

Such work is often still greeted with a mixture of amusement and disappointment, since painting seems at once denuded or debased in the encounter, while modest printing sources are absurdly elevated or exalted. Similarly, the work is commonly misunderstood as impersonal, mechanical; even industrial. Warhol in particular is quick to encourage this sentiment through the use of silkscreens in works such as *One Dollar Bills* (1962) and *Green Coca-Cola Bottles* (1962) that press the definition for a work of sole instance - and painting - still harder.²²³ It is a smaller move to then adopt photo-silkscreens, on which he settles²²⁴. Yet his work remains highly distinctive or personal, with his own approach to photography and silkscreen printing technique, and no more mechanical or industrial than in the traditional supervision of studio assistants. Much the same can be said for Lichtenstein, who is largely content to adopt and give increasing prominence to Benday tone patterns. The use of photography as a further sampling of printing by painting is taken up in the following chapter.

Here the study concentrates on how basic linear or graphic styles for printing provide the core of Pop Art, for it is the power and elegance of this initial print sampling by painting that effectively displaces Late Modernism.²²⁵ Following work pursues the print sample to more diffuse sources, or more diffusely samples the

²²³ These silk-screened enlargements of common designs also lead to sculptures, such as the collections of *Brillo Boxes*, *Kellogg's Cornflake packets* and *Mott's Apple Juice* cartons of 1964 in which packaging design is printed upon smooth wooden cubes or solids. The *Brillo Boxes* in particular are famously held to be 'indiscernible' from their referent by the philosopher and art critic Arthur Danto. See Danto, 'The Artworld' in *The Journal of Philosophy* LXI 1964, pp. 571-584, (reprinted in *Philosophy Looks At The Arts*, Joseph Margolis (editor) Philadelphia, 1987, pp. 155-167). However, the absence of folds or a double thickness to the upper edges of each box indicating a lid to the top or sides, alert the careful observer, indeed the more discerning or supermarket-savvy critic, to crucial differences either from cardboard packaging or wooden crates used in wholesale marketing. The sculptures properly echo just those concerns found in preceding and accompanying painting by Warhol, rather than 'indiscernible' identity.

²²⁴ Regrettably the scope of this study must forego consideration of Warhol's additional activities as graphic designer, photographer, filmmaker, journalist and publisher.

²²⁵ Print sampling here and henceforth is understood only as those features of printing available to sampling in painting, rather than a stricter view of sampling.

print source. Either way, contributes to a dissipation of the coolness of attitude, of the disturbing meagreness of source and of the subversion of traditional painterly values. Eventually such variation exhausts Pop Art. This is now traced along three paths, firstly in work that samples less obvious or potent styles for printing, secondly in work that samples 'layouts' less exclusively related to printing and thirdly in work that samples printing strictly in matters of text.

Along the first path we first encounter work such as that of Englishman, Patrick Caulfield (b.1936). He too initially adopts the black and white of basic graphics in works such as *Engagement Ring* (1963) (Figure 43). While the ring itself conforms to standard illustrative style, the background grid gives it a further, less obvious or necessary setting. Caulfield quickly focuses on the use of a black outline of uniform width (initially quite thin) in perspectival picture planes and a restricted range of flat or single colours, often rich in hue. Such outlines recall a range of printing styles, from advertising and amusements to basic instructional and scientific illustration, yet the choice of objects and allocation of colour is decidedly at odds with these styles. The result is consequently a more muted uneasiness as well as cool. In an example like *View of the Rooftops* (1965) (Figure 44) colour relations are played off against the linear simplification and perspective of the four chimneys. The chimneys acquire a stark, somewhat comic dignity in the emphasis upon their basic volumes and configuration, while colour relations are at once reduced to an exercise in colouring-in, even as mere colouring-in assumes some of the scope and rigour of Modernism's pure or formal colour relations. A red sky for example unavoidably offers a sunset or sunrise, even as it urges a more abstract harmony.²²⁶

Similarly, the work of Italian Valerio Adami (b.1935) and New York-based John Wesley (b.1928) falls within the projection of Pop Art through flatness or evenness of colour, strictness of outline, even though print style is again more general or weaker in sample. Adami's work of the period such as *Gil omosessuali – Privacy* (1966) (Figure 45) preserves single colours and black outlines, sometimes of a modulated width, recalling brush-formed line, but here enlarged to improbable scale. The work

²²⁶ On Caulfield, see Christopher Finch, *Patrick Caulfield*, Harmondsworth/Middlesex/Baltimore/Maryland/Ringwood/Australia, 1971, Marco Livingstone, *Patrick Caulfield*, (catalogue) London, 1981.

also fragments perspective and proportion, creating a kind of graphic designer's version of Picasso or Klee. Printing here samples and is sampled by a demure version of Overstyle. The effect is surprisingly inoffensive, given that a central tenet of Modernism is reduced to a slick mannerism, perhaps because the ingenuity of the drawing still gives the painting and its immaculate surface, a certain impressive presence, lost in printing. Wesley uses objects often with comic and erotic themes isolated against a single colour ground at this time. Objects are also presented as symmetrical and repeating motifs that recall textiles, wallpaper or wrapping paper, but the style of line, its thin, even, spare and somewhat clumsy articulation, and choice of object resist closer identification with a printing style, and consequently the 'flatness' (literal and metaphorical) sampled is less compelling.²²⁷

The comic strip, as a sequence or storyboard is also sampled as a print style in painting. Experiments in the fifties such as the collages of San Francisco-based Jess Collins (b.1923) and the drawings of Swede Oyvind Fahlström (1929-76) variously draw upon comic strips and 'layout', but the project of print sampling for painting redirects attention to comic strips by the mid sixties²²⁸. Unlike Lichtenstein or Warhol, subsequent work uses familiar characters and settings more freely, as in the work of Paris-based Haitian Hervé Télémaque (b.1937) such as *Pastorale* (1964) and the strident satire of San Francisco-based Peter Saul (b.1934). Saul later adopts radical contortions of the figure and thinner, multi-coloured outlines that influence the work of the Chicago-based group, *The Hairy Who* (1966-1969).²²⁹ Their work also features frames in ambiguous sequence and a merging with text or calligraphy,

²²⁷ On Adami, see Hubert Damisch and Henry Martin, *adami*, Paris, 1974. On Wesley, see Alanna Heiss, *John Wesley*, New York, 2000.

²²⁸ Fahlström's work is more commonly associated with the sixties, because of his presence in New York at that time, however his earlier work produced in various parts of Europe, such as the enormous *Opera* (1952-53) and *Feast on MAD* (1957-59) have more recently been acknowledged. See Raphael Rubinstein 'Fahlström Afresh' *Art in America*, July 2001, pp. 61-69 and p. 113.

²²⁹ On Saul, see Jonathan Fineberg, *Art Since 1940: Strategies of Being*, (2nd ed.) London, pp. 270-272. Also note *The Hairy Who* (1966-68) comprised James Falconer (b.1943), Art Green (b.1941), Gladys Nilsson (b.1940), Jim Nutt (b.1938), Suellen Rocca (b.1943) and Karl Wirsum (b.1939). On *The Hairy Who*, see Franz Shultze, *Fantastic Images: Chicago Art since 1945*, Chicago 1972, Jonathan Fineberg, *Art Since 1940: Strategies of Being*, (2nd ed.) New York/London, 2000, pp. 272-276, there, also detailing less strictly print sampled work of Chicago New Imagists.

as does the work of Frenchman Bernard Rancillac (b.1931) at this time, while similarly preserving flat colours and uniform outlines.²³⁰

The drift from standard comic strips and printing styles also projects to other sorts of 'layout', and brings us to the second path for Pop Art. As noted, 'layouts' in Late Modernism often include problematic sequence or storyboard, as in Rauschenberg's illustrations to *Dante's Inferno*, or contrasting depictive styles and materials, as in his *Rebus* (1956). Post-Modernist or Pop 'layouts' tend to narrow the range of materials and styles, so that 'layouts' – as the name suggests – draw more heavily upon printing styles. This path is traced in both London and New York. In London it passes through the work of Hamilton and Blake, to a group of younger artists at The Royal College of Art between 1959 and 1962.²³¹ Derek Boshier (b.1937), Pauline Boty (1938-66), Patrick Caulfield (b.1936), David Hockney (b.1937), Allen Jones (b.1937), R.B. Kitaj (b.1932), and Peter Phillips (b.1939) all pursue 'layout' that variously combines depiction with text or notation. Yet such 'layouts' typically avoid any single or obvious print source. Hamilton's work does not look especially like an advertisement for example, devoid as it is of brand names or a single prominent product, and even where advertising elements are detected, their use points as much to shared stylistic features with 'Overstyle'. Similarly, Blake's Holbein-like precision of line and characteristic modelling do not derive from pin-ups or amusement arcade decoration, but rather are set off in a particular way by his choice of such objects. In fact works sample printing and fairground sources by more complex means and for more complex ends. The cool attitude here ignores any one style of printing or painting, urges only degrees and provides a porous periphery to Pop Art.

The works of Hockney and Kitaj from this time are key examples. Hockney's work initially would seem to stress 'interruption', with its accretion of graffiti-like texts

²³⁰ On Rancillac, see Serge Fauchereau, *Bernard Rancillac*, Paris, 1991. On Telémaque, see Marco Livingstone et al., *Herve Telémaque, Des Modes Et Travaux 1959-1999*, Tanlay, 1999. Also see Livingstone, *Pop Art: a continuing history*, London 1990, pp. 55-59, 141-146, for links with various collage in the work of Martial Raysse (b.1936), the torn posters of Mimmo Rotella (b.1918) Raymond Hains (b.1926) and Jacques de la Villegle (b.1926). But while explicitly sampling prints, often including photographs, sampling is less by painting, than by literal sample of practices of public defacement.

²³¹ The exception to this group is Patrick Caulfield, a student in the following year of the course at the R.C.A. (1960-63) yet his work at this time conforms to the features of 'layout' discussed here.

over stricter background designs and casual foreground figures, in works such as *The Most Beautiful Boy In The World* (1961) (Figure 46a)²³². However, the familiar theme or object that channels de Kooning's *Woman I* or Rivers' *Studio* here takes on a more freewheeling quality, leaving the emphasis less on 'interruption' than on contrasting or conflicting styles, the cool rigidity of the Alka Seltzer box against the floppiness of the valentine and phallic protuberance in the face of the vague, rather coy male below. But the contrast between parts or pictures gradually diminishes, as 'layout' gives way to a single picture plane in Hockney's work. *Flight into Italy – Swiss Landscape* (1962) (Figure 47) and *The Second Marriage* (1963) show how such contrasts may tentatively share a picture plane. Unlike 'Rerealism', the objects not only argue over location and scale, light, colour and volume, but also about line, facture and technique. The contrast is still between objects and styles, but now styles are rendered fumbling and fickle. Indeed Hockney's idle line and cursory handling acquire an appealing insouciance. Yet it proves difficult or tiresome to maintain such contrasts, and by the end of the decade Hockney's work all but forsakes them.²³³

Kitaj's work follows a more measured trajectory and around 1963 settles on a distinctive linear assembly of persons by parts, and into larger more dispersed groupings and settings through the use of single colours for shapes that surrender perspective to basic geometry and orthogonal projections. In *The Ohio Gang* (1964) (Figure 48) 'layout' juggles degrees of pictorial continuity, so that outlines maintain a standard realism in places, such as the nude woman to the centre of the painting, while around her, line slides into more problematic depiction, as in the gesture of the woman to her right, and the blue figure to her left, and compiles a figure through a contiguity rather than a continuity of parts, in the manner of 'Overstyle'. Print styles, along with realism play their part without acquiring particular

²³² Scrutiny of certain reproductions of this work reveals significant changes or stages to it, or possibly confused versions. The former would seem more likely, on the basis of the artist's methods. The work is reproduced in Marco Livingstone, *Pop Art: A Continuing History*, London, 2000 and in Mark Glazebrook, *David Hockney: Paintings, Prints and Drawings 1960-1970*, (catalogue) London, 1970 as well in David Hockney and Nikos Stangos, *Pictures by David Hockney*, London, 1977. The latter two reveal more and starker text in the upper left portion of the picture, a ladder linking the two small figures above the valentine to the lower left of the picture, and firmer outline to the transparent skirt worn by the figure, amongst other changes. This version, reproduced here as Figure 46b, probably represents an earlier stage, documented, but subsequently reworked prior to exhibition and sale, rather than the artist's revision since. These curious differences are hitherto unacknowledged in publication.

²³³ On Hockney, see Marco Livingstone, *David Hockney*, London, 1983.

prominence.²³⁴ The passivity of the central figure to her captors is paralleled by the smaller nude in a pram to the lower right, yet her vulnerability here begins to seem more like a burden to her insubstantial nurse. Here too continuity gives way to 'layout' and metaphor, for the scale of the figures and light area to the right also depart from the four larger figures and the darkened office setting. That the work is about sex and power is obvious enough, where the power actually lies, is less certain. 'Layout' here does not simply marshal the figures within a familiar Modernist geometry, for the geometry is also part of the settings, so that figures and costume in effect sample the geometry and grant it a distinctly seedy décor. But like Hockney, Kitaj gradually concedes 'layout' to a more sustained picture plane and by the late seventies his work too lapses into more familiar depiction.²³⁵

Turning to the path in New York, Pop Art radiates to the 'layouts' of Jim Dine (b.1935) Tom Wesselmann (b.1931) and James Rosenquist (b.1933). Dine's sub-Johnsian attention to 'traction' and three-dimensionality are farthest from print sampling, and weakest in projection. Wesselmann's collage of photography and extended materials is in many ways closer to the spirit of British work, and also resists closer sampling of printing by painting (as pigment). Rosenquist emerged with a striking commitment to 'layout', in his first solo show in 1962. However, his starting point, some years earlier, was not, as one might suppose, a Magritte-like interest in unsettling juxtapositions of objects, but rather abstraction, "a cross between Mark Tobey and Bradley Walker Tomlin" and a response to the work of Johns and Rauschenberg.²³⁶ At some point he then realised that abstraction, and the materials of painting need not start from point, line, plane, volume and so forth, but from bigger bites, so to speak, from common styles of depiction in fact, and then build a bigger and more abstract 'layout' through sustained contrasts. Chapter

²³⁴ An interesting and generally overlooked feature of Kitaj's work at this time is the dry-brush scrubbing or rubbing of colour as in *Juan de la Cruz* (1967) for example, which strikingly recalls the mottled effects of aging and wear on cheap publications, particularly the covers of paperbacks. In this respect, it converts a common if overlooked print property to a stylistic one.

²³⁵ On Kitaj, see John Ashbery et al., *Kitaj, Paintings, Drawings and Pastels*, London/Washington/Dusseldorf, 1983 and Richard Morphet (ed.) *R.B. Kitaj: A Retrospective*, (catalogue) London/Los Angeles/ New York, 1994 and *Currentartpics* 61.

²³⁶ Very few of the artist's works from this period survive. This description is quoted in Judith Goldman, *Rosenquist*, Denver/New York, 1985, pp. 26-27. Also in this passage, the artist describes his development thus: "Everyone was searching to get down to absolute zero, to just colour and form in their abstract pictures. So I thought I wanted to get below zero, and the only way I knew to do that was to start using imagery again". He also attests to the influence of Johns and Rauschenberg in this.

Twelve has shown how this strategy also becomes available to the 'Rerealist' such as Magritte or Dali by the middle of the century, and it is not therefore surprising that initial critical response to Rosenquist's work often dismisses it for its derivative Surrealism²³⁷. But Rosenquist's version does not focus on conflicting objects within a single picture plane so much as a smooth progression to multiple pictures, and it is in their stark assembly within a painting, in their sampling of a certain style of billboard depiction that they qualify as Pop Art and Post-Modernism.

While Rosenquist's 'layouts' are usually based upon a photo-collage, photographic properties are less prominent than the style of billboard illustration of the era. Then again, the general absence of brand names and accompanying copy, and the general presence of radical fragmentation make them seem less like a billboard than a collage of only certain properties of billboard illustration, or a billboard illustration of only certain properties of collage. In other words, properties of billboard and collage are mutually sampled. Yet 'collage' here does not assemble disparate materials, since all parts are painted, all sources are printed, but rather aggressively frames or crops pictures within and beside other pictures. Works, while often very large, rarely rise to the scale of actual billboards at this time, and as noted, mostly ignore text, to concentrate on impressive enlargement of standard scale of object, its isolation against a background of little or no distance, and emphasis upon linear and textural properties. The sample is not only a kind of close-up of billboard illustration, but reciprocally, of some of painting's materials and technique, and early works often include additional attachments of actual objects, somewhat after the manner of Rauschenberg, to underscore the attendant three-dimensionality to such an approach.

But it is the smooth, broad-brushed, de-saturated modelling, the blending of colours and tones that more effectively declare crucial properties of painting here. It is not so much a 'flatness' to painting, as a smoothness even blandness to technique that is highlighted, and while its sheer economy has a softening, soothing quality, its pervasiveness also alerts us to qualities omitted or hidden. As when someone continually tries to reassure us, so that our suspicions cannot help but be aroused, the smoothness of the fragments lead us to inspect the 'layout' for some further

²³⁷ See Goldman, *Rosenquist*, Denver/New York, 1985, p. 13.

insight, and occasionally these are forthcoming, as in *I WILL LOVE WITH MY FORD* (1962) (Figure 49) yet such works also seem somewhat obvious and disappointing. Mostly our suspicions remain unallayed as works set a blandness of depiction against an edge - literal and figurative - of 'layout'. This spawns any number of interesting contrasts between objects and pictures or edges and frames, ranging from matters of line, colour and scale to fashion, period and prestige. Typically, there are too many or none and the blandness is reinforced by a vagueness of 'layout'. In this way Rosenquist's work displays an unsettling detachment or passivity, and something of the cool of a Lichtenstein or Warhol. Similarly, he resists greater variety of facture in order to make such blandness itself an expressive quality. Yet unlike the elegance of their sampling of printed depiction, Rosenquist's sample is more complex, even messy. For the reference is not simply to billboards, nor a standard practice of collage. Rather it straddles, and not always comfortably, the stylistic boundaries between object and edge or frame of picture. While Rosenquist sustains his practice more successfully than Hockney or Kitaj, he can neither expand the stylistic parameters as impressively to those of early Hockney, nor reduce them - equally effectively - to those of early Kitaj, without compromising the desired blandness, or similarly falling back into a single picture plane.

These examples show more complex ways of arranging contrasting pictures, how differing 'layouts' bring out different qualities for styles, and generally dissipate the issue of print sampling for painting. There are of course more straightforward 'layouts', such as grid-like arrangements, and exponents of these also range from the Englishman Joe Tilson (b.1928) and Englishwoman Pauline Boty to Americans Rosalyn Drexler (b.1926) and Allan D'Arcangelo (b.1930) but such 'layouts' neither sample specific printing styles in this way nor are sampled by them. Nor do these varieties exhaust the diffusion of Pop Art, but hopefully this path is now clear and attention may be turned to the sampling of printing as 'text-only'. Painting as 'text-only' traditionally arises as calligraphy, and is abstracted in Modernism to qualities of line, and annexed in Late Modernism to 'layouts'. It arises in the work of Johns, where the use of alphabet stencils deal firstly in letters, and later single words, such as *Tennyson* (1958). But while Johns remains more interested in a template for painting and stencils for this purpose, the use of standard and familiar typefaces and

layouts as a more elaborate kind of stencil, is pursued with impressive dedication in the work of Los Angeles-based Edward Ruscha (b.1937).

Of course typefaces and layouts alone do not deliver a print sample by painting, but only of sign-writing. Yet where a distinctive typeface is coupled with a distinctive word or text, as in Ruscha's *Annie* (1962) (Figure 50) the sign then refers to the title of the comic strip *Little Orphan Annie*, in the manner of a logo, and so to a print source. *Large Trademark with Eight Spotlights* (1962) adopts the perspective and setting of the Twentieth Century Fox film studios logo, and although a filmic print incorporates text within a perspectival picture plane, something Ruscha explores in a variety of works, where text seldom refers to a common print source. While choice of word or text together with typeface and layout, allows painting to point to established printing, reciprocally, such choices also allow 'text-only' to point to certain properties of painting, although 'text-only' need not be print-based to do this. Strictly speaking, this is now 'Reciprocal *Denotation*', where unusual choices of text, typeface and layout highlight paint application and support, and contrast with standard sign writing as well as printing. In works such as *Chemical* (1966) (Figure 51) the word's stretched spacing and exact bisection of the canvas give its shape and surface a measured precision, perhaps echoing the scientific connotation of the word, just as the shaded green background accordingly takes on a certain synthetic hue. At the same time there is some uneasiness at this 'cool' annexation of graphics to painting's formal properties, much as we find with Lichtenstein and Warhol. Ruscha later expands words to phrases, even whole sentences, and also adopts silkscreens, but in contrast to Johns' templates, they supply only backgrounds to the blanked letters, in a variety of unusual pigments, including gunpowder, Pepto-Bismol, spinach, carrot and onion stalk extracts²³⁸.

Ruscha also pursues the sampling of printing conventions beyond painting, pigments and even 'text-only', to book formats, such as his *Twentysix Gasoline Stations* (1963) where text is replaced by a collection of photographs, while later books introduce sequences to the photographs such as *Every Building on Sunset Strip* (1966) and even notional events and narrative as in *The Royal Road Test* (1967) and *Crackers* (1969). Here books are sampled as the collection and conformity of photography,

²³⁸ See Edward Ruscha, *Guacamole Airlines and Other Drawings*, New York, 1980.

with and without sequence, by the omission of text.²³⁹ Other artists such as Los Angeles-based John Baldessari (b.1931) pursued painting as ‘text-only’ in this period, but where ‘text-only’ is extended beyond a single simple sentence, generally sampling abandons painting. Los Angeles-based Lawrence Weiner (b.1940) for example exhibited a publication or print of instructions or descriptions of a work, while New York-based Joseph Kosuth (b.1945) used enlarged and ground-reversed photocopies of dictionary definitions in works such as *The First Investigation, Titled (Art as Idea as Idea)(meaning)* (1967). Significantly, the work adopts a similar square composition to Ruscha’s *Chemical* (1966) and samples, in other words, not all and only the layout of the dictionary, but also ‘text-only’ works as photocopy and picture. The work of the British group *Art and Language Press*, comprising of Terry Atkinson (b.1939) Michael Baldwin (b.1945) and Mel Ramsden (b.1944) pursued ‘text-only’ work in a different direction, and published a journal titled *Art-Language* that used self-referential texts to sample certain formats of the Art world’s more academic publications.²⁴⁰

‘Text-only’ works are taken up again in Chapter Eighteen. Here it is enough to see how ‘Reciprocal Depiction’ and the period of Late Modernism give way to a new emphasis upon print sampling by painting and the period of Post-Modernism. It has shown how this leads firstly to a concern with styles of depiction closely associated with printing, with common line illustrations for example, and to the style called Pop Art. Further print sampling follows on the momentum or projection of this style, to the sampling of photography most notably, as well as to ‘text only’ works. But this spread at a certain point stretches the label of Pop Art, deals in less common or familiar prints, more familiar or milder qualities of painting. A principal strength to the analysis in terms of print sampling lies in the ability to explain the potency of print sampling for painting, according to the view of painting adopted earlier, as the main means for a work of sole instance, in direct contrast with printing. Print sampling also serves to integrate Pop Art with later variations or

²³⁹ On Ruscha, see Elbrig de Groot, (catalogue) *Edward Ruscha: Paintings*, Rotterdam/London/Los Angeles, 1991, Siri Engberg and Clive Phillpot, *Edward Ruscha Editions 1959-1999*, Minneapolis, 1999 and Currentartpics 67.

²⁴⁰ On ‘text-only’ works under other descriptions, see Joseph Kosuth, ‘Art After Philosophy’, *Studio International*, October 1969, p.135, Charles Harrison, *Essays on Art & Language*, Oxford, 1991, Michael Newman and Jon Bird (eds.) *Rewriting Conceptual Art (Critical Views)*, Oxford/New York, 1999 and Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimson, *Conceptual Art: A Critical Anthology*, New York/Boston, 1999.

styles, such as 'text only' works and to give the period greater coherence. The following chapter traces the sampling of photography by painting to the style (strictly, sub-style) of Photo-Realism, and shows how print sampling remains crucial to the period of Post-Modernism after Pop Art.