15

Post-Modernism Continued

Painting Photography 1962–1978

As noted, the project of print sampling by painting looks to photography quite promptly. It again seeks firstly the commonest and meanest of uses and in this is consistent with the basic line illustrations adopted by Lichtenstein and Warhol. What is sampled is the kind of photography and objects firstly associated with wide publication. The initial interest is therefore with the extended printing process for photography used in mass or popular publications, and in particular the half-tone screens used to translate a photograph to a simple inking matrix. However, even in sampling this, a variety of objects and emphases arise and as the project gains momentum, other objects and aspects to photography are sampled, steadily diluting a simple Pop Art label.

The point is not so much to endorse a preferred or pure practice for Pop Art, but rather to trace a sequence – indeed history – of print sampling by painting through selected aspects of photography. This leads nonetheless to a dilution of obvious and sample-able aspects to photography and roughly parallels the dilution of print illustration styles traced in the preceding chapter and to the dissipation of Pop Art as a movement. But as shall be shown, it also leads here to a dilution of painting at a more fundamental level. This chapter is therefore less concerned with a demarcation between Pop Art and the following style of Photo-realism than with the persistence of print sampling by painting and of the varieties established. To resume this history we return to the pivotal work of Warhol.

In 1962 Warhol made the switch from graphic silkscreens to photo-silkscreens in his work. Shortly after, Rauschenburg made the switch from photo-collage and photo-transfers to photo-silkscreens in his work[241]. Both artists not only make the printing process a prominent part of what is nominally painting, but also adopt

---

[241] See Andy Warhol and Pat Hackett, *Popism: The Warhol '60,* New York, 1980, pp. 22-23.

distinctive 'layouts' in which to accommodate multiple prints, and reciprocally, sample other aspects of painting. The respective 'layouts' however sample different kinds of photographs for different aspects. Initially Warhol's choice of photographs, like his choice of illustrations, tend to point to standard and familiar formats or styles, yet unlike his illustrations, the photo-silkscreens concentrate on entertainment celebrities of the time, such as Elvis Presley, Marilyn Monroe, Elizabeth Taylor and Troy Donahue. In this respect Warhol's work deals not just in the popular but the glamorous and topical. Against this glamour he employs a systematic coarsening or degradation of the depiction, firstly through the enlargement of the published photograph, that similarly to Lichtenstein, stresses the half-tone screen, its 'dot gain', and compressed tonal range, secondly through the uneven inking of the silkscreen, its match to the weave of canvas, and often to the broadly allotted areas of single colour upon which the screen is placed, and thirdly through the repetition of the silkscreen print upon the canvas, so that the depiction, usually only of a head or bust, is virtually reduced to a motif in the simplest of repeating patterns – again a common print style used in textiles, wallpaper, wrapping paper and so forth.[242]

Yet the identity of the stars is not just preserved but strengthened by these challenges, so that their depictions emerge somewhat as icons, acquiring a kind of shorthand resemblance through fewer but starker features. The stars thus extend their resemblance through re-printing to 'layout' patterns and painting, while conversely, painting extends its patterns to re-printing and the depiction of stars. Whether such works are properly paintings or merely monotypes remains a moot point, but crucially, 'layout' determines unique placement for screens *within* the work or as only part of the area of the painting, and the unorthodox inking of the screen, and its erratic placement and colouring, even in repetition or grid-form, argue for the materials and technique to be now taken as a work of sole instance, and properly, painting.

Warhol is not content with just the stars of the day however, and soon broadens his selection to include photographs of the *Mona Lisa*, the mourning Jackie Kennedy,

---

[242] Information on printing process throughout this chapter and subsequently is drawn from Helmut Kipphan (ed.) *Handbook of Printed Media,* Berlin/Heidelberg/New York, 2001.

the thirteen most wanted men from police files, spectacular car crashes, race riots, suicides and an electric chair, amongst others. The *Mona Lisa* trades upon familiarity obviously, and if anything its identity as a painting points more emphatically to the coarse monochrome re-printing adopted by Warhol, and the process by which it acquires a further iconic status, even as it surrenders much detail. Other selections however pursue quite the opposite pole and trade in the disturbing and violent. Yet the striking nature of these images is preserved, even as their photographic details are lost. Morbid curiosity also earns its icons. Warhol also begins to vary 'layout' or pattern in four ways, firstly through more irregular placements upon the canvas, as in *Mona Lisa* (1963) (Figure 52) including overlapping, secondly through combining different silkscreens of the same object upon the one canvas, this can also be seen in the lower row of *Mona Lisa* (1963) but is more prominent in *16 Jackies* (1964) and *Red Race Riot* (1963) thirdly through the use of the same silkscreen with different inks, as in *Elvis I and II* ((1964) and fourthly through a reduction in the number of silkscreens to a canvas, where the blank canvas or coloured ground now frame the silkscreen printing, and emphasise 'layout' in relation to the whole of the painting, as in *Orange Disaster* (1963) (Figure 53).

In accommodating the photo-silkscreen within painting in this way Warhol obviously forfeits other means to painting and depiction, although his later work pursues some of these with limited success. There is, for example, work which introduces bold and vigorous brushwork to grounds, somewhat after the manner of de Kooning, such as the *Mao* series (1972) yet the gulf between painted ground and silkscreen negates any more engaging role for the gestures – unlike de Kooning. The same holds for lines introduced which trace features over the surface of the photograph but which lack the stylistic reference or resonance of say, an Adami or Caulfield and of integration of line within the photograph. Exercises with standard symbols such as *Skull* (1976) and *Hammer and Sickle* (1977) curiously lack the extended settings against which earlier work forged its icons, while attempts at abstraction such as the *Oxidation* series (1978) the *Rorschach* series (1984) and the *Camouflage* series (1986) all pursue familiar designs or fields, mostly in a by now

familiar strategy, but their massive enlargements do not so much embarrass painting with mundane sources as now embarrass sources with mundane painting.[243]

Rauschenberg's photo-silkscreens embrace a broader range of photographs, and more complex 'layouts'. While his choice of photographs overlaps with Warhol's in the use of topical figures such as President Kennedy (while Warhol adopts The First Lady) sporting events, the Statue of Liberty, and reproductions of the old masters, Rauschenberg also includes photographs of technical diagrams, ornithological charts, the NASA space programme, military craft, close-ups of mosquitoes, heavy seas, a key ring, a glass of milk and his own photographs of the New York landscape. His 'layouts' share with Warhol the repeated silkscreen, overlaps, changes of colour of ink to the one screen within a painting, and a rough and ready inking technique, but also introduce colour separations and close registration for certain screens, segments and objects carefully and roughly painted around and over in the same and other colours. The contrast is between properties sampled. While both exploit a coarsened version of photo-silk-screening, for Warhol the process subtly transforms familiar and compelling sources, for Rauschenberg diverse sources subtly transform the process. Warhol's samples are icons of glamour and gloom. Rauschenberg's samples are the grades in between, are therefore less tethered to Pop Art, while no less committed to print sampling. Here, icons blend into indexes, sources with technique[244]. This gives his work an especially elusive, discursive quality.

Consider the example of *Estate* (1963) (Figure 54). Here 'layout' finds firstly an obvious metaphor in the prominent street sign with its various directions and the buildings to its right. The buildings are not literally located by the sign from the corner of Nassau and Pine of course, but extend the metaphor of 'layout' to location and orientation. Equally, a second, sloping version of the high-rise building in turn builds the metaphor into one of multiple orientations while the abutting silkscreen of a building site and the colour version of the interior of the Sistine

---

[243] On Warhol, see Kynaston McShine (ed.) *Andy Warhol: A Retrospective*, New York/ Boston, 1989.

[244] Talk of icons and indexes drifts into Peircean terminology a little here, but is another way of saying that competing samples trade object for material, or two-dimensionality for three. Incidentally, the application of Peirce's Semiology to photography and cinema is profitably explored in Peter Wollen, *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema,* London, 1972.

Chapel beneath, serves as a projection and heritage to the orientation, to the building of buildings, in a sense. At the same time the signpost is itself realigned through the painting over of its background and base, so that directions and orientation also stop at its stop sign, and give way to a flurry of red paint that links colour and sign while contrasting with the grey geometry and detail of the buildings. A second orientation is found in the dial face superimposed upon the Sistine Chapel interior. The Sistine Chapel of course, offers an especially loaded model for painting. Yet in aligning the dial face with the vault of the ceiling and the radiating perspective lines of the walls, the dial points both to the centrality of the model and its outward projection. The bright colours and painting that bracket its top, bottom and left side, announce three 'directions' painting may sample the print and pursue the model, while a third version of the high-rise building to its lower left, now on its side or at 'three o'clock' supplies a further re-orientation. In the lower left corner an almost full colour print of the Statue of Liberty featuring a blue sky and clouds, is placed beside a red print of a NASA rocket. The statue builds on a location, then a nation and space programme. Above these, a broadly brushed, tapering column of red and yellow complements the colours below and carries their sentiment into the broad and easy brushstrokes that link them to the birds to the left, also directed skyward, and back to the stop sign, for redirection.[245]

'Layout' then orders the silkscreens according to colour, density or detail, geometry and less formal properties of the object depicted, so that some or all are present at any one placement within the 'layout'. Again, painting and 'layout' meet printing and depiction, and for Rauschenberg also the scheme entails certain omissions. For while painting may trace around and blot out certain objects and sections of a print – it does not draw upon the kind of stylistic resources available to, for example a Rosenquist, a Kitaj or a Hockney. For Rauschenberg painting remains tethered to the broad and bold gestures he inherits from de Kooning and Late Modernism. By the same token, his photo-silkscreens also observe certain surprising constraints, and no use of Modernist master reproductions is made for example, or indeed of

---

[245] On *Estate*, see Sidra Stich, *Made in U.S.A: The Americanisation in Modern Art, the 50s and 60s,* Berkeley/London, 1987, p. 52, Marco Livingstone, *Pop Art, A Continuing History*, London, 1990, p. 116. For standard interpretation of similar works, see Andrew Forge, *Rauschenberg*, New York, 1968, pp. 92-111. For resistance to iconography in interpretation of Rauschenberg, see Branden W. Joseph, *Random Order: Robert Rauschenberg and the Neo-Avant-Garde*, Cambridge/ Mass./London, 2004 and Robert S. Mathison, *Robert Rauschenberg: Breaking Boundaries,* New Haven/ London, 2004. See also Currentartpics 73.

Modernist photography, although later works to some extent redress this through the incorporation of his own, abstracting photography, as in *Exotic Trail* (1988) (Figure 55).

Yet the extended printing process for photography may be sampled without silkscreens, or 'layout' in painting. The work of Frenchman Alain Jacquet (b. 1939) used silkscreens without 'layout' to sample colour separation angles in half-tone screens, yet in substituting 'layouts' for traditional composition as in *Dejeuner sur l'herbe* (1964) (Figure 56) rather weakens the potency by dividing the composition into theme and modern setting variation, and the distinction between painting and print into the bargain. The work of Englishman Gerald Laing (b. 1936) on the other hand uses 'layouts' without silkscreens to sample half tone dots, by 'hand painting' works such as *Deceleration No 3* (1964-9) (Figure 57) but again the sample is weakened by the restricted role assigned to the dots, with its perfunctory motor too easily preserved by the too-small dots. German, Sigmar Polke (b. 1941) pursues a more promising line in works such as *Tennis-player* (1964) (Figure 58) where dots are hand-painted to a scale that makes a feature of screen faults merging with the artist's own faltering diligence. The result transforms the depiction, much like a close-up of a Warhol, but here no icon emerges, rather, as in a Rauschenberg, the tennis player becomes an index to the anonymity of the dot printing/painting degeneration. The focus of Polke's work however soon shifts from half-tone screens and photography to include other forms of print and is pursued in Chapter Sixteen[246].

Just as 'layouts' and silkscreens are not necessary to sample some aspects of the half-tone process in photographic printing, the half-tone process is not necessary to sample other aspects of photography. Yet this distinction perhaps marks a convenient demarcation for Pop Art. The work of German Gerhard Richter (b.1932) is notable for his sampling of blurring in photography, in works such as *Administration Building* (1964) (Figure 59). At first this would seem an attribute of camera process, as loss of focus, or a slow shutter speed's registration of movement, as if the building were glimpsed from a speeding vantage point. Yet in subsequent

---

[246] On Polke, see Martin Hentschel, et al., *Sigmar Polke, The Three Lies of Painting*, (catalogue), Munich, 1997 and Currentartpics 99.

paintings the blurring becomes more ambiguous, static objects such as *Kitchen Chair* (1965) (Figure 60) neither register the directional sweep of movement, nor a consistent depth of field for focus. Equally publication formats such as postcards - *The Sphinx at Ghiza* (1964) wildlife close-ups *Tiger* (1965) pornography *Student* (1967) and the obligatory old master reproduction, *The Annunciation, After Titian* (1973) grant the blurring a degraded or coarsening quality of printing, a kind of summary of lowered half-tone screen rulings, without going into 'dot gain'. Moreover the blurring can in cases be aggressively painterly, so that the dragged brushstrokes are also recorded in the blurring, as in *Tiger* (1965). Blurred brushing is rarely taken further, into brushy blurring so to speak, perhaps because this technique lapses into something too akin to traditional facture. Yet this is tested, against the notably photographic formats of aerial views of mountains and cities in the late sixties, such as *Cityscape Madrid* (1968) (Figure 61).

Richter also pursues blurring to abstraction in parallel works throughout most of his career, firstly overworking colours into masses of writhing brushstrokes in works such as *Triptychon (Inpainting – Grey)* (Richter No 326/1-3 1972) then to their exhaustion in fields of grey, such as *Grey* (Richter No 361/1 1974) secondly, through seemingly soft focus close-ups of brushstrokes, as in *Abstract Painting* (Richter No 418 1977) to their eclipse by the massively loaded deposits and removals of paint in the eighties and nineties, such as *Courbet* (Richter No 616) (1986) (Figure 62). What starts as blurring and photography thus ends as dragging, abstraction and painting. Equally and elegantly, what is sampled throughout all of these works is not just loss of focus, movement or printing degeneration in photography, nor their combinations, but reciprocally, the way they also constitute a version of painting. Accordingly, *Courbet* retains vestiges of depiction in the dragging of colours into one another. While a later work such as *Skull* (Richter No 548/1 1983) (Figure 63) resists resolution as focus, tremor or print. Yet Richter also addresses abstraction as single colours and their relations in grids or charts, and so maintains a print format, although not photography. Pointedly, no blurring or mixing occurs here, but rather the random ordering of colours is spread across saturation and luminosity to a formidable range, inevitably rendered imperceptible by complementary contrasts, and accommodated only by diminishing size of sample, as in *4096 Colours* (Richter No 359 1974) (Figure 64). Abstraction is thus

rendered relative in grids as well as in blurring or dragging. The scope and power of Richter's approach thus does not rest with only extended printing or camera processes to photography. It largely ignores 'layout' for parallel series of works and encompasses geometry and grids as well as gesture, striking techniques or 'traction'. Yet Richter's system and samples nonetheless make sacrifices. While dragging can accommodate shifts in direction, tool and colour, blurring cannot accommodate line or drawing, nor the styles and 'layout' available there. In this respect Richter remains a hostage to the photograph, and the single depiction models of early Warhol and Lichtenstein.[247]

The work of American Chuck Close (b.1940) initially samples camera process more narrowly, and concentrates on focus and depth. His paintings do not deal with great depth, but rather just the depth of facial features, generally viewed from the front, and enlarged to an overwhelming scale, often 108 X 84 ins or 274 X 213 cm, and treated with a radically narrowed depth of field for focus. Yet, as with Lichtenstein's magnifications, certain properties are also excluded in the process, such as texture of paper, grain size of film or colour separation incident. In *Mark* (1978-9) (Figure 65) we can see how this gives a spectacular clarity even to individual skin pores or strands of hair, and an intensified depth to the softening of focus at the shoulders and back of the head. It is this exaggeration that enables Close to exemplify depth of field[248]. The effect is unsettling but curiously unreal, and after a short time the heads come to seem more like superior waxwork dummies, because the enormous detail and precision give them an unnatural stillness[249]. Our perception of faces and portraits resists the kind of scrutiny Close engineers, to be able to focus upon a single strand of hair or skin pore, the sharpness of the pupils, and yet take in the whole of the head, gives it an utterly frozen, even dead quality. Close is able to 'put

---

[247] On Richter, see Roald Nasgaard and Terry Neff (eds.) *Gerhard Richter: Paintings*, Toronto Chicago and London, 1988, Robert Storr and Gerhard Richter, *Gerhard Richter: Forty Years of Painting*, New York, 2002 and Currentartpics 87.

[248] A fact Close concedes, but not quite for the real reasons. "My paintings always transcended the photograph, even from the beginning. The paintings looked more like the people than the photographs did. I always ended up putting more into the painting. Unconsciously I was trying not to. I was trying to be very flat-footed, and effect this translation and not editorialise and not crank anything up for greater effect. But unconsciously I couldn't help but do it." See *Chuck Close: Recent Work,* (catalogue) New York, 1986, reprinted in Jochen Poetter and Helmut Friedel, Chuck Close, Ostfildern-Ruit and New York, 1994, pp 65-66.

[249] As is customary in discussions of photo-based painting, a disclaimer is lodged against the special limitations of reproduction for such work, since many of the crucial features are necessarily lost by the return to a photograph.

more into them' than the photograph, but standards of realism make this into something other than 'life'. And this is not a shortcoming in the paintings, but rather their insight. Again, as with Lichtenstein, the divorce of the picture from matters of paper texture and printing at this level of magnification, also create a certain interest in the supporting surface and painting. Close's airbrushed and methodical glazings deal in the thinnest of paint surfaces. The scrupulous sampling of depth of field thus reciprocally serves to demonstrate a literal flatness for painting, a fastidious rigour to depiction. Later developments however tend to retreat both from this degree of focus and flatness, with the prominence of a grid and looser interpretation of its co-ordinated tones, in works such as *Francesco II* (1988) (Figure 66). The grid in fact now preserves liveliness, even as focus and realism recede. The sources remain photographs, but the sample is now of printing and colour separation, albeit granted a latitude not available to Close with depth of field.

However the strategy of eliminating film grain, print dots and supporting surface from massive enlargement does not render the sample only of camera process. Close's use of depth of focus, or indeed of print process, is allied to the portrait as a single head and shoulders or bust for example, and this are also part of what is sampled.[250] Yet the sample need not always rest upon such basic or traditional formats, nor always point to a flatness in painting. It may sample styles as common and overlooked as the travel brochure illustration, for example. In *On Deck* (1966) by Englishman Malcolm Morley (b.1931) (Figure 67) colour saturation, wide-angle distortion, and 'art direction' in furniture and costumes are picked out as salient features of the polished and published photograph. While in *African Lady* (1971) and *Lizard's Head* (1971) (Figure 68) by American Joseph Raphael (b 1933) the categories of wildlife and ethnographic photography are sampled for long lens close-ups, absence of scale or setting, hard light and ambiguous colours and textures. Morley paints with a smoothness and flatness of handling that accents the stiffness of print deprived of actual process, and gives the cruise holiday an amusing formality. Raphael favours a more broken facture and even greater enlargement, where highlights are treated in bead-like strings, akin to the 'circles of confusion'

---

[250] On Close, see Robert Storr, *Chuck Close*, New York, 1998, Jochen Poetter and Helmut Friedel, *Chuck Close*, (catalogue) Munich/ New York, 1994 and Currentartpics 35.

that arise beyond photographic focus. But here they blend with a version of painting as an incremental accretion, and give even science's specimens a slight mystique.[251]

Other samples do not exploit enlargement to the same extent, although dealing with more elaborate objects and scenes. They also ignore obvious print process, publication categories and lens character to concentrate on more testing samples. For, the line between painting and photography is not always clear-cut, and properties sampled cannot always be easily or usefully attributed to one or the other. For example, perspective and an extended depth of field are not exclusively photographic, scrutiny of the contemporary landscape and the particulars of everyday life are not the exclusive domain of painting. A sample may be too minor or banal to be worth sampling, or too vague or elusive to be effectively sampled. Work that flirts with and often succumbs to these dangers is often described as Photo-realism. Because photography may be smoothly integrated with painting and tradition in this way, the approach attracts many proponents at this time, particularly in the United States, where they include Charles Bell (b. 1935), Robert Cottingham (b. 1935), Richard Estes (b. 1936), Audrey Flack (b. 1931) and Ralph Goings (b. 1928). Because the work can so easily fail to sample enough of photography or with enough of painting, many critics dismiss the project as flawed or futile. The paintings are either too much like photographs or not enough. And the failings are undeniable. Where painting offers no more than routine technique, and photography's composition is too close to traditional styles of painting, what is sampled is no more than massive diligence at the service of meagre ambition. Where photography offers complex and elusive properties of object and composition, and painting technique fails to display consistency, the result is over-ambition married to inadequacy. Yet as slippery as the samples may be, Photo-realism cannot finally be avoided. Painting must have its depiction if it is to sample more of photography, and the sample, when effective, is all the more rewarding for this acuity.[252]

---

[251] On Raphael and Morley as Photo-realists, see Gregory Battcock (ed.) *Super Realism: a critical anthology,* New York, 1975.

[252] On Photo-realism, see Gregory Battcock (ed) *Super Realism: a critical anthology*, New York, 1975, Louis K. Meisel, *Photo-realism*, New York, 1989 and Edward Lucie-Smith, *Artoday*, London, 1995, pp. 204-227.

As shown, where sample eliminates print process, the depiction is not simply left pristine, but subtly transformed. For to 'copy' the depiction and ignore these factors is nevertheless to inscribe it with a new instrument, and regardless of degree of enlargement, focus and depth of field, the picture introduces the subtlest of outlines. The sample starts here for painting and stops here for photography. In *Dick's Union General* (1971) (Figure 69a) by Goings we can see how this linear quality is carefully accented and creates an attendant smoothness to surfaces, an evenness to gradings. It favours the curves, modelling and detail to the pick-up for example, in a way that leaves the stains to the forecourt lacking in a further texture or resolution. It favours the linearity of signage, even to a very small scale, such as the parking sign to the rear of the pick-up, where we can still read the word 'limit' beneath the bumper, but which leaves the adjacent shrubbery looking more cursory for it (see Figure 69b). Inspection of such detail, even in reproduction, confirms how even the faithful copy must traduce the source, when excluding film grain and print surface.

Yet Going's linearity can then subtly excel in the planes of the architecture, the crisp shadows and the complex layers of reflectance and transparency of windows, and gives truck and building, shadow and depth an additional cohesion, less prominent in a photograph. The composition does not simply balance the diagonals of the shadow to the upper left with that of the roof to the right, the blue of the truck with the blue and tan discs affixed to the side of the roof, or rhyme the period, style and social status of the building with that of the pick-up, but aligns their lines, draws them into drawing, and casts a design across depth and shadow, colour and light. It carries the signage on the pick-up's door, with its cartoon graphic and orange border to the curves of the pick-up's body, as one design, then to the brown frames of the building windows and roof, as one design, and then to the blue and tan disks above and the lights and wheels of the pick-up below, as one design. And that design rests on the line where photograph meets printing and printing meets painting.[253]

---

[253] On Goings, see Gregory Battcock (ed.) *Super Realism: a critical anthology*, New York, 1975, and Linda Chase and Ralph Goings, *Ralph Goings, an Interview*, New York, 1988.

Yet to carry drawing into the photograph or to carry the photograph into drawing, builds a dilemma for Photo-realism. To go further into the photograph for line and drawing is to abandon painting and sample *with* the photograph rather than *of* it. To go further from the photograph in assimilating line is to confront 'layout' and the kind of issues engaged by Rauschenberg or Rosenquist. Photo-realism is finally stranded betwixt and between, and stalls by the late seventies. Photography on the other hand, attains new momentum with firstly renewed interest in wide-angle deep focus depiction and something of the all-embracing composition outlined, in for example the work of Germans Bernd and Hilla Becher (b.1931 and 1934) Americans Stephan Shore (b.1947) and Robert Adams (b.1937) and others. Secondly it pursues 'layout 'and sequence in the work of Frenchman, Christian Boltanski (b.1944) American Duane Michaels (b.1932), Englishman and German, Gilbert and George (b.1943, b.1942) and others. Thirdly it returns to studio-based tableau, and greater graphic or printing aspects, with the work of Americans Jan Groover (b.1942), Robert Mapplethorpe (1946-89) Cindy Sherman (b.1954), and others. Fourthly it leads to photography's own sampling of further print properties in the 're-photographing' strategies of Americans Richard Prince (b.1949), Sherrie Levine (b.1947) and others. Sadly space does not allow this study to pursue photography any further, although it is touched upon again in Chapter Eighteen[254].

Finally, while the late seventies largely exhaust Photo-realism and print sampling, this does not quite exhaust Post-Modernism. Although print sampling dominates more concrete depiction up until this point and signals most clearly the abrupt departure from earlier Late Modernism, there are rival styles that gradually arise, persist and gain ascendance by this time. The following chapter traces these other strands.

---

[254] On Richard Prince, see Currentartpics 80, on Cindy Sherman see Currentartpics 12.