

Päivi-Maria Jaatinen

The Rebirth of an Image

In Velasquez it's a very, very extraordinary thing that he has been able to keep it so near to what we call illustration and at the same time so deeply unlock the greatest and deepest things that man can feel.

Francis Bacon, 1962

Päivi-Maria Jaatinen

The Rebirth of an Image

Transformation in the Construction of Meaning in Painting

A Case Study of Diego Velázquez' and Francis Bacon's
Papal Portraits of Innocent X

Master of Arts Thesis
Art History
Department of Arts and Culture Studies
University of Jyväskylä
Finland
2006

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Faculty Humanities		Department Arts and Culture Studies	
Author Päivi-Maria Jaatinen		Subject Art History	
Title The Rebirth of an Image. Transformation in the Construction of Meaning in Painting. A Case Study of Diego Velázquez' and Francis Bacon's Papal Portraits of Innocent X.			
Level Master of Arts Thesis		Month and Year June 2006	Number of pages 74
Abstract <p>The present study addresses the question "How can we understand transformation in the referential relationship between paintings" by exploring how the meaning of paintings can be construed. To frame my approaches I chose two paintings under closer research: <i>Portrait of Innocent X</i> (1650) by Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez (1599-1660) and <i>Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X</i> (1953) by Francis Bacon (1909-1992). The meaning of a referential relationship between two paintings is a sort of <i>terra incognita</i> when we discuss the matter from another art historical position than influence, style, or genre. There is a need, grown especially in the Anglophone art history, to reconsider the conditions of interpretation in the contemporary art theoretical writing. Also visual semiotics might re-evaluate its methods by approving, as Finnish art historian Altti Kuusamo suggests, the ontologically cumulating historical knowledge as the basic starting point of its contextualism.</p> <p>The thesis provides an interdisciplinary set of discursive readings on the relation between the two papal paintings through an approach that combines visual semiotics, art historical hermeneutics and effective-historical hermeneutics. The point of view is based primarily on the theories of Oscar Bätschmann, Hans-Georg Gadamer and Roland Barthes. The Gadamerian principle of effective history means that we should also study the effect of works of art in history, not only their place and situation in it. Furthermore, a historian who aims for understanding, which is the common principle in all hermeneutics, can not perform her act from a single approach.</p> <p>The main bibliographical sources are the Francis Bacon interviews by David Sylvester and the contemporary art historical interpretation on Velázquez and Bacon, focusing on the articles by Norman Bryson, Ernst van Alphen and Barbara Steffen. In addition, the notions by the philosopher Gilles Deleuze, are considered critically. The meaning of Bacon's creation of a suitable context for his papal portraits is developed through an interpretation of Jean Baudrillard's culturalized difference. The representational character of the papal portraits is related to the recent research on the historical sociology of the papal court and to Erving Goffman's symbolic interactionism. The cultural image of the pope is discussed through the contemporary philosophical theories on religion, the referred philosophers being Jacques Derrida, Gianni Vattimo and Gadamer, and on the sociology of the priests' institution, Max Weber.</p> <p>As a conclusion, the painting process of Francis Bacon was intertextual, as he created his work of art as a visual response to the reproductions of the Velázquez' painting. By choosing as a subject, the painting of the previous master Velázquez, Bacon was able to create a context of 'a master author' for his art work as the Velázquez' painting was established firmly in the Western art history. In the logic of culturalized difference Bacon's interpretation was <i>avant-garde</i> in its statement and form. The papal uniform is vital to the principal, thematic motif, the ergon, of the pope, and the concept of pope is essential to the meaning of these portraits. The meaning of the Velázquez' and Bacon's paintings is construed from our present cultural horizon considering the pope as a cultural model, whose <i>front</i> is revealed in the both paintings. However, the imitative relationship of the Bacon painting is not a relationship to a reality of any certain pope named Innocent X but to <i>a reality of another painting</i>. Therefore, in the ontology of painting there exists no act of transformation as the <i>being</i> of these paintings is different when contrasted. However, there is a transformation process of the visible between the two paintings based on the logic of intertextuality. Bacon was able to change the Velázquez' painting aesthetic-visually by, for example, creating a <i>stigma</i> for his papal figure, which refers not only to the affect of Velázquez' painting but to the 'Anatomy of Horror', a selection of images of the Nazi leaders. For Bacon, the act of transformation is a painting process that includes firstly, the accidental <i>moment</i> and secondly, the artistic choice, the intentional <i>movement</i>. Bätschman and van Alphen suggest that the notion of influence should be replaced in art theory, the relevant contemporary concept being that of the visual reference. However, when we reverse the relationship between the predecessor and the later artist, we are forced to ask questions that require not only historical consciousness, but are in their nature ontological, which is one of the directions for further study.</p>			
Keywords Diego Velázquez, Francis Bacon, Innocent X, papal portraits, image of pope, meaning of painting, transformation, visual reference, intertextuality, visual semiotics, art historical hermeneutics, effective-historical hermeneutics, ontology of painting, art theory			
Depository Department of Arts and Culture Studies			

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos Taiteiden ja kulttuurin tutkimuksen laitos	
Tekijä Päivi-Maria Jaatinen	Oppiaine Taidehistoria	
Työn nimi The Rebirth of an Image. Transformation in the Construction of Meaning in Painting. A Case Study of Diego Velázquez' and Francis Bacon's Papal Portraits of Innocent X.		
Työn laji Pro gradu-tutkielma	Aika Kesä 2006	Sivujen määrä 74
Tiivistelmä <p>Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan, miten voimme ymmärtää transformaation maalausten välisessä viittaussuhteessa tutkimalla, kuinka maalausten merkityksiä voidaan rakentaa. Kysymystä pohditaan kahden esimerkkiteoksen valossa, jotka ovat Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquezin (1599-1660) <i>Portrait of Innocent X</i> (1650) ja Francis Baconin (1909-1992) <i>Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X</i> (1953). Kahden maalauksen välisen viittaussuhteen merkitys on eräänlainen taidehistoriallinen <i>terra incognita</i>, mikäli lähtökohtana eivät ole vaikutteet, tyyli tai genre. Erityisesti anglosaksisen taidehistorian parissa on syntynyt voimakkaita pyrkimyksiä tulkintatapojen uudelleenarviointiin. Myös visuaalinen semiotiikka saattaa joutua miettimään metodologiaansa. Kuten Altti Kuusamo on ehdottanut, semiotiikan tulisi ottaa ontologisesti kumuloituva historiallinen tieto kontekstuaalisoinnin lähtökohdaksi.</p> <p>Tutkielmassa esitetään diskursiivisia luentoja esimerkkimaalausten välisestä suhteesta, tutkimuslähtökohdan ollessa monitieteinen. Tutkimushorisontti pohjautuu Oscar Bätschmannin, Hans-Georg Gadamerin ja Roland Barthesin teorioihin, yhdistäen visuaalisen semiotiikan, taidehistoriallisen hermeneutiikan ja efektiivis-historiallisen hermeneutiikan. Hermeneuttinen, efektiivis-historiallinen lähtökohta tarkoittaa, että taideteosten historiallisen position määrittelyn lisäksi tutkija on metodologisesti tietoinen taideteosten efektiivisyydestä. Hermeneuttinen metodologia pyrkii ymmärtämiseen, joka tarkoittaa usean mahdollisen tulkintalähtökohdan hyväksymistä. Tutkielman pääasialliset kirjalliset lähteet ovat David Sylvesterin toimittamat Francis Baconin haastattelut ja viimeisimmät taidehistorialliset tulkinnat, keskittyen Norman Brysonin, Ernst van Alphenin ja Barbara Steffenin artikkeleihin. Lisäksi filosofi Gilles Deleuzen käsitteitä teoksista pohditaan kriittisesti. Tulkiten Jean Baudrillardin teoriaa kulttuurisen eron logiikasta, Baconin luomalle kontekstille rakennetaan merkitys. Tutkimuskohteena olevien paavien muotokuvien representaation luonnetta tulkitaan sekä paavillisen hovin historian sosiologian että Erving Goffmanin symbolisen interaktionismin kautta. Paaviuden kulttuurista mallia ja mahdollisuutta nykyaikaiseen maalaukseen Innocentius X:sta pohditaan Jacques Derridan, Gianni Vattimon ja Gadamerin uskonnonfilosofisten teorioiden läpi.</p> <p>Johtopäätöksissä todetaan, että Francis Baconin maalausprosessi voidaan käsittää intertekstuaaliseksi, visuaaliseksi vastaukseksi Velázquezin maalauksesta tuotettuihin reproduktioihin. Valitessaan maalauksensa aiheeksi aiemman mestarin, Velázquezin teoksen, Bacon pystyi luomaan omalle maalaukselleen 'mestariauktorin'- kontekstin, koska Velázquezin teos oli jo pysyvä osa länsimaista taidehistoriaa. Kulttuurisen eron logiikan mukaan, Baconin visuaalinen uudelleentulkinta oli avantgardistinen muodoltaan ja ilmaisultaan. Semioottisen kommutaatiotestien kautta, sekä Derridan ergon-teoriaa tulkiten, paavin univormu on välttämätön teosten aiheen rakentumiselle, ja paavin käsite on oleellinen maalausten merkityksen muodostumiselle. Nykyisestä yhteiskunnallisesta horisontista tarkastellen paavi voidaan nähdä kulttuurisena mallina, jonka julkisivu paljastetaan kummassakin maalauksessa. On kuitenkin huomattava, että Baconin maalauksen imitatiivinen suhde ei ole suhde aktuaaliseen henkilöön, jonka nimi on Innocentius X, vaan toisen maalauksen todellisuuteen. Maalauksen ontologian kannalta transformaation prosessia ei synny, koska maalausten olemisuus on rinnastettaessa erilainen; niiden viittaussuhteet todellisuuteen poikkeavat toisistaan. Näkyvien, visuaalisten elementtien suhteen maalausten välillä tapahtuu transformaatioprosessi, joka pohjautuu intertekstuaalisuuden logiikkaan. Bacon pystyi muuttamaan Velázquezin maalauksen esteettis-visuaalisia ratkaisuja luomalla esimerkiksi stigman paavin hahmolle, joka ei viittaa vain Velázquezin maalauksen luomaan affektiin, mutta myös Baconin keräämään "Kauhun anatomiaan", natsijohtajien kuvakokoelmaan. Baconille transformaatio maalausprosessissa tarkoittaa ensiksi sattumanvaraista hetkeä, ja toiseksi taiteellista valintaa, tarkoituksellista liikettä. Tutkielmassa päädytään kannattamaan Bätschmannin ja van Alphenin ehdotusta, että vaikutuksen käsite korvattaisiin visuaalisen viittauksen, referenssin, käsitteellä taideteoriassa. Mikäli vaikutussuhde aikaisemman ja myöhemmän taiteellisen teoksen suhteen käännetään, kysymyksenasettelusta tulee luonteeltaan, paitsi historialliseen tietoisuuteen suuntautuvaa, myös ontologista, mikä on jatkotutkimuksen mahdollinen suunta.</p>		
Asiasanat Diego Velázquez, Francis Bacon, Innocentius X, paavien muotokuvat, maalauksen merkitys, transformaatio, visuaalinen viite, intertekstuaalisuus, visuaalisen semiotiikka, taidehistoriallinen hermeneutiikka, efektiivis-historiallinen hermeneutiikka, maalauksen ontologia, taiteen teoria		
Säilytyspaikka Taiteen ja kulttuurintutkimuksen laitos		

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Tiivistelmä	4
Table of Contents	5
1. Introduction	
1.1. The Structure of the Study	7
1.2. Research Methods	8
1.3. Research Problems	10
1.4. Research Material	
1.4.1. <i>Portrait of Innocent X</i>	12
1.4.2. <i>Study after Velázquez’ Portrait of Pope Innocent X</i>	13
1.4.3. Corpus of Literature	15
2. The History of Readings	
2.1. The Primary Frame of Masterworks	18
2.2. The Hermeneutical Situation	19
3. The Transformation of the Visible	
3.1. The Twin Image	22
3.2. The Difference and Continuity of Motifs	26
3.3. The Papal Figure	30
3.4. Velázquez’ Representation	32
4. Constructing Meaning through Contexts	
4.1. Intertextual Transitions and the Particularity of a Painting	35
4.2. Bacon’s Creation of the Context	40
4.3. Culturalized Difference	44
4.4. From Rivalry to Life-Force	45
4.5. The Reversed Gaze	48

5. The Image of the Pope as a Cultural Model	
5.1. The Chains of Pictures	51
5.2. The Sensation of Duality	52
5.3. The Pope as the Bearer of Salvation	56
5.4. The Possibility of the Infinite Artistic Act	58
6. Conclusions	
6.1. Synthesis	62
6.2. Further Study	66
References	68
Appendices	
I. List of Illustrations	
II. Illustrations	

1. Introduction

1.1. The Structure of the Study

The present study addresses the question "How can we understand transformation in the referential relationship between paintings" by exploring how the meaning of paintings can be construed. To frame my approaches and to be able to discuss the complexity of this issue I have chosen two paintings under closer scrutiny: *Portrait of Innocent X* (1650) by Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez¹ (1599-1660) and *Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X* (1953) by Francis Bacon (1909-1992). (Ill. 1, 6)

This thesis is divided into six chapters. The first, introductory chapter, contains background information necessary for understanding my approach, the statement of the research methods and problems and the description of the research material. The second chapter discusses the concept of the masterwork and the framework of the history of readings. The point of view is constructed by the combination of hermeneutical effective-historical and semiotic approach. In the third chapter, I will study the transformation process of the visible elements of the paintings and offer a group of readings on the difference and continuity of the aesthetic-visual solutions of the paintings. Furthermore, the meaning of these similarities and discontinuities will be considered. In the fourth chapter, the relevant contexts of the portraits will be developed, the intertextual transitions in relation to the particularity of a painting will be discussed, and a reading on the meaning of a culturalized difference is constructed. Based on the logic of a reversed art historical point of view to the relationship of the predecessor and the later artist, a suggestion of the use of the concept of visual references, instead of influence, will be discussed. In the fifth chapter, the meaning of the cultural theoretical difference and the effect of these papal portraits will be further

¹ Jonathan Brown explains that Velázquez' name has been spelled in different ways, this practise beginning in his own lifetime. The form artist himself preferred in his later years was Diego de Silva Velázquez, a signature used also in the *Portrait of Innocent X*. In this thesis, I apply the art historically most common version of Diego Velázquez. See Brown 198, 284. Excursion to Galleria Doria Pamphilj, October 2005.

analysed. The thought of these paintings' positions in a chain of pictures, based often on religious motifs, will be analysed. The possibility for a contemporary re-invention of the portraits will be considered as the paintings are read to interpret the image of the pope as a cultural model that has symbolic meanings. Finally, I round off the thesis in a concluding chapter where I offer a synthesis of my statements and a discussion of the possibilities for further study.

1.2. Research Methods

This thesis provides a set of discursive readings on the relation between the two paintings of Velázquez and Bacon. Generally, my present work could be categorized as art history in an art philosophical context. As a background for this thesis my research runs in three stages. First, I studied the international databases for bibliographic references, and acquired relevant literature from United Kingdom. This step was necessary in order to make my study workable: there is no detailed study of the ways in which these paintings might be read together, in Finnish academic, referee-level research. Secondly, I travelled to Rome, to Galleria Doria Pamphilj in order to see the Velázquez' painting *Portrait of Innocent X* myself. Bacon's *Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X* is in the Nathan Emory Coffin Collection of the Des Moines Art Center in the United States of America. Thus, I had to study this painting from reproductions.

Thirdly, from the research material gathered, I made a literature survey. As a result, the main bibliographical sources in this thesis are the Francis Bacon interviews by David Sylvester and the contemporary art historical writing, focusing on the articles by Norman Bryson, Ernst van Alphen and Barbara Steffen, published in connection with the Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art exhibition in 2003. Furthermore, the visuality of these two paintings is cross-read by considering critically the writings of the French philosopher Gilles Deleuze. The aesthetic-visual elements of the paintings are studied through an approach that combines visual semiotics, art historical hermeneutics and hermeneutics. The point of view is based on the theories of Oscar Bätschmann, Hans-Georg Gadamer and Roland Barthes. The meaning

of Bacon's creation of a suitable context for his papal portraits is developed through an interpretation of Jean Baudrillard's culturalized difference. The representational character of the papal portraits is related to the recent research edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia on the historical sociology of the papal court in the 17th century, and to Erving Goffmann's symbolic interactionism. Finally, the cultural image of the pope is discussed through the contemporary philosophical theories on religion, the referred philosophers being Jacques Derrida, Gianni Vattimo and Gadamer, and on the sociology of religion, Max Weber.

This thesis draws also on three papers of my earlier studies in art history: *The Transcendental Landscape. Caspar David Friedrich and the Expressions of Consciousness* (2002) and *The Sealed Poetry. Helene Schjerfbeck's Dressmaker Interpreted through Iconographic and Semiotic Visual Analysis* (2002). As a conclusion, both of these essays resulted into the need for considering the philosophical conditions of interpretation in the contemporary art theoretical writing. After studying the origins of Oscar Bätschmann's method for art historical hermeneutics for my seminar work *On the Trail of the Hermes' Task. Discursive Approaches to the Art Historical Hermeneutics of Oscar Bätschmann* (2006), I discovered a relevant approach from the general hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002) and his principle of effective history. Effective history means that we should also study the effect of works of art in history, not only their place and situation in it. Furthermore, a historian who aims for understanding, which is the common principle in all hermeneutics, can not perform her act from a single approach. Having also worked as an artist for over a decade and taught courses in semiotic picture analysis, my approach in this thesis could be called interdisciplinary. However, the statements aim to be logically argued. In addition, the study aspires to raise further questions on the subject matter of ontology of a painting.

Oscar Bätschmann has suggested that we should consider what are the basic requirements for a scholarly academic work. In his point of view, a researcher becomes a member of a discursive community by offering his

founded method which is sealed by a conclusive argument.² Nevertheless, in humanities, we have seen the rise of the more experimental scientific writing: a study may be even close to poetic prose (Julia Kristeva) or self-expression (Jean-Luc Nancy). This thesis also aims to relate to the praxis of a discursive, essay-type of writing, which has a long tradition, for example, in France.³ Thus, the topic is treated by taking into account also personal reflections upon the paintings. Although Bättschmann strives for an interpretation which is complete and correct, he summarises that in an interpretative effort, one never operates in a closed system, but rather in one, whose coherency is always open to further development.⁴ The idea of an open system is also in the core of the hermeneutics of Gadamer and very close to the thoughts of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834): "(...) the task of hermeneutics is endless. The hermeneutical task moves constantly".⁵

1.3. Research Problems

The notion of time, history and the referential relationship between two paintings is a sort of *terra incognita* when we discuss these matters from another art historical position than influence, style, or genre. When, over one hundred years ago, the acknowledged Finnish art philosopher Yrjö Hirn (1870-1952) explained the point of view of his work, *The Origins of Art*, he remarked that even the very definition of the subject under the aesthetic discussion may become a matter of uncertainty. As Hirn states, the difficulty of formulating the so-called *data* of art philosophy - the facts which we have to go upon, and the facts which we wish to find out - "constitutes the first, and by no means the least important, problem."⁶

² Bättschmann 2003, 207.

³ See for example Barthes 1984, *Image, Music, Text*; or Barthes 1991, *The Responsibility of Forms*.

⁴ Bättschmann 2003, 207.

⁵ Schleiermacher 1977, 73.

⁶ Hirn 1900, 6.

In Finland Riikka Stewen has researched the being of a painting in her PhD dissertation *Beginnings of Being: Painting and Topography of the Aesthetic Experience* published in 1995. Stewen discusses several painters and paintings from a large art philosophical horizon.⁷ Altti Kuusamo made an extensive study of style for his PhD dissertation, *Semiotics in the Service of Iconography and the Study of Style* in 1996. Kuusamo's study discusses, among other issues, the problem of the 'continuity of images' and intertextuality in iconography and semiotics. Kuusamo ends his study by considering the style as an institution and asking where its place (being) might be. What is important for this thesis is that he suggests that semiotics should approve the ontologically cumulating historical knowledge as the basic starting point of its contextualism. This means that the structures that have been interpreted change only because the interpretations themselves change historically.⁸

Having a BA in visual communication and the first, theoretical background in the British cultural studies and film theory, my own position as a researcher in art history emerges from the interest to the questions of art theoretical methodology as well as the work of art itself. In the Anglophone art history, three critical positions can be found. John Roberts has described them as the critique against concepts of *art* history, *Art History* and *art history*. Roberts explains that the first position is associated with the sociology of art and especially the Marxist art history and its detachment from formalist models, the second, with the rise of the so called New Art History in the 1960's and its rejection of the unitary field of art historical research, and the third, with modernist accounts of the superfluity of historical analysis in the context of individual aesthetic experience.⁹ In this thesis the works of arts as objects and events are discussed alongside with the aesthetics, and illustrations necessary and available for the argumentation process are presented in the appendices. This can be seen as an attempt to engage the theoretical discussion closer to its origins: the artworks themselves.

⁷ See more on Stewen 1995.

⁸ Kuusamo 1996, 241.

⁹ Roberts 1994, 1.

From this contemporary situation follow the research problems of this thesis. In the artistic process, the 'borrowing' of pictures, motifs and details is a common practice. The indication of continuity between images has been one of the core questions of art history. To begin with, is there a transformation process between these paintings? To what extent was Bacon able to change the Velázquez' painting? Furthermore, how can we conceptualize this process of change and offer suitable contexts for readings? What are the words we should use when discussing continuity and difference in a painting? Will the Velázquez portrait be looked at through the painting of Bacon and if so, how can we understand this reverse of thought? Moreover, how is the meaning of the Velázquez' and Bacon's paintings construed from our present, cultural horizon? Finally, we will ask: Is there a possibility for yet another, contemporary painting of Innocent X?

1.4. Research Material

1.4.1. Portrait of Innocent X

Diego Velázquez was appointed as a royal painter to the court of Spanish king Philip IV on 6 October 1623, at the age of twenty-four.¹⁰ Therefore, he had a long career of aristocratic portraiture behind him, when, in late November 1648, he set off on his second trip to Italy. This journey lasted two years and eight months, as he returned to Madrid on 23 June 1651. The official motive was to obtain sculpture and paintings for the Spanish king Philip IV's art collection to the new rooms of the Alcázar.¹¹ During this excursion Velázquez painted the *Portrait of Innocent X* (the pope former known as Giovanni Battista Pamphilj), which has stayed in the possession of the Pamphilj family and can be seen in Galleria Doria Pamphilj, in Rome, only.

According to Safarik and the information of Galleria Doria Pamphilj, the first inventory, drawn up between 1649 and 1652, documents the

¹⁰ Brown, 1986, 44.

¹¹ Brown 1986, 195.

portrait in the collection of the pope's nephew Camillo Pamphilj, in the Palazzo al Corso, as the work of 'Diego Velasco spagnolo'. Around 1684, the painting was on display in the Palazzo al Collegio Romano, in the grand salon, now called the 'Poussin room'. It was positioned in the small Cabinet of the Gallery, where it is now on display, in the 19th century.¹² The Velázquez painting had been isolated from the rest of the collection of Galleria Doria Pamphilj, because the painting was considered, as *the image of the collection* by reason of its importance in the Pamphilj family history, as well as being a masterpiece of portraiture.¹³

1.4.2. Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X

Although Velázquez and Bacon were approximately at the same age, in their forties, when producing the images of Innocent X, their careers were in very different phases. Velázquez was an accomplished and celebrated painter, whose production diminished towards the end of his life, not least because of his duties at the Spanish royal court. Bacon, on the other hand, was actually still in the beginning of his career. When he painted his reinvention of the *Portrait of Innocent X* in 1953, he had made only few art works that could be called "major" in the art historical sense.

Hugh M. Davies states that as Francis Bacon began to expect more constant exhibition of his works of art, he became increasingly prolific, at the same time destroying fewer paintings. While only fifteen finished works survive from the period between 1929-1944, during the one year of 1953, Bacon completed more than twenty paintings, among them two *Sphinx* pictures and the papal portraits.¹⁴ Davies, as an acknowledged Bacon scholar, has remarked, that "Bacon's most recognizable image, and hence most famous painting, is the screaming pope of *Study after Velázquez' Portrait of*

¹² Safarik 1993, 44 and excursion to Galleria Doria Pamphilj, October 2005.

¹³ *Arti Grafiche 1870-Roma* 1997, 42.

Excursion to Galleria Doria Pamphilj, October 2005.

¹⁴ Davies 2002, 18.

Pope Innocent X."¹⁵ Thus, this particular work of art is one of the key paintings in Bacon's oeuvre.

In addition to *Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X*, executed in February, the papal portraits of 1953 include a series of eight paintings; *Study for Portrait I-VIII*, painted during the summer. (Ill. 12-19) *Study for Portrait I-VIII* series is the longest in Bacon's career and the eight paintings were sent to New York to Durlacher Gallery, for Bacon's first exclusive exhibition outside Great Britain.¹⁶ However, only five paintings, numbers I, IV, V, VII and VIII were included in the exhibition. On the years to come he returned to the subject matter, for example, in the paintings *Study for a Pope* (1955); *Study for Portrait 1* (1956); *Study for Portrait* (1957); *Pope No. 2* (1960); *Study from Innocent X* (1962); and *Study for Portrait of Pope Innocent X* (1965). Steffen states that over a period of twenty years he painted over forty-five pictures that represented the pope.¹⁷

Nevertheless, as John Russell suggests, by the time of 1960's the subject matter had worn out. Russell argues that the reason for this was that the idea of 'one of Bacon's popes' was then already fixed in art history, hence plain and uninteresting. Russell states that the later popes have "an element of safety and repetition which is quite foreign to Bacon's nature".¹⁸ (Ill. 22-24) In the 1973 interview with David Sylvester Bacon reflects the painting process:

When I made the Pope screaming, I didn't do it in the way I wanted to. I was always . . . very obsessed by Monet. . . . Before that, I'd bought that very beautiful hand-colored book on diseases of the mouth, and, when I made the Pope screaming, I didn't want to do it in the way that I did it- I wanted to make the mouth, with the beauty of its

¹⁵ Davies 2002, 11.

¹⁶ Davies 2002, 14 and Seipel, Steffen and Vitali (eds.) 2003, 358.

¹⁷ Steffen (c) 2003, 115. However, Bacon is believed to have destroyed at least one of the early 1950's paintings of popes, so it is somewhat questionable to state precisely how many papal portraits actually has existed.

¹⁸ Russell 2001, 104.

colour and everything, look like one of the sunsets or something of Monet, and not just the screaming Pope. If I did it again, which I hope to God I never will, I would make it like a Monet.¹⁹

Thus, Bacon was himself exhausted of the subject too. Furthermore, it can be indicated that the motif of an open, screaming mouth, is present already in the *Three Studies for Figures at the Base of a Crucifixion* (1944), and repeats in paintings such as *Head VI* (1949) and *Study for Portrait* (1949). (Ill. 29-32,35,36) Therefore the screaming mouth of *Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X* is not just a comment to the Velázquez painting but an act of self-refentiality within Bacon's production.

1.4.3. Corpus of Literature

According to Velázquez researcher, Jonathan Brown, Velázquez' life and career are reasonably well-documented. There are noticeable gaps in the period between his birth (1599) and his installation at the court of Philip IV (1623). But from then, until the end of his life (1660), there is well-provided evidence of his official activities. However, Brown explains that there is a problem with this information. First, the basic knowledge of Velázquez as a person or as a thinker on art is lacking. There are only few private letters and they do not touch on Velázquez' intentions as an artist. Secondly, the documents do not help to attribute his paintings. They concern questions such as payments, salary or the matters of household service in which Velázquez was associated.²⁰

This is completely different when compared to the source material left from the life and artistic career of Francis Bacon. First of all, there are several, lengthy interviews of Bacon edited by David Sylvester and Michel Archimbaud, which are often cited in the writings concerning his art. These interviews offer us first-hand knowledge about the events in Bacon's life, his paintings and himself as a thinker on art. Martin Harrison has pointed out

¹⁹ Sylvester 2002, 72.

²⁰ Brown 1986, vii.

that, after the death of Bacon in 1992, three biographies have been published. The writings of the famous French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) on Francis Bacon from 1981, were translated and published in English in 2004. In addition, the art markets around Bacon are in a constant movement. After his death, a loosely biographical film has been made of the personal life and love affairs of the artist. The Bacon estate sued his art agency Marlborough, but decided to drop the case. Most of the important paintings of Bacon are part of well-founded collections of different international art museums and private collectors. Even his late London based studio was excavated, taken into pieces and rebuilt to the Hugh Lane Municipal Art Gallery in Dublin in 1999.²¹ However, Harrison states that the “layers of obfuscation surrounding a great artist are only just beginning to be penetrated”.²² A body of literature surrounding artworks has evolved, and continues to develop, which is a sign of the great interest in the paintings of Bacon. Thus, Francis Bacon is still a very contemporary artist, especially after the extensive exhibitions in Vienna and Riehen/Basel in 2003-2004 on the subject matter of the artist and the tradition of art.

As a research material, the literature on Francis Bacon opens up a magnificent source to the development of art history from the 1940's to the contemporary world. From the definitions of Bacon as a surrealist and Velázquez as a Baroque painter, the art historical perspective broadens into the re-evaluation of theoretical concepts in the issues such as the self or the gendered body. A good example of this contemporary methodological reflection in the larger scale is, for example, Ernst van Alphen's readings of Francis Bacon's production.²³

²¹ See Seipel, Steffen and Vitali (eds.), 2003. For this exhibition alone Bacon's art works were lent, for example, from the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, Tate Gallery, London and Museum of Modern Art, New York.

²² Harrison 2005, 8.

²³ See van Alphen: Francis Bacon and the Loss of Self, 1998. This book discusses another important issue central to the reception of Bacon's work: the intense admiration, therefore the emotional response of scholars to Bacon's work.

Furthermore, the Francis Bacon interviews offer us a valuable account to the philosophy of art. As Andrew Benjamin has remarked, the recorded interviews form one of the most important documents in contemporary art. Therefore, for Benjamin, it is 'tempting' to allow Bacon's own words to illuminate the frame of interpretation. But there is a difficulty, that according to Benjamin, emerges once there is a move away from 'simple history or biography', as the interviews become potential objects of interpretation.²⁴ Benjamin states that with Bacon it is the same problem that haunts the relationship between, for example, the notebooks and paintings of Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519). He argues, that the issue lies in plotting the relationship between the writing, (which he calls the discursive) and the figural. Important questions for Benjamin are therefore the following: Is the painting an exemplary instance of a discursive claim of Bacon? Does the written form resolve interpretive problems of the painting?²⁵

What Benjamin means with simple history is left unclear. However, we must remember that the co-operation with, and the reference to the artists' thoughts, is a research method which has a long tradition, on the one hand, in art historical studies and on the other hand, in art philosophical hermeneutics. For example, if we study Oscar Bätschmann's model for art historical hermeneutics and his idea of the scholarly established meaning of an artwork, he suggests that a researcher should, where ever possible, examine it in terms of whether the artist could support it.²⁶

²⁴ Benjamin 1991, 41.

²⁵ Benjamin 1991, 41.

²⁶ Bätschmann 2003, 204.

2. The History of Readings

2.1. The Primary Frame of Masterworks

In contemporary histories of art, these two paintings are generally classified into one category: a masterpiece painting. Therefore, we are obliged to start from a position that traditionally might be a conclusive statement in the evaluation process of art. In addition, we do not need to raise the perpetual, yet still current art question: Is this Art?²⁷ Daniel Chandler has indicated that a famous text has a history of readings. We can not look at a famous painting without the consciousness of the contexts that have been created around it. Chandler argues that such contexts as a matter of fact form a *primary* frame which the reader cannot avoid in interpretation.²⁸ Therefore, we must be methodologically conscious of the history of not only the Velázquez-Bacon paintings themselves, but the effect of the masterpieces in art history. It could be argued that sometimes historical, political or economical motives expressed in the disguise of art theoretical writing can turn the meaning and value of a work of art into something completely different than previously.²⁹ As the artist-writer group Inter Alia has pointed out: industries (even in the field of art) need markets so badly that they create them.³⁰

Thus, it is important to be able to distinguish between various concerns. It is temptative to analyse an individual painting through artist's biography, for example a change of a life style.³¹ However, this may prevail one into

²⁷ See on the development of aesthetics and the problem of art proper in the 20th century in the recent publication by Warburton, 2004.

²⁸ Chandler 2002, 198.

²⁹ See for example Franco 1991. This is an essay on the issue of releasing 'Frida Kahlo' in to the international art market by extending her myth as a tragic (expressive) artist. As a Mexican female artist Kahlo is doubly the Kristeva's Other.

³⁰ See Inter Alia 1994, 37.

³¹ I have commented this process previously in the essay '*Sealed Poetry*' (2002) which is an analysis of the artwork *Dressmaker* (1905) by Finnish artist Helene Schjerfbeck. Schjerfbeck as an Anchoresser is a special artistic myth developed by some Finnish art historians. The myth influences the reading of the artworks and changes their interpretation.

mythical (and even stereotyped) attitudes. Roland Barthes (1915-1980) has explained the myth as something expressed as a phraseology, *a corpus of phrases*, that culture creates in order to be able to understand or conceptualize history into the 'natural'.³² Velázquez as the Courtier and Bacon as the Great Loner of His Era, who mainly referred to the work of the predeceasing great masters, are mythical approaches to the reality of these paintings.

Oscar Bätschmann has stated that we should consider the works of art as *themselves*, to focus on what makes a work visible in terms of its materials, color, depiction, composition and content.³³ However, especially when we are studying masterpieces which have an extensive cultural position, we can not restrict our interpretation anymore to the works themselves as a matter between formal inventions and content. Nonetheless, for Bätschmann also, an art work's historical explanation is important for the logical basis of interpretation as for the reconstruction of the work's social context.³⁴ But when dealing with the masterpieces, we have to widen our perspective to the general intellectual history and hermeneutics as the masterpiece is a *prejudice* in its nature. Masterpiece is an art historical explanation that includes contextual and historical answers.

2.2. The Hermeneutical Situation

Hermeneutics as a method for the study of artworks has its roots in the specialized interpretative reasoning of the 18th and the 19th century theology and philology. Friedrich Schleiermacher's work had a profound meaning as he introduced the idea of interpretation of artworks as the *act of understanding*. But as Kurt Mueller-Vollmer demonstrates in his edition of German hermeneutics, contemporary usage of the term hermeneutics refers to a horizon that is shared by members of the academic society at large. Hermeneutics has been succesful in transforming itself from a set of specific

³² Barthes 1984, 165.

³³ Bätschmann 2003, 180.

³⁴ Bätschmann 2003, 181.

rules of interpretation and philosophical discipline to a general theory of the social and human sciences. Yet Mueller-Vollmer remarks that in discussion certain names and concepts obtained from this tradition have been used, often without a necessary grasp of their meaning and the context they imply.³⁵

One of the most influential philosophers on hermeneutics in the 20th century, Hans-Georg Gadamer, has insisted that hermeneutics has nothing to do with the creation or validation of *specific methodologies of any kind*. So there is an ambiguity on the nature of connotations, as hermeneutics, on the one hand, has referred to the special methods of interpreting literature (and with Bächtmann's art historical hermeneutics visual art works) and, on the other hand, in Gadamerian way, to the disciplines in the human sciences which ground their study in the methods of understanding, as opposite to the natural science.³⁶

Gadamer has defined the hermeneutical situation which involves the act of interpreting historical phenomena, such as a work of art. According to Gadamer, our historical consciousness is determined by the prejudices that we bring with us. These prejudices constitute the horizon of a particular, cultural presence. However, prejudices that Gadamer links to the constitutive character of our culture, are not a fixed set of opinions and evaluations that determine and limit the horizon of the present. This horizon is being continually formed, and we have to test all our prejudices.³⁷

The Gadamerian principle of effective-history means that the interest of the historian is directed, not only towards the historical phenomenon and the work of art, but also towards their *effect in history*. In consequence, historical consciousness should be aware of the fact that in the apparent immediacy with which it approaches a work of art, there is also present,

³⁵ See preface in Mueller-Vollmer 1985, ix.

³⁶ See more on the subject in the precise introduction in Mueller-Vollmer 1985.

³⁷ Gadamer 1988, 245-247.

although maybe not recognised, the other element of the effect.³⁸ Gadamer suggests that the effective-historical approach should be required every time that a work of art is taken from the region between tradition and history to be seen clearly and openly in terms of its own meaning. This is a demand addressed to the methodological consciousness itself. According to Gadamer, the effective-historical problematic is not something which can be considered as separate from the understanding of the work.³⁹ Thus, in this thesis the principle of effective-history is applied as the contemporary art historical writing on the relation between Velázquez and Bacon is placed under critical discussion.

How can the methods of visual semiotics bring extra exposure to our research problem? Göran Sonesson describes the difference between hermeneutics and a semiotic approach through discussing literature studies. Sonesson explains that in the traditional terms of hermeneutics, a semiotician after agreeing with the user in his understanding of the phoneme, goes on to explain the conditions of possibility of this understanding on the level of distinctive features. This means that semiotics contains the knowledge of the interpreter and something more. However, according to Sonesson, the main distinction is that semiotics is not a matter of achieving the correct understanding, but an approach in order to introduce an *element of subjectivity* within the interpretation.⁴⁰

³⁸ Gadamer 1988, 267.

³⁹ Gadamer 1988, 267.

⁴⁰ Sonesson 1989, 28.

3. The Transformation of the Visible

3.1. The Twin Image

The twin image of Velázquez-Bacon paintings has returned to me quite clearly from time to time. As I stood in front of the Diego Velázquez' painting *Pope Innocent X* in Galleria Doria Pamphilj in Rome, I felt very strongly the presence of Innocent X himself. It was as if Innocent X, the man, could have seen me, the spectator. Is this Innocent's gaze a reflection to his painter, Velázquez, or is it something Velázquez invented? It is the evocation of the sensation of attendance which is the great mystery of this painting. Francis Bacon has stated that this particular portrait was his first real subject, him becoming "obsessed by this painting" and buying "photograph after photograph of it".⁴¹ For Bacon the connection to Velázquez was indeed a romance of one kind, an *idée fixe*. We remember in flashes, and so is the Bacon portrait like a visual metaphor of a sudden flash of a memory of the Velázquez portrait. What we can see is the figure in a sinking motion, it is as if the pope is falling in to the darkness, with his face white, his eyes partly destroyed. We are asked to confront the nightmare of this figure.

When starting to research the transformation in these paintings and the possible ways to read the meaning, we obviously engage to the acts of comparing and contrasting. Although Gilles Deleuze claimed that we can not "simply compare the two portraits of Innocent X, that of Velázquez and that of Bacon, who transforms it into the screaming pope"⁴², I shall focus on this dual relationship. However, I naturally aim at going beyond the question of whether the paintings are simply the same or different. Deleuze suggests that we should compare Velázquez' portrait with all of Bacon's paintings. However, this approach is too general and may not survive critical art historical attention. As a matter of fact, this proposition of Deleuze reminds of a field within art history which is, according to Mieke Bal and Norman

⁴¹ Sylvester 1999, 71.

⁴² Deleuze 2004, 53.

Bryson, particularly persistent in its attempt for a positivistic historical perspective: the authentication of oeuvres.⁴³

As Nigel Warburton states, a philosophical theory can be judged by its explanatory power and insight, but also by its ability to withstand counter-argument.⁴⁴ Deleuze's work on Bacon in his *Logic of Sensation* is profound when considering issues such as emotional approach to Bacon's figurative bodies or the use of colour. However, artists themselves often speak about certain themes their production is about. Also in Bacon's oeuvre we may find several groups of works; the papal portraits being just one of these. Barbara Steffen has stated that "there is significant variation in Bacon's manner of painting, pointing to a number of various processes (...)."⁴⁵

In addition to the Papal Portraits, these Bacon themes might be called for example the 'Paintings with Egyptian References', such as the *Dog* (1952) and the above mentioned *Sphinx* pictures; the 'Van Gogh series', with paintings such as *Study for Portrait of Van Gogh II* (1957) and *Study for Portrait of Van Gogh VI* (1957); or the 'Crucifixion Paintings', such as *Three Studies of a Crucifixion* (1962) and *Crucifixion* (1965). (Ill. 45-50) Therefore, we should be able to look at the paintings of Velázquez and Bacon also as themselves, as Oscar Bätschmann suggests. But what does it mean to study the artwork as itself? It means, and this is one of the most important ideas in Bätschmann's art historical hermeneutics, that we should not view a work of art as *evidence of something else*.⁴⁶ Thus, we should not consider Bacon's production first as a proof of, on the one hand, Velázquez' painting processes, or, on the other hand, for example, Deleuze's philosophical assumptions. It is naturally possible to draw some general lines on Bacon's oeuvre, such as the often misused interpretation of Bacon through violence, but the analytical art theoretical gaze requires, in addition to the historical context, the concentration on individual works and the consciousness of the

⁴³ See Bal and Bryson, 1991, 243.

⁴⁴ Warburton 2004, 57.

⁴⁵ Steffen (a) 2003, 36.

⁴⁶ Bätschmann 2003, 180.

fact that there is the variable, physical element in painting as it consists of base, first coats, marks of pencil or ink, pigments and varnish.⁴⁷

Let me take this counter-argument to Deleuze further. Historically Francis Bacon painted the single image of *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* before the series of the eight papal portraits of the same year. Ernst van Alphen has indicated how the *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* expresses the pope primarily in extreme pain, whereas the series present the pope with only one image with which pain in lesser degree can be associated, others presenting boredom, dullness and even the grinning pope.⁴⁸ (Ill. 7; 12-19)

As mentioned before, *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* is considered in the literature as one of the most celebrated of Bacon's paintings and it is the only preserved papal painting that has in its title a direct reference to the specific painting of Velázquez. *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* includes formal, aesthetic-visual inventions that differ from the other papal portraits in their degree. The Papal Portraits from 1950; *Study after Velázquez* and *Study after Velázquez II* already include the strong physical, artistic act of the vertical movement of brush strokes that stroll down like 'rivers.' (Ill. 25, 26) Furthermore, the movement and the play between an object of veil and the sensation of water can be seen in *Study from the Human Body* (1949), where a naked male figure enters a black space through a shower curtain. (Ill. 27) When read in the political context of the Second World War dictators (whose pictures Bacon collected), and as a semiotic visual metaphor, these striking strokes of the early papal portraits and *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* can be seen as a

⁴⁷ These are often referred as the material of the artwork. But we can develop the idea of material further. A simple exemplary question in this issue might be: are the lines of Matisse's drawings firstly ink on paper, his individual artistic presentation or symptoms of the historical reasoning? Inter Alia has referred to artistic material not only as stone or paint, but as the whole scale of cognitive and cultural conventions of the artist. However, this definition of material is somewhat broad in its explanation. See more on Inter Alia 1994, 62.

⁴⁸ Van Alphen 2003, 61.

reference to the metaphor of Holy Bible's Old Testament as biblical justice rolls down like many waters.

However, what is missing in the paintings of 1950, is the modality of royalty, which Bacon was able to construct to the *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* by the yellow, golden-like of colour of the railings and the detailed ornament of the papal throne. (Ill. 8) The repetition of the golden throne from the Velázquez' painting can be read as the necessary, diegetic symbol of wealth and power, in the same way as *gold* in Sergei Eisenstein's (1898-1948) film *Ivan the Terrible* (1944) where the two courtiers are raining down gold over the young czar's head, and which Barthes interpreted as having a twosided symbolic level: firstly the referential symbolism which is the imperial ritual and, secondly, the diegetic symbolism which is the *theme* of gold and therefore wealth.⁴⁹ (Ill. 9)

When comparing *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* to the *Study for Portrait I-VIII* series there is one major difference; the series is indeed *serial* in its nature and refers to the techniques of photography and cinema, and more precisely to a film strip. The work by photographer Edward Muybridge (1830-1904) is often mentioned as an important visual source for Bacon's paintings. (Ill. 20, 21) As a matter of fact, Bacon himself has stated in 1974, that the work of "Michelangelo and Muybridge are mixed up in my mind together".⁵⁰ Harrison argues that in the 1970's there was a significant change in Bacon's use of photographs. Bacon quoted from themes in his own oeuvre. This means to Harrison that the relationship of the author to the pictorial elements in the painting became self-referential, even parodic.⁵¹ Although not parodic, the act of self-reference is obvious in this series of papal paintings. Hugh M. Davies has explained that soon after the series were published, Sam Hunter wrote in 1953 *Art Digest*, that Bacon had been able to try for a continuous cinematic expression in his popes, which was considered by Hunter as an entirely new kind of painting experience. It

⁴⁹ Barthes 1984, 52

⁵⁰ Bacon cited in Harrison 2005, 57.

⁵¹ Harrison 2005, 11.

was the combination of the monumentality of the great art of the past and the modernity of the film strip which was so epoch-making.⁵²

Finally, as Deleuze is a philosopher, we may suggest that the idea of a transformed 'Doppelgänger' is a conceptual framing: the working hypotheses of metaphysics is that there is a future for the Velázquez painting (the Bacon painting), in which the past will alter its meaning. We may strain a mental string between the two poles which these paintings present in a time chain. Hence, they will exist in connection not only historically, but metaphysically.

3.2. The Difference and Continuity of Motifs

Deleuze states that Bacon has hystericized all the elements of Velázquez' painting and that the elements of Bacon's version (and as a matter of fact of Bacon's whole oeuvre) are already present in Velázquez' portrait of Innocent X. From the semiotic perspective this means that, for Deleuze, the level of the signifiers is the same in both of the paintings. Deleuze argues that in the Velázquez' portrait, first, the armchair already is a character of 'the prison of the parallelepiped', secondly, the curtain in back is already tending to move up front, third, the mantelet has aspects of a side of beef, fourth, an unreadable, yet clear parchment, is in the hand, and fifth, the attentive eye of the Pope already sees something invisible looming up. However, for Deleuze all this in the Velázquez painting is strangely restrained, as if something that is going to happen.⁵³

The armchair exists in the Bacon painting and, as suggested before, creates the modality of royalty, the curtain is transformed into strolls of paint, the mantelet as a uniform of the pope exists, but its form and colour has changed, and the eyes are destroyed. The 'unreadable parchment' is also missing in Bacon's painting. As a matter of fact, this letter is a significant element of the Velázquez' painting and readable. In the portrait, in his left hand, Innocent X holds a piece of paper. Written on the letter is the

⁵² Davies 2002, 16.

⁵³ Deleuze 2004, 53.

following text "Alla Sant.ta di Nro Sig.re/Innocencio X°/ Per Diego de Silva Velazquez dela Ca-/mera di S.M.ta Catt.ca."⁵⁴ (Ill. 3)

The piece of paper in the hand of the subject of the portrait, was Velázquez' method of implying the author of the painting, *the artist*. The same strategy can be seen in the paintings of *Philip IV in Brown and Silver* (circa early 1630's) and *Archbishop Fernando de Valdés* (circa 1633-39). If we look at the gesture of the hand in the preserved detail of *Archbishop Fernando de Valdés*, we may find that the hand and the letter are similar to the *Portrait of Innocent X*, if reversed as horizontal opposite. Velázquez' letter is more than a mere signature. It can be seen as a visual sign that underlines the presence of the artist in the art work. In addition, Brown suggests that this letter was used by Velázquez "both to identify himself as the author of the picture and to serve as a petition to the pope".⁵⁵ Brown connects the letter as a petition to the experience of the human situation in his interpretation. He argues that by means of this dramatic device, Velázquez portrait becomes the man rather than just an image or record of his appearance.⁵⁶

The imaginary binary opposition to the eyes that see everything is blindness. It is understandable that Bacon chose to destroy the eyes of Velázquez' Innocent X. As Davies, Harrison and Steffen⁵⁷ have proofed there is a visual reference to this strategy: the image of the hurt woman of the Sergei Eisenstein's classic 1925 film, *Battleship Potemkin*. (Ill. 39, 40) The pope's screaming mouth, shattered pince-nez, and eyes bare a clear resemblance to the film's blood-dripping image of the woman's face. Bacon

⁵⁴ Safarik 1993, 45. Excursion to Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphilj in October 2005.

In Barbara Steffen's article 'The Papal Portraits' a different text is cited. Steffen refers to Lopez-Rey (1999) and states that the paper has the inscription "Alla Santa di Nr. Sigre/Innocencio X/Per/Diego de Silva/ Velázquez dela Ca/mera di s. Mte Cattca.1650." See Steffen (b) 2003, 116.

⁵⁵ Brown 1986, 199.

⁵⁶ Brown 1986, 200.

⁵⁷ See for example Steffen (c) 2003, 147.

first saw this film in 1935, and viewed it frequently thereafter. Throughout his career he kept the photograph in his studio.⁵⁸

But what is the meaning of using this sort of visual solution? One of the readings might be historical. It must be remembered that Bacon's first major work was displayed in 1945, after the disastrous Second World War. In the 1950's one of the reproductions of the Velázquez painting was assembled in an 'Anatomy of Horror', a selection of Bacon's working documents alongside with the images of the Nazi leaders, such as Joseph Goebbels, photographed mouth wide open.⁵⁹ (Ill. 33, 34, 37, 38) When one of the classics in social psychology, Erving Goffman (1922-1982) published his book on Stigma, which can be understood as the symbol of the spoiled identity, he referred to the studies of war blinds in American social structure in the 1950's. Goffman wrote in 1957 that there may be a hesitancy about touching or steering the blind, while for others, the perceived failure to see may be generalised into a gestalt of disability, so that the individual shouts at the blind as if they were deaf or treats them as if they were crippled.⁶⁰ We feel the urge to steer the blind, to help him to move. In the context of the post-war European society and the actual war cripples we can understand that the Velázquez' pope can be associated to all dictators and needs no help, needs no steering. On the contrary, the hypnotic gaze of Innocent X must be destroyed as Bacon did. Thus, Bacon created a *stigma* for the pope, which for the Greeks referred "to bodily signs designed to expose something unusual and bad about the moral status of the signifier."⁶¹ Stigma as a concept is understood to be applied both to the disgrace itself and to the bodily evidence of it. (Ill. 2, 7)

Velázquez' pope never seems to surrender his reserve. Although set in interiors, there is no code of domesticity in the portraits, which is a similar approach to both of the paintings. Furthermore, as mentioned before, the paintings have in common the visual element of the veil. Another visual

⁵⁸ Steffen (c) 2003, 147-150.

⁵⁹ Harrison 2005, 67.

⁶⁰ Goffman 1986, 16.

⁶¹ Goffman 1986, 11.

reference, indicated by Steffen, Davies and van Alphen, for Bacon's interpretation is Titian's (Tiziano Vecelli's) (*circa* 1485-1576) *Portrait of Filippo Archinto* (*circa* 1551-62). (Ill. 28) This picture, which, according to Davies, in pose anticipates also the Velázquez portrait of 1650, is unique for the transparent curtain hanging across the right half of the painting.⁶² Nevertheless, as van Alphen indicates, the meaning of the curtains of Titian and Bacon is completely different. In Titian's portrait the curtain is at rest, whereas there is the movement of the veil in Bacon's painting.⁶³

However, we should be able to suggest another approach apart from the Biblical metaphor to the question what is the meaning between the difference of the curtains of Velázquez' and Bacon's portraits. As Signorotto and Visceglia state, Rome was defined in the early modern era as the *teatro del mundo*, which is a sign of the cultural belonging and undisputed political centrality.⁶⁴ Rosa has explained the papal court and politics in which the bravura in dealing with the succession of turns of fortune was essential. Rome was the World's Theatre in which "the 'actors' ability to hold the stage was of vital importance".⁶⁵ The curtain and the pose in the Velázquez painting emphasize the *fact* of being on a stage. A pope is always in a public role. It is a life of stage. Thus, the effect and meaning of the Velázquez and Bacon papal portraits can be read also through Goffman's symbolic interactionist perspective. Goffmann viewed human interaction as a performance on various *stages*, which has a resemblance to the strategy of a play and the way actors express emotions and thought. The performance is shaped by environment and audience and constructed to provide others with suitable impressions, or the *front*, for their social status.⁶⁶ For some reason, Velázquez, a courtier himself, decided to question the front of Innocent X and reveal the arbitrary nature of the papal stage in the facial expressions of his model, that represent doubt, tension and watchfulness. The idea of the

⁶² Davies 2002, 13.

⁶³ Van Alphen 2003, 63.

⁶⁴ Signorotto and Visceglia 2002, 1.

⁶⁵ Rosa 2002, 78.

⁶⁶ Goffmann 1959, 6-8.

revelation through painting, is the process Bacon continued, though the actual, visual solutions, like the expression of the stage's curtain, were different and transformed.

3.3. The Papal Figure

If we look at these paintings and address to them the Barthesian semiotic commutation test: that is we artificially introduce a change in the plane of expression (signifiers) and observe whether this change brings about a correlative modification on the plane of content (signifieds), we will find out that there is one specific unit which can not be replaced by another, without the paintings emptying of their meaning.⁶⁷ This is the garment, the uniform of the pope. Here, it is necessary to understand that for Barthes the sign is a slice of visibility. The signification is a process, it is the act which binds together the signifier and the signified, an act whose product is the sign. Furthermore, this distinction is only a classifying tool and therefore possesses no phenomenological value. Barthes explains this as follows: the sign derives its value also from its surroundings and secondly, the mind probably does not proceed in the semantic process by conjunction, but by carving out.⁶⁸ Barthes also explains that for Ferdinand Saussure (1857-1913) there was an arbitrary relation between signifier and signified. Even for Saussure, who made the first division of the sign as a 'dyadic' or a two-part model of the signifier and the signified, the sign is not the 'thing', but the mental representation of the thing (concept).⁶⁹

If in the Velázquez' portrait we substitute the garment of the main figure into something else, we will understand how important the clothing is for the reading of this man as a pope. Correspondingly, if this painting is not read as a portrait of a pope, but on the contrary as a picture of a common man, the meaning changes dramatically. The clothes create an aura of ancestral, papal perfection. Furthermore, if in the Bacon painting we will

⁶⁷ Barthes 1981, 65.

⁶⁸ Barthes 1981, 48.

⁶⁹ Barthes 1981, 50.

change the garment, for example to a business suit, it is not possible to identify the figure as a pope. In the ordinary commutation test, paraphrasing Barthes, “one calls into use the form of the signified (...), not its substance”⁷⁰. This means that the difference between the significations is of use, but the significations themselves are without importance. However, we can not underestimate the signification, the substance, created by the commutation test. The question is as follows: Is this Velázquez’ man a truly stronger, superior creature, or do we just perceive him as such, not for any genuine reason, but because he carries the aura of a pope?

Interpreting Derrida’s concepts of Argument, in other words, ‘ergon’ and by-work or ‘parergon’, the principal thematic motif in Velázquez’ portrait is to present a painting of a pope. This is the argument of the painting. In the Velázquez’ painting, the parergon comes beside the ergon, it co-operates within the operation. Andrews has explained Derrida’s use of a classical example of Immanuel Kant’s (1724-1804) *Critique of Judgment* and the drapery on near-nude statues. In the first level the ergon is the nude, the body, and the drapery is the ornamental extra. But the statue’s body as ‘nude’ is partly constructed by the addition and co-presence of the drapery. The nude requires the parergon drapery to reinforce the sensation of nudity. Hence, the nude statue is conditional to, and co-operative with, the parergon, and the parergon loses its position as an independent supplement.

71

Although not exactly the same case as the nude and the drapery, the strategy is the same in the both papal portraits. The papal uniform is vital to the Argument of pope and the concept of pope is essential to the meaning of these paintings. Furthermore, without the Velázquez’ artistic expression of the garment; the red cape and the glowing mantelet, there would not exist the colour, the powerful reds, which was one of the most important things for Bacon in the Velázquez portrait. When Sylvester asked the motivation behind choosing the Velázquez painting as a subject, Bacon answered: “I

⁷⁰ Barthes 1981, 66.

⁷¹ Derrida cited in Andrews 1999, 7.

think it's the magnificent colour of it."⁷²

Within art history there is a convention of papal portraiture. According to Jonathan Brown, this type of portraiture was given a definitive form in Raphael's (1483-1520) *Portrait of Julius II* (1511-12) and used thereafter by many other artists. Brown argues that the traditional requirements of the papal portrait established, not only the pose, but also the colour harmonics. Usually, the pope wears the red cap and manteletta and the white rochetto. The red drapery behind the pope was most often used in portraits of important ecclesiastics.⁷³ Brown states that the pose of Innocent X is partly dependant on these constraints.⁷⁴ Therefore, it is interesting to notice, that Bacon decided not to use the red colour at all, but replaced it with purple and violet. In the Velázquez painting, the red manteletta is represented as a realistic code; the direction of light and shadows, the surface of the fabric being almost metallic, create a photographic illusion even though we are discussing a 17th century painting. (Ill. 4) When compared to Bacon's version we can understand that the Velázquez' painting refers more to the *fact* and Bacon's work to the *fiction*. But when contrasted to the previous, formal papal portraits, we can understand, that Velázquez was able to create a sensation of appearance into his portrait, which, in addition to the Argument of pope, influences the readings of his painting.

3.4. Velázquez' Representation

Deleuze argues that Velázquez was the wisest of the classical painters and that he possessed an immense wisdom. This means for Deleuze, that Velázquez was able to create extraordinary audacities, but this was done by holding firmly to the coordinates of representation, and therefore assuming completely the role of a documentarian.⁷⁵ But what is the *fact* in the Velázquez painting? Is the *Portrait of Innocent X* figurative in its being, and is it so that the portrait's relation to reality is documentary, as Deleuze states?

⁷² Sylvester 2002, 25.

⁷³ Brown 1986, 200.

⁷⁴ Brown 1986, 199.

⁷⁵ Deleuze 2004, 53.

To begin with, from the art historical point of view, Velázquez was one of the first to introduce a painting technique which precisely *challenged* the codes of representation by emphasizing on the presence of the artist, not only by signature, and by painting his own appearance in *Las Meninas* (1656), but through the particular, expressive marks on the canvas.

Velázquez partly abandoned the fluid technique of creating an even surface in oil and used, paraphrasing Brown “short, succinct, impastoed strokes of infinite shape and size which are applied so that they appear to hover above the brown ground.”⁷⁶ Barbara Steffen remarks that the Velázquez biographers, Francisco Pacheco and Vicente Carducho described this special manner of painting as the technique of *borrones* - spots of thickly applied paint. These were associated by Pacheco with the late works by Titian and El Greco (1541-1614), and by Carducho with Venetian painting.⁷⁷ However, there is a difference in the level of degree, which make, in the context of the 17th century, Velázquez’ painting acts truly original. Jonathan Brown characterises, that this remarkable technique set Velázquez apart from almost every other artist of his day.⁷⁸

One of the first examples of this free movement of a brushstroke is in the garment in *Portrait of Philip IV in Brown and Silver* (circa early 1630’s)⁷⁹. This technique can also be seen in the details of *Portrait of Innocent X*, in the ornate clothing. (Ill. 5) Brown suggests that if seen at close range, Velázquez’ brushwork may appear random and formless. But at a distance, it reproduces the surface of a richly brocaded garment. Velázquez created a spontaneous,

⁷⁶ Brown 1986, 85.

⁷⁷ Steffen (a) 2003, 31.

⁷⁸ Brown 1986, 85.

⁷⁹ Velázquez stayed in Rome for the first time in 1629-30. The first surviving authentic work of the “post-Italian” phase is the *Portrait of Baltasar Carlos and a Dwarf* (circa 1632). About a year later, Velázquez painted a second *Portrait of Baltasar Carlos*, showing him as he looked around the age of four. According to Brown, the next in the series of royal portraits is one of the best-known and most problematic examples when it comes to dating a portrait; *Philip IV in Brown and Silver*.

malerisch effect, which was properly introduced by Vincent Van Gogh (1853-1890) and Paul Cezanne (1839-1906). Thus, another connection between Velázquez' and Bacon's paintings is, that they have the act of painting in common. Moreover, Bacon himself has not expressed that Velázquez completely took up a role of a documentarian. On the contrary, Bacon explains that Velázquez was able to practice in two levels when creating the meaning of a painting:

(...) and in Velázquez it's a very, very extraordinary thing that he has been able to keep it so near to what we call illustration and at the same time so deeply unlock the greatest and deepest things that man can feel.⁸⁰

Bacon states that there is a difference, when compared Velázquez' paintings of the people of his time, to the strategies of modern art: the really good, contemporary artist would be forced to make a game of the same situation. Bacon explains that the artists today know that the recording can be done by film (and nowadays by several digital means). This means that the side of recording or documenting in artistic activity has been taken over and all the artist is involved with "is making the sensibility open up through the image".⁸¹

⁸⁰ Sylvester 2002, 28.

⁸¹ Sylvester 2002, 28.

4, Constructing Meaning through Contexts

4.1. Intertextual Transitions and the Particularity of a Painting

Bacon explained his method of working and the relationship between different paintings in a series in a 1962 interview:

Of course, what in a curious way one's always hoping to do is to paint the one picture which will annihilate all the other ones, to concentrate everything into one painting. But actually in the series one picture reflects on the other continuously and sometimes they're better in series than they are separately because, unfortunately, I've never yet been able to make the one image that sums up all the others. So one image against the other seems to be able to say the thing more.⁸²

Eventhough Bacon felt that he was never able to create the one particular image, that sums up all the others, we may argue that in *Study after Velásquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X* he was very close to this, when compared to the visual solutions of the other papal portraits he executed. However, intertextuality is one of the contemporary artistic strategies that questions the aura of masterwork and the author. The classical Barthesian slogan of the author's death is a conceptual expression that we should focus more on the work *itself* than its author. As Michel Foucault has put it: "author" does not refer to the true artist behind the text, but to a functional principle applied to the process of eliminating and choosing texts (works of art) among others. The name of the author makes it possible to group certain texts together and distinguish them from others.⁸³

Intertextuality means that a text can not exist as a self-sufficient whole, and therefore it does not function as a closed system. The term *intertextuality* was coined by Julia Kristeva in 1967, but as Michael Worton and Judith Still illustrate the phenomenon is at least as old as recorded human society. Plato is often mentioned in reference. Worton and Still indicate, that one of the most influential literature theoreticians, Mihail Bakhtin has located in the

⁸² Sylvester 2002, 22.

⁸³ Foucault 1979, 151.

Socratic dialogues one of the earliest forms of “the novel, heteroglossia or dialogism”, which Kristeva later called intertextuality.⁸⁴ Foucault has claimed that texts have a more distinct relationship to other text than to their maker, the author. Eventhough Foucault talked about literature and books, this thought has often been referred to in contemporary art history. Intertextuality to Foucault meant that the frontiers of a book are never clear-cut: the book is not simply a material object, its unity is variable and it exists in a system of references to other books, other texts and other sentences.⁸⁵

One of the classical questions of visual semiotics is the one that concerns the nature of painting: Is painting a language of its own or does a painting have a language of its own? In his short statement as an introduction to a catalogue for an exhibition “The Artists’s Eye” in the National Gallery, London in 1985, Francis Bacon stated that “painting is its own language and not translatable into words.”⁸⁶ If we accept this thought we can also ask the following questions: What are the specific grounds in accepting concepts coined from literature theory to define visual processes? Should we question the concept of intertextuality when discussing change and continuity in these two paintings?

Innocent X is one of the large number of existing images Francis Bacon used during his career. For example, as a visual reference to his *Three Studies for a Crucifixion* (1962) he used Cimabue’s (*circa* 1240-1302) *Crucifixion* (1272-4), which he thought was “great” and “as a worm crawling down the cross”.⁸⁷ The existing images “breed other images” to him. He also expresses the hope to be able to “renew” them.⁸⁸ In the interview with Sylvester, Bacon explained how he thought about the act of transformation:

⁸⁴ Worton and Still 1990, 3.

⁸⁵ Foucault 1989, 23.

⁸⁶ Steffen (a) 2003, 23.

⁸⁷ Sylvester 2002, 14.

⁸⁸ Sylvester 2002, 14.

DS And they do get very transformed. But can you generalize about how far you foresee these transformations or existing images before you begin a canvas and how far they, happen in the course of painting?

FB You know in my case all painting - and the older I get, the more it becomes so - is accident. So I foresee it in my mind, I foresee it, and yet I hardly ever carry it out as I foresee it. It transforms itself by the actual paint. (...)⁸⁹

What Bacon means by the image transforming itself by the actual paint is that he normally uses very large brushes and in the working process he did not actually know what the paint would do. The paint itself does many things that are, according to Bacon, very much better than he himself could manage. However, Bacon was able to explain this idea of transformation further by defining the role of the accident in his painting processes:

Perhaps one could say it's not an accident, because it becomes a selective process which part of this accident one chooses to preserve.⁹⁰

Paintings, and especially, abstract paintings are one of the most complex sign systems and a challenge to semiotics. For Saussure *langue* refers to the system of conventions which is independent of its users, whereas *parole* refers to the use of the pre-existing *langue* in particular instances. The misunderstanding of Saussure was to think of the structure synchronically rather than diachronically; in terms of its evolution over time.⁹¹ However, in painting there is no pre-existing *langue* in the same way as in language. Therefore, there can not exist an instance of *parole* in the same way as in speech. This can be demonstrated, for example, by the concept of double articulation. As Chandler has stated, there is a contemporary discussion on the subject whether visual media, that is film, photography or painting have a double articulation. Double articulation, an essential feature of human language, means, for example, that English language has only about forty or fifty elements of second articulation (phonemes) but these can generate

⁸⁹ Sylvester 2002, 16.

⁹⁰ Sylvester 2002, 17.

⁹¹ Chandler 2002, 12.

hundreds of thousands of words. Chandler explains that it is by combining words in various ways that we can express a particularity in experience.⁹²

First of all, we should be able to understand that all these three forms of visual expression have a logic of their own: photography with a reference to reality, notion and chance, film with movement and suspense of belief, and painting with presence of marks, colours, lines and strokes; therefore the presence of the artistic act on basement. In painting there is an infinite number of elements of articulation as these may be, for example, ink, pencil, carbon, pastel, water colour, gouache, acrylic or oil marks or combinations of these all. Colour fields, lines and strokes are created by each individual artist differentially and the same author may alter her technique in various paintings. For Bacon, the act of transformation is a painting process that includes firstly, the accidental moment and secondly, the artistic choice, the intentional movement. This process is very different when compared to language.

Philosopher Susanne Langer has pointed out already in 1951 that the elements of paintings are abstractable and combinatory and just as capable of articulation, that is, of complex combination, as words. However, a visual symbolism with many elements, cannot be broken up into basic units. Langer has argued that it is impossible to find the smallest independent symbol, and recognize its identity when the same unit is met in other context. Furthermore, she explains that there is naturally a technique of picturing objects, but the laws governing this technique cannot properly be called a 'syntax', since there are no items that might be called the 'words' of portraiture. She argues that we should not seek to fix linguistic models upon other media since the laws that govern their articulation are as a whole different from the laws of syntax that administer language. Likewise Bacon, Langer suggests that paintings resist translation and treating them in linguistic terms leads us to misconceive them.⁹³

⁹² Chandler 2002, 10.

⁹³ Langer cited in Chandler 2002, 10-11.

But how could we understand and read the visual elements that are so specific to a being of a painting? In Bacon's *Study after Velázquez' Portrait of Pope Innocent X* there are the strong vertical strokes, that have required a steady and focused, bodily movement from the painter and red, sprinkled color splotches like blood. (Ill. 10, 11) The movement and the moments create the sensation of the artistic act and the presence of the artist on canvas. Steffen suggests that there is an event of throwing paint in some of the Bacon's paintings that has a proximity to Jackson Pollock's (1912-1956) drip paintings. She refers to Harold Rosenberg who has explained that with Pollock what goes on the canvas is not a picture but an *event*.⁹⁴ Furthermore, the art historian David Rosand has emphasized on the fact of observing the importance of the *marks* on the surface of an artwork with an example from the drawings of Leonardo da Vinci and strokes of the brush of Titian. He proposes that we should attend to the marks, and that in so doing, we re-establish contact with the making of the image. He sees a distinct relationship between the *presence* of an artwork and the artist, as the selfreferentiality of the mark is a reference to the self.⁹⁵ So the act of transformation between the Velázquez' and Bacon's paintings is also in the painting activities itself, as there is transformation also between every singular Bacon painting.

Thus, we should ask, can art as an activity be an ontological question? As Benjamin has indicated, 'event' does not fall outside ontology. The event 'is'. Benjamin suggests that the question of the mode of being proper to the event needs to be relocated, that is given a new point of departure. This reconsideration should be made within the recognition of the inherent plurality of modes of being.⁹⁶ Interpreting Derrida, an art work can be seen as a certain type of an event in the history of painting. When talking about Cézanne's promise of telling the truth in painting, he writes that the promise is made by one "whose signature is linked to a *certain type of event* in the

⁹⁴ Steffen (a) 2003, 32.

⁹⁵ Rosand cited in Vakkari 2000, 16 and 131.

⁹⁶ Benjamin 1991, 39.

history of painting".⁹⁷ Although Derrida writes here mainly around the concept of promise, this is an important sentence. Paintings are signed; and by signature they link to a particular type of artistic incident, i.e. an act, in the history of painting.⁹⁸

4.2. Bacon's Creation of the Context

Intertextual strategies can be explained in art history also with the concepts of visual references and context. Daniel Chandler remarks that the framing of a text by other texts (or painting by another painting) has implications for the writers and the readers. Chandler argues, that our understanding of any individual text relates to a framing, obvious ones being formal frames, such as a genre. Texts provide contexts within which other texts may be created and interpreted.⁹⁹

At the time Bacon worked with his papal imaginery, he used reproductions of the Velázquez painting. (Ill. 41-44) As a matter of fact he never saw the actual painting. Barbara Steffen remarks that Bacon owned many art books, and he cut and tore illustrations from them.¹⁰⁰ Russell indicated that Bacon had in his studio a physical stock of images: pictures from catalogues, newspapers and magazines.¹⁰¹ In the interview with Sylvester from 1984-86 Bacon reflected on the essential things that make an artist:

You see, I have looked at everything in art. And also at many kinds of documentary books. I have looked at books of wild animals, for instance, because those images excite me and every so often one of them may come up to me and suggest some way to use the human body.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ Derrida 1987, 3.

⁹⁸ Derrida 1987, 3.

⁹⁹ Chandler 2002, 199.

¹⁰⁰ Steffen (a) 2003, 36.

¹⁰¹ Russell 2001, 24.

¹⁰² Sylvester 2002, 199.

In a traditional art historical way Steffen calls the past works of art and other visual material as ‘sources of inspiration’ to Bacon. When writing about the idea of comparing the figures and compositions of the paintings Steffen uses the concept of ‘corresponding source material’. Steffen argues that by examining this material we may begin to understand the way in which Bacon ‘newly interpreted’ Velázquez’ or Van Gogh’s paintings.¹⁰³ Steffen takes the idea of the visual interpretation of a reproduction very far when she argues that it is evident that the folds and tears in one particular reproduction, the physical object of paper, correspond with the lines and contours in Bacon’s painting *Study after Velázquez’s Portrait of Pope Innocent X* and *Study for Portrait VII*.¹⁰⁴ (Ill. 41) Harrison has stated that there are several reproductions collected by Bacon of the image of Velázquez’ *Pope Innocent X*¹⁰⁵. It is perhaps impossible to do more than speculate, whether this or that fold in a paper exists also as a transformed form in the actual painting of Bacon. As Harrison explains, Bacon’s consumption of imagery was non-hierarchical and irrespective of an image’s original state.¹⁰⁶

Bätschmann has challenged the commonly used notions of ‘sources’ and ‘influence’ as he states that the new work does not so much emerge as the outcome of a passive ‘confluence’, but functions as *an active center* in which particular visual or literary motifs are evoked in a constructive manner.¹⁰⁷ In Bätschmann’s art historical hermeneutics the concept of *visual and literary references* replaces sources and influence. Bätschmann explains this practise by indicating that the traditional notion of sources suggests that a new work is based on given models. Furthermore, by using the word influence we may engage to a misleading conceptualizing which prevents us from investigating the proper interaction of the art works.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Steffen (a) 2003, 35-36.

¹⁰⁴ Steffen (a) 2003, 36.

¹⁰⁵ Harrison 2005, 14-15.

¹⁰⁶ Harrison 2005, 8.

¹⁰⁷ Bätschmann 2003, 195.

¹⁰⁸ Bätschmann 2003, 195.

According to Bächtmann, this interaction can generally only be studied when the genesis of the visual image is sufficiently documented by sketches, designs, and preliminary studies. Bächtmann argues, that where these materials are available, one can often notice that artists select and insert existing motifs only during a later stage of their work on a particular painting.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, this artistic process is the opposite to the Bacon's technique. Bacon was famous not only as referring to other visual works but for working almost straight to the canvas:

Well, I sketch out very roughly on the canvas with a brush, just a vague outline of something, and then I go to work, generally using very large brushes, and I start painting immediately and then gradually it builds up.¹¹⁰

We agree on the Bächtmann's idea of the active nature of the later work and on the importance of understanding the nature of visual reference, but the problem with the Bächtmann's thought emerges from his hierarchical approach to the use of these references in the artistic process. Furthermore, Bächtmann's equal emphasis on the use of the literature motifs as a reference to a visual work of art is a very complex issue when thinking of modern and late-modern art. Bacon has claimed that he has always been influenced by T.S. Eliot (1888-1965), but not in the sense of any specific poems. Bacon explains that it is very difficult to use any poetry for one's painting: it is the whole atmosphere of poetry that affects one.¹¹¹

Van Alphen states that the traditional notion of influence is very persistent. He lists as the main opponents to the notion of influence as above mentioned T.S. Eliot, art historian Michael Baxandall and the cultural analyst Mieke Bal. However, Baxandall connects the influence to "bad artists": only bad artists let themselves to be influenced.¹¹² Therefore, for Baxandall the question is also aesthetic in the context of art proper, i.e. in

¹⁰⁹ Bächtmann 2003, 195.

¹¹⁰ Sylvester 2002, 195.

¹¹¹ Sylvester 2002, 152.

¹¹² Van Alphen 2003, 57.

the definition of artistic invention. As a contrast to this, Eliot has claimed that if we can approach a poet without the prejudice of originality and difference, one may find out that “not only the best, but the most individual parts of (an author’s) work may be those in which the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously”.¹¹³ This immortality of Velázquez is one of the meanings of the Velázquez-Bacon relationship and it is created through Bacon’s painting processes. If there were no Bacon’s papal portraiture in art history, the readings of the Velázquez painting would also be different.

Bacon’s artistic strategy could be seen as intertextual. There is no reason to abandon the concept of intertextuality, if we bear in mind the particularity of a painting. However, it is important to acknowledge the fact to whom Bacon chose to refer in his artworks and interviews. Van Alphen remarks that Bacon’s place in the history of art is, to a large extent, constructed by himself in his interviews.¹¹⁴ He refers to the work of Bernhart Schwenk who has stated that Bacon kept almost the whole of the 20th century art at bay and dwelled with the work of geniuses such as Michelangelo or Velázquez.¹¹⁵ As Bättschmann wisely points out, we should always try to detect what a specific artistic comment means and how, exactly, it relates to the work, as “there is a difference between artistic work and artistic self-interpretation.”¹¹⁶ Therefore, even though intertextual in strategy, by choosing the subject of the painting of the previous master Velázquez, Bacon was able to create a context of a ‘master author’ for his art work as the Velázquez’ painting was firmly established in the Western art history. This creation of a suitable context constitutes also the position and effect of the Bacon’s painting.

¹¹³ Worton and Still 1990, 12.

¹¹⁴ Van Alphen 2003, 58.

¹¹⁵ Van Alphen 2003, 58.

¹¹⁶ Bättschmann 2003, 188.

4.3. Culturalized Difference

But what is the meaning of Bacon's creation of a context? In order to study this, we may interpret the relation of the Velázquez' and Bacon's paintings from the horizon of the late-modern society. Baudrillard has defined the present as a privilege. We are living in a consumer society, where generations of objects are short-lived. A serial object is not designed to last.¹¹⁷ Baudrillard argues that in the world of objects the past and the exotic have a social dimension. This means that things have a relationship to culture and income. Thus, there is a status attached to regression in time. Baudrillard explains this status by referring to the different social classes who purchase furniture in the market of antiques. One's means are exposed in the act of acquiring a genuine ancient Greek vase as opposed to a reproduction.¹¹⁸

Baudrillard argues that in the system of objects the only people who can regress in time are those who can afford it. Culturalized difference is what creates value, and it has to be paid for. In this range of possibilities the maximum value is either in the most *avant-garde* of objects, or objects from the past with an *aristocratic dimension*. In architecture it is either the ideal future or the ancien régime, the glass-and-aluminium villa or an eighteenth-century château.¹¹⁹ If we interpret the works of art by Velázquez and Bacon through Baudrillard's idea of culturalized difference, we can understand that the Velázquez painting has an enormous aristocratic value: it is a painting of a pope, it is a painting of Innocent X, a member of the rich and sovereign Pamphilj family, it is a painting representing the court of Vatican and finally it is made by an acclaimed painter and a courtier, a member of the powerful Spanish Court of King Philip IV.

Thus, when choosing the subject to be the Velázquez painting, Bacon created an extensive value for his interpretation. When the chosen object of

¹¹⁷ Baudrillard 1996, 150.

¹¹⁸ Baudrillard 1996, 150-151.

¹¹⁹ Baudrillard 1996, 151.

Velázquez had the maximum cultural value in the system of objects, Bacon's interpretation could not have been in the logic of difference nothing more but avant-garde in its statement and form. However, adapting the cultural value from the Velázquez painting has made the Bacon paintings valuable and unplaceable.

4.4. From Rivalry to Life-Force

Barbara Steffen discusses the theory of the art historian Richard Wollheim who has described the artistic "way of borrowing" motifs and compositions from other artists using Edouard Manet (1832-1883) as an example. Wollheim has referred to the work of Harold Bloom, who has investigated the theme of an artist's fear of artistic influence as found in British and American literature. Steffen explains that Wollheim has taken this fear as a fact and suggested that it results primarily from the following two factors: there is a rivalry that exists between the present and the past, and from the fact that artists are always more likely to "borrow" from artists that they admire. The element of feeling that links rivalry and admiration is envy.¹²⁰

However, this kind of explanation, which is in its nature psychological, is not a novelty in the history of interpretation. Worton and Still demonstrate that Gadamer has argued that all tradition in the form of writing is simultaneous with present time, yet the writer's relationship to the tradition is usually and perhaps necessarily, one of *contestation*. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) has explained the relationship between an author and tradition by insisting that to believe that one is a latecomer, is harmful and degrading.¹²¹ Furthermore, Nietzsche argues that such a belief must appear frightful and devastating when it reaches the latecomer by godhead, as "the true meaning and object of all creation"¹²².

¹²⁰ Steffen (a) 2003, 24.

¹²¹ Worton and Still 1990, 10.

¹²² Worton and Still 1990, 35.

Is Bacon a latecomer and can the idea of contestation explain the painting of Innocent X? In 1962 Bacon explained his motive and relationship with the Velázquez painting:

I think it is one of the greatest portraits that have ever been made (...). I buy book after book with this illustration in it of the Velasquez Pope because it just haunts me, and it opens up all sorts of feelings and areas of - I was going to say - imagination, even, in me.¹²³

Thus, the idea of contestation is replaced by the idea of honouring. Bacon is conscious of his own position as somebody-coming-after. It is very hard to see rivalry in the art philosophy of Francis Bacon, nor in the paintings themselves. Norman Bryson argues that in Bacon's interactions with tradition there is no existence of the anxiety of influence. In addition, there is no signs of Bacon feeling his position within a long tradition a burden. He speaks highly of many of his predecessors. According to Bryson this is enabled by the fact that he posits behind their work something else; "a libidinality that exists in a configuration that is not his own, but can become his own".¹²⁴

Bryson interprets the Velázquez-Bacon relationship through 'libidinality' and the 'rhythm of life-energy' which can be considered as psychoanalytical responses to the art works. Bryson tries and refers to the same technique as Sylvester earlier in a 1971-73 interview series when he attempted to relate the subject matter of pope to the Bacon's relationship to his own father:

DS (...) Do you think your involvement in it had something to do with feelings about your father?

FB I'm not sure I understand what you're saying.

DS Well, the Pope is *il Papa*.

FB Well, I certainly have never thought of it that way, but I don't know - it's difficult to know what forms obsessions.¹²⁵

¹²³ Sylvester 2002, 24.

¹²⁴ Bryson 2003, 55.

¹²⁵ Sylvester 2002, 71.

As Bryson indicates, Sylvester was surely “leading the witness” and it would be certainly wrong to take the father-son relationship as any key to the actual works of art. However, Bryson insists on relating the Bacon’s disclosure concerning the sexual allure of the father to the aspect of carnality and to the brutality of power that subtends the polished manners of the courtier in Velázquez. This idea of the “murder of the father” reflects not only to these specific papal portraits, but to a larger, feminist explanation of the art history of styles. Kuusamo paraphrases Norma Broude and Mary Garrard who have suggested that the masculine art history wants to see art as histories of styles; spectacles of rise and fall, competition and defeat between son and the father.¹²⁶

Bryson argues that for Velázquez and Bacon the power resides in flesh, flesh being its true resistance. For Bryson, the body is less the effect of power than its ultimate cause and source. Bryson suggests that the Velázquez’ and Bacon’s relation is also “something to do with (...) faces, and power, the power that incarnates in flesh and especially in the portrait, and the fluctuating currents of attraction and destruction that always play around power and flesh in Bacon’s universe.”¹²⁷ As a result, Bryson states that all the masters of past become Bacon’s contemporaries because he looks at the body, and at the history of painting through the *constellation of life-force*. Bryson argues that this force’s most vital expressions are sexual.¹²⁸

Bryson’s thought can be seen, not only as psychoanalytical, but also evolutionary. It reminds of the emotional approaches to the origins of art that have been presented since the birth of evolution theory and its effect to the re-evaluation of aesthetic experience. Finnish philosopher Yrjö Hirn was one of the first to engage to this kind of research in the late 19th century and the early 20th century. In his art philosophy Hirn was interested in the external aspects; works of art as the outward manifestations of mental states.

¹²⁶ Kuusamo 1996, 215.

¹²⁷ Bryson 2003, 48.

¹²⁸ Bryson 2003, 55.

Hirn suggests that in an art work there is a connection between emotional states and movement-sensations. The departure point is the following: any sensation of art is always more or less derived from our mind. This means that there is no passive reception of art. Paraphrasing Hirn “it is only by considering art as *an activity* that we can explain the great influence which it has exercised on social as well as on individual life.”¹²⁹ This activity is explained through the evolutionary need for expressing continuity of life through life-forces that express themselves in works of art. In some cases the artistic act may be referred to the idea of sexual selection. Hirn argues, that the artistic expression, which is addressed to a fictitious audience, can only be explained by relating it to the enrapturing and relieving effects which an artist and the spectator can experience as a result of emotional transmission.¹³⁰ As Hirn indicates, the relationship between artistic activity and emotional conditions had been overlooked in all works of aesthetic proper. Yet this question of the psychology of feeling and the act of art is in the very core of any artistic production, and especially in Bacon’s paintings.

4.5. The Reversed Gaze

Van Alphen states that it is due to Bacon's papal portraits that we can now have a different kind of perception of the Velázquez’ painting. Van Alphen argues that the reason, why we no longer accept the aura of authority the pope radiates in Velázquez painting, is Bacon's papal portraits.¹³¹ Nonetheless, Van Alphen may be guilty of circular reasoning, as he has also stated that the Velázquez’ pope is corrupted, even ‘evil’.¹³² This refusal of accepting the appearance of pope’s authority is an element that already exists, is present, in the Velazquez’ painting. However, this existence is not dependant on the being of any of the Bacon’s papal portraits.

¹²⁹ Hirn 1900, 19.

¹³⁰ Hirn 1900, 298-303.

¹³¹ Van Alphen 2003, 61-62.

¹³² Van Alphen 2003, 61.

According to van Alphen, it is not particularly meaningful just to *reverse* the traditional hierarchical relation of influence. Van Alphen indicates that the traditional notion of influence includes the ascribing of authority and agency to the predecessors.¹³³ Van Alphen refers to the statement by Francis Bacon: “Great art is always a way of concentrating, reinventing what is called fact, what we know of our existence - a reconcentration (...)”¹³⁴. From this statement Van Alphen concludes that we should evaluate Bacon’s relationship to his forebears not in terms of influence, but in terms of reinvention.¹³⁵ In consequence, Van Alphen proposes that we should not only reverse the relation between the predecessor and the later artist, but also open up the notion of influence by refusing its inherent individualism. This act enables us to look at the precursory paintings from the perspective of Bacon’s work. Van Alphen adds that Bacon has not only reconcentrated specific art works of specific artists. More precisely, he has reinvented our general way of looking at art.¹³⁶

When I saw the Velázquez painting in Rome it was evident that I could not see it simply “through Bacon” as Van Alphen suggests. I felt that Velázquez was able to play a game of hide and seek with the *image* of pope. It is a picture of the pope as a man, but in addition, as a rationally organized character of the patriarchal system. When we consider the referential relationship of these paintings, we must remember that the *idea of the Pope* continues to survive even though social systems and states collapse around and compulsory state religions have met their end in several western countries. Nevertheless, Velázquez’ pope on canvas behaves as if the history of the papal institution is no longer under control: as a matter of fact the Velázquez pope can be seen as disturbed, almost desolate and destroyed as a *human being* which may be the consequence of the circuitous history of the institution itself. It is this effect that Bacon was able to visually paraphrase: to put the original statement of Velázquez in different forms.

¹³³ Van Alphen 2003, 68.

¹³⁴ Davies and Yard 1986, 23.

¹³⁵ Van Alphen 2003, 60.

¹³⁶ Van Alphen 2003, 68.

Bacon's work may help us to relate to older art in a new way. However, unlike Van Alphen suggests, this is not due to the artistic production of Francis Bacon alone. It has certainly been thinkable and not as Van Alphen states, "unthinkable before we had seen Bacon's works"¹³⁷ to engage to these issues in a different way since the birth of photography and especially since photography has developed into one of the most important contemporary art forms. As Bacon himself has stated in 1962:

But of course so many things have happened since Velasquez that the situation has become much more involved and much more difficult, for very many reasons. And one of them, of course, which has never actually been worked out, is why photography has altered completely this whole thing of figurative painting, and totally altered it.¹³⁸

Photography has brought the question of the art work's relationship to the reality and representation to the core of the discussion regarding painting. Russell speculates whether the end of the painting is at hand; Bacon might be the last man in the world who still believed in painting.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Van Alphen 2003, 68.

¹³⁸ Sylvester 2002, 28.

¹³⁹ Russell 2001, 51.

5. The Image of the Pope as a Cultural Model

5.1. The Chains of Pictures

When David Sylvester pointed out to Francis Bacon that he often paints pictures that are connected with religion and asked for the reason for themes which touch on religion, Bacon answered in 1962 that:

In the Popes it doesn't come from anything to do with religion; it comes from an obsession with the photographs that I know of Velasquez's Pope Innocent X.¹⁴⁰

Kuusamo has remarked that especially *religious* themes have a life-force among larger art historical context. Kuusamo explains that the continuity of pictorial history is based on variation. Variation can not be explained by an unchanging picture stock, which, for example, the psychoanalytic Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) created for archetypes, in which, only a selected part of pictures were considered by Jung as *Urbilder*.¹⁴¹ Kuusamo points out that, in the German research tradition Aby Warburg ja Emmanuel Löwy were the first to discuss the concept of Typenwanderung, whereas Erwin Panofsky used the notion of the history of iconographic types.¹⁴² Panofskian study of iconographic types means that we should follow the line of a certain pictorial type and discuss the changing meanings. Kuusamo argues that there are cases in which the simplest level of the signifier stays fairly the same, eventhough the conception of the world changes. As an example, Kuusamo refers to Fritz Saxl who has studied the pictorial continuity of an angel. Kuusamo argues that some pictures live longer, have a greater persistence than others. These may be the so called basic human situations or fundamental myths, such as a nude in a landscape or a sacrifice.¹⁴³

Kuusamo argues that chains of pictures form their own paradigmatic series. This means that pictures replace themselves diachronically the same

¹⁴⁰ Sylvester 2002, 24.

¹⁴¹ Kuusamo 1996, 98.

¹⁴² Kuusamo 1996, 92.

¹⁴³ Kuusamo 1996, 92.

way as metaphores.¹⁴⁴ This is also the strategy how the papal portraits of Velázquez and Bacon form a paradigm within the tradition of art history, but the origin of this paradigm is not the same as in the idea of Typenwanderung or Erwin Panofsky's iconographic types. The greatest problem in iconographic types is their relationship to the literature and pictorial sources. It is the narrative context of iconographical types that does not relate to these paintings of Velázquez and Bacon. In addition, eventhough the subject matter has a relationship to religion, the paintings themselves are not religious, but they have a relationship to the power of pontiff.

Although Bacon expressed no specific interest on representing religion in general in his paintings, Sylvester tried to ask on several occasions about the intention underlying the Bacon's act of choosing the subject matter of pope. Furthermore, Sylvester suggested that the pope is a sort of heroic figure and referred to some paintings Bacon had made of Pius XII. Again, Bacon answered that the motivation lied more in the magnificent processional *photographs* taken when Pius XII was being carried through St Peter's. However, Bacon agreed with Sylvester that:

It is true, of course, the Pope is unique. He's put in a unique position by being the Pope and therefore, like in certain great tragedies, he's as though raised onto a dais on which the grandeur of this image can be displayed to the world.¹⁴⁵

5.2. The Sensation of Duality

Innocent X (1574-1655), made a cardinal in 1629, had ascended the papal throne on September 16, 1644 and reversed the strong anti-Spanish policy of his predecessor, Urban VIII. Innocent X was seventy-five years old when he sat for Velázquez. The old age is, according to Brown, "in no way apparent in the portrait; the pope was renowned for his vitality."¹⁴⁶ Brown

¹⁴⁴ Kuusamo 1996, 93.

¹⁴⁵ Sylvester 2002, 26.

¹⁴⁶ Brown 1986, 197.

explains that in 1649, he was described by an eyewitness as having the "voice, complexion, and bearing of an adolescent." He was also famous for his ugliness.¹⁴⁷ Giacinto Gigli described the pope in 1655 as "tall in stature, thin, choleric, splenetic, with a red face, bald in front with thick eyebrows bent above the nose (...), that revealed his severity and harshness..."¹⁴⁸. Further evidence on the Innocent's physiognomy is found as he is described by his contemporaries as "tall, gaunt stature, with small eyes, large feet and spare beard, his skin colour almost olive green, his head bare".¹⁴⁹

From these eye-witness descriptions of Innocent X, we are able to conclude that the effect of strength and the hypnotic gaze may have been something that Velázquez was able *to invent* as an artist. This Velázquez' artistic interpretation has led to readings of duality and unsafeness in the character of pope among scholars. Davies suggests that the true brilliance of Velázquez' accomplishment in this painting is to have satisfied his papal client "with a nattering, beautifully rendered portrait while at the same time passing on for the ages the unmistakable hint of corrupt character and deep-seated deceit behind that well-ordered and stern facade."¹⁵⁰ Van Alphen describes the Velázquez' subject as the forceful and "unscrupulous pope who duplicitously took the name 'Innocent' for himself."¹⁵¹ Furthermore, according to Van Alphen "this duality in Velázquez' painting of the pope is indeed striking: pope does not only look powerful, heroic, self-confident, but at the same time, corrupt and even evil."¹⁵² Thus, both Davies and Van Alphen express an effect of dishonesty, two-facedness or treacherous character in the pope himself.

Innocent X was undoubtedly powerful. However, historically it can be argued that duplicity was not perhaps the main motive for the process of

¹⁴⁷ Brown 1986, 197.

¹⁴⁸ Cited in Safarik 1993, 44.

¹⁴⁹ Steffen (c) 2003, 116.

¹⁵⁰ Davies 2002, 12.

¹⁵¹ Van Alphen 2003, 61.

¹⁵² Van Alphen 2003, 61.

himself choosing the name of Innocent. Steffen explains that the reason why Giovanni Battista Pamphilj chose the name of Innocent was to honour the memory of Innocent VIII, who had come to Rome because of the Pamphilj family.¹⁵³ In addition, there was a long tradition of popes who were called Innocent from the first Innocent I who was the pope in the 5th century.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, the succeeding pope after the Pamphilj pontiff took the same name and became Innocent XI.

Brown claims that Innocent X knew Velázquez from his years in Spain as a nuncio. Brown speculates that Velázquez, through the Spanish ambassador, could have had immediate access to the pope. Therefore, he could have asked permission to paint his portrait as a token of esteem and to gain support for his artistic mission.¹⁵⁵ However, the commission might have come originally from the pope himself. Renate Ago has proofed that there was a hegemony of more informal plane in the eternal city during Innocent X. This was due to the effort to gain power by governing the cultural and festive scene of Rome. According to Ago, this policy of individuals and families of gaining advances by promoting themselves through magnificent *'society life'* was also pursued by Innocent X. The Pamphilji Pope purchased the houses surrounding his family palace and combined them behind its new facade. In addition to this, he also had part of another building destroyed because it spoiled the symmetry of the place. The church of St. Agnes became his family chapel. The Roman Piazza Navona practically transformed into being the Pamphiljis' own square.¹⁵⁶

Therefore, the papal court can be seen as a particular social environment in which the high nobility strives to emphasize their distinctness from the rest of society. This practice sometimes has a resemblance to the image manipulating work of today's corporations. For example, according to

¹⁵³ Steffen, 116

¹⁵⁴ O'Collins and Farrugia 2003, 281.

¹⁵⁵ Brown 1986, 197.

¹⁵⁶ Ago 2002, 233.

Ago refers also to L von Pastor, *Storia dei Papi*, 20 vols., Rome, 1908-34, vol. XIV/I.

Mario Rosa, Cardinal Ludovisi had to organize an 'advertising campaign' in order to maintain his image as an honest and unselfish man.¹⁵⁷ Ago calls this practice as the *rhetoric of pretence* of the papal court in Rome. In this pretence, competition and uncertainty are expressed in the shape of formal conventions. According to Ago, the later French court protocol is greatly indebted to Roman curial and ecclesiastical ceremony.¹⁵⁸ The Velázquez' portrait can be seen as a procedure of the social system of the papal court in order to enhance the status of Innocent X, as the artist, Velázquez, chosen to execute the work, was famous for his talent and competence especially in royal paintings.

Further, Innocent X was not perhaps the one particular pope, to whom corruption should be linked in the history of the papal courts. As Marco Pellegrini has proofed, the late fifteenth century papal regime of Alexander VI, the Borgia Pope, was notorious for nepotism.¹⁵⁹ As a matter of fact, Antonio Menniti Ippolito has demonstrated that during the pontificate of Innocent X the nature of nepotism was slightly altered as the balance shifted decisively in favour of the Secretary of State, now Giacomo Panciroli, considered sometimes as the first full-fledged holder of that office. Ippolito suggests that, in fact, the situation within the papal court at the time was nearly unique. In 1650, the year when the *Portrait of Innocent X* most likely was finished, a cardinal-nephew, Camillo Pamphilji, whom his uncle had sidelined, and who had ended by resigning from the clergy and getting married, was replaced. After a few years, during which the office was left vacant, a new cardinal, adopted nephew, Camillo Astalli Pamphilji was

¹⁵⁷ Ago 2002, 230-231.

¹⁵⁸ Ago 2002, 230-231.

¹⁵⁹ See Pellegrini 2002, 20. Pellegrini explains that apart from individual tragedies which have constructed the *Borgia legende noire*, there were collusion between the Borgia party of cardinals and Alexander in order to machinate property and economical means to the family. For example, the duchy of Benevento and the cities of Terracina and Pontecorvo were subtracted from the Patrimony of St. Peter and granted to Giovanni Borgia, the pope's son. According to Pellegrini even more notorious is the collaboration of the Borgia cardinals in the creation of a principality in Romagna for Cesare Borgia.

elected. Therefore, the curia was dominated for a long time by Innocent's powerful sister-in-law, Lady Olimpia, on whom Secretary of State's, Panciroli's authority was "totally dependent".¹⁶⁰

How, then, after learning about the socio-historical facts of the court of Innocent X, can we understand the affect of duality in the Velázquez' painting that art theoreticians have been effected to? Maybe, in a way, the Velázquez' pope represents not only a particular pope; Innocent X, but every pontiff, thus, *the concept of the Pope*, accordingly to the Bacon's papal figure. Hence, Bacon ensured the continuity of not only the images of pope Innocent X, but the continuity of the sensation of anxiety and distress which Velázquez was able to create, as he took this effect as the starting point and the core of his painting. The effect of duality has a relation to the universal notion of the pope as somebody who speaks the truth and offers salvation; but as a matter of fact, the cultural and historical structures behind the *front* of the pope may be tense and contradictory to this impression. Therefore, the meaning of the image of the *pope* in these portraits does not necessarily change through the Bacon's re-interpretation, even though the ontology of painting changes and the visual elements have been transformed.

5.3. The Pope as the Bearer of Salvation

Interpreting Max Weber's (1864-1920) sociology on the relationship between salvation religion and the society, the pope can be seen as a product of the inevitable accommodation to the needs of the masses. The meaning of the pope is to be the human bearer of salvation with the additional consequence that the religious relationship to this personage becomes the precondition of salvation.¹⁶¹ Furthermore, Derrida has stated that in the being of religion, there exists also the promise of keeping one's promise to tell the truth, in other words, there is an alliance and promise of testifying truthfully to the truth. Therefore, there is "no religio without

¹⁶⁰ Ippolito 2002, 147-148.

¹⁶¹ Weber 1985, 25.

sacramentum”.¹⁶² Derrida explains that in faith there is an exchange of guarantees with a reference to a priest that has a long history. Respondeo or responsum, is the concept Derrida uses for the interpreters of the gods, of priests. They give “a promise in return for the offering, depositing a security in return for a gift; it is the 'response' of an oracle, of a priest.”¹⁶³

We may think of the Velázquez pope in this context; the meaning well established in Latin by ‘respond’ and we find out that the image of the Velázquez’ pope does not deposit any such security. This visual deconstruction of ‘responsum’, which Velázquez invented, was the process of signification Bacon continued in his painting. As the contemporary historical sociology of the system of papal courts has shown, it can be argued that the papal courtal power itself has been built on nepotism and materialistic needs. Weber has explained that in Christianity, for God all things are possible, even the salvation of the wealthy. The rich man who does not want to part with his wealth may nonetheless achieve salvation. The logic of this lies in the interpretation of the God’s infinite love as the basic structure, the *being* of life, even the mundane aspects of it.¹⁶⁴ From the reactions to the Velázquez’ and Bacon’s paintings we can read that the paintings are able to represent the complexity of structures in the logic of Catholicism in the form of portraiture. In this sense they can be considered even political. We may refer to the classical thought of Karl Marx (1818-1883) in 1844 who wrote as a contribution to the critique of Hegel's (1770-1831) philosophy that:

Man, who looked for a superman in the fantastic reality of heaven and found nothing there but the reflexion of himself, will no longer be disposed to find but the semblance of himself, the non-human [Unmensch] where he seeks and must seek his true reality.¹⁶⁵

Davies argues that the subject of the Velázquez’ painting is the most powerful man in the world, who “sits confidently on the papal throne, fully

¹⁶² Derrida 1998, 30.

¹⁶³ Derrida 1998, 32.

¹⁶⁴ Weber 1963, 29.

¹⁶⁵ Marx and Engels 1955, 11.

at ease *ex cathedra* - literally, from the cathedral seat - as God's representative on earth."¹⁶⁶ Further, from the Marxist perspective we can also offer a more traditional, critical reading, that the superman on earth representing God's divine servant is the pope. But as Velázquez has shown, he is just a semblance of ourselves: essentially a human, with contradictory emotions. What is more, as Bacon visually interpreted: in the figure of almost non-human pope we may be able to seek and find the true reality of humanity.

5.4. The Possibility of the Infinite Artistic Act

Finally, we will consider the question whether there could be a serious, contemporary visual interpretation of the Velázquez' or Bacon's papal portraits? Gadamer has suggested that today in the place of Marxism, there is a new type of atheism. This denial of belief is not a global rejection of all forms of religion, but based on *indifference*. According to Gadamer, indifference increasingly seems to characterize the attitude of the younger generation in the industrialized world, but we should add to this that it is not an attitude that could be connected to youth only. Rather it penetrates the whole Western society.¹⁶⁷ Gianni Vattimo argues that the contemporary approach to belief is actually, at least among advanced societies, a *fear*. It evolves from the risk of losing the meaning of existence, through that profound boredom which seems unavoidably to accompany consumerism.¹⁶⁸

Weber explained that the sociology of belief of the non-privileged classes was based on the idea that *honesty* is the best policy. The middle-class urban dwellers lead economic existences which influence them to entertain the view that faithful work and the performance of obligations will find their reward and are 'deserving' of their just compensation.¹⁶⁹ However, in the 21st century there is no longer a unifying ethic of compensation. On the contrary, the present ethical strategy is to gain economical or social profit to

¹⁶⁶ Davies 2002, 11.

¹⁶⁷ Gadamer 1998, 202.

¹⁶⁸ Vattimo 1998, 80.

¹⁶⁹ Weber 1963, 22.

oneself. The profit is not necessarily due to the effort or the amount of work, but of the marketing, the *display* and presentation of the work in proper social and visual networks. For the modern middle-class, this process was still in the beginning in the early 1950's, when Bacon made his version of Innocent X. The rise of the world wide hyper-free market: multinational corporations, option deals and the discharge of workers from economically sound companies, create the sense that one can not rely on one's own achievements.

Nevertheless, Derrida argues, that beyond its strictly capitalist or politico-military figures, a hyper-imperialist assignment has been underway now for *centuries*. According to Derrida, there is a conceptual apparatus of international law and of global political rhetoric where it imposes itself in a particularly palpable manner. In addition to this, Derrida states that “wherever this apparatus dominates, it articulates itself through a discourse on *religion*.”¹⁷⁰ Derrida argues that there is a struggle even today to control the sky as the new 'wars of religion' are unleashed over the human earth. But these struggles are executed by digital systems and almost immediate visualization, telecommunications satellites, information highways and the essence of capitalistic-mediatic power. Moreover, Derrida explains that without digital culture and TV, there could be no religious manifestation today, for example *no voyage or discourse of the pope*.¹⁷¹ Thus, the papal institution is closely connected to the visual.

Chandler has stated how many cultural theorists have commented on the growth of visual media compared with linguistic media in contemporary society and the associated relocations in the communicative functions of such media.¹⁷² Hence, it is very interesting that, for example, Kuusamo has indicated that the traditional art historical genre of *portrait* is very contemporary in video art. The explanation for this *being in vogue* is

¹⁷⁰ Derrida 1998, 29.

¹⁷¹ Derrida 1998, 24.

¹⁷² Chandler 2002, 4.

connected by Kuusamo to theoretical framing; the rise of the portrait can be seen partially as the redefinition of the subject.¹⁷³ Moreover, we are living in an era of transformation. The rise of the interest on the questions, such as subject, change of identity or difference, reflects the contemporary society where the constant flow of reality television series offer us the idea of transformation; people losing more weight, falling more in love or feeling life more adventurous. One of the concrete means of human transformation is plastic surgery. We only have to take a glimpse to some of Bacon's figures and heads, for example, *Seated Figure* (1977) or *Study of the Human Body* (1982) to realise how up to date Bacon is today. (Ill. 51, 52). However, the Western hyper-imperialism aims at transforming also nature. Vattimo argues that it is partly the radicality of the risks of genetic engineering, which seem to threaten the existence of the species and the very 'essence' of nature in the world.¹⁷⁴

In addition to this development and the rise of the visual in the Western society, the scholarly art historical field has broadened during the last three decades including now commercials, computer graphics or games. Even though we might not want to go back to the jargon of postmodernism, there is a lot of sense still in the thought of Baudrillard of contemporary world as ecstasy of communication, where pictures can be seen as instruments of endless circulation without messages.¹⁷⁵ In this spirit, we might argue that a part of contemporary art can be seen as imitation of commercial pictures and vice versa. Therefore, it is unlikely that our era could produce a painting of Velázquez' or Bacon's Innocent X without irony or parody.

Accordingly, we should consider the metaphysical question of the Velázquez' portrait. Can the image of the man of the Velázquez' painting ever cease to exist? Gadamer states that human beings anticipate what is to come, the future. Therefore, we are inescapably led to try to think beyond

¹⁷³ Kuusamo 1996, 237.

¹⁷⁴ Vattimo 1998, 80.

¹⁷⁵ Baudrillard 1987, 13-14.

the fact of death. In conclusion, Gadamer suggests that this is the reason why human beings are the only living creatures who are known to bury their dead. In burying the dead we seek to hold on to those who are no longer living and to venerate them through cults as still preserved in memory.¹⁷⁶ The Velázquez portrait operates on this level. It is important not only to Innocent X himself, but to the Pamphilj family, the Catholic Church and finally to global Catholic believers. If we look at the painting as a preparation for a preservation of the memory of Innocent X, we will find that there is at least one direction in which we should enter: the portrait as a symbolic action. Gadamer explains that the action of placing the votive offerings that have gone to the grave alongside the deceased, is a form of symbolic. He speculates that the attempt to think beyond death and the miracle of language, which can allow something to be brought before us even in its absence, may be inseparable.¹⁷⁷ To this we should add that a picture, whether photography, painting, drawing or film is in its being exactly like this: it refers to reality (as the world) even in its absence and connects us to our memories. Thus, we should speak also of the miracle of the visual expression as symbolic in the Velázquez' portrait.

This question relates also to the emotional response these paintings are able to create. The Bacon painting is an image of the condemned, behind whose destroyed gaze we can experience the slow opening of the abyss, which grew during the hundreds of years that passed between these two paintings. As a result, in the Bacon painting the anxiety of the abyss has grown so sad and so infinite, that there may not be another *serious* attempt to paint a new version of these images.

¹⁷⁶ Gadamer 1998, 206.

¹⁷⁷ Gadamer 1998, 206.

6. Conclusions

6.1. Synthesis

When examining the art historical and theoretical literature there can be no doubt that Velázquez was one of the most important painters of the seventeenth century and Bacon of the twentieth century. Therefore, when discussing masterworks we must acknowledge the fact that there already exists a history of readings. In order to be able to understand the contemporary readings we need to apprehend that a masterpiece is a prejudice that includes contextual and historical answers and apply effective-historical approaches to the research process of these paintings. Therefore, we must be methodologically conscious of the history of not only the Velázquez-Bacon paintings themselves, but the effect of these paintings in art history.

Contemporary art theoreticians discussed in this thesis employ several, interdisciplinary practices in interpreting the Velázquez-Bacon paintings. They discursively shift between the approaches of interpretation that together constitute a flexible interpretative field of the meaning in painting. I learned that both of these paintings have made, in addition to the possibility of the re-evaluation of art theoretical concepts, an emotional impact to the art historical scholars. It is due to the extraordinary ability of these portraits to offer a wide variation in the ways in which these paintings can be understood. But the understanding of the connection between these paintings differs according to the position of the reader. Therefore, interdisciplinarity is a challenge for art history. Thus, the definition of change and continuity and the transformation of the visual elements in the construction of meaning became in this thesis a question of not only of the work of art, but of methodology.

The making of paintings, as proofed in the case of Francis Bacon, is intertextual. The Baconian artistic practice was based on constructing paintings from various, hierarchically equal visual references. Even though intertextual in strategy, by choosing the subject of the painting of the

previous master Velázquez, Bacon was able to create a context of ‘a master author’ for his art work as the Velázquez’ painting was firmly established in the Western art history. When the chosen object of Velázquez’ painting had the maximum cultural value in the system of objects, Bacon’s interpretation could not have been in the logic of difference nothing more but avant-garde in its statement and form. But this process created also the immortality of the Velázquez’ painting. If there were no Bacon’s papal portraiture in art history, the readings and the cultural value of the Velázquez’ painting would also be different.

Thus, the past worked actively in Bacon. I came to understand that the reality of Bacon’s painting is that of the Velázquez’ painting. The imitative relationship of this painting is not a relationship to a reality of any certain pope named Innocent X, but to *a reality of another painting*. Therefore, in the ontology of painting, there exists no act of transformation as the *being* of these paintings is different when contrasted. However, there is a transformation process of the visible between the two paintings. Bacon was able to change several of the Velázquez’ paintings aesthetic-visual solutions. Bacon created a *stigma* for the pope, which refers not only to the affect of Velázquez’ painting but to the ‘Anatomy of Horror’, a selection of Bacon’s working documents alongside with the images of the Nazi leaders, such as Joseph Goebbels. However, the screaming mouth of *Study after Velázquez’ Portrait of Pope Innocent X* is an artistic invention of Bacon; an act of self-referentiality within Bacon’s production. Nonetheless, it can be read as enchancing the modality of anxiety and distress already present in the Velázquez’ painting.

The papal court which Velázquez was involved to can be seen from the point of view of historical sociology and symbolic interactionism as the World’s Theatre, in which the actors’ ability to hold the *front* was of vital importance. The curtain and the pose in the Velázquez’ painting emphasize the *fact* of the pope being on a stage. However, Velázquez, a courtier himself, decided to question the front of Innocent X and reveal the contradictory nature of the papal stage by the artistic invention of the facial expressions.

These are read by art scholars as an effect of duality in the character of pope. The idea of the revelation is the process Bacon continued in his painting, though the actual, visual solutions, like the expression of the stage's curtain, were different and transformed.

Velázquez was one of the first to introduce a painting technique of borrones which *challenged* the codes of representation by emphasizing on the presence of the artist through the particular, expressive marks on the canvas. As I have explained, for Bacon the act of transformation is a painting process that includes firstly, the accidental *moment* and secondly, the artistic choice, the intentional *movement*. Thus, what goes on the canvas with Bacon is not a narrative, figurative or illustration, but an *event*. So the act of transformation between the Velázquez' and Bacon's paintings is also in the painting activities itself, as there is transformation also between every singular Bacon painting. Art as an activity can be an ontological question as Benjamin and Derrida indicate that the artistic 'event' does not fall outside ontology. This process of painting is very different when compared to language. Therefore, we should be methodologically conscious when using concepts coined from literature theory, such as intertextuality. I agree with Langer and Bacon in their suggestion that the laws governing painting cannot properly be called a syntax, since there are no items that might be called the words of the painting. Thus, painting remains a challenge for visual semiotics.

At the time Bacon worked with his papal imaginery, he used several reproductions of the Velázquez' painting. We can conceptualize these processes of continuity by using words of reconcentration or reinvention, which van Alphen coined from Bacon. As a conclusion, to the question of suitable concepts for the interpretation of change and continuity in painting, I agree with Oscar Bätschmann and Ernst van Alphen in their suggestion of replacing or opening up the notion of influence, the relevant contemporary concept being that of *visual reference*. Therefore, the Bacon's painting does not so much emerge as the outcome of a passive influence but functions as an active center. Furthermore, via the interpretative work of Van Alphen, the Velázquez-Bacon relationship is reversed and the connection of these

paintings is reconstructed. This act may enable us to look at the Velázquez' painting from the perspective of Bacon's work.

However, this approach can be seen as an attempt to break up the story which relates to the contemporary discussion in cultural theory. The Velázquez-Bacon paintings can be seen as a series, a paradigm, in art history that is called the *Papal Portraits of Innocent X*. However, this chain of pictures does not origin from the Panofskian iconographic types. The paradigm can be seen also as a form of a narrative with the beginning in the Velázquez' painting and the end in the Bacon's papal portraits. The strategy of van Alphen is to challenge this by turning our gaze reverse. From the perspective of the 21st century one can not genuinely gaze at the painting of Velázquez without the knowledge of Bacon's papal portraits. However, when we reverse the relationship between the predecessor and the later artist, we are forced to ask questions that require not only historical consciousness, but are in their nature ontological.

Furthermore, when we consider the referential relationship of these paintings, we must remember that the *idea of the Pope* continues to survive even though compulsory state religions have met their end in several western countries. This reverse of thought should be understood also from the perspective of interdisciplinary cultural studies; in the context of the pope as a cultural model. In these paintings the papal uniform is vital to the Argument of pope and the concept of pope is essential to the meaning of these paintings. The core meaning of the Velázquez' and Bacon's paintings is construed from our present cultural and socio-historical horizon as the pope, whose anxiety is revealed in the both paintings. Hence, Bacon ensured the continuity of not only the images of pope Innocent X, but the continuity of the sensation of uneasiness and tension of the Velázquez' image, as he took this affect as the core of his painting. The effect of duality has an explanation in the universal notion of the pope as somebody who speaks the truth and offers salvation; but as a matter of fact, the cultural and historical structures, as explained by the historical sociology of papal court, may be contradictory to this impression. Therefore, the *meaning* of the image of the pope in these

portraits does not necessarily change through the Bacon's re-interpretation, even though the ontology of the paintings is different and the visual elements have been transformed.

To conclude with, according to Gadamer, the cultural horizon of today presents a denial of belief that is based on *indifference*. The transformative nature of our time, the development in the visual arts after photography and film, and the rise of the visual through digital means requires a different kind of artistic departure point than in Velázquez' and Bacon's portraits. As Derrida has explained, without the means of visual communication, such as tv, or digital media, there would be no discourse of the pope today; thus, the institution of the pope has a close connection to visual. Therefore, it is unlikely that our era could produce a painting of Velázquez' or Bacon's Innocent X, within the frame of the art world, without irony or parody.

6.2. Further Study

The literature on Francis Bacon reflects the changing nature of art history from the 1940's to the latest, contemporary contributions. Therefore, it offers an unique research material and a point of view also to the development of art history as a science. Hence, the further study should concern the philosophical assumptions, foundations, and implications of art theoretical statements regarding Francis Bacon's work, including the Francis Bacon interviews. In order to frame the approach, the questions of the further study could be restricted to one key concept of Francis Bacon's oeuvre and painting today: the relation between the ontology and the aesthetic psychological approach to the origin of a painting. The idea of the presence of the artist in the work of art, represented by his physical marks, like in case of Velázquez and Bacon, leads us also to the question of the interpretation of the presence of the painting. Paraphrasing Derrida, if we ask what is the present, we are obliged to continue, to say: what is history, time or being? Therefore, we should place the following question: can the ontology of a painting be understood without the notion of metaphysical meta-narratives of transcendental origin? Furthermore, the contemporary

ontology of a visual art work could reflect the radical event-like character of painting's being which is presented by, on the one hand, in the emotional approaches of aesthetics, and on the other hand, in the phenomenological thinking of writers such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty. The research problem is in its nature therefore the same as is the motto by Bacon in the title page of this MA-thesis, i.e. how is it possible to understand that a painting can be so near to what we call a illustration, a figurative or a narrative and at the same time so deeply unlock the deepest things that man can feel? One of the contemporary interests and possible answers within cultural studies is the concept of *affect*. What is the relationship between affect, sensation and feeling and how do we understand the concept of affect in art theory? How does the affect exist in a painting? Finally, let me propose the following research hypotheses: the presence of the artistic acts as physical marks and events, is an essential entity to the ontology of painting.

References

- Ago, Renata (2002) *'Hegemony over the Social Scene and Zealous Popes'* in Signorotto, Gianvittorio and Visceglia, Maria Antonietta (eds.) *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrews, Malcolm (1999) *Landscape and Western Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Arti Grafiche 1870-Roma (1997) *Guide to the Doria Pamphilj Gallery*. Translated by Brandan Withe. Roma: Arti Doria Pamphilj S.r.l.
- Bal, Mieke and Bryson, Norman (1991) *'Semiotics and Art History: A Discussion of Context and Senders'* in Preziosi, Donald (ed.) (1998) *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barthes, Roland (1981) *Elements of Semiology*. Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. First published as *Éléments de Sémiologie* (1964). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, Roland (1984) *Image, Music, Text*. Essays selected and translated by Steven Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Baudrillard, Jean (1996) *The System of Objects*. First published as *Le système des objets* (1968) Translated by James Benedict. London and New York: Verso.
- Baudrillard, Jean (1987) *Ekstaasi ja rivous*. Original work *L'autre par lui-même*. Habilitation. Translated by Panu Minkkinen. Gaudeamus.
- Benjamin, Andrew (1991) *Art, Mimesis and the Avant-Garde: Aspects of a Philosophy of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.

Brown, Jonathan (1986) *Velázquez, Painter and Courtier*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Bryson, Norman (2003) 'Bacon's Dialogues with the Past' in Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art*. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel.

Bätschmann, Oscar (2003) 'A Guide to Interpretation: Art Historical Hermeneutics' in Farago, Claire and Zwijnenberg, Robert (eds.) *Compelling Visuality*. University of Minnesota Press.

Chandler, Daniel (2005) *Semiotics: the Basics*. Oxon: Routledge.

Coliva, Anna (ed.) (1999) *Velázquez a Roma. Velázquez e Roma*. Ginevra-Milan: Skira.

Davies, Hugh and Yard, Sally (1986) *Francis Bacon*. New York: Abbeville Press.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries.

Derrida, Jacques (1998) 'Faith and Knowledge: The Two Sources of 'Religion' at the Limits of Reason Alone' in Derrida, Jacques and Vattimo, Gianni (eds.) *Religion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Derrida, Jacques (1987) *The Truth in Painting*. First published as *La vérité en peinture* (1978). Translated by Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Deleuze, Gilles (2004) *Francis Bacon. The Logic of Sensation*. Translated by Daniel W. Smith. First published as *Francis Bacon: Logique de la Sensation* (1981). London and New York: Continuum.

- Foucault, Michel (1989) *Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1998) 'Dialogues in Capri' in Derrida, Jacques and Vattimo, Gianni (eds.) *Religion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Heidegger, Martin (1935) 'The Origin of the Work of Art' In Preziosi, Donald (ed.) (1998) *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirn, Yrjö (1900) *The Origins of Art. A Psychological and Sociological Inquiry*. London and New York: MacMillan and Co.
- Inter Alia (1994) 'Francis Picabia: Another Failure to Interpret the Work' in Roberts, John (ed.) *Art Has No History. The Making and Unmaking of Modern Art*. London and New York: Verso.
- Ippolito, Antonio Menniti (2002) 'The Secretariat of State as the Pope's Special Ministry' in Signorotto, Gianvittorio and Visceglia, Maria Antonietta (eds.) *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, Michel (1979) 'What is an Author' in V. Harari, Josué (ed.) *Textual Strategies. Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Franco, Jean (1991) 'Manhattan Will Be More Exotic This Fall: The Iconisation of Frida Kahlo' in *Women: a Cultural Review*. Vol 2. No 3. Oxford University Press.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1988) *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed and Ward.

Goffman, Erving (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goffman, Erving (1986) *Stigma. Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Original American edition published by New Jersey: Prentice-Hall inc. (1963) UK: Pelican Books and Penguin Books.

Kuusamo, Altti (1996) *Tyylistä tapaan. Semiotiikka, tyyl, ikonografia*. Tampere: Gaudeamus.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich (1955) 'On religion' in Bobock, Robert and Thompson, Kenneth (eds.) (1985) *Religion and Ideology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mueller-Vollmer, Kurt (ed.) (1985) *The Hermeneutics Reader. Texts of the German Tradition from the Enlightenment to the Present*. Oxford: The Continuum Publishing Co.

O'Collins, Gerald and Farrugia, Mario (2003) *Catholicism. The Story of Catholic Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pellegrini, Marco (2002) 'A Turning- Point in the History of the Factional System in the Sacred College: The Power of Pope and Cardinals in the Age of Alexander VI' in Signorotto, Gianvittorio and Visceglia, Maria Antonietta (eds.) *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, John (1994) 'Introduction' in Roberts, John (ed.) *Art Has No History. The Making and Unmaking of Modern Art*. London and New York: Verso.

Rosa, Mario (2002) *'The World's Theatre: The Court of Rome and Politics in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century'* in Signorotto, Gianvittorio and Visceglia, Maria Antonietta (eds.) *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, John (2001) *Francis Bacon*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Safarik, A. Eduard (1993) *Galleria Doria Pamphilj. Masterpieces: Paintings*. Florence: Scala, Rome: Arti Doria Pamphilj S.r.l.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich D.E. (1977) *'General Hermeneutics. Introduction'* in Mueller-Vollmer, Kurt (ed.) (1986) *The Hermeneutics Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. The Continuum Publishing Co.

Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (eds.) (2003) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art*. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel.

Signorotto, Gianvittorio and Visceglia, Maria Antonietta (2002) *'Introduction'* in Signorotto, Gianvittorio and Visceglia, Maria Antonietta (eds.) *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sonesson, Göran (1989) *Pictorial Concepts. Inquiries into the Semiotic Heritage and Its Relevance to the Analysis of the Visual World*. Lund: University of Lund.

Stewen, Riikka (1995) *Beginnings of Being. Painting and the Topography of the Aesthetic Experience*. *Studies in Art History*, 15. Helsinki: Society for Art History in Finland.

Steffen, Barbara (2003 a) *'Chance and the Tradition of Art in Francis Bacon's Work'* in Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel.*

Steffen, Barbara (2003 b) *'The Papal Portraits'* in Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel.*

Steffen, Barbara (2003 c) *'The Scream'* in Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel.*

Sylvester, David (2002) *Interviews with Francis Bacon.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Vakkari, Johanna (2000) *Lähde ja silmä. Kuvataiteen tuntemuksen historiaa ja perusteita.* Helsinki: Palmenia-kustannus.

Van Alphen, Ernst (1998) *Francis Bacon and the Loss of Self.* London: Reaktion Books.

van Alphen, Ernst (2003) *"Reconcentrations": Bacon reinventing his Models'* in Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel.*

Vattimo, Gianni (1998) *'The Trace of the Trace'* in Derrida, Jacques and Vattimo, Gianni (eds.) *Religion.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Warburton, Nigel (2004) *The Art Question*. London and New York: Routledge.

Weber, Max (1963) '*The Sociology of Religion*' in Bobock, Robert and Thompson, Kenneth (eds.) (1985) *Religion and Ideology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Worton, Michael and Still, Judith (1990) '*Introduction*' in Worton, Michael and Still, Judith (eds.) *Intertextuality: theories and practices*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Appendices

I. List of Illustrations

1. Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez

Portrait of Innocent X (1650)

Oil on canvas, 141 x 119 cm.

Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome.

Coliva, Anna (ed.) (1999) *Velázquez a Roma. Velázquez e Roma.*

Ginevra-Milan: Skira, 97.

2. Detail of Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez'

Portrait of Innocent X (1650)

Oil on canvas, 141 x 119 cm.

Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome.

Coliva, Anna (ed.) (1999) *Velázquez a Roma. Velázquez e Roma.*

Ginevra-Milan: Skira, 97.

3. Detail of Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez'

Portrait of Innocent X (1650)

Oil on canvas, 141 x 119 cm.

Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome.

Coliva, Anna (ed.) (1999) *Velázquez a Roma. Velázquez e Roma.*

Ginevra-Milan: Skira, 97.

4. Detail of Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez'

Portrait of Innocent X (1650)

Oil on canvas, 141 x 119 cm.

Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome.

Coliva, Anna (ed.) (1999) *Velázquez a Roma. Velázquez e Roma.*

Ginevra-Milan: Skira, 97.

5. Detail of Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velázquez'

Portrait of Innocent X (1650)

Oil on canvas, 141 x 119 cm.

Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome.

Coliva, Anna (ed.) (1999) *Velázquez a Roma. Velázquez e Roma.*

Ginevra-Milan: Skira, 97.

6. Francis Bacon

Study after Velázquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X (1953)

Oil on canvas, 153 x 118 cm, Des Moines Art Center, Iowa.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile.* New York: Rizzoli, 61.

7. Detail of Francis Bacon's

Study after Velázquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X (1953)

Oil on canvas, 153 x 118 cm, Des Moines Art Center, Iowa.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile.* New York: Rizzoli, 61.

8. Detail of Francis Bacon's

Study after Velázquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X (1953)

Oil on canvas, 153 x 118 cm, Des Moines Art Center, Iowa.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile.* New York: Rizzoli, 61.

9. Film Still from Ivan the Terrible (1944) by Sergei Eisenstein

Barthes, Roland (1984) *Image, Music, Text.*

Essays selected and translated by Steven Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 53.

10. Detail of Francis Bacon's

Study after Velázquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X (1953)

Oil on canvas, 153 x 118 cm, Des Moines Art Center, Iowa.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile.* New York: Rizzoli, 61.

11. Detail of Francis Bacon's

Study after Velázquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X (1953)

Oil on canvas, 153 x 118 cm, Des Moines Art Center, Iowa.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile.* New York: Rizzoli, 61.

12. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait I (1953)

Oil on canvas, 59 7/8 x 46 1/2 inches.

Collection Denise and Andrew Saul, New York.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*.

Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 2.

13. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait II (1953)

Oil on canvas, 60 1/2 x 45 1/2 inches.

Private Collection.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 2.

14. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait III (1953)

Oil on canvas, 60 x 45 7/8 inches.

Private Collection.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 2.

15. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait IV (1953)

Oil on canvas, 60 x 45 3/4 inches.

Collection Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center, Vassar College, New York

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 2.

16. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait V (1953)

Oil on canvas, 60 1/8 x 46 1/8 inches.

Collection Hirshborn Museum and Sculpture

Garden, Smithsonian Institution.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 3.

17. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait VI (1953)

Oil on canvas, 60 x 45 3/4 inches.

Collection The Minneapolis Institute of Arts.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 3.

18. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait VII (1953)

Oil on linen, 60 x 46 1/8 inches.

Collection of the Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 3.

19. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait VIII (1953)

Oil on canvas, 60 x 46 inches.

Private Collection.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 3.

20. Hand-written note by Francis Bacon on a leaf

from Edward Muybridge's the Human Figure in Motion,

Philadelphia: 1887, London: 1901.

Dublin, Dublin City Gallery, The Hugh Lane, F1:59.

Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (2003) (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art*. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel, 309.

21. Black-and-white images of two wrestlers.

A leaf from Edward Muybridge's the Human Figure in Motion,

Philadelphia: 1887, London: 1901.

Dublin, Dublin City Gallery, The Hugh Lane, F1A:27.

Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (2003) (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art*. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel, 327.

22. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait I (1956)

Oil on canvas, 197,7 x 142,3 cm.

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 221.

23. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait (1957)

Oil on canvas, 152,5 x 118 cm.

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 89.

24. Francis Bacon

Study from Innocent X (1962)

Oil on canvas, 198 x 141,5 cm.

Collection M. Riklis, New York.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 58.

25. Francis Bacon

Study after Velázquez (1950)

Oil on canvas, 78 x 54 inches.

The Estate of Francis Bacon/ Tony Shafrazi Gallery.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 17.

26. Francis Bacon

Study after Velázquez II (1950)

Oil on canvas, 78 x 54 inches.

The Estate of Francis Bacon/ Tony Shafrazi Gallery.

Davies, M. Hugh (2002) *Francis Bacon. The Papal Portraits of 1953*. Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego in association with Lund Humphries, 17.

27. Francis Bacon

Study from the Human Body (1949)

Oil on canvas, 147,5 x 131 cm.

The National Gallery Of Melbourne (Felton Bequest).

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 58.

28. Tiziano Vecellio

Portrait of Cardinal Filippo Archinto (circa 1551-62)

Oil on canvas, 114,8 x 88,7 cm.

Philadelphia, Philadelphia Museum, The John G. Johnson Collection

Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (2003) (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art*. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel, 136.

29. Francis Bacon

Three Studies for Figures at the Base of a Crucifixion (1944)

The middle panel.

Triptych. Oil and pastel on a cardboard, each panel 94 x 74 cm.

The Tate Gallery, London.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 51.

30. Francis Bacon

Three Studies for Figures at the Base of a Crucifixion (1944)

The right hand panel.

Triptych. Oil and pastel on a cardboard, each panel 94 x 74 cm.

The Tate Gallery, London.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 51.

31. Detail of Francis Bacon's right hand panel of

Three Studies for Figures at the Base of a Crucifixion (1944)

Triptych. Oil and pastel on a cardboard, each panel 94 x 74 cm.

The Tate Gallery, London.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 51.

32. Detail of Francis Bacon's

Study after Velázquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X (1953)

Oil on canvas, 153 x 118 cm, Des Moines Art Center, Iowa.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 61.

33. Hermann Goering

Picture Post, April 26, 1947 (Photographer unknown).

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 67.

34. Bacon's working document of Joseph Goebbels

Picture Post, April 26, 1947 (Photographer unknown).

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 67.

35. Francis Bacon

Head VI (1949)

Oil on canvas, 93,2 x 76,5 cm.

The Arts Council of Great Britain, London

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 91.

36. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait (1949)

Oil on canvas, 147,5 x 131 cm.

Chicago, Museum of Contemporary Art.

Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (2003) (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art*. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel, 179.

37. 'Anatomy of Horror' a selection of Bacon's working documents

photographed by Sam Hunter in 1950, as reproduced in the Magazine of Art, January 1952.

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 67.

38. Detail of 'Anatomy of Horror' a selection of Bacon's working documents

photographed by Sam Hunter in 1950, as reproduced in the Magazine of Art, January 1952.

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 67.

39. A spreads of stills from the Battleship Potemkin (1925) by Sergei Eisenstein

reproduced in Roger Manvell, Film.

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 90.

40. Film Still of the Nurse from the Battleship Potemkin (1925) by Sergei Eisenstein

Dublin, Dublin City Gallery, The Hugh Lane, F105:144.

Seipel, Wilfried, Steffen, Barbara and Vitali, Christoph (2003) (eds.) *Francis Bacon and the Tradition of Art*. Exhibition Catalogue of the Kunsthistorische Museum and the Fondation Beyeler. Vienna and Riehen/Basel, 158.

41. Working document from the collection by Bacon of Velázquez' Pope Innocent X
Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of
Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 14.

42. Working document from the collection by Bacon of Velázquez' Pope Innocent X
Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of
Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 14.

43. Working document from the collection by Bacon of Velázquez' Pope Innocent X
Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of
Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 14.

44. Working document from the collection by Bacon of Velázquez' Pope Innocent X
Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of
Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 14.

45. Francis Bacon

Dog (1952)

Oil on canvas, 199 x 138 cm.

The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 60.

46. Francis Bacon

Sphinx I (1953)

Oil on canvas, 199,5 x 137 cm.

Harrison, Martin (2005) *In Camera. Francis Bacon. Photography, Film and the Practise of
Painting*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 227.

47. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait of Van Gogh II (1957)

Oil on canvas, 198 x 142 cm.

Collection Edwin Janss, Thousand Oaks, California.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 68.

48. Francis Bacon

Study for Portrait of Van Gogh IV (1957)

Oil on canvas, 202,5 x 142 cm.

The Arts Council of Great Britain, London.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 69.

49. Francis Bacon

Three Studies for a Crucifixion (1962)

Oil with sand on canvas, triptych, each panel 78 x 57 inches.

The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Davies, Hugh and Yard, Sally (1986) *Francis Bacon*. New York: Abbeville Press, 43.

50. Francis Bacon

Crucifixion (1965)

Oil on canvas, triptych, each panel 78 x 58 inches.

Staatsgalerie Moderner Kunst, Munich.

Davies, Hugh and Yard, Sally (1986) *Francis Bacon*. New York: Abbeville Press, 43.

51. Francis Bacon

Seated Figure (1977)

Oil on canvas, 198 x 147,5 cm.

Mrs. Susan Lloyd, Nassau.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 58.

52. Francis Bacon

Study of the Human Body (1982)

Oil and pastel on canvas, 198 x 147,5 cm.

Musée National d'Art Modern, Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris.

Leiris, Michel (1983) *Francis Bacon. Full Face and In Profile*. New York: Rizzoli, 232.

II. Illustrations

Illustrations have been used for research purposes only and are not published in the e-thesis.