

From: *Max Ernst. Sculture / Sculptures*, curated by I. Gianelli, exhibition catalog (Rivoli-Torino, Castello di Rivoli Museo d'Arte Contemporanea, 16 May - 15 September 1996), Charta, Milano 1996, pp. 51-121.

Mythology and Mathematics. Max Ernst's Sculpture

Jürgen Pech

When I reach an impasse with my painting - which happens again and again - sculpture is left to me as a way out, for sculpture is more of a game than painting. In sculpture, as in love-making, both hands play a part. Therefore it is like taking holidays so as to return to painting later.ⁱ

Max Ernst's sculpture first began to be shown in thematic exhibitions in the 1960s, after a representative selection of twenty sculptures had been included in his 1959 retrospective. A number of gold and silver ornamental masks were exhibited in summer 1961ⁱⁱ and there was a comprehensive survey of his three-dimensional work at the end of 1961.ⁱⁱⁱ In the accompanying interviews and texts to these exhibitions Ernst drew attention to the playful aspects of his sculpture and its formal relationship to the games that children play in the sand, on the beach and on holiday: 'It is like a child's game. I play as if with sand on the beach. I place the forms in a mold and then the game of anthropomorphism begins.'^{iv} Indirectly, and in an allusive way, he indicates that individual groups of works, such as the granite sculptures from Maloja and the plaster sculptures on Long Island, were created whilst on holiday or in places far removed from the city life of Paris and New York. This is how he came to decorate his houses in Saint-Martin d'Ardèche and Sedona with numerous sculptures in cement and, later on, to carve in plaster and sculpt in stone in the equally remote places where he took up residence, in Huismes and Seillans. However, assemblages and objects had already formed an accompaniment to the Dadaist work in Cologne and surrealist activity in Paris. Furthermore, in *Inspiration to Order* of 1932, his first theoretical text on art, Max Ernst had already compared artistic activity to love-making, as an illustration of the process he used for making a collage: Let a ready-made reality with a naïve purpose apparently settled once for all (i.e. an umbrella) be suddenly juxtaposed to another very distant and no less ridiculous reality (i.e. a sewing-machine) in a place where both must be felt as out of place (i.e. upon a dissecting table), and precisely thereby it will be robbed of its naïve purpose and its identity; through a relativity it will pass from its false to a novel absoluteness, at once true and poetic: umbrella and sewing-machine will make love. This very simple example seems to me to reveal the mechanism of the process. Complete transmutation followed by a pure act such as the act of love must necessarily occur every time the given facts make conditions favourable: the pairing of two realities which apparently cannot be paired on a plane apparently not suited to them.^v The setting of Lord Snowdon's 1963 portrait photograph of Max Ernst working on the plaster model for *Capricorn* was clearly deliberate. However, the association of making a sculpture with making love can also be traced back to Ernst's earliest sculpture, *Les amoureux (The Lovers)* of 1913, which was first exhibited in his 1959 retrospective.

Apprenticeship in Bonn: Influences and Independence

Four years before the outbreak of the First World War Max Ernst enrolled as a student of philology

at Bonn University. He attended courses on psychology, psychiatry and - from the very beginning - art history, in addition to philosophy, German and the Romance languages. The work that he made during this period suggests a basic openness to all forms of contemporary art and to the art of earlier periods as well. In his biographical notes Ernst recalls the variety of early influences to which he submitted: 'He drinks in with his eyes everything that comes into his field of vision'.^{vi} In 1913 he was a member of a group of students from the Institute for Art History who visited the French sculptor Auguste Rodin under the tutelage of their professor, Paul Clemen, and took part in a discussion in Rodin's studio at the Villa des Brillants in Meudon. The compressed forms and surface animation of the two figures in *Les amoureux* reveal Max Ernst's efforts to come to grips with Rodin's art.^{vii} However, the strongly expressive quality of the work, attributable to its state of semi-completion and emphasis on the material processes involved, also point to another source of influence. One year previously, Ernst had written of a sculptor from Bonn, in one of his humorous contributions to the Bonn newspaper *Volksmund*: 'He has taken too much from the Greeks, Michelangelo and Rodin. He should go to the Negroes to learn how to make sculpture.'^{viii} Max Ernst had seen African sculpture at the home of August Macke, who was in touch with the Munich artists' group 'The Blue Rider'. Macke had contributed to their Almanac an article entitled 'Masks', furnished with illustrations of non-European, primitive sculpture: To create forms is to live. Are we not children, who draw on the secret of their inner emotions, more creative than those who would imitate the forms of the Greeks? Are not the 'wild' artists, who have a form of their own, as strong as the form of thunder?^{ix} In the same year, Macke carved two wooden legs for a sideboard,^x whose size and formal construction must have had a direct influence on Max Ernst's first attempt at making a piece of sculpture. In *Les amoureux*, the space beneath the arm of the woman and the dislocation of the legs as the couple stride forward combine to break up the block-like structure which Ernst, like Macke, had taken as his starting point. In addition to giving rhythmic articulation to his figures, Max Ernst used a variety of means to suggest analogies in form and subject-matter to the sagging body and supporting figure in a Christian *Pietà*.

Dadaist Breakthrough in Cologne: Relief-Montages, Found Objects and Assemblages

Max Ernst's work took quite a different form after the First World War, in which he had served in the artillery. In 1919, the Dadaist movement, which had begun in Zürich, established a base in Cologne. The chief initiators in Cologne, besides Ernst himself, were Hans Arp and Alfred Ferdinand Gruenwald. Arp, with whom Max Ernst had been acquainted in the pre-war period, had reinforced the contacts with Zürich, and Gruenwald, who came from a well-to-do family, had (in addition to his artistic work) undertaken to finance the enterprise, under the punning pseudonym of Johannes Theodor Baargeld. Some years later, a woman artist from Cologne described the atmosphere in the apartment of Max Ernst and his wife, Luise Strauss-Ernst, whom Ernst had met at the Institute for Art History in Bonn and married shortly before the end of the First World War: Max Ernst lived on the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Ring with Lou and Jimmy. He was rather like a big brother to us. He enjoyed our respect. He usually wore a gentle, somewhat bemused smile. On our first visit to him, I was taken aback by his accommodation. The first things one saw were some brightly painted sculpted figures in the stairwell. There was a smell of glue and distemper. The studio was a room of approximately four metres square, with a window onto the ring road and a work table in front of it. On the left was a large, painted wooden cupboard. Max Ernst was expecting a visit from a trade union delegation. These people were disconcerted by the sight of the wooden idols, and I could not comprehend the self-assurance with which the painter, in apparent disregard for the gulf which this created between them, set about engaging them in serious men's talk. How superstitious these workers were! Indeed, this art was intended to *épater les bourgeois* and I was to see this happen, at

the Winter Brewery.^{xi}

The Cologne Dadaists' activities spanned half a year: two exhibitions were held at the Cologne Kunstverein and the Winter Brewery and were backed up not only with accompanying catalogues, *Bulletin D* and *Dada-Vorfrühling*, but by an extensive and elaborately devised newspaper, with the title *die schammade*. In contrast to his procedure with *Les amoureux*, Max Ernst did not attempt to rework the quadrangular form which, here too, served as the point of departure for his wooden relief-semblage, *Architekt*, illustrated in the catalogue *Bulletin D*. Ernst set the quadrangle, which is, in geometric terms, a variant of a parallelogram demarcated by six rectangles, straight into a picture frame, in its raw, unworked state, and then combined it with additional found objects, selected for their simple or complex stereometric forms. On the left hand side a figure rolls forward on two spindles. It has two tube-shaped legs and body formed by a quadrangle resting on one corner. Its head is an ellipsoid knob with two notches, inserted into a tube-like neck. The position of its arms, made out of a triangle and a machine-lathed length of wood, emphasises the forwards motion. In contrast to this, the figurative construction in the right foreground is simple and statuesque. Bodies and legs are formed by interlocking quadrangular and cylindrical forms. Here, a large reel of thread attached to the body at an angle functions as a head, which seems to look diagonally at the figure behind it on the left, while the right arm points forwards, out of the frame of the picture. These anthropomorphic figures may be traced back to Giorgio de Chirico's painted marionettes - Max Ernst had discovered 'pittura metafisica' in autumn 1919, reworked some of its motifs as sketches for imaginary constructions in his suite of lithographs, *Fiat modes pereat ars*, and now incorporated three-dimensional realisations of some of them into his picture.

Max Ernst now added overpainting to his formal vocabulary, which already included the interpenetration of forms and augmentation of forms. Towards the end of 1919, he made his *Relief 123*. As he wrote, in a letter to Tristan Tzara: 'The Poster for Archipenko's show in Zürich has been merzified in Relief 123'^{xii} This assemblage contains three wooden quadrangles situated in different positions; they are joined at their corners by diagonal lines and the artist has painted over the resulting triangular areas. The inscription, 'sculpto-peinture', borrowed from a poster by Alexander Archipenko, suggests the origin of this procedure, but Max Ernst makes far more varied use of the technique of 'sculpto-painting' than its inventor. Whereas there is a changing game of illusion between the volumetric boxes and pyramidal forms at the bottom, the painted wooden block in the upper part is combined with a semi-circular disc, so to suggest a bird's head with a beak. The striped and chequered dice which Max Ernst lifted from the city of Cologne's catalogue of teaching aids^{xiii} alludes in summary fashion to the relationship between form and content. In his autobiographical notes, Max Ernst described his discovery of this catalogue of teaching aids and its importance in providing him with the primary source material for many of the overpaintings and collages, from his Dadaist period in Cologne: One rainy day in Cologne on the Rhine, the catalogue of a teaching-aids company caught my attention. It was illustrated with models of all kinds - mathematical, geometrical, anthropological, zoological, botanical, anatomical, mineralogical, paleontological, and so forth - elements of such a diverse nature that the absurdity of the collection confused the eye and mind, producing hallucinations and lending the objects depicted new and rapidly changing meanings. I suddenly felt my visionary faculties so intensified that I began seeing the newly emerged objects against a new background. To capture it, a little paint or a few lines were enough: a horizon, a sky, a wooden floor, that sort of thing. My hallucinations had been fixed. Now it was a matter of interpreting the hallucination in a few words or sentences.^{xiv}

In this account he seems consciously to emphasise the transition from mathematics and geometry to anthropology, zoology and botany, in order to draw attention to the reinterpretation of geometrical forms in human or humanoid figures. This way looking into and reinterpreting things is so

fundamental to Max Ernst that he also draws attention to it, in relation to other objects in the *Bulletin D* exhibition. The chief theme of the catalogue text is a criticism of expressionism, as a fashionable style which has lost its meaning. At the same time, he attacks the commercialisation and homogenisation of art and bourgeois smugness and narrow-mindedness. Accordingly, the catalogue draws attention not only to the work of Hans Arp, J. T. Baargeld, Max Ernst and Angelika and Heinrich Hoerle, but to several works by 'unknown masters of the beginning of the twentieth century', children's drawings, a Negro sculpture, curves of polarised light, a craftsman's pipe and a piano hammer. He elevates industrial products and the work of amateurs, by taking their aesthetic value seriously and including them in the context of an art exhibition. The letter D in *Bulletin D* may thus be read as standing both for Dada and (with a hint of self-irony) Dilettantism. Of the artists mentioned, J. T. Baargeld, Max Ernst and Angelika Hoerle had never attended art school and Hans Arp and Heinrich Hoerle had grown disillusioned and abandoned their studio, after only a short spell. Ernst deliberately singles out industrially manufactured products for attention. Thus, he characterises the piano hammer as 'exemplary sculpture' in his catalogue and in his later *Typescript Manifesto*, a Dadaistic send-up of official documents of this nature, comprising a 'proposal for the foundation of an imperial deconstruction centre for pianos', in which he proposes, among other things, taking out the piano hammers, for use in anatomy courses at expressionist art academies, and turning piano varnish into a substance for spreading on bread. Finally, the aim of the four curves of polarised light was explained by a critic, in a review of the exhibition: the wire models, which illustrated the undulating motion of light, were constructed 'in order to teach us to see'.^{xv}

Max Ernst also employed spiralling wire forms similar to those of his curved polarisations, in the construction of some of his free-standing sculptures. *The Objet d'art*, which is illustrated in the periodical *die schammade*, is put together out of a number of similar spirals, in addition to springs and cogs, to create an overall effect of visual and sensory confusion, in which the geometrie clarity of individual forms is lost in a chaos of tangled confusion. A reviewer of the breakaway *Bulletin D* exhibition in nearby Düsseldorf, in February 1920, tore into the show in an extensive article, in which he gave a detailed account of both the reliefs and sculptures: A certain Max Ernst had already drawn attention to himself as a kind of Peter Simple, through his primitive pictures at the 'Young Rhineland' exhibition. He has now gone so far in his childhood regression as in all seriousness to cobble together 'knotted sculptures' out of reels of thread, wires, wads cotton-wool, limbs of broken puppets, flywheels and whatever else he can find in the junk-room, to the point where even the most credulous viewer is left to conclude that these can only be a harmless nonsense, if they are not to be taken for mousetraps or infernal machines. Ernst's... paintings (so-called Merz paintings) consist of pieces of wood nailed together, cotton reels, wire, cogs and the suchlike.^{xvi}

After his activities in Cologne, Max Ernst presented further examples of these free-standing knotted sculptures at two exhibitions, which were to be of considerable importance to his career: on the one hand, his piece *Falustratra*^{xvii} at the 'First International Dada-Fair', which was held in Berlin from the beginning of July to the end of August 1920, and on the other, *The Little Virile Tree*,^{xviii} which was included in his first exhibition in Paris, in May 1921.

In working on his sculpture, as on the relief-assemblages, Max Ernst applied the principles of interpenetration of forms and augmentation of forms. At the same time as working on the 'interpenetrative' knotted sculptures, through mixing up and recombining disparate elements, Max Ernst made additive constructions out of existing objects. These doubtless included the works described by one critic as 'flower-pot sculptures'^{xix}, which have not survived, as well as a work described as a monumental sculpture, which had the title *Ein Lustgreis vor Gewehr schützt die museale Frühlingstoilette vor dadaistischen Eingriffen (L'État c'est moi!) (A Lascivious Old Man Standing at Arms, to Guard the Muse's Spring Toilette from Dadaist Attacks (L'État c'est moi!))*,

which - like almost all his sculptures from the Dadaist period - is only known to us from a documentary photograph.

This monumental sculpture was shown with the knotted sculpture *Falustratra* at the second Cologne Dada exhibition, which, like the *Bulletin D* exhibition, had a secessionist character. Originally, Max Ernst and J. T Baargeld had wanted to take part in the unjuried spring exhibition of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Bildender Künstler (Fine Artists' Group) in the Museum of Arts and Crafts, but they were turned down by Professor Karl Schafer, the new director of the museum. Thereupon, they both rented the internal courtyard of the Winter Brewery for the 'Dada-Vorfrühling' (Dada Early Spring), which was held there in April and May 1920. Just as the title of the exhibition punningly alluded to the venue in the Winter Brewery, the title of the work itself and its description in the catalogue as a 'monumental sculpture' made ironic reference to the fact that it had been rejected by the museum.^{xx} The larger-than-life caricature of the monarch of the museum was put together out of hat boxes and elaborate banisters from a stair-rail which Max Ernst had found in the straw and felt hat factory of his father-in-law. The hat as a fashion accessory reappears in serial form in a collage which Max Ernst made at the same time, called *C'est le chapeau qui fait l'homme* (*The Hat Makes the Man*). Its use is intended as a critique of contemporary civilisation, which is also reflected in the title of the portfolio *Fiat modes pereat ars* (*Let Fashion Flourish, Art Will Perish*). It stands for the purely superficial, meaningless social gesture. For Max Ernst, the conventional relationship between form and content had become obsolete, not only in art, but in society. This break with traditional ways of seeing gave him enormous freedom and enabled him to give fresh meaning to a whole range of new subjects.

Armada v. Dulgedalzen provides a final example from Ernst's dadaist period in Cologne of an 'object-assemblage', an assemblage of found objects which the artist defined as 'sculptosculpture dada'. A photograph of this work shows a simple combination of three elements, brought together by the augmentation and interpenetration of forms. A doll's hand, with a cotton-reel on its thumb, projects out of a glass jar, which narrows at the neck. The caption beneath the photograph makes a verbal play on the left hand of the doll by describing it as the right hand of the central DaDa W/3, in an allusion to the role of Luise Strauss-Ernst, who had adopted the dadaist pseudonym of 'Armada von Dulgedalzen'. On one level, then, this work is a dadaist portrait, featuring a hand and a function, rather than a head. However, its theme may also be interpreted as a dadaist version of a reliquary arm and transposed, fittingly enough for the Holy City of Cologne, onto a religious, ecclesiastical plane. Thus Max Ernst draws the hagiolatry of Catholicism into a still wider field of association, by combining myth with geometrical forms and the human body.

Sculpture and Painting: Surrealist Recollections of Dadaism

In the following years, Max Ernst mainly used painting and drawing to try out his new repertoire of indirect working techniques. In addition to wooden reliefs and object-assemblages, he made impressions of printers' blocks, pencil rubbings, overpaintings, stencilled drawings, photocollages, woodcut collages and works using a combination of all these techniques. He then started to apply all these new procedures to oil painting, which he had neglected up until 1921. In doing so, he also borrowed some of the processes which he had developed in his sculpture. *The Elephant of Celebes* (1921), for example, includes a tower constructed by standing individual tubular sections one on top of another; there is also a suggestion that the side of the tower has been penetrated by two other forms. Like other motifs from this period, such as the monumental-seeming *Ubu Imperator*, these forms have the appearance of painted sculptures, and the figures in *Es lebe die Liebe ou Pays charmant* and *Sainte Cécile (le piano invisible)* of 1923 are surrounded with mantles, in a direct reference to the moulds used in the casting process.^{xxi} Ernst had moved to Paris in 1922, and this

show him with one of the features of incipient surrealism - the intersection between external and internal reality, stemming from the suspension of rational thought processes. In his text on the theory of art, *Au-delà de la peinture (Beyond Painting)* of 1936, Max Ernst made it clear that he considered it the duty of the painter to release 'what "sees in him" from its protective mantle and make it visible'.^{xxii}

The assemblages *Oiseau (Bird)*, *Deux enfants sont menacés par un rossignol (Two Children are Threatened by a Nightingale)* and *Dadaville* were all created in around 1924, the year in which André Breton published his *Manifeste du Surréalisme*. All three works hark back to Dadaism.

According to Max Ernst, the free-standing sculpture *Oiseau* was originally part of a larger sculptural grouping with the title *Vogelfriedhof (Bird Cemetery)*.^{xxiii} In relating this, he alluded to Dada as an earlier period which was now over. For this work, he once more created a figure from a combination of found objects. Two flat pieces of wood with rounded contours are used, with minor adjustments, to suggest the side view of a bird's head, looking upwards, set on a long, gently curving neck. The bird's body is likewise composed of curvilinear pieces of wood, sawn out and arranged symmetrically around a triangle. Max Ernst thus commits to memorises the bird, which had played an increasingly important part in his work after in the post-war period and, by his own account, had formed part of his private mythology ever since childhood: 1906. Head Bird Hornebom. A friend by name of Hornebom, an intelligent, piebald, faithful bird, dies during the night; the same night a child, number six, begins life. Confusion in the brain of this otherwise quite healthy boy - a kind of interpretation mania, as if new-born innocence, sister Loni, had, in her lust of life taken possession of the vital fluids of his favourite bird. The crisis is soon overcome. Yet in the boy's mind there remains a voluntary, if irrational, confounding of the images of human beings with birds and other creatures; and this is reflected in the emblems of his art.^{xxiv}

The painted wood relief *Deux enfants sont menacés par un rossignol* clearly illustrates the way in which Max Ernst abolished the distinctions between genres and relativised the significance of his return to the classic medium of oil painting, at the same time as extending its applications. A moveable garden gate, made of lattice-work, intersects the broad frame of the relief, whose inside edge is painted over and bears the inscription of the title. Here, illusionistic painting and real objects meet. Max Ernst himself described this in his autobiographical notes as a 'perhaps (for now) ultimate development of collage'.^{xxv} In the material-relief *Dadaville* nine strips of cork are mounted vertically side by side, the broad strips alternating with the narrow ones, whilst a tenth strip, with nail heads sticking out of it, serves as a base. The upper edges of the strips of cork have been gouged out in places, to look like the discarded parts of a wooden frame. This thematic reference to the iconoclasm of the Dadaist period, which also recalls the motif of a carpet-forest of 1920, abolishes the separation between illusion and reality: the microstructure of the cork is turned into the macrostructure of a forest.^{xxvi} Max Ernst underlines the significance of this game by imitating in silhouette, at the upper edge of the frame, the dovetailing which he has deliberately left exposed at the bottom. The uppermost section, including the simulated dovetailing, is overlaid with white plaster, on a blue ground, which creates the impression of a cloudy sky. These kinds of experiments with materials such as plaster eventually led Max Ernst on to make his first editioned object, *Ci-fut une hirondelle (Here a Swallow was Born)*, which was announced in March 1928, in the periodical *La Révolution Surréaliste*,^{xxvii} two years after other plans had been made for marketing artists' multiples, such as snowballs designed by Pablo Picasso and Man Ray.^{xxviii} Max Ernst painted each of the plaster casts in his edition of twelve in a different manner, so that each acquired the status of a unique object. He partially rounded out the cavities caused by the casting of convex forms, coloured in some of the winged forms and made circles to stand for heads and eyes. He overpainted the egg-shaped mould beneath the swallows, to suggest a further wing. At this point, he again

played games with illusion and reality: the outspread wing makes the concave oval form look as if it curves outwards. The egg motif is used emblematically in this context to stand both for the creation of the world and for the process of seeing. Two years later, Max Ernst gave the title *À l'intérieur de la vue: dans l'oeuf* (*The Inside of Seeing: The Egg*) to a whole series of paintings whose oval forms are packed with different species of birds.

Towards the end of the twenties, works of this nature led to the creation of Loplop, a bird creature in Max Ernst's easel paintings, who enabled the artist, by means of indirect self-portraiture, to parade the entire range of his themes and techniques. 'Loplop' pictures were first exhibited towards the end of 1930, in the Galerie Vignon in Paris. In the accompanying catalogue, the artist described his bird creature, in a commentary on his picture *Loplop présente Loplop* (*Loplop Presents Loplop*) as 'A private phantom, bound up with the personality of Max Ernst, sometimes winged, always sexual.' In his series of 'Loplop' pictures, Max Ernst generally reduces the parts of the body to summary forms and amalgamates body and form, at the same time as identifying the painter's easel with the artist's body. Equating the human body with a mathematical sign is also the subject of a postcard, produced in conjunction with the catalogue. This shows the front and rear views of a female torso, furnished with numbers,^{xxxix} which Max Ernst uses to highlight the erotic zones of the woman's body. Through his use of the torso, Ernst refers more widely to a further principal theme in his work, the headless woman, who appears alongside the bird Loplop in his first collage novel, *La Femme 100 têtes*, of 1929, and provides the title for this visual manifesto of surrealism.^{xxx}

The exhibition also included two found objects which formed a suitable accompaniment to the presentation figures. In these, Max Ernst explicitly refers back to the Dada exhibitions in Cologne, in which he had likewise shown anthropomorphic easel figures, and a selection of objects had been selected, to raise fundamental questions about ways of seeing and thinking about art. This time, he exhibited several pyrometric gauges in a small box. Ernst had brought these gauges, used to measure the temperature in firing ovens, from the studio of the potter Artigas, where he had fired the day models of his first chess set. Ernst had created basic forms of the pieces by moulding lumps of clay in his hands and then going on to model the individual details. In 1975, he cast the king, queen and a bishop in bronze - likewise, the queen on her own, without a plinth. Ernst also mounted another pyrometric gauge on his Loplop painting *Matin et soir* (*Morning and Evening*) this time sexual connotations. In conjunction with each other, however, the hands from these gauges seem rather to suggest birds' claws or beaks, and the straw underneath lends support to the notion that this might also be a bird's nest.

Ernst contrasted this group of works with an individual piece, which his friend, the artist and collector Roland Penrose, had brought back from his travels in Egypt: One of the simplest and most lasting souvenirs I brought back was a small pebble I had picked up. Polished by the sand, spherical in shape like a large cherry stone, it was encircled by horns like the crescent of the moon... On my return to Paris Max Ernst seized upon it as a surrealist object of significance and putting it in a plush jeweller's box he kept it beside him or exhibited it as a rare treasure trove among his paintings.^{xxxi}

These found objects were displayed once more seven years later in London, in the exhibition 'Surrealist Objects and Poems' and given the titles *Cactus and Sphinx Eye*^{xxxii} in the catalogue. The place where the polished, spherical stone was found and one of the central themes in Ernst's work of the thirties are conjoined by their association with the oracle of Greek mythology, whose origins go back to the fabled creature of the Egyptians, with a human head and lion's body. In 1934 Ernst published his third and last collage novel, *Une semaine de bonté, ou les sept éléments capitaux* (*A Week of Goodness, or the Seven Capital Elements*). Oedipus is the protagonist in the collages in the fourth section in which, according to the legend, he solves the sphinx's riddle. Max Ernst had taken

an interest in Greek mythology as far back as 1922. The pierced hand in his painting *Oedipe Rex* (*Oedipus Rex*) makes pictorial play on Oedipus' name (= Schwellfuss or Swellfoot) and verbal play on the relationship between solving a riddle and cracking a nut. The chief figure in the suite of collages is characterised by a bird's head, which varies from image to image. In some pictures, the bird-person-creature is given the attribute of a nest with eggs. Other images depict Oedipus' murder of his father and encounter with the eye of the sphinx. In these, the spherical form largely corresponds to that of the found object and is likewise set in a narrow surround. Thus, in the context of Ernst's work the found object stands, on the one hand, for the riddle of the universe and (via the egg form) the creation of a new world and, on the other, for a new way of reading into things and brooding over them - in other words, for the very process of seeing.

The Granite Sculptures of Maloja

After completing the work on his collage novel, Max Ernst spent the summer of 1934 as the guest of Alberto Giacometti in his house in Swiss Bergell. Giacometti, who had been taken up by the surrealist group for his celebrated mobile erotic object *Baule suspendue* (*Hanging Ball*)^{xxxiii} of 1930, introduced him to the techniques of carving. Max Ernst wrote from the holiday resort of Maloja to the art historian Carola Giedion-Welcker in Zürich, with whom he had first become acquainted as a student in Bonn: Alberto and I have been seized with a fever to sculpt. We are working on large and small granite blocks on the moraines of the Forno glacier. These have been strangely carved by time, ice and the weather, and look fantastically beautiful, in themselves. Why not, then, leave the main work to the elements and be content with scratching our secrets into them, like runes...?^{xxxiv}

They had used a team of horses to drag the polished boulders to the front of Giacometti's house where Giacometti lived in Maloja. In the course of his stay there, Max Ernst worked on over twenty sphere-shaped and egg-shaped stones. In certain instances, he roughened up whole areas of the surface with a chisel, until oval or undulating contours emerged. The interplay between smooth and structured areas of the rounded stones suggests a variety of biomorphic forms, and one of these blocks is, indeed, directly reminiscent of Roland Penrose's eye-stone. Moulds of eyes are sometimes used, to give emphasis to the incised, linear network and to add a new meaning, as in *Oiseau ovoïde* (*Ovoid Bird*) or *Tête d'oiseau mordant une pierre* (*Bird's Head, Biting a Stone*). Presumably, Max Ernst was acquainted with the painted stone reliefs and corresponding bird reliefs from the Easter Islands,^{xxxv} for he had selected *L'Île de Pâques* (*Easter Island*) as the subject of the fourth section of his collage novel *Une semaine de bonté* at the beginning of the year and furnished the male figures with the kind of monumental stone heads that are to be found on the island. In ways such as this, Ernst enriched the themes in his own work with references to ancient, non-European cultures.

Max Ernst painted certain of the granite blocks in red and black oil colours. These are reminiscent of some of Hans Arp's biomorphic works of the twenties, with their open-ended forms.^{xxxvi} More importantly, however, they reveal Ernst's attempts to come to grips with his own work, and with some of the themes and forms with which he had been engaged, earlier in the year, from the series of paintings bearing the title *Nageur aveugle* (*Blind Swimmer*) to the large mural paintings for the theatre in Zürich. In the *Blind Swimmer* paintings, Ernst reworked some diagrams used in physics^{xxxvii} to illustrate the movement of currents of air and water. In Maloja, he translated these model depictions of the effects of collision and displacement into the undulations and mountainous waves enveloping the surface of his stones. There seems to be a clear allusion to water on one of these stones, where a duck-like form is depicted in the middle of an unpainted area covered with what look like bubbles. In the mural painting in Zürich Ernst overlaid the central Loplop figure with a correspondingly fluid, biomorphic surface which, however, in this instance, was transparent. The

fish swimming in the sky of *The Elephant of Celebes* had already furnished Ernst with a motif for expressing the extension of his powers of seeing and his new-found ability to dive down into the different layers of the unconscious. As he put it in 1935, in reply to a round-robin from the periodical, *Comune* (What will become of Painting?): Before he goes into water, a diver cannot know what he will bring back. A painter does not choose his subject. Imposing one upon himself, be it ever so subversive and exciting, and treating it in an academic manner, would mean producing a work of weak revolutionary effect.^{xxxviii} One year later, Max Ernst added a painted stone to his assemblage *Loplop présente une jeune fille* (*Loplop Introduces a Young Girl*), first by winding a fishing line around found object and then, in the final version, by wrapping it in a fishing net.

This addition provides a further due to the creative process and a metaphorical link to the stones of Maloja. Max Ernst made direct reference to the egg form in his text *Was ist Surrealismus?* (*What is Surrealism?*), published for a group exhibition at Kunsthaus Zürich in October 1934. In this text, he stressed that Surrealism, with its use of psychic automatism, had dealt a blow to the myth of creation and the related concept of genius, and he went on to add, teasingly: It's all over for the old notion of 'talent', just as it is for hero-worship and the legend, so beloved of his greedy worshippers, of the artist's 'fecundity', the artist who lays three eggs today, one tomorrow and none on Sunday.^{xxxix} When a number of writers had disputed the possibility of successfully adapting automatist techniques and *écriture automatique* to painting and drawing procedures, Max Ernst had replied with the publication in 1926 of his portfolio *Histoire naturelle*, a surrealist history of the creation,^{xl} which relied on use of the indirect technique of frottage. Now he went on to side with the sculptors: In fact, the fundamental opposition between meditation and action (according to the view of classical philosophy) disappears along with the fundamental distinction between exterior and interior world, and the universal significance of Surrealism lies precisely in the fact that, in the wake of this discovery, no area of life can remain closed to it. This is why sculpture, too, though apparently obstinately resistant to every form of automatism, had to find entry into the Surrealist movement.^{xli}

Although Max Ernst went on to mention the sculpture in the exhibition at the Kunsthaus Zürich by Hans Arp and Alberto Giacometti and himself made the strongest showing of all, with over fifty paintings and collages, he was unable as yet to show any of his own sculptures.

The Sculptures in Plaster of 1934-35

On his return to Paris, Max Ernst began work in the winter of 1934 on a series of free standing sculptures in plaster of Paris. A total of nine works may be shown to have existed, but the only evidence to survive is a photographic record of two of them.

The two displaced eyes of the plaster sculpture *Tête d'homme* (*Head of a Man*), now destroyed, show a resemblance to certain works by Picasso, and the triadic grouping of, *Chimères* (*Chimaeras*), which is also no longer extant, looks forward to the sculptural groups which Ernst was to make in Saint-Martin d'Ardèche and Sedona. A photograph with the title *Jeu de constructions anthropomorphes* (*Play of Anthropomorphic Constructions*) shows the repertoire of forms which served as a starting point and a number of possible further combinations. Most frequently Max Ernst used smooth, tapering, truncated cones, which served as a reminder of his Dada period and were formed by taking casts of flower-pots.

For his figure *Habakuk*, Max Ernst stacked up three casts of flower-pots in alternating positions, so that the narrower bases and broader tops were matched up to each other. He then moved the top cast back somewhat and tilted it up at a slight angle, completed the join with the cast on which it rested beneath and modelled the gap between the two flower-pot forms into a mouth. He inserted a fourth cast into the bottom one and the narrow section of this which was visible served as the base for the

figure. This base, in turn, was acentrically positioned on a circular plinth. In a first version, the area of the plinth not taken up with the base of the figure was occupied by a pipe, as a further reminder of the craftsman's pipe from the Dadaist period, and a cast of Penrose's stone. The bronze cast taken in 1971 from an altered version includes an indentation which is recognisably a negative impression of the eyestone, in addition to a cast of the eyestone itself. There are also adjustments to the figure's beak-shaped head-piece, so that it now appear to be looking upwards, instead of downwards, as before. Two further casts of Penrose's stone here function as eyes. Whereas these had originally been fixed directly on to the edge of the pot adjacent to the beak form (or nose-shape), they are now only fastened to the beak, and elimination of visual distractions serves once more to emphasise their prominence and isolation. These changes, which Max Ernst made in the course of the thirties,^{xlii} are to be explained by a different interpretation which he gave to the *Habakuk*. In the original version he created a portrait of the small Old Testament prophet who was embittered by the fact that no one heeded his warnings. In the reworked version he concentrated instead on the connections which he perceived between the soothsayer and visionary of the Bible and the visionary, transcendental aspects of his own work. Indicative of this was his inclusion on the plinth of an emblematic representation of the dual nature of vision, directed inwards as well as outwards; in addition, the focus in this work is displaced from the biblical figure onto the bird figure, who is the private phantom of the artist. Both *Oedipe I (Oedipus I)* and *Oedipe II (Oedipus II)* were likewise assembled from casts of flower-pots. In both, a horned figure is surmounted by a second figure, set slightly to one side, whose compositional structure echoes that of the *Habakuk*. Apart from the more pronounced lips, the only difference is in the formation of the eyes, which are semi-circular protrusions, rather than rounded sockets. In contrast, the horned figures are quite differently constructed. In *Oedipe I* the mouth bordered by narrow lips is placed on the narrow concave meeting-point between two flower-pot casts, and a segment stepped back twice serves, instance, as a foot. Whereas, in *Oedipe I*, both the stepping back and off-centre positioning of this foot form serve to emphasise the distance of the figure from the base, the horned figure in *Oedipe II* seems to be all of one piece with the base. This figure is also more rounded, in general, and organically formed. Max Ernst uses only a few, concentrated and carefully calculated, formal means to depict the horned figures as a male king and female queen, whose relationship to Oedipus is accentuated by a number of further variations. In the Greek legend, King Laios of Thebes consulted the Delphic oracle, who prophesied that his son, Oedipus, would be the future murderer of his father and husband of his mother. Thereupon, Laios pierced the infant Oedipus' feet with a nail and sent him away, to rid of him. Oedipus' relationship to his father is portrayed in *Oedipe I*. The son's foot has been perforated and the two figures look in apposite directions. Oedipus' stance also looks shaky and insecure, although the composition is brought into formal equilibrium by the off-centre positioning of the figure on its base. In contrast, in the second version of the sculpture, Oedipus is held aloft by his mother, Jocasta and they look in the same direction. The sculpture *Les asperges de la lune (Lunar Asparagus)* shows a comparable arrangement of two figures. Two long thin stems rise up from a broad cylindrical base. Both stems are unevenly fluted and swell and contract from one end to the other. One stem culminates in a bulbous excrescence with a mouth-like aperture. The other is surmounted with a prism-shaped triangular at the ends, with a flat rectangular surface for a face and two casts of Penrose's stones, for eyes. The general outline of this is reminiscent of the frottage *Faussés positions (False Positions)*, but there are also cross-references to stimuli from non-European cultures.

Thus there is a striking resemblance to dubs from the Easter Islands, but only on a formal level.^{xliii} Max Ernst was also certainly acquainted with a wood carving of two figures, which Jacques Viot, his first Paris dealer, had brought back from Lake Sentani in New Guinea in 1929,^{xliiv} but the only

link between this figurative sculpture and his own, stylised work was that both made use of a single base. Instead, Ernst seems to have isolated the mouth and the eyes, in order to concentrate on the themes of speaking and seeing. The cycle of frottages had itself been a riposte to the dispute between the surrealist painters and writers. Both circular faces were identified by the sculpture's title as creatures of the moon and, in consequence, the products of nocturnal dreams. In the original version in plaster, the seeing stem had leaned farther over, and this had meant giving stronger emphasis and greater prominence to speaking stem, which was somewhat larger and stood bolt upright.

Two slim, vertical shafts standing close up against each other form a part of the sculpture *La belle allemande* (*The Pretty German Girl*). This time the shafts are centred on another cylindrical plinth and support a circular disk. Two hemispheres with different radii enliven the front side, and a flat oval intersects the disk at right angles, along the bottom edge. A fan-shaped, fluted shell form sits on the top of the pod-shaped form on the reverse side. Although this work appears quite dear and simple at first sight, its form and content are so complex that three views of it - from the front, back and side - were reproduced in the special Max Ernst issue of the review *Cahiers d'Art* in 1937.^{xlv} According to the viewpoint, the sculpture presents a changing appearance, from swelling voluminousness to filagree-fine slenderness and suggests now a place and now a bird figure or again a bird's head at one moment and a woman's body at the next. Views from close up and farther away alternate and merge, in a constant metamorphosis of forms. As far back as 1921 Max Ernst had combined in one of his collages the figure of Eve, from Albrecht Dürer's famous engraving *The Fall*, with two birds. Now he went back to Dürer's contemporary, Gregor Erhart, whose painted lime-wood carving *St Mary Magdalen* is called *Eve* or *La belle allemande* by the French.^{xlvi} Besides borrowing the title of this mediaeval nude, Max Ernst indulged in a playful allusion to his own painting *The Creation of Eve*, or *La belle Jardinière* of 1923, which depicts a combination between a female figure and a bird. The accumulation of erotic references thus extended from the sinful lover of the gospels via the biblical Fall to the birth of Venus, goddess of love, represented here by a sea shell. The ancient myth of Venus' birth in the foam was given universal currency by Sandro Botticelli's painting. The sea shell is an age-old symbol of the resurrection, which crops up in many places in Max Ernst's work.

In the earlier prints *Les pampas* (*The Pampas*), and *Elle garde son secret* (*She Keeps her Secret*) in the *Histoire naturelle*, he had given it a fresh twist, by converting paper rubbings of shells into trees, and he called a whole series of paintings, which he made in the second half of the twenties, *Fleurs coquillages* (*Flower Shells*). The sea shell represents, for him, the theme of metamorphosis. It may be interpreted as an emblem of creativity and of the act of making things visible, comparable, in respect, to the egg form as symbol for the creation of a new world. Even the flower-pot is a Dadaistic variation in this concatenation of meanings, and acquires its own internal meaning in addition to its everyday, geometrical form.

The basic rectangular form of the sculpture *Oiseau-Tête* (*Bird-Head*) may be set beside the circular form of *La belle allemande*. The flat metal plate representing the head or body of the figure stands on two triangular feet, whose narrow sides project forwards. This time, the base is quadrangular rather than cylindrical in shape, and thus picks up the form of the sculpture as a whole. The plate representing the body and head is modelled with three triangles: the lowest triangle, with its pointed corners, and the top triangle, with its blunt corners, make a smooth join with the flat surface, whilst the sharp-edged pyramid of the middle triangle thrusts straight through the surface. This middle triangle represents the nose and is supplemented by a rounded indentation for the mouth and two casts Penrose's stone for the eyes. Above the head, a fish-head protrudes through the surface, at right angles to it. It is composed of two casts of Penrose's stone and a pair of pincers. In the original

version in plaster this second head consisted of a cast of a long flat pebble, which chimed in with the pod-shaped form of *La belle allemande*. In the photograph, it is still easy to make out the line between the eyes marking the division between the two halves, on top of which the artist added further casts, to the front and back of the circular disk. This small detail illustrates the lengths to which Max Ernst went, in his efforts to develop a clear, restricted vocabulary of geometrical forms which he could then apply in an infinite variety of combinations. As Joseph Breitenbach's photograph proves, the plaster sculpture broke, some years after it was made. The modified version for the bronze couples two heads with a standing bird and a floating fish. The fusion of these forms, alluding to the opposing elements of air and water, is consistent with the Surrealist practice of abolishing the distinctions between different categories. This metaphor for surrealism is a re-enactment in the third dimension of the processes involved in painting, such as *Loplop présente* (*Loplop presents*). The reference to the Loplop figure in Ernst's own easel paintings is so unmistakable that formal comparisons with Alberto Giacometti's sculptures of the end of the 1920s^{xlvii} or Tusyan masks from Upper Volta,^{xlviii} which only became known in Europe after the Second World War, merely demonstrate the possibility of some interesting parallels rather than providing evidence of direct influence.

The last sculpture belonging to the 1934-35 series is *Gai* (*Gay*). This has a foot made out of a tetrahedron, which looks like a single triangle when viewed from the front. The apex of the tetrahedron is surmounted by a biomorphic form, which already existed as a separate element (along with other elements which served as a starting-point for the sculpture), to judge from the photograph of *Jeu de constructions anthropomorphes*. On the left-hand side, between this and the foot, it is possible to make out a sharpened crayon with a prism-shaped shaft, which Max Ernst inserted diagonally between the two forms. For the main part of the figure, Ernst superimposed overlapping rectangular and quadrangular surfaces to which eyes were originally applied, according to the photograph, whilst the metal sheet at the top is furnished with the stylised forms of an eye and a nose, which together resemble the handles of a pair of scissors. Max Ernst clearly used this imprint of bent wire, laid flat on the surface, to give stronger emphasis to the surface planes, whose essential clarity was a prerequisite for creating the impression of depth in a body built up out of trapezoidal forms, attached at the sides. Here, Ernst again took as his theme the alternation between illusion and reality. Even the biomorphic form is inserted between the triangle, rectangle and quadrangle in such a manner that it resembles a lozenge, at first sight. The crayon-bottle, in particular, draws attention to the alternation of forms. It is in two parts and consists, respectively, of a cambered tip, and an octagonal, pyramid-shaped stump, with flat surfaces.

Surrealism and the Object

In May 1936 Max Ernst took part in the 'Exposition surréaliste d'objets' in the Galerie Charles Ratton, which normally specialised in African, Oceanic and American objects. André Breton had organised this survey show and structured it in different categories, listed in an accompanying issue of the periodical *Cahiers d'Art*: Objets mathématiques. Objets naturels. Objets sauvages. Objets trouvés. Objets irrationnels. Objets ready made. Objets interprétés. Objets incorporés. Objets mobiles. (Geometrical objects, natural objects, wild objects, found objects, irrational objects, ready-made objects, interpreted objects, assimilated objects, mobile objects.) André Breton subsumed Max Ernst's works under the headings 'Objets naturels incorporés' (incorporated natural objects), 'objets trouvés' (found objects) and 'Objets surréalistes' (surrealist objects). The assemblage *Objet mobile recommandé aux familles* (*Mobile Object Recommended for Family Use*), which Ernst had made specially for the exhibition, fell into this last category: L'objet que j'exposerai et qui sera assez beau je pense est encore chez le menuisier, je ne l'aurai pas avant lundi ou mardi. (The object that I

shall exhibit, and that I think will be rather beautiful, is still with the carpenter; I shall not have it before Monday or Tuesday).^{xlix} This wood sculpture makes reference to the surrealist conception of the object, developed, above all, by André Breton and Salvador Dalí in the early thirties. In his 1931 text, *L'objet fantôme (The Phantom Object)*, André Breton had already written: Tout récemment encore j'ai vivement insisté auprès de tous mes amis pour qu'ils donnassent suite à la proposition de Dalí, concernant la fabrication d'objets animables, manifestement érotiques, je veux dire destinés à procurer, par des moyens indirects, une émotion sexuelle particulière. (I recently strongly urged all my friends to give practical effect to Dalí's proposal to make overtly erotic, mobile objects, that is, objects whose purpose is to a specific sexual thrill, by indirect means).¹ Breton was basically concerned with the foreing up of thought processes. He also alluded to this fundamental concern in his contributions *Crise de l'objet (Crisis of the Object)* to the double issue of the periodical *Cahiers d'Art* devoted to the object. In this text he makes it clear that the point of representing objects which cropped up in dreams was to devalue the currency of every day, utilitarian objects and, above all, to give objective value to the life of dreams. All thought freed by Surrealism from the constraints of reason, aesthetics and ethics might thus be said to have acquired objective value. According to Breton, it was necessary to establish what Paul Éluard referred to as the 'Physics of Poetry' and this was also the aim of the surrealist object, created from the combined effects of transforming everyday objects and alienating them from their familiar function.^{li} Breton's text was prefaced by illustrations of numerous geometrical models, which Max Ernst had discovered in the Institut Poincaré in Paris. Man Ray photographed these and a selection of them was exhibited in the Galerie Charles Ratton. As a pendant to the geometrical objects, Max Ernst added a spinning-wheel to his assemblage *Objet mobile recommandé aux familles*. This was attached so that it could move on a horizontal axis and was presented by an anthropomorphous Loplop figure with a screwed-on spherical head and hair made of hemp. Max Ernst gave two sets of meaning to this useable object: on the one hand, its mobility depicted sexual behaviour; on the other, it was reminiscent of the intersection of curves of polarisation and suggested a link between undulatory motion and the power of seeing.

At the same time, Max Ernst completed a collage for the catalogue of the International Exhibition of Surrealism in London, which was re-used for the colophon of the retrospective of his sculpture at the Galerie Le Point Cardinal and the Musée Grimaldi, and thus acquired emblematic significance. For this collage, he had recourse to a reproduction of the Apollo of Belvedere, stuck onto it a head with a wide-open mouth, put a hat onto this, added complex geometrical shapes to the statue and furnished the outstretched hand with an image of a surface curving away in opposite directions. The corresponding photograph of this geometrical model was placed opposite an accompanying text by André Breton in the review *Cahiers d'Art*. Max Ernst's choice of this image was determined by its prominent position in the review and above all the opportunity for combining disparate elements. Apollo was also a deliberate choice for the collage and for the Surrealists' group exhibition, in his role as the Greek god of the arts and patron of the muses. The hat and echoing laughter are included by Ernst as references to the original inspiration provided by his collage art and to the Dadaist spirit of iconoclasm. With the aid of classical sculpture, Max Ernst thus combines in his collage a mythological figure and a geometrical object and achieves the emblematic fusion of his formal and thematic repertoire.

The Surrealist Palace in Saint-Martin-d'Ardèche

One year after the great Surrealism exhibition in London, the Mayor Gallery put on a solo exhibition of work by Max Ernst. During this period, Ernst met and fell in love with the young painter, Leonora Carrington. In 1938, the couple moved to Saint-Martin-d'Ardèche, where they

discovered and bought a tumbledown seventeenth- and eighteenth-century farmhouse outside the village. Together, they renovated the entire complex. One room was given an extra window and extended into a loggia; a balcony was added at roof level; and the walls were plastered. In the process, Max Ernst provided the house with bas-reliefs, wall paintings and free-standing sculpture in reinforced concrete. The façade beneath the loggia was decorated with a group of three figures. He incorporated into this one of the joists from the wall, which lay to hand, and added a head and two upraised arms at one end, thus transforming the joist into the body of a male figure. On the rectangular surface itself he placed a small winged creature. Beside the male figure, which related back stylistically to the Loplop works, he modelled a female figure, carrying a lion's head in her left hand; her own bird-shaped head is placed on a long neck and encircled by a fish. These naked, timorous hybrids of human beings, animals and birds were constructed by piecing together ready-made body parts and joining them with limbs. For the body parts, Max Ernst drew on his existing thematic repertoire from his collages, sculptures and paintings. Thus, the head of the small winged creature was made from the reworked cast of a bulbous pot. The gesture of the large male figure and the stance and wing-position of the small creature, as well as the gaping mouth of the large figure, may be traced back to the painting *L'ange du foyer* (*The Angel of the Hearth*) of the previous year. The long neck with the bird's head was prefigured by the Oedipus section of the collage novel *Une semaine de bonté* and the outstretched arm with the lion's head was a quotation from the cover for the special Max Ernst issue of *Cahiers d'Art* of 1937. The head encircled by a fish can be traced back to the year 1929, when the motif first cropped up in an oil painting in the series *À l'intérieur de la vue*. The fish-bird combination corresponds to the mingling of air and water, which Max Ernst had repeatedly treated as a theme in the twenties, as a way of demonstrating the surrealist abolition of the distinctions between opposites and between the different genres. The female figure may be interpreted, with the aid of these motifs, as an introspective Sphinx, absorbed in the enigma of her riddle. Her passive, introverted attitude contrasts with the aggressive posture of the two angels of the hearth, who challenge visitors as they come over the top of the hill and attempt to warn them off. The surrealist sphinx leans to the right and points in the direction of a narrow neighbouring garden, surrounded by walls. On the higher wall at the back, there was a free-standing sculpture made out of a combination of a male and a female figure. Max Ernst made casts of flower-pots for the heads of both these figures and cemented onto them horns, made from three-pronged pitchforks (with one prong removed in the case of the female figure). This sculpture, too, was made in stages; after completing the woman, Ernst first made the man's head as a single piece and then put together his body. The man holds a finned amphibian fast between his teeth whilst a second creature lurks in his hair. These figures would appear to a couple, to judge by their posture and the direction of their gaze; the man's trident is an attribute of Poseidon and the fish's tail denotes a mermaid.

Max Ernst decorated the breastwork of the staircase leading up to the loggia in internal courtyard with two more nixies which were female hybrids with fishy, reptilian attributes. The lower mermaid was richly appraised in a scaly dress, which served to identify her as the Melusina of the old French fairy tale. This lavishly adorned nixie was followed up to the exterior wall of the loggia by a naked nixie, with a narrow, snake-like, bifurcated fish's tail. This figure can also be identified with Melusina, after her metamorphosis, for according to legend, this sea sprite turned herself into a snake from the belly button down, every Saturday. André Breton's novel *Nadja*, published in 1928, the heroine identified herself with this legendary figure: Nadja often depicted herself as Melusina, the mythical figure to whom she felt closest of all. I noticed that she even tried to take the resemblance as far as she could in ordinary life, by requiring her hairdresser, at any price, to divide her hair into five distinctive bunches and leave enough over for a starfish in the centre of her forehead.^{lii} Max Ernst incorporates a starfish into his mermaid's head-dress, and by thus quoting

from the novel draws André Breton's private mythology into the orbit of his image. However, this mermaid is also endowed with a pair of wings which would seem to allow for the possibility of identifying her as a siren. Characteristically, Max Ernst alludes to a number of different legends and mixes them up, in the same way as he fashions his hybrid creatures out of a variety of disparate elements. Ernst used pots, jugs and tubes the head and body of the naked fish-bird figure and blended these different forms, by adding them together, in series.

Two circular masks surmounted the doors opening onto the staircase. Max Ernst made these by assembling a variety of metal parts from some farm machinery. The masks were a pendant to *Les asperges de la lune* and may traced back to this earlier sculpture. The eyes of the first mask were formed two broad rings, whilst the mouth of the second mask was given especial emphasis through its circular form and protending tongue which hung out. The eyes the second mask were made up of two short cylindrical sections which projected at right-angles to the surface of the disk and looked like closed eyes, when viewed through the narrow sides that were visible. Finally, a double bust projected out over the window at first floor level, and the upper of the two heads held a fish in its mouth. Max Ernst made the broad shoulder section the upper head with the fish in its mouth by standing two casts of flower-pots next to each other at an angle, and filling in the gap. For the head he used the cast of an upturned pot, moulded into a face. He then put together the lower of two heads out of two basic elements - a bulbous pot for the upper part of the cranium and a flower-pot for the chin and neck. Here too, he indicated the eyes simply by making shallow indentations. This double bust was visible from a long way off and provided a counterpart to the main group on the external wall.

Max Ernst furnished the walls of the loggia with a number of different figures. On the side wall leading to the point where the staircase started he painted a horned chimaera standing on a snake with outstretched wings. For the back wall he chose the motifs of an owl-woman, lying on top of a fishman and one of his Loplop presentation figures, providing the frame for a projecting section of the wall with a quadrangular niche. The bodies of these figures were outlined by simple, swinging contours; in contrast, their heads, mouths and eyes were sculpturally formed, and Loplop and the fish-man crowned with three-pronged pitchforks. During his time at Saint-Martin-d'Ardèche Max Ernst also completed a related assemblage, to which he gave the title *Tannhäuser*. This consists of a three-pronged wooden fork and a cast-iron lion's head, taken from a billiards table. Ernst had a photograph taken of himself holding a pitchfork, which identified him as the bearded Poseidon holding his trident. Ernst's allusion to the god of the sea was quite intentional, since he identified with this figure from Greek mythology, through his own private mythology and through the theme of his series of paintings, *Nageur aveugle (Blind Swimmer)* and metaphorical description of the artist as a diver into the unconscious. The assemblage is painted light green, in reference not only to the presence of objects found in the sea, but to the title. According to the popular German legend, the Minnesanger Tannhäuser was lured into the magic mountain by Venus and then tried to save his soul, by making a pilgrimage to Rome. God assured him of redemption through working the miracle of the flowering staff, but Tannhäuser, despairing at what he was told by the Pope, soon returned to the magic mountain.

As André Breton put it, in his essay of 1933, *Le message automatique (The Automatic Message)*^{liii}, Ferdinand Cheval's *Palais idéal* provided a 'mediumistic antecedent' for the Surrealists' attempts at giving artistic form to their immediate living space. Cheval's naïve, imposing, life's work at Hauterives, not far from Saint-Martin d'Ardèche, was celebrated by members of the group. In 1932, Max Ernst paid homage to Cheval in one of his Loplop collages, and Leonora Carrington mentioned, in her story *Little Francis*, a man who spent his entire life turning 'the landscape into a zoo' and making 'lions and tigers, cabinet ministers, centaurs, historical characters' out of stones.^{liv}

In 1938 Lee Miller had visited and photographed the *Palais idéal* at Hauterives. The following year, she and Roland Penrose came to stay at Saint-Martin-d'Ardèche and their photographs of Max Ernst's *Palais surréel* were published in the *Cahiers d'Art*, with a poem by Georges Hugnet^{lv} by way of an introduction. In the middle of the war, too, the *London Magazine* drew its readers' attention to the ensemble and in June 1940 published a page of photographs by Lee Miller and Roland Penrose.^{lvi}

Max Ernst, who was persecuted as a 'degenerate artist', had to leave Europe after being interned a number of times. Leonora Carrington fled to Spain while he was in German internment. In Marseilles Max Ernst was reunited with many of the Surrealists as well as the collector, Peggy Guggenheim. The latter paid for him to fly to America and the couple arrived in New York on 14 July 1941.

The Long Island Sculptures

Max Ernst's marriage to Peggy Guggenheim did not last long. He had already met the artist Dorothea Tanning by the end of 1942. After a summer holiday in Sedona, the two of them spent the summer months of 1944 in Great River, on Long Island. The gallery owner Julien Levy, whom Ernst had invited to join them, reported: Max and Dorothea have found an old house with any number of nooks and crannies on a solitary part of the coastline of Long Island, where we can spend the summer together. It is pleasantly situated in the small creek of Great River, on the opposite side to elegant, mondain Hampton Beach, but it is possible to bathe here, too... Max has converted the garage into a workshop and there pours plaster, which he has brought with him from Paris, into forms of astonishing simplicity and originality. He uses all kinds of tools, which he has found lying around in the garage, and even kitchen utensils.^{lvii}

Julien Levy's observation that the working material came from Paris may be taken as an indication that the new plaster sculptures were linked to the series which Ernst had made ten years previously. On Long Island, too, Max Ernst worked on several sculptures at the same time. On this occasion, the total came to ten; and once again, the workshop and atmosphere within it have been captured in a photograph, in much the same way as with *Jeu de constructions antropomorphes* in Paris. The view into the garage shows four sculptures in plaster, in addition to a heap of component parts, laid out on a chest of drawers: it is possible to make out numerous cones, a squared stone, a bent plane and a variety of cylindrical sections, as well as the upended flower tableau *Jeune femme en forme de fleur* (*Young Woman in the Shape of a Flower*). Casts of individual objects, such as buckets, bowls, boxes, tubs and tins are also lying around. In the left background it is possible to discern the figure of the *White Queen*. This sculpture in plaster, which no longer exists, was constructed from circular forms. Max Ernst placed the base at an angle, on two cones, and stacked three casts of plates onto this. The plates, in turn, were fixed on a slant, to give the semblance of bringing the whole into a precarious state of equilibrium. The head was composed of two forms - a circular bowl and a cylinder - and given two hemispheres for eyes, and a beak made out of two casts taken from spoons. Two thin, bent, circular planes supported the bowl-shaped head on the disk-shaped body and gave it stability.

Max Ernst now went on to make a suitable pendant for this piece, in much the same way that in Paris he had created *Oiseau-Tête*, with its emphasis on the rectangle, as a counterpart to the circular form which dominated *La belle allemande*. This pendant can be seen in the left foreground of the photograph of the studio. *An anxious Friend* stands on a rectangular base, which is stepped back slightly towards the top. The legs and head are stepped back in a similar fashion, and this sets off a chain of associations, from the disrupted surface of the base via a framed picture plane to a highlighted presentation panel for the reflective figure of Loplop. Whilst the lower and upper

surfaces are of almost equal size, the surface area of the body in the middle is larger, and its dimensions correspond to those of the base. In addition to establishing similarities, Max Ernst applies the principle of variation, as a contrary method of composition. The shape the horizontal base is repeated in the central body plate of the figure, but in a thinner version, angled upwards until it is almost vertical; the tall rectangle of the feet is transposed into the broad rectangle of the head, and the vertical thrust of figure is carried over into the steep angle of its upturned gaze. The surfaces are very varied, yet they too are bound together by repetitive elements. Max Ernst divided the flat areas of the body and legs symmetrically, with the imprint of a drill, and he established a visual link between the head and the body by giving them with a concave indentation and two smaller convex protuberances. His work the twenties and thirties had already incorporated surfaces which had been treated in relief, as in the case of the editioned object *Ci-fut une hirondelle* and the Loplop painting *Anthropomorphic Figure*, of 1930.^{lviii} Another instance of this was the sand drawing *Fait pour périr* (*Made to Perish*), which Max Ernst completed by Lake Pontchartrain near New Orleans, in September 1941, shortly after his arrival in America. The wings of this lion-headed sphinx were made from a series of impressions of a spoon and, as Julien Levy related at another point, Max Ernst had alienated this functional object from its original purpose by using it as a form for making an impression and as a working tool, in his sculpture *An anxious Friend*. As a comparison with the Loplop picture reveals, the body area of *An anxious Friend* is not framed. Instead, the figure seems to present an open book - a map of the stars with planets and spiral nebula. It thus becomes takes on the identity of Atlas, holding up the firmament.

The idea for the supporting structure of the head found a precedent in Friedrich Kiesler's designs for the architecture and layout of Peggy Guggenheim's first, public exhibition of her collection, 'Art of this Century'. For this, Kiesler had arranged for the unframed pictures to float in space, by suspending them in front of the concave wall of the vaulted room, at some distance from the recycled baseball bats to which they were attached.^{lix} The head plate of the second figure sitting at Atlas' back is likewise set back, at a distance. The body plate, furnished with two hemispherical shapes, measures approximately the same as the front side of the leg plate, but it is set at an angle which gives formal emphasis to the significance of the seated posture and the figure's attitude of repose. This second figure is Heracles. According to the Greek legend, Atlas went to fetch him the golden apples of the Hesperides. In the meantime, Heracles took the weight of the firmament upon his own shoulders. Since Atlas was unwilling to resume the burden on his return, Heracles had to outwit him, so he asked for a short rest. Atlas consented, and Heracles obtained the apples, here indicated by hemispheres. This work is Janus-headed and has two titles, like the sculpture *White Queen*, which also bears the title *Jeune femme en forme de lunes* (*Young Woman in the Shape of Moons*). *An anxious Friend* has the additional title *Un ami empressé* (*A Solicitous Friend*). Both names apply to the mythological figure of Atlas, for according to the legend of Perseus the son of the Titans was turned to stone by the Medusa's gaze. The first title plays on this and is reinforced by the figure's pose and the positioning of its head, whilst the second title alludes, in contrast, to Atlas' helpfulness to Heracles. There are also correspondences between the other works produced on Long Island. Through its description, *Jeune femme en forme de lunes*, *White Queen* can be interpreted as a companion piece to *Jeune femme en forme de fleur*, as if Max Ernst had intended the names to indicate not only the forms used to depict the personages, but the personages themselves - Luna and Flora, the Roman goddesses of the Moon and of Spring. Two other works which went together were *Femme assise* (*Seated Woman*), of which a photograph provides the only surviving documentary evidence and *Jeune homme au coeur battant* (*Young with beating Heart*). Both have a rectangular base and are constructed from almost identical forms. In both cases, Max Ernst formed the bowed legs of the figures by placing a cylindrical bucket at an angle, inside a bowl a flat bottom and

curved edge, taking a cast of the space in between and repeating the process, once the first form had dried. The body of the male figure was taken from a cast of a slightly distorted metal box. Ernst then inserted a spoon into the top of this, while the plaster was still wet. After the plaster had dried, he removed the covering of the mould and placed the cast vertically on the bowed legs, so that the curved recess which had been formed now inclined forwards. As the case of the editioned object *Ci-fut une hirondelle*, the oval form can be interpreted either as arching outwards or as bending inwards, so as to suggest the beating of a heart. For the abdomen of the female figure he made a bowl-shaped form, conjured up out of the space between two long half tubes. Max Ernst used thin curved planes for the heads of both figures, but this time took casts of weighing pans from a set of scales. The heads were attached to long necks, similar to those he had made for *An anxious Friend*. Both figures were thus given volume and presence, in marked contrast to their simple clarity and light airiness.

In the photograph of the studio *Jeune homme au coeur battant* stands to the right on a wooden barrel. *Moonmad* can be seen next to it, to the left. Max Ernst asked a local carpenter to make rough copies in mahogany of both figures and he himself then worked up the details and gave them a finishing polish. The first bronze casts were then taken from the plasters, at the beginning of the fifties.

Moonmad has a much more complex structure than *Jeune homme au coeur battant*. Admittedly, for *Moonmad*, Ernst made fresh casts of almost all the same components that he had used for his earlier, male figure, but he combined these with much more complicated formai elements. He took over unaltered the rectangular base, bowed legs and body, but did not replace the mould for the heart. In the right angles between the figure and the base he added a third supporting leg, which was at variance with the bowed legs and added to the overall complexity of the figure. Once again he had recourse to a bowl shape, but this time, instead of using a round vessel, he inserted two box shapes with different diameters. For the upper part of the body he adopted a similar approach, with three acentrically positioned cylinders, producing a total of four circles or segments of circles, including the circular outline of the torso itself. The legs at the front were still formed from two segments of circles and the back leg used three, but for the head he now raised the total to five full circles. Here he modified his technique of casting for the third time. In Paris he had only taken casts of hollow spaces, for his flower-pot sculptures. On Long Island, for the first time, he made forms from the intervening spaces and created the head by a combination of both processes. He filled up a hemispherical bowl with plaster, pressed an iron ring into the material, it was till wet, smoothed and hollowed out the internal surface and, finally, imprinted concave forms, such as egg shells and egg cups, for the eyes, and a convex form, like the scoop of ladle, for the mouth, whose protruding lips had already been marked out by a smaller ring. Max Ernst finished off *Moonmad* with two bent horns and two curved bowl shapes, corresponding to the male and female figures. These forms, thus augmented, are now brought into play: open and closed form follow each other, in dose succession, jagged silhouettes answer swinging contours and close-ups alternate with longer vistas. Throughout all this, Max Ernst makes playful allusion to the moon. He shows the crescent moon, the full moon with its halo, the half moon, the chubby face of the moon and the friendly moon of children's books. The phases of the moon correspond to the phases of the night and to the surrealist evocation of dreams.

For Ernst, playing with forms is the equivalent to playing chess. The determining factors in both are intuition and reflection. Marcel Duchamp and Man Ray had turned the game of chess into one of the principal themes of Surrealism.^{lx} Many of the Surrealists were fascinated by the mathematics lecturer, Charles L. Dodgson, who had published his writings under the pseudonym of Lewis Carroll. Doubtless, the main reason for this was Carroll's opposition to everyday reality and

received ideas, which permeated the whole of his dream narration, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, of 1865; but also a shared interest in the game of chess, which formed the basis of his story *Through the Looking-Glass*.^{lxi} The chess set which Max Ernst designed in Long Island was executed in maple wood and walnut wood. For the figures he resorted to simple mathematical shapes, once more built up on a circular base. The pawns were made out of cones, and the castles and queens out of a combination of cones, truncated cones and spherical segments. The heads of the knights' horses were formed from bent horns, as in the case of *Moonmad*, and the bishops pieced together from casts of spoons. Finally, the kings were made by slicing through cylinders at an angle and setting them onto truncated cones. Thus, the sedate ellipse of the king's body is placed beside the decorative circle of the queen's head.

The use which Max Ernst made of these figures proves that, for him, chess was really a game of forms. In 1952 he went back to the bishop and combined it with two new figurative forms, to make *Fou, reine et cheval (Bishop, Queen and Knight)*. He also took some individual pieces from his first chess set of 1929 and presented them on a plinth as a threesome. Finally, Ernst made a combination of his two chess sets - that of 1929, which had been taken from impressions of anthropomorphic forms and that of 1944, which had been constructed from geometrical forms. From the first version he took the castle and pawns, as well as the king and queen, whom he endowed with new, mask-like heads. From the second version he selected the bishop and the knight, supplementing the horned form of the latter with a horse's head. This third version of 1966 was then executed in gold and silver by the goldsmith François Hugo.^{lxiii}

In the last three sculptures from Sedona the chessboard takes the form of a table. Two individual forms in the sculpture *Tortue (Tortoise)* also have a link with chess: the two conical legs supporting the body made up of casts of plates; and the head, composed, once again, of two spoon shapes, positioned at opposite ends to each other.

Max Ernst turns this game with anthropomorphic constructions into the subject of his *Table mise (The Table is Set)*, where a quadrangular table top is laid with a variety of different forms. This motif may be traced back to one of the prints in his portfolio, *Fiat modes pereat ars*. However, it also recalls Alberto Giacometti's display models, variable games board sculptures, symbolically loaded *Projet pour une place (Model for a Square)* of 1932, which was in the Peggy Guggenheim collection,^{lxiii} and the sculpture *La Table (The Table)*, which had been exhibited in the Galerie Pierre Colle in 1933, with a catalogue text by Max Ernst and Tristan Tzara.^{lxiv} The polyhedron on Giacometti's high table is quite as complex and as simple as the double cone in *Table mise*, which is constructed on an elliptical surface, resting on a square plinth. In contrast to Giacometti, however, Max Ernst displays not single figures on their own, but four groups of figures. In the foreground the tip of a cone juts out of the flat base, this motif is repeated by another form with a convex surface. In a different group, forms emerge into view, merge with each other and are supplemented with an additional square and double cone. In the fourth group Max Ernst presents a bent plane and a crooked plane on a plate, through which once again the tip of a cone protrudes. Lively tensions are created, through the presentation and combination of these different possibilities, and the relations between corner and edge, surface and void, acquire added significance. *Table mise* but serves the dual function on studio table and presentation area.

The forms themselves are the building blocks and play bricks which Max Ernst used for making the remainder of his Long Island sculptures, and they are recombined one last time in *The King playing with the Queen*. Three cones representing pawns stand on the front table which is the playing area, and are backed up by a bishop, a knight and a castle. The queen, on the left hand side, has been considerably enlarged and provided with a different head, resembling that of the king, in the last three chess sets. The mighty king, of the sculpture's title, is planted onto the second, slightly lower,

table at the back. His body and arms are formed by shell-like bent planes, whose curves are picked up by his horns. His flat rectangular face is a formal echo of the flat surface on which he stands and the chessboard in front of it. He dominates the group, with his size and the all-encompassing sweep of his arms. With one hand he takes the queen into his protective embrace; with the other he clutches a double cone at the ready. The king is presented both as chess player and as the artist himself, playing with forms and transforming them by his thought and intuition.

In the years that followed, Max Ernst also turned his attention to ways of dealing with geometrical objects in his painting. Man Ray who, like Ernst, had had to emigrate to America in the Second World War, took with him from Paris, in 1940, the photographs which he had made at the Institut Pointcaré. The two artists were reunited in California and celebrated their double wedding in Beverly Hills in 1946: Man Ray to Juliet Browner and Max Ernst to Dorothea Tanning. In the years after that Man Ray's photographs provided the inspiration and point of departure for a whole series of paintings, of his own and by Max Ernst.^{lxv} Max Ernst used some such photographs for his painting *Le régal des dieux (The Feast of the Gods)* of 1948. Likewise, the forms of the eyes in his drawing *Mask* of 1947 and the manner in which he reworked his painting of the same year, *Jeune homme intrigué par le vol d'une mouche non-euclidienne (Young Man Intrigued by the Flight of a Non-Euclidean Fly)* can be traced back to these photographs of geometrical objects.^{lxvi} Five years after painting the *Jeune homme* (1942), Ernst added a head to the linear drip structure of the original work, which had been created by an indirect drip technique which he had invented. In part, he followed the existing network of lines, but he also reinforced the sweeping contours of the geometrical body. However, Ernst only took over details of the geometrical object, as a formal stimulus to his interpretation, or his 'inwards-looking gaze' as he termed it, and he expressly inserted two additional triangles into the sockets of the eyes. With a few brushstrokes he transformed the left-hand part into a fish's head and the right-hand part into a bird's head, once more making emblematic use of these creatures of the of opposites, and abolition of the distinction between active and passive.

The Decorations for the House in Sedona and *Capricorn*

In 1946, Dorothea Tanning and Max Ernst moved to New York. In the small village of Sedona they bought a piece of land overlooking Oak Creek and built a simple wooden house for themselves. After the water supply was connected to the house one year later, Max Ernst added a spacious extension, built out of breeze blocks.^{lxvii} He decorated the outside walls with several friezes of masks, making up one large frieze, composed of eight individual elements and a small frieze with four motifs. He surrounded one of the outside windows with eleven stones, which framed the upper embrasure of the window and extended both ways across the entire width of the walls. He also lined upper and lower edges of another tripartite window with decorated stones.^{lxviii} Finally, he furnished the exterior walls of the internal courtyard with a frieze. All in all, Ernst decorated forty-six breeze blocks with heads, gargoyles, masks, animals, constellations and signs. Twenty years later, some of these stone reliefs were cast in bronze - namely, the twelve individual parts of the two friezes and a further fourteen blocks. In addition, in 1968 Max Ernst had bronze casts taken of two sculptures in the round, resembling a head and a seated figure, which he had made for the house and placed against chimney. Max Ernst emphasised the fact that the individual groups belonged together by adding linear forms to the large and small friezes, at a second stage the work, and allowed his imagination to be guided by the structure of the wall.

The linear form of the bodies and the motif of the striding figure go back to the Loplop figures of the thirties. The three figures in the large frieze are depicted a wild, dancing posture and counterbalance the row of individual heads, amongst which a bird has been included. In contrast,

the central motif of the small frieze is a fish flanked by winged and finned creatures. A variation of the Loplop figure is also included here: its upstretched arms and entwined legs function as frames for two presentation panels, one of which is opened upwards and the other downwards. Max Ernst gave clear contours to both friezes, but was freer in his use of the motifs on the external wall of the internal courtyard. Here he not only used indirect impressions taken from a variety of forms, but made strong gestural incisions into the cement, while it was still damp. In this frieze, the fish is transformed into an eye form. The sun is surrounded by rays scratched the surface of the wall and these are reflected in the surface of the moon, which has one eye open and the other shut. Here, Max Ernst tackles the themes of visibility and invisibility, day and night, upper and lower and light and darkness. The heavenly bodies of the sun and moon also provide the motifs for the window wall, together with countless living creatures of air, land and water. The remaining stones come from the front façade of the house. They, too, are decorated with incisions and the imprints of objects, but also supplemented with found objects, such as metal tubes, an iron trident and metal washers fastened with nails. Patrick Waldberg, Max Ernst's first biographer, wrote about the works from Sedona: Max Ernst's art is like that of the Hopis, Navahos and Apaches, who were his neighbours for more than ten years, in that it is neither realistic nor abstract, but emblematic. With few exceptions, he never attempted to make a faithful copy of the outline of the human form (or, indeed, the form of any object). In all his work, human beings are represented at one remove, by something else, such as a phantom form or mask, most frequently a bird, but occasionally also a schematised human figure, whose head might be a right angle, triangle or a round. The Indians, too, use figures and masks - simple, geometric forms - in their pictures. Sometimes the head is a circle, at other times a square or a triangle. The ornaments with which the Indians adorn themselves, whether they be checked, striped or in parallel bands, symbolise the sea, the clouds, the days and seasons. Form is used to depict, not appearances but an idea.^{lxix}

Strict frontality and simple forms reinforce the emblematic character of the individual masks and motifs. In Ernst's large frieze, the allusions to the spellbinding dances of the Hopis and Zunis and above all the multitude of different creatures are to be interpreted as an artist's homage to the native inhabitants of America. Ernst did not borrow specific elements from the art of the American Indians - rather, he was fascinated by the similarities which he detected between their work and his own. The ritualistic element in the Indians' work matched the emotional power of his own art. Indeed, Ernst had taken an interest in the art and culture of the Hopi and Zuni Indians and collected their Katchina dolls, ever since his arrival in the USA. In New York he frequently visited the Museum of the American Indian, which he had come to know about from André Breton, and on his first journey across the continent with Peggy Guggenheim he had visited an exhibition of primitive American art in San Francisco, where he had had been heard to exclaim: 'Wonderful! The best thing that I have seen in this country.'^{lxx} In Sedona, he made two large, free-standing sculptures, in addition to the decorative friezes on the side of the house. In *Femme debout (Standing Woman)*, which was destroyed and is only known to us from a photograph, Ernst combined two traditional strands in his sculptural work. A long, thin form, reminiscent of the thin stems of *Les asperges de la lune*, is furnished with a plate-like face, which goes back to *The King playing with the Queen*. Here, Max Ernst combined elements from his series of works dating back to 1934 and 1944, respectively, created on different continents and separated by a gap of ten years. The slender body of the woman is elegantly curved and stands in marked contrast, both to the rectangular base, and to the form of the head, which is only brought to life by the circular mould used for the mouth. This standing woman summarises Ernst's sculptural achievement, but also makes reference to his paintings. It can be seen as yet another presentation figure with a painted tableau for a head. In 1948 Max Ernst also worked on his largest sculpture, to which he gave the name *Capricorn*.^{lxxi} Here, the female presentation figure cropped up

again, in the form of a sceptre. However, the facial area was transformed into a mask, taken from a cast of an egg box, with the addition of holes for eyes and a slit for the mouth. The shaft forming the body was made from casts of bottles, stacked vertically, one on top of the other. As with the flower-pot sculptures that he had made in Paris, Ernst joined up truncated cones of equal radii, to create a gently undulating surface from top to bottom. The sceptre was held by an imperious king, sitting on his throne with a slim mermaid at his side. For both figures and for the two creatures on the king's lap and hand Max Ernst used the same iron rods, rings and disks as provided the supporting armature and a substantial proportion of the basic forms for this sculpture in cement and pumice-stone. The king took up the largest amount of space on the pedestal. He was built up on a quadrangular base, representing the lower part of his body, from which his feet peeped out in front. His abdomen, which also served as a bench, was supplemented by a back rest with arms on each side. The neck and horned head jutted up from the shoulders of this utilisable trunk. Max Ernst added a ridge and a washer to the face, to indicate, respectively, the eyes, and mouth. In his left hand the king presented a circular fishy creature, with antennae-like feelers on its head. The tail fin was bent forwards and, when viewed from the front, looked like a presentation surface for the circular head. Beneath this, a second creature was stretched out flat. It had stuck out its tongue and held one hand protectively over its head, as if it were oppressed by the weight on top of it. The body of the mermaid ended in a fish's tail and sat bolt upright on a narrow seat. Its naked 'cello-shaped trunk gave way to an overlong neck, crowned by a circular face and a circular head. Max Ernst had rejected the original version, with two tubes for eyes, in order to give greater prominence to this dual form. In the reworked version a large fish could be seen swimming through the head and came to indicate not only locks of hair, but the waves of the sea. Ernst embellished the back of the head, like the sceptre, with a cast taken from an egg box, only this time he created a variation by omitting two of the indentations, so as to form the capital 'A' of his first name.

In 1962 Max Ernst made a plaster cast of *Capricorn*, had the individual parts transported to France, reassembled them at his new domicile in Huismes and reworked them, effecting some small changes and, in general, smoothing out the surfaces of the sculpture. Twelve bronze casts were taken of this modified version, from 1964 onwards. The biggest change was to the small fish-like creature. It was endowed with breasts and a scaly dress, making it look still more like a mermaid's daughter, and given a head with a curved shell form which owed its origins to the sculpture *Jeune homme au coeur battant*. Max Ernst offset the convex form of the head with the concave form of a fin. The mermaid herself was also altered and simplified. Max Ernst extended her fishy tail to the edge of pedestal, raised her scaly dress to the level of her thighs and remodelled her breasts into a pointed, conical shape. He smoothed out her forehead and the back side of her head by removing her coiffure. He gave a pointed form to the fish and a gentle curvature to its flight, as a means of enhancing the dynamic effect.

In an interview, Max Ernst described *Capricorn* as 'my family'.^{lxxii} The king and queen may be interpreted as a family portrait, depicting the two artists; the small creatures on the plinth of the male figure then become the dogs belonging to Max Ernst and Dorothea Tanning,^{lxxiii} one of which was named 'Katchina' after a type of doll common to the Hopi and Zuni Indians. Further interpretations can be attached to the name 'Capricorn'. Henry Miller, who contributed a text to the Max Ernst issue of the periodical *View* in 1942,^{lxxiv} had published two novels with related titles in the nineteen thirties. In *Tropic of Cancer* of 1934, he depicted his experiences in France, whilst the *Tropic of Capricorn*, which appeared in 1939, dealt his time in America. In both books, Miller drew a parallel between periods in his life and geographical places.^{lxxv} Max Ernst had become an American citizen in 1948, and his cement sculpture might thus be interpreted as a recapitulation and representation of his experiences under the southern firmament. In Greek mythology Capricornus

was the son of Pan, who was fashioned like a ram, and goat-nymph Aix, who was turned by Zeus into a constellation of stars, after her birth. In astrological lore, the sea-god Capricorn had a ram's torso and a fish's abdomen.^{lxxvi} However, Max Ernst jumbled up these mythological attributes in his imagination and gave a profusion of new meanings to the attributes with which endowed his figures. He uses these creatures from his artist's family to project a world of his own and a new mythology.

Return to Europe: The Late Sculpture

Ernst first revisited the old continent with Dorothea Tanning in 1949. The sculpture *La Parisienne* (*The Parisian Woman*) was created the following year, as a declaration of love for the old artistic metropolis, Paris. A slim figure stands on a circular pedestal. She seems to have bobbed up out of the sea, her legs evolve out of the pedestal, her head is shaped like a conch and the back of her dress is adorned with a seashell. As in the case of the earlier painting *La belle allemande*, the mythological reference is to the birth of Venus in the foaming waves. In 1953 the two artists definitively returned to France. After receiving Grand Prize for Painting at the 1954 Venice Biennale, Max Ernst began to enjoy widespread international recognition. From this time on he at last acquired means progressively to have a number of his plasters cast in bronze. He was also able to buy a house in the Touraine, in 1955.

In his new abode in Huismes Max Ernst found some agricultural machinery, which used to make two assemblages. The first of these, *Êtes-vous Niniche?* (*Are You Niniche?*), consists of two ox yokes joined by a bar to create a form which repeats the presentation figure in the small frieze. The four side parts, which are fastened to this symmetrical figure, are pierced through in a number of places and look like the heads of four animals, keeping guard or on look-out, suspiciously sniffing the air. This creature stands on a printer's block, bearing the name included in the questioning title of the work. Through this combination, Max Ernst builds up a cultural-anthropological field of tension which stretches from the earliest times to the present day, opposes agriculture to technology and makes visible the relationship between the object and description. The title alludes to his own artistic procedures, in that he draws attention to his method of examining objects for their meaning, looking into things and interpreting them anew. For his second assemblage *Deux et deux font un* (*Two and Two make One*) he modified only one object. He took a wooden box, open on two sides and filled with asparagus, tipped it forwards and extended the back side with a flat quadrangular piece of wood, from which he carved out two circular eyes and a slit for a mouth. Ten casts of the wooden model were taken in bronze and painted by the artist, in accordance with the original design, but with small individual variations, in each case. He provided the internal and external surfaces of the open box form with the contour line of a seated figure, added a circular form to the extra quadrangle of wood, to indicate a head, and painted the reverse side with the silhouette of a human body. Max Ernst used this presentation figure to interweave volumes and planes, illusion and reality. The seeming absurdity of the equation in the title is resolved when it becomes clear that two views of a space - an inside space and an outside space - and two artistic genres - painting and sculpture - are combined to make up one figure.

Max Ernst, who was expelled from the Surrealist group when he accepted the Biennale prize in Venice, emphasises through these two assemblages his descent from Dadaism and affiliations to Surrealism. At the same time he makes pregnant allusion to his artistic means: word and image, painting and sculpture.

Towards the end of the fifties and the beginning of the sixties Max Ernst created a group of eleven sculptures, as an extension of his artist's family. A photograph of 1961 clearly shows how effortlessly these new creatures were assimilated into the universe that he had peopled. The bronze

cast of the sculpture *Gai*, which had been created a quarter of a century previously, in Paris, was now placed alongside the two new sculptures, *Basse de nage* (*Born Swimmer*) and *Dream Rose*. The gaze of both these figures is directed upwards - a characteristic they share with the pair depicted in the third of these sculptures from 1959, *Fille et mère* (*Daughter and Mother*). Max Ernst formed the mother's eyes from two thin loops of wire laid on a flat surface, in a manner reminiscent of *Gai*. The gently curving convex planes of the mother's face show an affinity to certain aspects of the works made on Long Island, in much the same way that the daughter has an ancestry going back to the queens of 1944 and 1952. Throughout his œuvre Max Ernst repeatedly used borrowings of this kind, as a means of testing the validity of newly acquired formal principles, and he sometimes even went so far as to lift entire figures from his earlier works. Thus, for example, he employed a twin of the 1948 *Crouching Figure* for the small bird figure on the head of the sculpture *L'imbécile* (*The Imbecile*).

As in *L'imbécile*, the relationship between the two figures, whose smooth, richly adorned bodies are sharply differentiated from each other, is determined by theme of carrying a burden. Two forms placed towards the front of an bevelled plinth underline the contrast between the figures. With this sculpture and *La Tourangelle* (*The Woman from Tours*), who is likewise splendidly apparelled, Max Ernst creates variations on a group of presentation figures who retain their clear Loplop form in the presentation tableau, *Un Chinois égaré* (*A Chinaman gone astray*) and *Dans les rues d'Athènes* (*In the Streets of Athens*). However, Ernst here introduces an innovation, in comparison to works such as *Oiseau-Tête*, by attaching small fully three-dimensional figures to the tall rectangular surfaces the two bodies. The principal figure to do the carrying in *Dans les rues d'Athènes* is depicted as an owl, the emblem of Athena, by virtue of its head comprising a flat diagonal rectangle onto which have been modelled two large, round eyes. This wise bird is linked to Athena, the protectress of the city and goddess of wisdom, in an almost subsidiary way, as the owl was also the motif for Zeus, supreme god of the Greeks. Athena sprang from Zeus' head fully armed at birth, and this seems to be indicated by the head plate Max Ernst has given her. The female figure attached to the left hand side of the owl's body is there to indicate the goddess Athena's role as the protectress of Athens. She stood up to Poseidon, the god of the sea, in the fight for the city. The defeated god is here surrounded by the waves, and the triangular shape of his head alludes to his trident.

In addition to these disk-shaped sculptures Max Ernst also made, in the period around 1960, three stalk-shaped sculptures, whose ancestry extended from *Femme debout* to *Les asperges de la lune*. The sculpture *Âmes sœurs* (*Twin Souls*), with its bipartite structure, is most closely related to the earliest of these antecedents. In *Le génie de la Bastille* (*The Spirit of the Bastille*) the stalk which performs the dual function of carrying and presenting the principal image, has grown into a column of immense length. The slight fluting of the original form has now given way to a stronger sense of structure. Max Ernst obtained the crude irregular surface pattern by taking a cast of a fishnet. It is possible to make out a small woven net of the kind that he used, in a photograph of his studio in Huismes, where it leans up against the left-hand side of the wall in the background. After the plaster was dry, Ernst cut up the mesh of the net, took four casts and placed them one on top of the other to form the shaft of the column. On the tip he placed a bird figure with outspread wings. This emblematic animal, which stands for the artist, is perfectly symmetrical. It consists of three basic forms, each of which was made twice and arranged in such a way as to reinforce the carefully balanced effect. This free-born creature that Max Ernst has created is a bird monument to the struggle for freedom of the French Revolution. The title is a reminder of the state prison at the Bastille, which had been a notorious symbol of royal tyranny, from the time of Richelieu until its destruction at the beginning of the Revolution, in 1789. It also recalls the column erected on the Place de la Bastille to commemorate the July revolution of 1830, which carries aloft the Roman

genius of freedom - a male figure, likewise furnished with wings. Max Ernst also created a monument to a frog, in a mocking Dadaist gesture, with *Sous les ponts de Paris (Under the Bridges of Paris)*. The frog sits on a column which, this time, was cast from only one fishnet. As with *Apaisement* and *Le génie de la Bastille*, Ernst plays off flat and structured surfaces against each other. For the form of the frog he went back to the bird of freedom, in *Le génie la Bastille*. He read the frog's face out of the upper part of the bird's body and gave clear form to his vision, by adding two eyes. He then increased the legibility of the forms, which now ran from the bird's head to the lower part of its body, by adding another pointed form to the final upper section of the column supporting the frog. In Huismes, from 1959 onwards, Max Ernst designed numerous pieces of jewellery, which were executed in gold and silver by François Hugo. In this Ernst made variations on individual themes from his sculpture, in a smaller format. The plaster maquettes for the two small sculptures *Homme (Man)* and *Femme (Woman)* are to be seen lying on the table in the photograph of the studio at Huismes. Max Ernst now also started to introduce 'microbes' into his painting. The first examples were created in 1946, in Sedona, and evoke wide, visionary landscapes. Then, in 1953, he produced his small 'Livre d'artiste', *Sept microbes vus à travers un tempérament (Seven Microbes seen through a Temperament)*. In this, small gouaches serve as an accompaniment to seven poems, the first of which is dedicated to a hill. Here, Max Ernst makes a play on Paul Cézanne's paintings of *Le Mont Sainte-Victoire*, in the landscape near Aix, and adoption of an approach described by his friend, Émile Zola's fictional character, Maxime. 'Une œuvre d'art est un coin de la création vu à travers un tempérament'.^{lxxvii} A corner of the creation, a mere part of nature, is quite sufficient to enable the artist to develop his own, internally consistent, autonomous realm of visual forms. In this homage to the pioneer of modern art, Max Ernst replaces the notion of a selective view of a motif from nature with his own concept of 'microbes' - minute, mostly mononuclear, living organisms, which are only visible under the microscope and whose importance in the natural order of things is to furnish the symbiotic link between different organisms. It is thus possible to discern a correspondence between the activity of microbes and Max Ernst's own combinative working procedures.

The title of the sculpture *Un microbe vu à travers un tempérament (A Microbe seen through a Temperament)*, which originated as an assemblage in 1964 and was cast in bronze in the same year takes as its theme the symbiotic structure of micro-organisms as a point of departure for the invention and depiction of forms. For his assemblage, Max Ernst used implements which he had found in a nearby farm. He inserted the cross-bars of a wagon-shaft into two sections of a narrow, smoothly sawn wooden board and mounted an iron wheel bearing to the upper end of the plank, which was fixed vertically into a wooden base. Two pairs of chains of unequal length, joined together by a ring, hang between the slightly bent wagon-shafts. This new combination adds to the meaning of the individual forms which are brought into play. An image is created of a stela-like creature, which transfixes the viewer with its round eyes and gaping mouth and throws its two excessively long extremities into the air, as if caught unawares. Max Ernst submits these objects from real life to his artistic temperament and they are transformed into an anthropomorphic configuration, like a gigantic microbe appearing under the magnifying glass of the artist's imagination. This sculpture embodies to perfection Max Ernst's method of seeing and interpreting the world - from microcosm to macrocosm, in turn - and posing questions about identity and the unity of opposites.

1964 Max Ernst and Dorothea Tanning moved close to the coast in the South France, where Patrick Waldberg had found them a house, in Seillans. The two of them had lived for nine years in Huismes, in the hilly country between Loire, the Indre and Vienne. Amboise, where Leonardo da Vinci had died 1519, was not far distant. It seemed natural, therefore, that Michel Debré, mayor of

Amboise and then French Minister of Foreign Affairs, should have thought of asking Ernst to make a fountain, as a farewell present to the town - not least since a review of one of his exhibitions in 1963 had described him as the 'Leonardo of Surrealism'.^{lxxviii} After a gestation period of several years, the sculpture was inaugurated in November 1968. The fountain is situated on a circular site on the banks of the Loire, diagonally across from the Amboise war memorial. The edge of the basin is decorated with six tortoises spouting water, as a parody on the Latona basin in the park at the Château of Versailles.^{lxxix} For the form of these bronze figures Max Ernst went back to his sculpture *Tortue* of 1944, but he replaced the rectangular table with a combination of a hemisphere, a truncated cone and a plate, to which last it owes its title, *Petite tortue sur socle rond (Small Tortoise on a round Base)*. *La grande tortue (The Large Tortoise)* is a four times enlarged version the original tortoise with table, which stands in the basin of the fountain, on a flat stone plateau. The backdrop is provided by a mighty gateway, which picks up on the form of the table. This positioning of the tortoise in front of the entrance to the kingdom of the dead makes clear its symbolic meaning as a sign of immortality. On the gateway, three egg-shaped bodies in a light-coloured stone are piled up one on top of each other. *Le grand génie (The Great Spirit)* is placed, with outstretched wings, on top of the highest of these forms, which is shaped like an amphora. This figure, too, was created from a four times enlargement of its original incarnation, as the bird figure of *Le génie de la Bastille*. Two further pedestals project out of the surface of the water and are once again created from playing around with the basic egg form, in a variety of different shapes and combinations. *Le grand assistant (The Great Assistant)* stands on a low plinth; the twinned *Deux assistants (Two Assistants)* are placed on a somewhat higher column.^{lxxx} These figures owe their origin to the frog in *Sous les ponts de Paris* but are threefold and twofold enlargements, respectively.

The fountain is a playful homage to Leonardo da Vinci, the universal genius of the Renaissance, known equally as a painter, sculptor, builder, natural scientist and engineer. As far back as 1936, Max Ernst had quoted passages from Leonard's treatise on painting, in support of his frottage technique and as a means of explaining his manner of seeing into things.^{lxxxi} For Leonardo, too, seeing had been a means of cognition. The egg form which came to dominate his thinking was a symbol for the creation of a new world, for brooding and introspection, for methods of seeing and for invention. In his sketchbooks, Leonardo had noted that both frog and the tortoise were born from an egg.^{lxxxii} Thus, Ernst's choice of animals had an emblematic character. Moreover, the contour line of the egg could also be read as a simplified sign for the Penrose stone, as an eye and as the centre of the creation of the world.

Max Ernst also used the forms of the frog and the tortoise in the production of one of his last sculptures. The figure of Janus is constructed on a narrow slab. Along with *Chéri Bibi*, which was also made in 1973, it belongs to the group of disk sculptures. Ernst took over the compositional scheme direct from *Un chinois égaré* and *Dans les rues d'Athènes*. Whilst the head of *Chéri Bibi* is captured from behind in a presentation tableau, the two heads of *Janus* protrude above the upper edge of the stand. A further difference was in the size of the editions. The reason for this certainly lay with the content of *Janus*. The photographer Edward Quinn succeeded in documenting the creation of this work in a number of photographs.^{lxxxiii} For the tortoise and frog, Max Ernst poured two shapes in sand moulds, but removed the feet from both. He then set these forms, now stylised but still recognisable as animals, on the front and back sides of the sculpture, where they usurp the position and functions of the male sexual parts. This configuration is a conscious reference to classical representations of the Greek god Hermes, as an emphatically phallic columnar bust. Ernst decorated the circular heads on both sides with a variety of shell forms, which serve to strengthen the notions of courtship and virility. Two final examples from the late work will serve once more to

illustrate the range of reference of Max Ernst's sculpture. *Totem* is constructed out of basic cylindrical forms cut away at certain points and punctuated with circular indentations, to suggest heads with a variety of different facial expressions. The cylindrical form which served as the point of departure is supplemented by an expressive form reminiscent of Indian totem poles on the north-west coast of America.^{lxxxiv} Ernst's *Totem* of 1973 displays formal affinities to those squatting ancestors piled up on top of each other in animal or human form, whilst *Portrait d'un ancêtre* (*Portrait of an Ancestor*), of 1974 provides more of a thematic link. Ernst's *Totem* depicts two animals capable of seeing in the night: a cat on top and an owl underneath. His emblematic column deals not with death but with seeing. *Le musée de l'homme* (*The Ethnographic Museum*) is also constructed from the simple geometrical forms of dice and prism. The basic form goes back to a large stone version, made in 1965, then extended and furnished with another head in the work of 1967, fashioned out of silver, *Man with Folded Arms*. Whilst the first version of *Le musée de l'homme* is open and looks like a table, when viewed from the front,^{lxxxv} in the later version the back wall is closed off by a circle, formed by a mask in the centre. The composition may be compared to that of the assemblage *Deux et deux font un*, but also to the cube-shaped squatting statues of the ancient Egyptians. Max Ernst embraces both possibilities and transcends them both. His *Musée de l'homme* dissolves geometry and mythology in the human image, connects life and death and looks simultaneously inwards and outwards, at one and the same time.

-
- i Max Ernst 1963 in the Film *Entdeckungsfahrten ins Unbewusste* by Peter Schamoni. Quoted in: Peter Schamoni (ed.): *Max Ernst- Maximiliana. Die widerrechtliche Ausbung der Astronomie*. Munich 1974. P.56.
- ii *Max Ernst. Masques sculptés*. Exhibition catalogue Galerie Lucie Weill Paris, June-July 1961.
- iii *Max Ernst. Oeuvre sculptée 1913-1961*. Exhibition catalogue Galerie Le Point Cardinal Paris, November-December 1961.
- iv Michel Ragon: "L'oeuvre sculptée de Max Ernst". In: *Cimaise*. No.57. Paris, January-February 1962, pp.12-25.
- v Max Ernst: "Inspiration to order". In: *This Quarter*. Surrealist Number. Vol.V, No.1. Paris, September 1932. Pp. 79-85.
- vi Max Ernst: "Biographische Notizen (Wahrheitgewebe und Lügengewebe)". In: *Max Ernst*. Exhibition catalogue. Wallraf-Richartz-Museum Cologne, 28.12.1962-3.3.1963, Kunsthau Zürich, 23.3.- 28.4.1963. Pp. 19-35.
- vii *Die Umarmung*, reproduced in: Gustave Kuhn: *Auguste Rodin*. Berlin 1912. P. 44.
- viii Max Ernst: "Im Obernriermuseum". In: *Volksmund*. December 11 1912.
- ix August Macke: "Die Masken". In: [Wassily] Kandinsky, Franz Marc (eds.): *Der Blaue Reiter*. Munich 1912. Pp. 21-26.
- x The two wood sculptures *Frau mit Hirsch* (*Woman with Stag*) and *Pierrot*, both from 1912 and 34,5 cm high are reproduced, in: Dominik Bartmann: August Macke. *Kunsthandwerk, Glasbilder, Stickereien, Keramiken, Holzarbeiten und Entwürfe*. Berlin 1979. Pp.134-135.
- xi Johann Raderscheidt: "Marta Hegemann - Erinnerungen". (from the handwritten manuscript, Cologne 1965). In: Michael Euler-Schmidt (ed.): *Marta Hegemann (1894-1970) - Leben und Werk*. Exhibition catalogue Kölnisches Stadtmuseum, Cologne 31.8.-7.10.1990. Pp.73-83.
- xii Letter of Max Ernst to Tristan Tzara. Cologne, 31. December 1919. Quoted in: Werner Spies: *Max Ernst - Collagen. Inventar und Widerspruch*. Cologne 1974. P.236.
- xiii William A. Camfield indicated the source for this reproduction which had been glued in, and the title of the relief: *Max Ernst: Dada and the Dawn of Surrealism*. In: Idem: (ed.): *Max Ernst. Dada and the Dawn of Surrealism*. Exhibition catalogue The Museum of Modern Art New York, 14.3.-2.5.1993, Munich 1993. Pp. 29-155.
- xiv Max Ernst: "Biographische Notizen (Wahrheitgewebe und Lügengewebe)". In: *Max Ernst*. Exhibition catalogue Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne, 28.12.1962-3.3.1963, Kunsthau Zürich, 23.3.- 28.4.1963. Pp. 19-35, I-X.

-
- xv [Anonymous]: "Kunst. Ausstellung im Kunstverein. I. Die Gruppe D". In: *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*. Cologne, 12 November 1919. Zitiert in: Werner Spies: *Max Ernst - Collagen. Inventar und Widerspruch*. Cologne 1974. P. 243.
- xvi [Anonymous]: "Dada in Düsseldorf. Dadaisten im Düsseldorfer graphischen Kabinett (Blumenhaus)". In: *Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung*. Essen, 3. February 1920. Quoted in: Werner Spies: *Max Ernst Collagen. Inventar und Widerspruch*. Cologne 1974. Pp. 244-245.
- xvii Reproduced in: *Stationen der Moderne. Die bedeutenden Kunstaussstellungen des 20. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland*. Exhibition catalogue Berlinische Galerie, 25.9.1988 8.1.1989. Berlin 1988. P.159.
- xviii Reproduced in: William A. Camfield: (Ed.): *Max Ernst. Dada and the Dawn of Surrealism*. Exhibition catalogue The Museum of Modern Art New York, 14.3.-2.5.1993, Munich 1993. P.98.
- xix [Anonymous]: "Kunst. Ausstellung im Kunstverein. I. Die Gruppe D". In: *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*. Cologne, 12 November 1919. Quoted in: Werner Spies: *Max Ernst - Collagen. Inventar und Widerspruch*. Cologne 1974. P. 243.
- xx Ludger Derenthal drew attention to this background: "ubi bene ibi DaDa" Max Ernst (and Johannes Theodor Baargeld) on the way to the Tirolean mountains. In: Gnther Dankl and Raoul Schrott (Eds.): *DADAutriche 1907-1970*. Exhibition catalogue Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum, Innsbruck, 7.4.-6.6.1993. Pp.93-107.
- xxi Stefanie Poley: "Die Bildquellen zu 'Sainte Cécile' und 'Ubu imperator' von Max Ernst". In: *Jahrbuch der Staatlichen Kunstsammlungen in Baden-Württemberg*. Vol.10. Stuttgart 1973. Pp.89-98.
- xxii Max Ernst: "Au-delà de la peinture". In: *Cahiers d'Art*, 11e Année, Nos. 6-7. Paris, October 1936. Pp. 149-182.
- xxiii Werner Spies: *Max Ernst. Loplop. Die Selbstdarstellung des Künstlers*. Munich 1982. P.177.
- xxiv Max Ernst: "Biographische Notizen (Wahrheitgewebe und Lügengewebe)". In: *Max Ernst*. Exhibition catalogue Wallraf-Richartz-Museum Cologne, 28.12.1962-3.3.1963, Kunsthau Zürich, 23.3.-28.4.1963. Pp.19-35, I-X.
- xxv Max Ernst: "Biographische Notizen (Wahrheitgewebe und Lügengewebe)". In: *Max Ernst*. Exhibition catalogue Wallraf-Richartz-Museum Cologne, 28.12.1962-3.3.1963, Kunsthau Zürich, 23.3.-28.4.1963. P.19-35, I-X.
- xxvi Uwe M. Schneede: *Max Ernst*. Stuttgart 1972. P.69.
- xxvii *La Révolution Surréaliste*. 4th year, No.11. Paris, 15. March 1928. inside front cover.
- xxviii *La Révolution Surréaliste*. 2nd year, No.7. Paris, 15 June 1926. Inside the front cover. *La Révolution surréaliste*. 2nd year, No.8. Paris, 1. December 1926. The snowball by Man Ray is reproduced in: *Man Ray: Objets de man affection*. Paris 1983. P.51.
- xxix Six years later the british artist and collector Roland Penrose went back to the same plaster torso, printed it likewise, and gave this object-assemblage the title 'Captain Cook's last voyage'. Reproduced in: "Dawn Ades: Dada and Snrrealism reviewed". Exhibition catalogue Arts Council of Great Britain, Hayward Gallery London, 11.1.-27.3.1978. P.367.
- xxx Jürgen Pech: Max Ernst. *La femme 100 Têtes*. Exhibition catalogue Max-Ernst-Kabinett der Stadt Brhl, Brühl 27.9.1984-31.1.1985.
- xxxi Roland Penrose: *Scrap Book 1900-1981*. London 1981. P.35.
- xxxii The exhibition 'Surrealist Objects & Poems' took place from 24 November to 22 December 1937 in the London Gallery see: Arturo Schwarz (ed.): *I Surrealisti*. Exhibition catalogue Palazzo Reale Milan, 7.7.-10.9.1989. German edition: Frankfurt 1990. P.382.
- xxxiii Reproduced in: *Le Surréalisme au service de la révolution*. No.3. Paris, December 1931. P.39. On the double page 18-19, this issue contains also, illustrated with drawings, the text 'Objets mobiles et muets'.
- xxxiv Carola Giedion-Welcker: *Plastik des XX. Jahrhunderts. Volumen- und Raumgestaltung*. Zürich 1955. P. 242.
- xxxv Reproduced in essay: Lucy R. Lippard: "The Sculpture". In: *Max Ernst. Sculpture and Recent Painting*. Exhibition catalogue The Jewish Museum New York, 3.3.17.4.1966. Pp. 37-52.
- xxxvi Reproduced in: Jane Hancock and Stefanie Poley (conceived by): *Arp 1886-1966*. Exhibition catalogue Württembergischer Kunstverein Stuttgart, 13.7.-31.8.1986, Pp. 130-131.

-
- xxxvii Charlotte Stokes draw attention to the illustrations of 1901 which Max Ernst found in the periodical *La Nature*: "The Scientific Methods of Max Ernst: His Use of Scientific Subjects from *La Nature*". In: *The Art Bulletin*. Vol.62, No.3. New York, September 1980. Pp. 453-465.
- xxxviii Conversation with Max Ernst. In: *Commune. Revue de l'Association des Écrivains et des Artistes révolutionnaires*. 2nd year, No.21. Paris, May 1935. Pp. 956-957.
- xxxix Max Ernst: "Was ist Surrealismus?" In: *Ausstellung [Hans Arp, Max Ernst, Alberto Giacometti, J. Gonzalez, Joan Mirò]*. Exhibition catalogue Kunsthaus Zürich, 11.10.-4.11.1934. P.3.
- xl See also: Jürgen Pech: *Max Ernst. Histoire Naturelle. Frottagen*. Exhibition catalogue Max-Ernst-Kabinett der Stadt Brhl, Brühl 28.9.1983-31.1.1984.
- xli Max Ernst: "Was ist Surrealismus?" In: *Ausstellung [Hans Arp, Max Ernst, Alberto Giacometti, J. Gonzalez, Joan Mirò]* Exhibition catalogue Kunsthaus Zürich, 11.10.-4.11.1934. P. 6.
- xlii After Max Ernst had exhibited the first version at the "Exposition surréaliste d'objets" at the Galerie Charles Ratton in Paris, 22 - 31 may 1936, he reworked this piece. He presented the altered version to his former wife, Luise Strauss, who returned to Cologne in 1939, in order to avoid internment in Paris as an enemy alien, and the sculpture in plaster eventually ended up in the collection of Wilhelm Hack. In 1971 the work was editioned in bronze cast seven and a half times the original size was also made and displayed in front of the Kunsthalle in Düsseldorf. For information about Schuppner's activities as an art dealer at the beginning of the Second World War see: Martina Sitt: *Auch ein Bild braucht einene Anwalt. Walter Cohen Leben zwischen Kunst und Recht*. Munich, 1944. Pp. 45-63.
- xliii Evan M. Maurer: "Dada and Surrealism". In: William Rubin (ed.): *Primitivismus in der Kunst des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts*. Munich, 1984. Pp.547-607; Ill. p. 575.
- xliv Michael Lloyd: "*Lunar asparagus by Ernst (1935) and Lake Sentani*". In: *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*. Vol.106, 127th year, No.1401. Paris, October 1985. Pp.137-140.
- xlv Christian Zervos (Ed.): *Max Ernst: Oeuvres de 1919 à 1936*. Cahiers d'Art, Sonderheft. Paris 1937. P. 95.
- xlvi Werner Hofmann: "Max Ernst und die Tradition". In: *Max Ernst. Das innere Gesicht. Die Sammlung de Menil*. Exhibition catalogue Hamburger Kunsthalle, 14.5-21.6.1970, Pp.9-20.
- xlvii Reproduced in: Reinhold Hohl: *Alberto Giacometti*. Stuttgart 1971. Pp. 48 - 49.
- xlviii Reproduced in: William Rubin (Ed.): *Primitivismus in der Kunst des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts*. Munich 1984. P.34; see also P. 37.
- xlix Letter from Max Ernst to André Breton. Paris, 26 March 1936. In: Agnes Anglivièl de la Beaumelle, Isabelle Monod Fontaine, Claude Schweisgnth: *André Breton. La beauté convulsive*. Exhibition catalogue Musée nationale d'art moderne, Centre Georges Pompidou Paris, 25.4-26.8 1991. P.229.
- l André Breton: "L'objet fantôme". In: *Le Surréalisme au service de la révolution*. No.3. Paris, December 1931. Pp. 20 -22.
- li André Breton: "Crise de l'objet". In: *Cahiers d'Art*. 11th year, No.1-2. Paris, May 1936. Pp.21-26.
- lii André Breton: *Nadja*. Pfullingen 1960. P.99.
- liii André Breton: "Le message automatique". In: *Minotaure*. No.3-4. Paris, December 1933. Pp. 55-65.
- liv Leonora Carrington: "Little Francis". In: *The house of fear*. New York 1988. Pp.69-148.
- lv *Cahiers d'Art*. 15th year, No.5-10. Paris, December 1939. Pp.140-145.
- lvi *London Bulletin*. No.18-20. London, June 1940. P.23.
- lvii Julien Levy: "Un été a Long Island". In: *Hommage à Max Ernst*. Paris 1971. (Numéro spécial de la revue XX^e Siècle). Pp. 60-62.
- lviii Lucy R. Lippard drew attention to this painting in a visual comparison in: "The Sculpture". In: *Max Ernst. Sculpture and Recent Painting*. Exhibition catalogue The Jewish Museum New York, 3.3- 17.4.1966. Pp.37-52.

-
- lix A side view of this moveable structure is reproduced in: Lisa Phillips: *Frederick Kiesler*. New York, London 1989. P. 64.
- lx Man Ray had designed several different chess sets between 1920 and 1972. See: Man Ray: *Objets de mon affection*. Paris 1983. P.161.
- lxi For the Surrealist's relationship to this literary anecdote see : Rüdiger von Tiedemann: "Alice beiden Surrealisten. Zur Rezeption Lewis Carrolls". In: *Arcadia*. Vol. 17, Issue No. 1. Berlin, New York 1982. Pp.61-80.
- lxii The figures are reproduced in: *Atelier François Hugo*. Exhibition catalogue Galerie Le Point Cardinal Paris, November-December 1967.
- lxiii Angelica Zander Rudenstine: *Peggy Guggenheim Collection*, Venice. New York 1985. Pp. 329-336.
- lxiv The named works are reproduced in: Reinhold Hohl: *Alberto Giacometti*. Stuttgart 1971. Pp. 58, 60, 61, 64, 66, 69. The text is printed in: *Max Ernst. Ecritures*. Paris 1970. Pp. 224-227.
- lxv The first reference to the influence of Man Ray's photographs on Max Ernst is to be found in: Ludger Derenthal, Jürgen Pech: *Max Ernst*. Paris 1992. Pp. 220-225. See also: Jürgen Pech: "Max Ernst, Bonn und Beethoven". In: *Max Ernst und Bonn. Student, Kritiker, Rheinischer Expressionist*. Exhibition catalogue August Macke Haus Bonn, 7.8.-23.10.1994, Pp.137-158.
- lxvi *Cahiers d'Art*. 11th year, No.1-2. Paris, May 1936. P.14. Also reproduced in: Arturo Schwarz: *Man Ray*. Munich 1980. P.99.
- lxvii For an account of the move and the time in Sedona see: Dorothea Tanning, *Birthday*, Santa Monica, San Francisco 1986. Pp.25-32 and 79-87.
- lxviii Part of the lower frieze is reproduced in: *Max Ernst, from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Jimmy Ernst*. Exhibition catalogue, The Glenbow Museum Calgary Alberta, Canada, 1979-80. P. 42. Max Ernst assigned the house to his son, Jimmy Ernst in 1954, when he definitively returned to Europe. The latter took down the decorative stones from this holiday house, in order to preserve them, and later sold the property. Three stones from the upper edge of the window embrasure were left in place and are still there, in the wall of the house.
- lxix Patrick Waldberg: "Max Ernst in Arizona". In: *XX^e Siècle*. No. 20. Paris, December 1962. Pp.41-46.
- lxx John Russell: *Max Ernst. Leben und Werk*. Cologne 1966. P.123.
- lxxi Only five fragments of this original cement sculpture have survived: the sceptre with the King's hand, the mermaid's breasts and the iron ring with the head of the small fishy creature. Reproduced in: *Max Ernst: Fragments of Capricorn and other Sculpture, Sedona, Arizona, 1948* Exhibition catalogue. Harnold Herstand & Company, New York, 8 november- 29 december 1984. Front cover and pp. 9, 11, 13, 15.
- lxxii [Anonymous]: "Mite-size art is shown actual size". In: *Life Magazine*. New York, 21 January 1952. Pp.58-62.
- lxxiii Lucy R. Lippard: "The Sculpture". In: *Max Ernst. Sculpture and Recent Painting*. Exhibition catalogue The Jewish Museum New York, 3.3-17.4 1966. Pp.37-52.
- lxxiv Henry Miller: "Another bright Messenger". In: *View. Max Ernst Number*. 2nd Series, No.1. New York, April 1942. P.17.
- lxxv Charlotte Stokes: "The thirteenth chair: Max Ernst's Capricorn". In: *Arts Magazine*. Year 62, No.2. New York, October 1987. Pp. 88-93.
- lxxvi Werner Haftmann: *Max Ernst Capricorne*. Berlin 1973.
- lxxvii Émile Zola: "Les Réalistes du Salon". In: *L'Événement*. Paris, 11 May 1866.
- lxxviii Quoted in: "A.M.M.: Max Ernst et la Touraine". In: *La Fontaine d'Amboise. Oeuvre de Max Ernst*. Brochure for the opening of the fountain, 23 November 1968.
- lxxix Günter Metken: "Abschiedsgeschenk an die Touraine. Ein Brunnen von Max Ernst in Amboise". In: *Weltkunst*. 34th year, No I. Munich, 1 January 1969. P.12.

-
- lxxx For a second fountain Max Ernst presented Brühl, the town where he was born, with a bronze cast of a pair of frogs and two casts of the small tortoises. A smaller version of the Amboise fountain was designed and inaugurated in 1971. See: Paul Georg Custodis: "Max Ernst-Brunnen vor den Städtischen Berufsschule" in: *Brülher Heimatblätter*. 28th year, no. 3, Brühl, July 1971. Pp. 21-22. And: Wilfried Hansmann: "Das Urbild des Brühler Max-Ernst-Brunnens in Amboise (Frankreich)." in *Brühler Heimatblätter*. 33rd year, no. 3. Brühl, July 1976. P. 22.
- lxxxix Max Ernst: "Au-delà de la peinture". In: *Cahiers d'Art*, 11th year, No. 6-7. Paris, October 1936. Pp. 149-182.
- lxxxii Edward MacCurdy: *The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci*. Vol I. London, 1956. P.109.
- lxxxiii Edward Quinn: *Max Ernst*. Zürich, Freiburg im Breisgau 1977. Pp.18-23.
- lxxxiv See the two posts from Max Ernst's collection, reproduced in: *Max Ernst from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Jimmy Ernst*. Exhibition catalogue The Glenbow Museum Calgary, Alberta, Canada, 1979- 80. Pp.54, 55.
- lxxxv The 140 cm high stone version was exhibited and reproduced for the first time in: *Max Ernst. Le musée de l'homme suivi de la pêche au soleil levant*. Exhibition catalogue Galerie Alexandre Iolas Paris, 16-11 December 1965.