The topic of intertextuality in painting is almost as broad as the field of art history itself, for even the most formalistic pictorial analysis makes reference to painting-painting or painting-literature relations. Yet there is a commonly held belief that paintings are texts whose closure and self-sufficiency are indisputable. Their material finitude seems so much more marked than that of the other arts. You can pick up a painting or statue in a much more literal sense than you can a novel or a symphony, and a painting appears to be visible all at once rather than abstractly unfolding over time. Moreover, paintings have what might be termed a "hyper-semantic" quality. Since the Renaissance, they have been understood as equivalents of arrested moments of visual perception. Their primary semiotic mode is assumed to be iconic, red paint signifying red objects, the size and position of shapes signifying the relative size and disposition of objects in space. Even those features of the painting that seem obviously conventional—the relations of up and down, right and left, frame and canvas, the size of brush stroke, shape of canvas, and so forth—have semantic value as rich as Jakobson shows rhyme scheme, metrics, and phonological structure to have in literature. In no sense is the conventional component of painting arbitrary or semantically indifferent to the degree, say, that pagination or print-type or size of page is for the novel.

This a-temporality and hyper-semantic quality—if one might so call it—have given rise to the naive view of painting as a mirror of nature, a perfect equivalent of a visual field, a complete vision of the beautiful. Interestingly, semioticians who have taken this position seriously, inquiring into the exact nature of iconicity, have deduced that painting is severely limited in its semantics. Sol Worth has accused painting of
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an incapacity for negation, contrary-to-fact statements, and ultimately any propositional meaning (Worth 1975). Meyer Schapiro points out cases of its inability to be vague or general (Schapiro 1973). Seemingly, the very semantic intensity of pictorial art restricts the sphere in which it can function semantically. And yet, as any interpreter of visual art knows, paintings can give rise to meanings that are propositional, tensed, and general, and that, moreover, rival literature in their richness and complexity.

This richness in painting, much more than in literature, is a function of intertextuality. It is only by viewing paintings in light of other paintings or works of literature, music, and so forth that the “missing” semiotic power of pictorial art can be augmented—which is to say that that power is not missing at all, but merely absent in the conventional account of the structure of the art. Thus, I would like to enunciate as a structural principle of painting the claim that paintings are always connected to each other and often to works of other arts, that pictorial meaning always is conditioned by these connections, and that these connections may exist on any or all of Morris's three semiotic dimensions (Morris 1939). In saying so, I am not describing a state of affairs that differs in kind from that in any art, except that the prevailing notion of pictorial self-sufficiency makes the intertextual principle seem surprising.
Of Morris's three semiotic dimensions, the syntactic gives rise to the most striking cases of pictorial intertextuality, in which pictures are in some way physically linked. In the paired landscapes of the seventeenth-century Czech painter, F. X. Procházka (figures 1 and 2), the outline of hill and valley requires the juxtaposition of both paintings in order to form a symmetrical whole. The resulting design is thus a direct function of syntactic intertextuality. This linkage of canvasses was a fairly common practice among baroque and rococo painters. Titian's three separate works, Bacchus and Ariadne, The Bacchanal of the Andrians, and The Worship of Venus, for example, join in a continuous pictorial expanse separated by frames, though not one unified by an abstract design, as in Procházka's landscapes. The assemblage of altarpiece and predella panels or of the works in diptychs or triptychs also unites separate canvasses into a syntactic whole, creating semantic connections that will be discussed presently.

These kinds of syntactic connections directly challenge the view that a painting is complete in itself and limited to what exists within the frame. In Procházka's pair we are faced with a painting that lies, as it were, across two frames. It is not simply the case, as in Hollar's extremely wide panoramas of cities, that the technical medium was not large enough to allow the whole subject to be represented on one block, so that the
sheets had to be printed on several blocks and invisibly joined. With Procházka, the discreteness of the landscape portions is part of the meaning of the work, perhaps suggesting to the rococo artist nature's affinity for design. The separately represented horizons conjoin to form an abstract entity, a curved line, whose existence lies in the gestalt habits of the viewer (and artist). The viewer constructs that line out of the incomplete though framed parts presented.

An apt contrast to Procházka's technique of syntactic intertextuality is that of Jiří Kolář's collages. In these splendid works, two earlier masterpieces are spliced together, as if each were a Venetian blind before the other's "reality." It is easy to make out each painting; yet at the same time the two interact on every level, from the purely formal concerns of color and shape to the most complex semantic and meta-artistic meanings. *Venus Is Listening* (figure 3), for example, interleaves a Botticelli Venus with a bucolic musician, so that the one work of art is in effect "listening" to the other. In the collage, the work's connection to the past is its compositional present, and what is beyond the frame is in fact within it. Yet, paradoxical and unusual as this invention might seem, the intertextuality that it exemplifies can be found in any collage using artistic fragments. An equivalent in literature would be literary quotation or allusion, especially the massively allusive writing of T. S. Eliot or James Joyce.

Procházka's pairings or Kolář's collages upset the notion of part and whole in paintings. But in fact, the conventional position on this subject of wholeness is unjustified for other reasons. Painting-painting connections need not exist on the striking syntactic level of a Procházka or Kolář for problems to arise, but may crop up when paintings are connected on the semantic level. In representations of the seasons, for example, a canvas depicting spring gains part of its meaning oppositionally to the works representing the other seasons. The same applies to paired portraits of husbands and wives, to companion-pieces or "pendants," or to narrative sequences like the stations of the cross ranged along the walls of churches. In the altarpieces with predella panels mentioned earlier, the relation between altar painting and panels is often that of climactic moment to narrative past and future. In Gozzoli's altar of the Madonna of Cintola (figure 4), for example, the Virgin in the main work is narratively extended in the predellas, which show the annunciation, birth of Christ, and other crucial episodes in Mary's life. An alternate relation may be seen in Diego Rivera's mammoth frescos in the Detroit Institute of Art. Here the main work deals with the theme of industry, and the predellas exemplify this theme in particular products and processes. In all these
cases, the meaning in which an individual work participates is larger than it alone conveys, and this fact—its incompleteness—is part of its meaning.

The most important cue to this "synecdochic" quality of paintings is the title; indeed, titles are probably the most crucial intertextual mechanism in painting. They undercut everything that the iconicity and a-temporality of paintings achieve in the way of self-containment and completeness. Of course, the majority of paintings for a long time had no titles, in the sense of a unique verbal text composed by the artist and attached in some way to the picture. The titles of most older paintings are merely accounts of their subjects or genres—madonna with child, still life with grapes, and so forth. And many titles were actually assigned centuries after their paintings were made. Because of this temporal displacement and the differing receptions of the work in various countries, paintings may end up with several traditional titles.

The determinacy of the modern title is a result of advances in book publication and the growth and influence of the art-historical establishment. With this relatively new institution, few paintings of any period are ever received by the public without a title, and moreover one with the authority of the modern, intentional label. Generic or subject titles thus gain considerable importance in the work's reception; canonic subject and pictorial genre now seem structurally present within the text itself through the title. As a result, one cannot view an annunciation without an awareness of its relation to other annunciations, or a still life to other still lifes. That information is now coded in the work, and since its encoding is the outcome of art historians' research and their influence on galleries and publishers, it inevitably reflects art historians' concerns. Art history is by definition oriented toward historical groupings—genre, period, œuvre, and so forth. Thus, the title immediately implicates the work in an intertextual matrix whose relations reflect the most complicated conceptions of pictorial interconnection.

It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that this intertextual matrix also includes verbal art. Literature, myth, and sacred writing interact with a vast proportion of western painting and sculpture. In fact, probably no art is as dependent on subtexts from another art to complete its own meaning as is painting. Even abstract art, which can be taken as an extreme gesture toward pictorial self-containment, is "completed" or "modified" by manifestoes and other ideological literature. And titles, using the same verbal material as the allied literary source, establish this intertextual relation all the more clearly. Music, traditionally not included among the "sister arts," has had a more limited intertextual effect on
painting, though in more recent art, with such various figures as Turner, Mondrian, or Cage, the connections are obviously significant.

Important as titles might be, pictorial intertextuality need not depend on them. Any aspect of a painting that becomes established as a recognizable entity can be echoed by other artists to semantic effect. Chiaroscuro, a particular rendering of female beauty, the treatment of Venetian sunlight—these became so closely associated with Rembrandt, Raphael, and Canaletto, respectively, that schools of disciples, imitators, and revivalists can easily be discerned, even when titles are lacking. The meanings that result from these intertextual references are not only complex but often meta-artistic, interpreting and commenting upon aspects of the history of style.

Similarly, a painting may copy a traditional subject matter or pose for its own purposes. Benozzo Gozzoli, for example, in his Dance of Salome and Beheading of Saint John the Baptist (figure 5) depicts the final episode of the narrative, where Salome presents the saint's head to her mother, as if it were a pieta or an adoration of the Child, the mother cradling the head with Salome kneeling in reverence before her.
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(One might compare the pose in figure 6 by the same painter.) It is hard for me not to read this echoing as parody or irony—one of the modes that Sol Worth would deny to painting—since a system of pictorial meaning is being evoked in a context where its traditional meaning is reversed and undercut. Paintings very often transmit such modal meaning through relations to other works, so that not only parody but negation, humor, contrary-to-fact statements, and such are frequently meta-artistic in meaning when they occur in painting (as is the case in music and literature).

Perhaps even more anchored in intertextuality than the syntactic and semantic levels of painting is the pragmatic dimension of this art. Paintings are almost always seen in the context of other paintings, with museums usually organized according to the art-historical concepts of period, genre, oeuvre, style, or subject. Whether pictures are hung in official collections or on private walls, they always appear in each other’s company. No one ever exhibits a single painting, and probably no one has ever owned just one canvas. Critical books on art always group paintings, as, by definition, do catalogues. It is extremely rare for works to be presented or treated in isolation, and so one understands why the analysis of a single work by an art historian can seem like a revolutionary act.
Moreover, the fact that paintings turn up in galleries or books at all reflects another aspect of their pragmatic lives—their connection to each other on the fine art market. This market links works in use and function, reflecting their status as great, major, minor, or trash, or as fashionable or passé. Such intertextual relations redound on the semantic level, for paintings perceived as belonging to the same class—minor eighteenth-century woodcuts, for example—may end up together in an exhibit which will cause people to notice very interesting new semantic relations among them. The accidentality here is worth remarking. Anyone who visits the Barnes Foundation in Philadelphia will have had this experience, since the collection repeatedly juxtaposes Cézannes and Renoirs—contemporaneous, but very different works. The repeated conjunction of these two painters is so striking that one finds oneself thinking about what they might have in common.

I shall end by mentioning a special case of pictorial intertextuality that involves all three of Morris's semiotic dimensions: the relation between a painting and another work depicted within it. There is a whole sub-genre of museum paintings, such as Brueghel the Elder's "Sight" or the younger Tenier's "Archduke Leopold Wilhelm Inspecting the Pictures in his Brussels Gallery." These works reproduce actual pre-existent paintings, but group them and present them in a composition that is unique to the later work of art.

Other visual works represent imaginary works of art which are, however, actualized in becoming components of a real art work. In Picasso's *Vollard Suite*, for example, figures are often shown gazing raptly at works of art. *Sculptor and Model Seated before a Sculptured Head* (figure 7, 1933) shows a woman's, man's, and sculpture's heads all encircled by garlands, so that it is hard to see where one leaves off and the other begins. The woman is both the model for the bust and its enthralled audience, while the man is both its maker and its audience, his hands either modelling the work or caressing it. The roles of creator, beholder, and lover are thereby condensed. Moreover, the correspondence between the sculpture that it contains—both of them works of art that are being observed—invites another correspondence: that between the painting and the gazer-model-sculptor-lover and us, the audience of the etching. The act of viewing is by implication also a discovery of the self in the work, as it is for the woman, and a creation and act of love, as it is for the man. Viewer and work are intimately connected—encircled by the same garland, if you will—so that the painting, through its connection to the work within it establishes another kind of intertextuality: that between itself and us, whom it has made into a text for the occasion.
NOTES

1. Meyer Schapiro has admirably explained the structural significance of technical aspects of painting in his article, "On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art: Field and Vehicle in Image-Signs" (Schapiro 1969). Jakobson does the same for poetry in his many analyses: for example, see Jakobson 1968.
2. My thanks go to Professor Paul F. Watson for this example.
3. My thanks go to Professor John W. McCoubrey for these examples.
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