

Shifting Identities: Dalí looks to Picasso c. 1935-36

By Haim Finkelstein

The date in my title refers to the publication of three texts written by Dalí that have Picasso as their subject. One was a poem that formed part of the booklet *Conquest of the Irrational* that came out late in 1935 (it was published separately in English under the title "The Art of Picasso"[1]). And then there were two texts included in the special issue of *Cahiers d'Art* dedicated to Picasso that came out early in 1936,[2] an "Invitation" so to speak to the Picasso exhibition that opened in Barcelona in January 1936 and the text "Les pantoufles de Picasso," or "Picasso's Slippers." These three texts, coming after sporadic references to Picasso in Dalí's earlier writings, form a high point in Dalí's growing preoccupation with Picasso at the time – his looking to Picasso, as my title implies. Only later, in *The Secret Life of Salvador Dalí*, with its many references to Picasso, and later still, in his famous lecture "Picasso and I," will this engrossment in Picasso come again to the fore. Two of the texts, "The Art of Picasso" and the "Invitation," are laudatory enough of Picasso while, at the same time, aggrandizing Dalí himself. My main concern, however, is with "Picasso's Slippers," his major text devoted to Picasso at the time. I won't speculate about any effect that its publication may have had on the relationship between Picasso and Dalí. What is quite apparent, however, is that while we find numerous references to a continuous contact between the two up to that time, there is hardly any actual contact between them later on (notwithstanding the letters and postcards sent to Picasso by Dalí and Gala to which Picasso appears not to have responded). Be that as it may, it is quite obvious that this text does constitute a watershed point of some sort. In what follows I take off from some insights already given expression in my earlier book, *Salvador Dalí's Art and Writing* (1996)[3] – this with the addition of quite a few pivotal new insights.

The basic premise is quite simple. As Dalí relates in *Conversations with Dalí*, asked by Christian Zervos to do an article on Picasso, he came by chance across a book by Sacher-Masoch, *La pantoufle de Sapho* (*Sappho's Slipper*, 1859). "All I did was skim through the first chapter and replace Sappho's name with Picasso's." [4] Of course, he did not do just that, as I will show further on, and some of his modifications are quite radical and, also, quite telling. In hindsight, Dalí appears to imply that, in this chance encounter, the Sacher-Masoch text revealed its potentiality as a meaningful comment on Picasso. As Dalí tells us, Zervos waxed enthusiastic: "All your friends simply praised Picasso, but you're the only one who's said anything new, accurate and substantial." In hindsight, again, Dalí boasts that he is the "only person ever to cuckold Christian Zervos" and that the whole thing is a hoax. But this is Dalí who is reluctant to admit that there is more to it than merely a hoax. Without questioning the veracity of this story, it is quite clear that this text, as I am about to show, is a telling comment on Dalí himself, and on his less acknowledged feelings at the time with regard to Picasso.

To summarize the first pages of Sacher-Masoch's story,[5] Vienna in the winter of 1859 is wholly given to amusements and pleasures as well as to art and literature, all culminating in the popular Burgtheater. Between the public and the actors, there is a true intimacy, with the Viennese following with great interest even the daily routines and affairs of the actors and actresses. Of these, Sophie Schroeder is the first and foremost in public interest. Not pretty, her genius endows her with "superhuman" dignity and distinction, "as if she were born to see the people at her feet, so dominating was her look". She has "too exalted an idea of love, of art and of herself—in par-

ticular herself—to have her favors paid with diamonds," and she is the last to know when a rich young Pole becomes smitten with love for her. He attends all her performances, sitting in the same seat, following the performance with great enthusiasm. Learning about it by chance, she begins noticing his presence in the audience, and even looks for his reactions to her acting. He makes it a habit to stand waiting for her when she comes out of the theater, devouring her with his eyes, although "all he could see of her is the tip of her nose, all the rest being muffled with furs and veils." One evening the young man throws a crown of laurels at her feet and then flees. "This fearful homage, in a solitary place and under the cover of night," touches her heart. Another time, with the thaw setting in and cascades of water running down along the sidewalks, she is reluctant to step into the water while crossing over to her carriage, and the young Pole spreads his overcoat, and thus she can reach her carriage with dry feet. When she turns to thank him she realizes that he has picked up his coat and vanished from view.

Dalí's "version" of the story, or rather of the first pages of this story, reveals right away two blatant alterations of the original. The first has to do with the confused tenses of the text; it begins in the future tense, about things which will happen in the winter of 1937—as I will show later, it is a kind of sadomasochistic wish-fulfilling premonition—with the past tense intruding at some points and later taking over completely. The future is envisioned in the early part of Dalí's text as an apotheosis of Picasso that follows in its main outline the description of La Schroeder (the name by which Sacher-Masoch generally refers to her). The story switches to the past tense with the introduction of Dalí as the young and ardent lover of the original story, "a prince of the Catalan intelligentsia, colossally rich," who "took a seat in the first row to the extreme left of Surrealism."^[6] But then the roles of Dalí and Picasso — in respect to their definition in the original story— are continuously interchanged. At some point it is Picasso who becomes the ardent admirer, throwing a crown of laurels at Gala's feet and then fleeing, while Dalí, assuming the Schroeder persona, "began more and more to take an interest in Picasso and wondered whether he could not love him." And later still it is Picasso who goes out in his slippers, and Dalí who spreads his "heavy and hairy piled alpaca coat" and enables Picasso to reach the opposite sidewalk with dry feet.

Dalí's "version" is one of the earliest instances where he discloses his Picasso obsession—one that took an excessive form in later years. But even in the 1930s Dalí could not hide his ambivalent feelings regarding Picasso – an older and far more eminent artist – in which admiration for Picasso's genius was tinged with extreme jealousy. Dalí in this text is, indeed, quite cynical about Picasso's stature—his "star" quality—and very possibly it was this quality that may have brought him to associate Picasso with La Schroeder. The text is laden with references to Picasso's and Dalí's activities at the time, together with various topical comments on Parisian society and the current political situation. These, however, merely form a surface veneer reflecting Dalí's very clever, and fully conscious, manipulation of the original story, resulting in a text that combines both self-aggrandizement and self-abnegation, together with a mocking tongue-in-cheek apotheosis of Picasso himself. In what follows I'm attempting to decipher Dalí's quite involved frame of mind while engaged in writing the text, in which conscious motivations are intertwined with less conscious ones. This involves probing some very subtle and rather fleeting connections that may have been on Dalí's mind while engaged in rewriting the text— that may, I say, or may not have been on his mind at the time. Indeed, the reading I'm proposing here is highly speculative in part and I'm fully aware that I'm going out on a limb, but then it is Dalí's own text which also

begs it. In "Conquest of the Irrational" Dalí refers to his "next book," *The Tragic Myth of Millet's L'Angélu*, as one in which "the so-called method of Paranoiac-Critical Activity is applied to the delirious fact that constitutes the obsessional character of Millet's *L'Angélu*."^[7] Following Dalí's reasoning, one may argue that Sacher-Masoch's story indeed presented Dalí with what he refers to in "Conquest" as "instantaneous or successive solicitations," all partaking of the latent or hidden thought underlying his Picasso obsession. Thus, I venture to say that I'm using Dalí's text – in what might be described as an ersatz Dalinian method – as a tool that enables me to delve more deeply into Dalí's state of mind at the time in order to shed light on some hidden corners in Dalí's response to Picasso.

Probing the web of associations drawn between the two stories, the first thing we might consider, and this on the most obvious level, is the very charged connotations of their titles, evoking a prominent sexual fetish. A bit further in Sacher-Masoch's story – in the part not touched by Dalí – La Schroeder's slipper is quite explicitly referred to as a fetish, and there is a pronounced fetishistic dimension related to La Schroeder herself as a great "star" and celebrity. Profoundly immersed in Freudian lore, Dalí would not have remained oblivious to the connotation in this respect of the scene in which all the young admirer can see of her is the "tip of her nose, all the rest being muffled with furs and veils." Even if he had not read Freud's "Fetishism" (1927) at that time, he would have known that the nose in this essay, one of Freud's examples for the fetish, goes through all kinds of verbal and visual substitutions leading to the eroticizing of a "shine on the nose." However tentative such an assumption might be, there is no question as to the fetishistic dimension Dalí applies to Picasso when early in the text he refers to the interest that the whole city will take in Picasso's personality as being "of a fetishistic and increasingly exclusive nature."

Now the furs and veils muffling La Schroeder's nose turn in Dalí's version into "furs of amorous suaveness without veils." No need to harp on the obvious fetishization of fur found in quite a few Surrealist art works of the period, including Dalí's own.^[8] The evocation of "furs of amorous suaveness" quite clearly points to Sacher-Masoch's novel *Venus in Furs*, to which Dalí refers in his "De la beauté terrifiante," his Art Nouveau essay, where he announces that "there where Venus of logic fades away, there the Venus of 'bad taste,' the 'Venus in Furs' is heralded."^[9] In Sacher-Masoch's novel, the hero enmeshes the woman in his masochistic cravings, arguing that suffering has a peculiar attraction for him. "Nothing can intensify my passion more than tyranny, cruelty, and especially the faithlessness of a beautiful woman. And I cannot imagine this woman, this strange ideal derived from an aesthetics of ugliness . . . except in furs." I shall return to the notion of ugliness later on, but at this point, with regard to the fetishization of fur, one may suspect – and this, I hope, will gain further credence later on – that Dalí saw the relationship between himself and Picasso in terms associated with Sacher-Masoch's writings, and, in particular, with regard to the roles of dominator and dominated, which, in his version, are continuously reversed.

In delving deeper into the text, I turn now to the part which, while noticed at times, generally remains unexplored. I'm referring to the short opening section, a kind of anecdote, that serves as a motto of sorts for the text. It reads: "I showed Picasso a painting the ugliness of which had always seemed to me the most truculent and the most worthy of being taken as model. / Picasso studied the painting with surprise. 'What's the matter with you' said he with a marvelous self-assurance. 'Why do you hide your face from me, as if it were known to me?'" The phrasing of

this paragraph is somewhat peculiar. On the face of it, it may be understood as follows: the ugliness of the painting is a mask covering the true face of Dalí's that, while known to Picasso, remains hidden by Dalí because he is reluctant to expose it to Picasso, to reveal that he is indeed the one hidden behind this ugly mask. However, the phrasing of Picasso's words doesn't quite fit the situation. It should perhaps have been: Why do you hide your face from me, as if it weren't known to me, with the implication, I do know your face so why hide? The choice of this particular phrasing becomes clearer in the light of a passage found further on in "La Pantoufle de Sapho," beyond the text manipulated by Dalí, which appears to have been lifted almost verbatim by him to be used as a motto. At this point in the story, La Schroeder is accosted by a poor and decrepit woman whose face is hidden behind a shawl. The text reads: "Surprised, Sophie Schroeder studied the poor woman. – What's the matter with you? She said in her marvelous voice, you appear to be poor and unhappy. Why do you hide your face from me as if it were known to me?" In the context of the original story, this question makes perfect sense. The old woman, named Muller, who was at one time an admired and beautiful actress, hides her face because she doesn't wish to be recognized by Schroeder in her current sorry state. Obviously, the use of the exact wording of Schroeder's question, or indeed of the whole passage, annuls any possibility that this connection is mere coincidence. But this begs the question why does Dalí delve into the latter part of the story in order to pick up this particular passage? The answer lies in the description of the old woman who seems to be "more dead than alive," and who is "trembling all over," a fact noted twice. I find an obvious correlation between Muller and the little old lady evoked in the essay "Aerodynamic Apparitions of 'Beings-Objects'" as an example of "Object-Comedo" (Blackhead in popular parlance) on whose head is placed an omelet that will tremble following her "continuous wagging" or shaking (the word used in French is "branlement" with the connotation of masturbation).^[10] This connection must have been on Dalí's mind – all the more so since the extraction of comedones, which forms a central conceit in this essay, comes up also in "Picasso's Slippers" in an explicit reference to the extraction of a "supersmooth comedo" that happens this time to be a pin going through Picasso's blood circulation. I should add that this extracting activity seems to be associated in Dalí's mind with the sadistic manipulation of old women. One of the experiments proposed in his article "The Object as revealed in Surrealist Experiment" involves "causing in some way any little old woman to come along and then pulling out one of her teeth," an action, Dalí says, liable to produce deep currents of demoralization.^[11]

To this sadistic manipulation of the "being-object," the old woman – traditionally the "witch," the nonsexual female – Dalí applies the term "moral aerodynamism." In this he comes close to several early notions proposed by Georges Bataille. I won't go into this in detail; I have dealt with it quite extensively in my earlier Dalí work.^[12] Enough to say that Bataille views the "fetid ditch of bourgeois society"^[13] as polarized between two impulses, excretion and appropriation. Excretion is the expulsion of unassimilable elements – foreign bodies, in Bataille's phrasing – found in the social fabric. Declaring that Beings-Objects are the strange [or foreign] bodies of space, Dalí points to their excremental character as being subsumed in their expulsion out of "space" – or out of the social and cultural order. This activity is described in the very graphic terms of an expulsion of comedones out of the pores of the nose. The notion of "moral aerodynamism" in Dalí's scheme implies a system of sadomasochistic impulses encompassing "victim" and creator or perpetrator alike.

To return then to the passage under consideration, one may well ask why I am dwelling on this "being-object," the old Muller, whose presence is implied by the text? What has she to do with Picasso? My point is that Picasso in Dalí's anecdote gains, by association – for Dalí, it should be emphasized – something of the Being-Object stature, the excremental foreign body that is to be expelled. This association has to do with the reciprocity or reversal of roles and persona in Dalí's text. Muller is there in the text – rather as a subtext – perhaps not for a reader unfamiliar with the source story but certainly for Dalí himself, and we are after all dealing with Dalí in the process of concocting all this. Furthermore, Muller is there in the text the way La Schroeder is constantly present there, as a shadowy presence lurking behind or within the figures of Dalí and Picasso alike. In the title of this presentation I'm referring to shifting identities. And indeed the text is built around shifting identities – the reversal of roles of Dalí and Picasso in the course of the story as well as the shifting sexual identity, as each one in his turn becomes enmeshed within the shadowy presence of La Schroeder. As we have seen, such reversals also bring about Picasso's association with the figure of Muller in the opening paragraph, and, as I will show further on, place in a particular light the figure of the Hitlerian Nursemaid in the closing paragraph.

I should at this point raise another question with regard to Dalí's anecdote. What is this ugly painting shown to Picasso? Whose is it? In an article devoted to Dalí's painting *Le Jeu lugubre* that appeared in the 7th issue of *Minotaure* in December, Bataille noted that the paintings of Picasso are hideous but those of Dalí are frighteningly ugly.^[14] Dalí may have found it gratifying then, at that time, to be labeled thus, although one assumes he was less happy to read Bataille's note that this is "the only similarity between two bodies of work, which differ from each other as much as a cloud of flies differs from an elephant." However, now in 1935 this is no longer the case. Indeed, there is no question now as to at whose feet this ugliness is to be laid.^[15] "Picasso had too elevated a notion of ugliness," the text says, "to be able to treat his good taste to the diamonds of reality." For Dalí, this elevated notion of ugliness is inextricably related to the "merveilleuse assurance" – the marvelous self-assurance – with which Picasso responds to the painting shown to him (let's note that this "merveilleuse assurance" replaces the "merveilleuse voix," the marvelous voice of the actress). Dalí may have had in mind an essay by Michel Leiris concerning recent paintings by Picasso that appeared in the second issue of *Documents* published early in 1930.^[16] Arguing against prevailing views concerning the supposed ugliness or monstrosity of Picasso's creations, Leiris underscores instead Picasso's matter-of-fact treatment of everything, the way he treats things "aussi familièrement qu'il est possible," as familiarly as possible; nothing human – or inhuman – is strange to him. His creatures "are unlike ourselves, or rather, they are the same as us, but with a different form, a more radiant structure, and, above all, they are marvelously confirmed." Picasso's self-assurance then is born of familiarity with monstrosity and ugliness, with the everydayness of their existence. But why his surprise when shown the painting? Picasso's surprise is taken over verbatim from the original story where Schroeder looks at the old woman in surprise. But it may have served Dalí well enough, wishing to show that Picasso is surprised to view an ugliness that is "most truculent and the most worthy of being taken as model" which is not his own. Or, as the passage seems to imply equally well, Picasso's self-assurance may be taken as the cause of his inability to identify himself in this ugly vision facing him in this "abominable mirror" (to use Bataille's apt evocation of Dalí's paintings)^[17] – the mirror which Dalí places before him.

Ugliness, by implication, has to do also with the old woman, Muller of the original story, who comes up, as I have shown, to haunt the text, enmeshing Picasso – for Dalí, let's not forget, for Dalí in the process of writing – in her spectral presence. And a Specter she is, no doubt about it, as described in the source story: "ravaged by affliction, resembling one of these statues made of stone inserted in the walls of churches during the devout middle ages in memory of the dead." Such statues come close to the "Spectral" quality of objects and beings presented by Dalí, verbally and plastically, in terms of the macabre vision of fragmented anatomies and decomposition or partial decomposition, exhibiting partially revealed skeleton.^[18] That Picasso has been perceived by Dalí as an embodiment of the notion of the specter is well attested to in the essay "The New Colors of Spectral Sex-Appeal," where he is placed in the category of Specters (together with Gala, Harpo Marx and Duchamp). I should add that in the review or the "invitation" to Picasso's show in Barcelona, included as noted before in the same issue of *Cahiers d'art*, Dalí assigns a spectral quality to Picasso with his evocation of Picasso's "whitest bone, the terrible bone," in reference to what looks like skeletal forms and arrays of bones in several works by Picasso, and primarily the Crucifixion series of the early 1930s.^[19]

It's not by chance that Dalí and Picasso, entwined and merged with La Schroeder in the course of the main body of the story, are framed in the passages opening and closing the text by two female figures embodying the concepts of phantom and specter. One is the spectral apparition of the "being-object" hovering as a subtext in the opening section, the other the Hitlerian Nursemaid or wet-nurse appearing in the closing section (I won't go into the very involved question of Dalí's assumed flirting with Nazism; it has been extensively dealt with by others). Evoking "her edible and heavy sweetness resting with all its force of gravity, as she sits absent-mindedly in a large puddle of water . . ."^[20] Dalí saw her as an apotheosis of the Phantom. These two concepts, the phantom and the Specter, introduced by Dalí in his essay "The New Colors of Spectral Sex-Appeal,"^[21] parallel two thematic and stylistic aspects of Dalí's vision of softness and deformation. Both phantom and specter carry connotations of anguish or anxiety (*angoisse*). On the basis of hints strewn in Dalí's art and writing, one may surmise that the nursemaid, embodying his "cannibalistic" deliriums, represents the anxiety-ridden attraction-repulsion of being engulfed by the mother, while the "spectral sex-appeal" implies a dismemberment anxiety associated with the "fine biological terror," to use Dalí phrase, provoked by the missing phallus.

This notion of the missing phallus brings me back to my earlier consideration of Picasso's slippers in their capacity as fetish objects. These slippers, and, by extension, Picasso himself, are placed within Dalí's "heavy and hairy piled alpaca overcoat" (in the original story it is merely an overcoat), which fulfills well enough the role of the fur which, in Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*, stands for the pubic hair in dreams caused by the stimuli arising from the male sexual organs. It is in this respect that Picasso's slippers further gain in significance. Dalí was probably well aware of another fetishistic shoe reference, one that figures quite prominently in Breton's essay "Equation de l'objet trouvé" (published in *Documents 34: Intervention surréaliste*, 1934, and later included in his *L'Amour fou*).^[22] In Breton's essay, a wooden spoon, with a small shoe forming part of it, is placed at the core of an involved network of associations which includes the phrase "the ashtray of Cinderella," a "waking sentence" of Breton's, which gives rise to an equation built on the Cinderella story which reads, "slipper=spoon=penis=perfect mold of this penis," with Breton adding that Cinderella's slipper, in this case as well as in folklore, assumes the meaning of a "lost object." The "lost object" also fits Freud's definition of the fetish in his essay

on "Fetishism" as a substitute for the mother's lost penis. Thus in Dalí's sadomasochistic wish-fulfilling premonition, Picasso's slippers in their capacity of fetish or penis substitutes remain dry, while Dalí's fur, and by extension Dalí himself, "mud-spattered and dripping in dirty water" (this is an added touch of Dalí's), can only be compared, says Dalí, "in the light of its pitiful, depressing and demoralizing effect, to the genuine, profound and irreparable malaise that can be produced by the copious and unpleasantly drenched skirts of the well-known Dalinian nursemaid. . ." This is the nursemaid or wet nurse who embodies, as noted before, Dalí's "cannibalistic" deliriums of the merger with the mother. Biting into her soft back, Dalí declares in *Conquest of the Irrational*, is an attempt at overcoming "all kinds of paternal affective hungers." Picasso, in his capacity of fetish or a penis substitute, is by extension the father whom Dalí wishes to exorcise. In that case we might also see his phallic law as being undermined by this assumed act of homage, which is really a form of aggressiveness, of masochistic control, as *Venus in Furs* makes amply clear. With this in mind, and in view of the connection created by Dalí between his overcoat and the nursemaid's drenched skirts, shouldn't we see Picasso who remains dry as being expelled from the sphere of the "Hitlerian nursemaid" which is also the sphere of the mother? Thus the symbolic expulsion of Picasso the father in his capacity as an excremental being-object is enhanced by this added expulsion from the mother's sphere, that is to say, a symbolic expulsion from the setting of Dalí's affective representations. Or, in psychoanalytic terms, the masochism implied by the placing of the overcoat under Picasso's feet is in fact a form of aggressiveness that, according to Lacan, is directed not against the other nor against the self but rather against the self qua other – which in this case happens to be Dalí in his identification with Picasso as a father figure.

Overcoats play a role in this intricate web of associations formed by Dalí. Dalí's drenched overcoat is comparable to the envelope that transfigures the virtual volume of the phantom that is the nursemaid, as Dalí argues in the "Spectral Sex-Appeal" essay. Alongside this overcoat there is also the shabby overcoat worn by Picasso at all times – photos show him wearing it in his studio or at large – to which contemporaries and biographers often refer. "If he [Picasso] smiled at a wardrobe," says the text, "this smile would come from his overcoat, and if he consented to let himself get intoxicated by the wardrobe, he would also wish that his own overcoat were happy with all its soul . . ." This passage may have echoed the anthropomorphizing of objects in a text written by Picasso on November 7, 1935 (we know that Dalí had the opportunity to read some of Picasso's texts, as Gertrude Stein relates in her book *Everybody's Autobiography*). [23] Picasso's text reads, "As long as the chair doesn't come up to tap me on the shoulder with its usual familiarity and the kitchen table doesn't snuggle up in my arms and the hot-water bottle doesn't kiss my lips and smile laugh and whisper into my ears a thousand things I barely understand . . ." [24] The indefinite sexuality accorded to these objects and pieces of furniture in Picasso's text appears to find an echo in Dalí's phrasing. There the overcoat's masculinity replaces Schroeder's heart, or she herself, in the wording of the original Sacher-Masoch story – which refers to Schroeder smiling at a stranger with all her heart. What is significant in this respect is the association of the overcoat/Schroeder, or rather the androgynous Picasso/Schroeder entity, with a piece of furniture. Dalí probably was well aware of the mingling of male and female organs in Picasso's works of the late 1920s and up to the time of writing, with these associated at times with furniture, as in the series of drawings *Une Anatomie* (1933) with their "androgynous puns," to use Robert Rosenblum's phrase. [25] In fact, androgynous figures are to be found in Picasso's work all through this period, from the monstrous organisms of 1927-8, with their tumescent phallicisms or the

combination of male and female organs in a 1929 drawing for the Crucifixion, or the tongue emerging like a phallus from a toothed slit in the face in several works.^[26] The androgynous sexuality is expressed not only through single figures but also in bestial couplings where the lack of bodily distinction and fixed sexual identity conveys a sense of a single monstrous organism.^[27] Lydia Gasman, in an extensive and well-documented study, sees the androgyny in Picasso's works as reflecting a mythical sense of the primordial Androgyne, the bisexual first semi-divine man, in the framework of an autobiography in which the personal and the mythical are fused into an organic whole.^[28] It might be assumed that the perception of such mythological dimension won't be lost on Dalí with his penchant for mythologizing his own situation. In view of the reversals informing the figures of Dalí and Picasso in the text, shouldn't we see the expulsion of Picasso also as echoing Dalí's perception of his own battle of liberation from parental authority? Let's recall the staging of this conflict, in the early 1930s, around the androgynous figure of William Tell,^[29] personifying the repressions represented by the super-ego associated by Dalí with a combined parental figure. Let's recall also the bizarre bisexual combination of male and female genitalia in the description of his sister's image – the sister who assumes a parental stance – in the poem "Love and Memory."^[30]

I have built much of my argument in this presentation on the reversals of roles, shifting identities, and primarily the merging of identities – the merging of Dalí and Picasso with La Schroeder and with the two female figures opening and closing the text. I will stray now somewhat from Dalí's text in order to broaden the implication for Dalí of such merging. Picasso's question, "Why do you hide your face from me, as if it were known to me?" implies a sense of hiding and yet also knowledge of what is hidden. This is, in a way, something akin to the process of perceiving the images contained or hidden within paranoiac images, as documented by Dalí in 1931 in his "Communication: Visage paranoïaque."^[31] Beginning around that time to develop his concept of Morphological Echoes, Dalí was well aware of a somewhat similar conception underlying a drawing by Picasso, included by Breton in his essay "Picasso poète" that appeared in the same issue of *Cahiers d'Art*. The combination of a swan and its reflection which makes a scorpion is accompanied by the inscription "The Swan on the lake makes the scorpion in his manner."^[32] In 1937 Dalí reiterated Picasso's conception with his *Swans Reflecting Elephants*. However, in 1935 his interests lie elsewhere, as I will show next.

That Dalí had seen Breton's materials at the time he wrote his own text is well attested to by a text by Picasso, dated November 4 1935, to which Breton refers the reader and that appears as a facsimile insert on p. 181 in this *Cahiers d'Art* issue. It reads: "tonight I saw the last person leaving the concert at the salle Gaveau / and then I went out to get some matches in the tobacco shop a bit further along the same street,"^[33] a phrase echoes by Dalí in describing Picasso going out in haste to buy cigarettes near the Salle Gaveau. Dalí may also have seen the text dated by Picasso November 1, on the bottom of which Picasso added the following lines (undated but probably written around the same time): "we had come to be the most perfect image of infinity / I live in her and she lives in me."^[34] This notion of being one within the other, associated with the visual conception underlying the Swan-Scorpion image, appears to underlie what I have referred to as the androgynous Picasso/Schroeder entity, now in its more materially visual manifestation. This brings me to the last point that I wish to make.

Picasso's figures, androgynous or otherwise, were often referred to at the time as monsters. This is well-attested to by Michel Leiris's use of the term "monster" with regard to Picasso's creatures, in the essay referred to before, while insisting that, contrary to the popular notion, they are "neither phantoms nor monsters." I would hazard the thought that, for Dalí, the notion of the "monster" pervades "Picasso's Slippers" on account of the perception of both La Schroeder and Picasso as "monstres sacrés," that is, as venerable or popular public figures who are considered above criticism. But he also may have visually perceived the ghostly presence of La Schroeder intertwined with Picasso's figure as a swan-scorpion or a monstrous two-headed figure, not unlike the monstrous coupling of heads in some of Picasso's works of the early 1930s.^[35] However we may see this conjecture, it is quite apparent that Dalí does respond to this monstrous quality that he sees in Picasso, and this with his own monsters. The composite figures formed by the doubling of heads in the painting *The Invention of Monsters* (1937) and several associated drawings may have echoed Picasso's coupling of heads. However, contrary to the bestial self-devouring Picasso heads, the doubled heads in Dalí's painting – primarily those of Dalí and Gala – appear to reflect the sense of the myth of the androgyne which, as argued by Albert Béguin,^[36] consists of the nostalgia of return to a unity, to a figure in which all contraries are resolved– an idea that gets full expression in Dalí's painting and poem "The Metamorphosis of Narcissus." The doubled images of women and horses, which might be seen as hybrid forms of centaurs, seem to counter Picasso's often warring and violent Minotaurs, who appear threatening even when craving for love.^[37] Viewed thus, the painting seems to represent, following the trail carved by "Picasso's Slippers," yet another phase in Dalí's waged struggle to liberate himself from Picasso's parental authority, in what ultimately proves to be a conflict never to be fully resolved.

[1] *Contemporary Poetry and Prose*, nos. 4-5 (August-September, 1936), pp. 80-82.

[2] *Cahiers d'art* (Paris) 10 (7-10) (1935), pp. 208-12.

[3] Haim Finkelstein, *Salvador Dalí's Art and Writing 1927-1942: The Metamorphoses of Narcissus* (New York and Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 224-26.

[4] Alain Bosquet, *Conversations with Dalí*, trans. Joachim Neugroschel (New York: Dutton, 1969), p. 65.

[5] Sacher Masoch, *La Pantoufle de Sapho et autres Contes*, trad. D. Dolorès (Paris: Charles Carrington, Libraire-Éditeur, 1907).

[6] Quotations from the text are to *The Collected Writings of Salvador Dalí*, Edited and Translated by Haim Finkelstein (New York and Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 297-301.

[7] *Collected Writings*, p. 268.

[8] Prominent examples are Dalí's sculpture *Venus de Milo with Drawers* (1936) and Meret Oppenheim's object *Fur-Lined Cup, Saucer, and Spoon* (1936).

[9] *Collected Writings*, p. 200.

[10] *Collected Writings*, p. 210.

[11] *Collected Writings*, p. 241.

[12] *Art and Writing*, pp. 173-4.

[13] Georges Bataille, *Visions of Excess: Selected Writings, 1927-1939*, Ed. and trans. Allan Stoekl (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985), p. 43.

[14] Georges Bataille, "The 'Lugubrious Game,'" in *Visions of Excess: Selected Writings*, p. 27. In what concerns Picasso, Bataille may have had in mind works by Picasso like those that appeared earlier in the first issue of *Documents* in April 1929.

- [15] There are many works by Picasso that would fit the appellation of "ugly." Dalí may have had in mind a painting such as *The Woman with a Stilet*, now at the Musée Picasso, and a great many of the works done in 1933-4. For reproductions of many of the paintings referred to here and further on in this paper, see, *The Surrealist Picasso*, Fondation Beyeler, Flammarion, 2005; *Picasso érotique*, Galerie nationale du Jeu de Paume, Paris, 2001.
- [16] Michel Leiris, "Toiles récentes de Picasso," *Documents* 2, pp. 57-71.
- [17] *Visions of Excess*, p. 27.
- [18] See, for instance, Dalí's painting, *The Horseman of Death* (1935), and, most spectacularly, his *The Specter of Sex Appeal* (1934).
- [19] See, for instance, Picasso's *Woman in Red Armchair* (Jan 1932), studies for *The Crucifixion*, and the final painting in the series (Sept-Oct 1932), all at the Musée Picasso.
- [20] This evocation seems to fit best the image appearing in *The Specter and the Phantom*, 1934.
- [21] *Collected Writings*, p. 204.
- [22] See André Breton, *L'amour fou* (Paris: Gallimard, 1937), pp. 32-46; *Mad Love*, trans. Mary Ann Caws (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), pp. 25-38.
- [23] See Gertrude Stein, *Everybody's Autobiography* (London: W. Heinemann, 1938), pp. 6-26.
- [24] *Picasso: Collected Writing (Picasso: Ecrits)*, Ed. Marie-Laure Bernadac et al (New York: Abbeville Press, 1989), p. 34; Pablo Picasso, *The Burial of the Count of Orgaz & Other Poems* (Cambridge, MA: Exact Change, 2004), p. 42.
- [25] Robert Rosenblum, "Picasso and the Anatomy of eroticism," *Studies in Erotic Art*, ed. Theodore Bowie and Cornelia v. Christensen (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 349.
- [26] For instance, *Woman Reclining under the window* (Feb 1934) and *Figure on the Seaside* (Nov 1933), both at the Musée Picasso.
- [27] See, for instance, *Figures by the Sea* (Jan 1931), *Bathers* (April 1933), and *Coupling* (April 1933), all at the Musée Picasso.
- [28] Lydia Gasman, "Mystery, Magic and Love in Picasso, 1925-1938: Picasso and the Surrealist Poets" (PhD. Thesis, Columbia University, 1981), pp. 303-8. See Chapter V "Picasso's Cabana Seris: 1927-1938."
- [29] In paintings such as *William Tell* (1930), *The Old Age of William Tell* (1931), and *Memory of the Child-Woman* (1932).
- [30] "My sister's image/ the anus red/ with bloody shit/ the cock/ half erect/ elegantly propped up against/ a huge/ personal/ and colonial/ lyre / the left testicle/ partially dipped/ in a glass/ of tepid milk . . ." *Collected Writings*, p. 163.
- [31] Dalí, "Communication: Visage paranoïaque," in *Le Surréalisme au service de la Révolution* 3, December 1931.
- [32] *Cahiers d'art* (Paris) 10 (7-10) (1935), p. 191.
- [33] *Picasso: Collected Writing*, pp. 33-4 (insert reproduced on p. 35); *Burial of the Count of Orgaz*, p. 41.
- [34] *Picasso: Collected Writing*, p. 374.
- [35] For example, *Le Baiser (The Kiss)*, Aug 1929, and *Le Baiser (The Kiss)*, Jan 1931, both at the Musée Picasso.
- [36] Albert Béguin, "L'Androgyne," *Minotaure* 11 (1938), pp. 10-13, 66.
- [37] For example, *Minotaur raping a woman*, June 1933 (Musée Picasso), *The Minotaur*, Nov 1933 (Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts).

