The prints of David Hockney:

their cultural, autobiographical and artistic contexts

by Jane Kinsman

Volume 1: Text

Volume 2: Illustrations

Measurements are given in centimetres, height before width.

Where two sizes are listed for the prints, composition precedes sheet size.

December 2011

I, Jane Kinsman, declare that except where reference is made in the text of the thesis, the thesis is my own original work. No other person's work has been included except where this has been acknowledged.

Jane Kinsman

student Ron Fuller and print publishers Stanley Felson of Gemini GEL and Paul Cornwall-Jones of Editions Alecto and Petersburg Press.

Sadly a number of those interviewed as part of my research or who were in correspondence with me are now deceased.

On a personal level I would like to thank my daughter Bella Counihan for her support.

Précis

David Hockney has been a significant figure in contemporary printmaking in both the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Since 1954 making prints has been an integral part of Hockney's art practice. It is a field of art in which he is excelled and, over five decades, he has created a significant body of prints during a period which has witnessed a revival in this art form. Hockney has constantly pushed the boundaries of printmaking in terms of style, subject matter and technique.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 5: Figuring it out – Portraiture

Section 3: Collaboration and beyond

The prints of David Hockney: their cultural, autobiographical and artistic contexts

A synopsis

For almost five decades David Hockney has been involved in making prints and created a significant body of work which has extended the confines of printmaking in his exploration of techniques and scale. This body of work charts his artistic development in his choice of themes and as his style has evolved.

Printmaking has also provided Hockney with a diversion when other forms of his art, notably painting, were in a stylistic and iconographic cul de sac. The history of Hockney's involvement in making prints has formed a critical path in his overall artistic development in all its variety of forms. For much of his life as an artist, David Hockney has been freer, more experimental and less inhibited in his approach to creating art when making prints than when painting. A successful career in painting often eluded him during much of his early career, particularly after he adopted the use of acrylic paint, and he would often find himself in an artistic dead end in his painting style. In contrast, making prints often provided him a way forward.

Hockney's development from an emerging artist to a mature and successful one lay in his constant searching for new ways of depiction, other than those belonging to new modernist canons. He was constantly posing pictorial problems and then trying to solve them. To this end, Hockney developed a hybrid art in his printmaking, one of wide ranging eclecticism. He then turned to naturalism, only to find he needed to explore further choices. As a mature artist Hockney achieved a fusion of the abstract and formal elements in his work to tackle age-old issues – how to portray someone, how to depict a landscape and a season, a time of day and under certain weather conditions and how to indicate space and time in two-dimensional art forms. For Hockney, printmaking has been an integral part of this search and discovery.

Now entering the second decade of the twenty-first century, Hockney has achieved his ambition to become a landscape painter of consequence and therein lies his present focus. In this context the significant purpose and role that prints played in his artistic career in the twentieth century for the moment

has become less crucial in his artistic modus operandi. At the same time, his recent embrace of digital processes in art, using an iPhone or iPad, has led him into new methods of printmaking.

The thesis is arranged as follows:

VOLUME 1: TEXT

Title page, declaration of honesty and acknowledgments
Précis
Synopsis
Introduction

Section 1: Hockney's student days

Chapter 1: Bradford

Chapter 2: The art of lithography and a developing taste for the Nabis in Britain

Chapter 3: Hockney's first prints and current stylistic developments

Chapter 4: The London scene

Chapter 5: The Royal College of Art

Chapter 6: Hockney and the Pop Art movement

Section 2: Hockney as an emerging artist

Chapter 1: Developments in Hockney's iconography

Chapter 2: Graduation and new horizons

Chapter 3: Hockney in America and the development of the modern print workshop

Chapter 4: Literary imagery and intaglio prints

Chapter 5: Figuring it out – Portraiture

Section 3: Collaboration and beyond

Chapter 1: The art of collaboration

The prints of David Hockney:

their cultural, autobiographical and artistic contexts

INTRODUCTION

Printmaking is frequently a more 'diaristic', private, confessional and intimate medium and hence more revealing of the artist's makeup than the grand canvas[1] There is less pressure to create the *magnum opus* than one finds in 'finished' or large-scale painting. Instead the process is for the most part a more intimate one. Certainly in Hockney's case, his prints provide a breadth of understanding and a wealth of information about his own development in a rich and varied career as an artist. Hockney's initial chosen methods of lithography and then etching, so suitable for an artist whose prime focus was on drawing, beguiled Hockney from the very beginning, as he honed his skill as a gifted draughtsman. As an artist he has always been fascinated with various ways of making art:

> I love new mediums. I think mediums can turn you on, they can excite you; they always let you do something in a different way, even if you take the same subject, if you draw it in a different way, or if you are forced to simplify it, to make it bold because it is too finicky, I like that.[2]

Printmaking has led Hockney to create his compositions in new and different ways, in a field in which he produced some of his most accomplished and most diverse compositions. It is my intention in this thesis to provide an extensive and comprehensive account of Hockney's printmaking activities and to adopt the broad 'art as autobiography' methodology to present his printmaking practice within a broader sociological framework. It is this body of work that reveals Hockney's quest to explore and extend ways of depiction. It enabled a particularly intimate and personal iconography, allowing the artist to produce, on occasions, autobiographical themes relating to his own homosexuality. It is my intention in this thesis to provide a new account of Hockney's art practice.

---

[1] This argument and its theoretical and methodological framework has been rehearsed in reference to a number of artists, especially Picasso; see discussion in Brigitte Baer, *Picasso the printmaker*, Dallas: Dallas Museum of Art, 1983.

[2] David Hockney, *Paper pools*, edited by Nikos Stangos. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 10, quoted in Jane Kinsman, 'David Hockney: a moving focus' in *The art of collaboration: the big Americans*, Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 2002, p. 49.

Printmaking also facilitated Hockney's ability to explore in visual terms his great love of literature, as well as develop his fascination with various styles in art. When asked about why 'literary' art was a 'dirty word' in art schools of the early 1960s in an interview with gallery director Mark Glazebrook, Hockney responded by saying, 'I never ever worried about it in my etchings, simply because in my etchings I use line and I think a line can somehow tell a story. So etchings are still literary in that they actually tell stories, whereas the paintings stopped being literary about when I went to California in 1964.'[3] Other techniques followed which allowed Hockney to develop new themes and new formats and to concentrate his skills as a draughtsman.

This thesis is located within artistic and social developments which contextualise his work and contains an examination of post Second World War developments in Britain, such as art tuition, and notes the limited understanding of many in the British art world of the major avant-garde art developments in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century. This provides an understanding of Hockney's artistic oeuvre. As Hockney developed as an artist he nurtured a growing admiration for Pablo Picasso and a fascination, in particular, with Cubism. During Hockney's early development, the emergence of new styles, such as Pop Art, also had an influence on his printmaking. Most importantly his growing admiration and increasing understanding of Cubism – and later his personal interpretation of Cubism – played a significant role in Hockney's art.

Hockney gained a greater understanding of Cubism when he explored new techniques, such as the method of colour intaglio printing that the French printer Aldo Crommelynck had developed for Pablo Picasso. Unfortunately, Picasso died before he was able take up this technique. This layered process allowed Hockney to develop compositions as a collage – a critical component in Cubism, which would become a significant element in Hockney's art as he matured. By the early 1980s Hockney began devising compositions in layers, as he investigated the interplay of photo-collage, painting and printmaking, especially with the Mylar 'sketchbooks' that printer and publisher Ken Tyler had devised. This allowed Hockney to develop compositions in layers, again providing an element of collage, which became a key element in his art practice.

---

[3] Mark Glazebrook, 'David Hockney: an interview', *David Hockney: paintings, prints and drawings 1960-1970*, London: Lund Humphries, 1970, p. 8.

Such experiences allowed the artist to explore and develop new ways of depicting space and implement technical inventions, especially how to work in layers of colour. As we examine his print oeuvre we can observe the development of his art from one of imagination to naturalism, to a Cubist-inspired depiction of reality.

It is also my objective to understand in depth Hockney's working methods in his printmaking career. His involvement in making prints coincided with the post-war advances in printmaking, especially in the United States, and much of his graphic oeuvre was the product of these developments. This period witnessed the evolution of technical advances in printmaking and papermaking and the establishment of print workshops, both small-scale and large 'high tech' venues. The era also witnessed the burgeoning group of entrepreneurs keen to be active in new print-publishing ventures and to supply a new market of collectors. Prints were now seen to rival painting in terms of scale, impact and ambition. In such a climate a number of major artists developed an interest and involvement in the exciting new prospects of making art. In this way the print revival was where many major artists chose to focus their talents and energies. Hockney was one of the significant artists who played an important role in the progress and expansion of this revival.

At first Hockney was happy to play an active role in creating prints in a workshop; later in his career he found working collaboratively put strictures on his creativity and spontaneity. However, Hockney remained engaged with the idea of making prints and turned to what were more modest print ventures, making his 'home made' prints from colour photocopiers, or images sent through fax machines, returning only occasionally to the large print workshop. Hockney's involvement has continued with his interest in digitally created art, with the advantage of a full spectrum of colour. At last, in this arena, there was no need to rely on a skilled printer in a large print workshop. Hockney has now ceased making conventional prints in a large print workshop. In the new digital age, he has now turned to the iPhone and iPad to explore and produce graphic art.

Despite the omnipresent preoccupation with printmaking for much of David Hockney's life, there has been no dedicated study devoted to his printmaking

practice. This thesis sets out to fill this *lacuna*. His printmaking oeuvre is considered both as an act of autobiography as well as a mirror on his times and as such both biographical and broad sociological methodologies have been employed in this thesis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Hockney as author

For an artist who has had a remarkable and sustained career in printmaking from 1954 onwards, this aspect of his career is somewhat surprisingly not well reflected in the extensive literature that has been devoted to the art of David Hockney. Hockney considers his contribution in printmaking to be very important. This is evident in the many references to and illustrations of his graphic art included in the first volume of his autobiography, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, which was edited by Nikos Stangos and had an introduction by his friend and curator, Henry Geldzahler.[4]

After a major exploration of paper pulp with master printer Ken Tyler, *Paper pools* was published in 1980. This publication concentrated on a particular medium and the way in which both artist and printer developed a working method to create some large scale and vividly coloured works that constituted a breakthrough in Hockney's development.

In the second volume of his autobiography *That's the way I see it*, which was published in 1993, Hockney continued to include his prints, including his *Home made prints* and faxes, as a vital part of his artistic development, along with other aspects of his art, such as stage design.

Hockney also included some of his prints in his personally selected 'retrospective', *Hockney's pictures: the definitive retrospective* published in 2004, to which he added some of his own commentaries.[5] The images were arranged thematically rather than chronologically. The relatively small number of prints reflected his focus on watercolour and painting at the time, but it did

---

[4] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976.
[5] David Hockney, *Hockney's pictures: the definitive retrospective*, London: Thames and Hudson, 2004.

4

include some early etchings; later intaglio prints, including colour etching and paper pulp work; his large editioned newspaper print, *A bounce for Bradford* of 1987; and examples of the complex spatial works in the *Moving focus* series. This 2004 publication updated an earlier 'retrospective', *Pictures by David Hockney*, again arranged thematically, which included a selection of prints and a paper pulp work, with a brief introduction by the artist. Nikos Stangos, who selected the work and edited this publication noted: '[I]t has always been Hockney's desire to make available an album of his most representative pictures, unencumbered by any commentary; as he stated: "it is very good advice to believe only what an artist does, rather than what he says about his work".[6]

Hockney's prints as the subject

Given the vital role that printmaking has played in David Hockney's artistic development, it is surprising that only a few publications exist which focus solely on this very important aspect of Hockney's art. Director Michael Glazebrook produced the catalogue for the important early retrospective exhibition *David Hockney: paintings, prints and drawings 1960-1970* for the Whitechapel Gallery in 1970. As well as an interview with the artist by Glazebrook, some but not all of Hockney's prints were included, beginning in 1954, with accompanying comments by Glazebrook and others gleaned from the artist's own comments, as well as those by Robert Hughes and Paul Overy.[7]

The first publication devoted solely to a survey of Hockney's prints was for a catalogue accompanying the travelling exhibition *David Hockney prints 1954-77*, published by the Midland Group and the Scottish Arts Council in association with Petersburg Press. For this, Andrew Brighton wrote an introduction about Hockney's print oeuvre, providing some personal and cultural context for the prints and briefly outlining developments in this field. There were 218 entries for individual prints, which covered many, but not all of Hockney's work up to early 1977. More recently Brighton returned to a focus on Hockney's prints and his gay iconography in a thoughtful essay, 'Hockney's courage' for the Nottingham

[6] Nikos Stangos, 'Editorial note', *Pictures by David Hockney*, selected and edited by Nikos Stangos, New York; Harry N Abrams Inc., 1976, p. 13.
[7] Robert Hughes, *London Magazine*, volume 5, number 10, January 1966, pp. 68-73; Paul Overy, *The Listener*, 4 August 1966, p. 170.

Contemporary exhibition catalogue, *David Hockney 1960-1968: a marriage of styles*.[8]

Marco Livingstone wrote an introductory essay, 'Hockney: pleasures of the senses' for a publication devoted to printmaking, *David Hockney: etchings and lithographs 1961-1986*. This catalogue included a thoughtfully chosen group of prints up to and including several of the *Moving focus* lithographs made with Ken Tyler.[9] More recently Livingstone has added to our knowledge of Hockney's etchings for *The rake's progress* with an essay on three prints made in preparation for the series.[10]

In 1988 Craig Hartley wrote two articles which were published in *Print Quarterly*, 'David Hockney: printmaking and technique', I and II, which examined a select group of prints from 1961 to 1986 with an emphasis on the technical aspects of Hockney's printmaking and with little attention to subject matter and style.[11] These essays and chosen prints were modified and provided the basis for Hartley's introduction to the exhibition catalogue, *David Hockney: 25 years of printmaking* for the CCA Galleries, Berkeley Square Gallery, London.[12]

In 1992 Manfred Sellink wrote a good introduction and exhibition catalogue entries for the exhibition *David Hockney: Grafiek/Prints* for the Museum Boymans van Beuningen in Rotterdam. There were 62 prints in the exhibition, along with a portfolio of photographs.[13]

The Museum of Contemporary Art, Tokyo, in 1996 produced a catalogue *David Hockney: prints from 1954 to 1995* for a travelling exhibition in Japan. This included an essay in Japanese by Hiroko Kato.[14] Short catalogue entries were included with small images of a substantial number of the prints that were published during the period specified, but no proofs or other unpublished prints

---

[8] Andrew Brighton, 'Hockney's courage', *David Hockney 1960-1968: a marriage of styles*, Nottingham: Nottingham Contemporary, 2009, pp. 73-80.

[9] Marco Livingstone, *David Hockney: etchings and lithographs 1961-1986*, London: Thames and Hudson, Waddington Graphics, 1988.

[10] Marco Livingstone, 'Three Hockney prints rediscovered', *Print Quarterly*, volume XXIII, part 4, December 2008, pp. 417-420.

[11] Craig Hartley, 'David Hockney: 'printmaking and technique – I', *Print Quarterly*, volume V, part 3, 1988, pp. 242-256; 'David Hockney: 'printmaking and technique – II', *Print Quarterly*, volume V, part 4, 1988, pp. 373-394.

[12] Craig Hartley, *David Hockney: 25 years of printmaking*, London: CCA Galleries Berkeley Square Gallery, London, [1988].

[13] Manfred Sellink, *David Hockney: Grafiek/Prints*, Rotterdam: Museum Boymans van Beuningen, 1992.

[14] Hiroko Kato, *David Hockney: Prints from 1954 to 1995*, Tokyo: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1996

were included. Since then there has been no further extensive publication devoted solely to David Hockney's prints.

There are commercial gallery catalogues of Hockney's prints and the more significant of these have been included in the bibliography.

General studies

Marco Livingstone and Paul Melia have provided key studies in art history on the subject of David Hockney, while Peter Webb has published the artist's biography. These are major publications on David Hockney and all acknowledge the importance of printmaking in David Hockney's development as an artist. Livingstone updated his groundbreaking analysis of David Hockney first published in 1981, revised in 1987 and later in 1996.[15] It remains essential reading for all those interested in the artist for its historic overview. Livingstone also is the author of the entry for David Hockney in *Grove Art Online* (2009). Paul Melia has regularly contributed to the analysis of Hockney's art. His works are in the bibliography and include co-authored publications with Ulrich Luckhardt. Most original in Melia's writings to date has been the catalogue *David Hockney: you make the picture*: *Paintings and prints 1982-1995* which accompanied an exhibition held at Manchester City Art Galleries in 1996-1997 focusing on Hockney's growing depiction of space and the role of the viewer in his art.[16]

Peter Webb was the author of *The erotic arts* of 1975, which includes David Hockney's work and, in the deluxe edition, an etching by the artist.[17] Webb has written a biography of Hockney, *Portrait of David Hockney*, which provides a personalised account of the artist's life and his art including important information on his prints. This covers the Bradford years and includes the artist's life in Los Angeles in 1988, the year of publication.[18]

The major retrospective organised by Maurice Tuchman and Stephanie Barron *David Hockney: a retrospective*, was shown at the Los Angeles County

---

[15] Marco Livingstone, *David Hockney*, revised and expanded edition, London: Thames and Hudson, 1996
[16] Paul Melia, *David Hockney: you make the picture: Paintings and prints 1982-1995*, Manchester: Manchester City Art Galleries, 1996
[17] Peter Webb, *The erotic arts*, London: Secker and Warburg, 1975, limited edition of 100 includes a screenprint by Allen Jones and an etching by David Hockney
[18] Peter Webb, *Portrait of David Hockney*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1988.

Museum, The Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Tate Gallery in 1988-1989.[19] The accompanying catalogue reveals the important role printmaking played in this account of the artist's work.

All acknowledge the significant role that printmaking has played in Hockney's history, but each publication is focused on a broader account of the artist and so provides a very limited explanation of this important field of Hockney's art.

Art history and social theory

This thesis has been undertaken in the Department of Art History and Curatorship at the Australian National University, Canberra. Curatorial methodology has therefore to some extent informed the content of this text (see section on Methodology). However, the thesis has also been informed by biographical methodologies and broad sociological approaches. Because Hockney's prints, particularly from the 1960s, are concerned with gay imagery and an interpretation of art styles, some examination of relevant history and theory is required. The pioneering work on the theory of sexuality by the French philosopher Michel Foucault and the American Judith Butler have provided a guide to interpretation. Both have built on the cultural historiography of Raymond Williams, who argued, 'what always needs to be understood is the specificity of the response, which is not a judgement but a practice'. When explaining the use of the term 'critique', Butler notes that:

> Raymond Williams worried that the notion of criticism has been unduly restricted to the notion of 'fault-finding' and proposed that we find a vocabulary for the kinds of responses we have, specifically to cultural works, 'which [do] not assume the habit (or right or duty) of judgment'. And what he called for was a more specific kind of response, one that did not generalise too quickly.

Such a critique Butler argues:

> Marks the trajectory of Foucault's thinking on this topic, since 'critique' is precisely a practice that not only suspends judgment for him, but offers a new practice of values based on that very suspension.[20]

[19] Maurice Tuchman & Stephanie Barron, *David Hockney: a retrospective*, LA: Los Angeles County Museum, 1988.
[20] Judith Butler, 'What is Critique? An Essay on Foucault's Virtue'[1], California: UC Berkeley, 2001 (2002), viewed at http://tedrutland.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/02/butler-2002.pdf

In Foucault's three volumes *The history of sexuality*,[21] the philosopher and theorist argued that recent understanding of sexuality is linked with society's power structures. Accepting this argument, this thesis examines the background to developments in the decriminalisation of homosexuality in post-war Britain, which assists in the interpretation as well as understanding the context for Hockney's personal voyage in exploring and developing a personal gay iconography. Applying Foucault's assertion of the relationship of sexuality, criminality and those in power, I investigate the immediate post-war period in Britain, where homosexuality remained a crime or by some was considered a medical problem. Even after the Wolfenden Report[22] published its findings, there was reluctance by the British Parliament to implement the recommendations. The struggle towards decriminalisation, until the logically inconsistent legislation was introduced in 1967 in the British Parliament, highlights the strength of opposition to such a law. This provides a context for the self- and institutional censorship which transpired in the 1960s in relation to films with gay themes.

In a social and political history of Britain from the nineteenth century to the mid 1970s, Jeffrey Weeks contends:

> Attitudes to homosexuality are inextricably linked to wider questions: of the function of the family, the evolution of gender roles, and of attitudes to sexuality generally.[23]

Such reasoning reinforces the need to explore the changing perception of homosexuality. The more recent 2005 publication by Matt Houlbrook, *Queer London*[24] provides a further analysis of the history of crime, sexuality and geography in London. For Hockney – who belonged to a young generation of homosexuals living in London and who had not participated in the struggle for law reform in the 1950s – his own gay iconography developed using both coded references, names, humour and whimsy in the early 1960s. As has been

[21] Michel Foucault, *The history of sexuality*, volumes 1-3, translated by Robert Hurley, New York: Pantheon Books, c.1978-1986; Judith Butler, *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*, New York: Routledge, c.1999.

[22] For my research I read the authorised American edition, *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York, Stein and Day, 1963.

[23] Jeffrey Weeks, *Coming out: homosexual politics in Britain from the nineteenth century to the present*, London, Melbourne, New York: Quartet Books, 1977, p. 2.

[24] Matt Houlbrook, *Queer London: perils and pleasures in the sexual metropolis, 1918-1957*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 2005.

argued, a growing permissive society at this time also played its role in this personal history.

A major force in Hockney's development as an artist was the influence – as well as a growing understanding – of Pablo Picasso's Cubism. Thus the changing interpretation of this art movement has also been addressed in this thesis. Over the years Hockney moved from what had been a relatively traditional understanding of Cubism, born out of the tradition established by Picasso's art dealer Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler and proselytised by Douglas Cooper in Britain.[25] This tradition began with Kahnweiler in his account of Cubism published in 1920. The Kahnweiler approach was criticised in 2008 by Mark Antliff and Patricia Leighton in *A Cubism reader: documents and criticism; 1906-1914*, on the grounds that such an approach was out of step with more recent developments. They argue that:

> Over the past thirty years a new critical discourse on cubism has reshaped our conception of this movement and of early modernism as a whole.[26]

The Kahnweiler tradition, they consider, is descriptive and ultimately ahistorical but has remained influential, as seen in the scholarship of Alfred Barr, Clement Greenberg, Robert Rosenblum, Douglas Cooper, John Golding and Edward F. Fry (see details in Bibliography, Part 9 of this thesis). Antliff and Leighton are critical of Kahnweiler's interpretation of Cubism with his adoption of the so-called analytical and synthetic forms of Cubism and the separation of 'major' and 'minor' Cubists; moreover they are critical of the art dealer's subsequent influence, postulating that in the post-Clement Greenberg era Fry was informed by the formalism of the 1960s.[27]

Hockney's own interpretation of Cubism has changed over his lifetime as an artist and this change has been examined in this thesis, beginning with the Kahnweiler view as Douglas Cooper's proselytised in Britain in the post-war

---

[25] See Daniel Kahnweiler, *The way of Cubism*, translated by Henry Aronson, New York, 1949, originally published as *Der Weg Kubismus*, Delphin-Verlag, Munich, 1920; Douglas Cooper, *The Cubist epoch*, Phaidon in association with the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1970.

[26] Mark Antliff & Patricia Leighten (editors), *A cubism reader: documents and criticism; 1906 to 1914*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008, p. 1.

[27] Mark Antliff & Patricia Leighten (editors), *A cubism reader: documents and criticism: 1906 to 1914*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008, pp. 2-3.

period. Hockney's concept evolved into something of his own invention – what I have termed a 'Modern day Cubist'. Hockney's view of Cubism, to paraphrase theorist Yves-Alain Bois,[28] has become 'His Cubism', born out of the artist's close examination of depictions of space and his own artistic practice.

The print revival and collaboration

After the post-Second World War print revival and the development of significant print workshops, a number of art historians and curators have explored the idea of collaboration in the field of printmaking. Although artists have often worked with printers in the development of their prints, it is only in this new period in the second half the twentieth century and particularly in the United States that a more intense relationship has developed. Previously it was more that the artisan would develop the designs of the artist and there was little creative cross fertilisation. The 1960s heralded a newly developed art market where artists would make technically advanced and visually stunning graphics in collaboration with skilled master printers and assistants, supported financially by entrepreneurial publishing houses. These printers co-operated in a demanding, technically inventive and resourceful way with major or emerging talented artists, such as David Hockney, in order to produce prints that would rival paintings in scale and bravura.

In an account of a solo artist working in the field of modern day printmaking, Richard Field in *Richard Hamilton: image and process, 1952-1982*, described the need for Hamilton to receive professional assistance in print processes to be at his most creative.[29] Riva Castleman provided an in-depth account of another artist, Jasper Johns, and his need to have technically versatile support in a workshop in order to develop his complex iconography in *Jasper Johns: a print retrospective.*[30]

At the National Gallery of Art, Washington, where the Gemini GEL collection is held, Ruth Fine produced the catalogue for a travelling exhibition, *Gemini GEL:*

[28]In his published lecture, Yves-Alain Bois, 'The semiology of Cubism', in *Picasso and Braque: a symposium*; organised by William Rubin, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1989, pp. 129-208.
[29] Richard S Field, *Richard Hamilton: image and process, 1952-1982*, Stuttgart, London: Hansjörg Mayer, 1983.
[30] Riva Castleman, *Jasper Johns: a print retrospective*, Boston, Little Brown and Co, 1986.

art and collaboration.[31] The catalogue includes the prints produced at this workshop when Ken Tyler was both master printer and partner, and the period after 1973 when Tyler had left the business. The account provides details of how some of the most talented contemporary artists – Jasper Johns, Robert Rauschenberg, David Hockney and Roy Lichtenstein – worked collaboratively with the printing staff at the studio.

In the *Universal Art Editions workshop: a history and catalogue: the first twenty five years*,[32] Esther Sparks outlines the history of the role Tatyana Grosman and her workshop, which was a more traditional-style atelier, where artist and printer knew their roles.

Two publications from the National Gallery of Australia have examined the role of Ken Tyler and various contemporary artists in the post-war print revival in the United States. The first was Pat Gilmour's *Ken Tyler: master printer and the American print renaissance* published in 1986 and drawing principally on the rich collection of printer's proofs which were sold to the then Australian National Gallery in 1973.[33] In this publication Gilmour explores the role of Tyler as he worked with artists first on the west coast and then on the east coast of the United States and how the look of the prints changed. Gilmour also investigated the role of nineteenth-century printer Auguste Clot in her important essay, 'Cher Monsieur Clot...Auguste Clot and his role as a colour lithographer' in the book she edited, *Lasting impressions: lithography as art*, published in 1988.[34]This explores the pivotal role that Clot played in the execution of lithographs by French artists at the turn of century.

The second National Gallery of Australia publication on Tyler working with leading contemporary artists, I wrote in 2002, *The art of collaboration: the big Americans*.[35] This catalogue which accompanied an exhibition of prints made at

[31] Ruth Fine, *Gemini GEL: art and collaboration*, Washington: National Gallery of Art, date
[32] Esther Sparks, *Universal Art Editions workshop: a history and catalogue: the first twenty five years*, The Art Institute of Chicago and Harry N Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1989.
[33] Pat Gilmour, *Ken Tyler: master printer and the American print renaissance*, Canberra, Australian National Gallery, 1986.
[34] Pat Gilmour, 'Cher Monsieur Clot...Auguste Clot and his role as a colour lithographer', in *Lasting Impressions: lithography as art*, Canberra: Australian National Gallery, 1988 pp. 129-182. This publication also includes Clot's correspondence with some artists whose work he printed, such as Maurice Denis and Henri Fantin-Latour, along with publisher Ambroise Vollard and writer Octave Uzanne. A schedule of all the correspondence was also included in this publication, see pp. 382-391.
[35] Jane Kinsman, *The art of collaboration: the big Americans*, Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 2002.

the various Tyler studios by Josef Albers, Helen Frankenthaler, David Hockney, Jasper Johns, Roy Lichtenstein, Robert Motherwell, Robert Rauschenberg and Frank Stella, all drawn from the Tyler collection at the National Gallery of Australia spanned the period from 1965 until the end of the twentieth century. The publication examined the work of these various artists and the way they collaborated in the print workshop. Each artist had a different *modus operandi* which Tyler aimed to accommodate according to the circumstance and advances in the workshop over the years. Sometimes an artist would find the business of working placed great strains on his creativity, as Robert Motherwell describes:

> What actually happens when you're going to work with a noted printer/publisher such as Tamarind or Gemini or Tyler or Universal Limited Art Editions is that you arrive, say, at ten o'clock and are introduced to everybody. There are five or six printers standing around, there are a couple of secretaries, there's usually a photographer – maybe a member of the staff – and, in effect, you realise with a sinking heart that an enormous amount of time and money and organisation has been set aside in a definite time slot for you to be a creative genius. Now there's no situation that freezes your blood more.[36]

The modern print workshop was a double-edged sword. With its able assistants and leading printer it could provide a wonderful opportunity to create exciting and creative new editions. It could also sap creativity and chill the soul as Motherwell's comments attest.

In the essay on David Hockney's prints in *The art of collaboration: the big Americans*, I wrote:

> Of the many artists who have collaborated with Tyler in his four workshops over the years, it is only Hockney who has worked in all of them. In Tyler, Hockney found a printer who was both technically innovative and extraordinarily active: 'Working with someone who has an awful lot of energy is very thrilling. With Ken Tyler nothing was impossible. If I said, would we, he said, yes, yes, yes it can be done.'[37]

For any publication on David Hockney and his prints, his working relationship with Tyler has been an important element in the analysis of his progress as a printmaker from 1965. This has provided one important aspect for the thesis

---

[36] Robert Motherwell interviewed by Stephanie Terenzio, 28 December 1979, quoted in Jane Kinsman, *The art of collaboration: the big Americans*, Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 2002.
[37] Jane Kinsman, 'David Hockney: a moving focus' in *The art of collaboration: the big Americans*, Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 2002, p. 49, originally published in David Hockney, *Paper pools*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 10.

and contrasts with another dynamic in Hockney's working style – the need to be spontaneously creative and in control of his creativity.

David Hockney has given a large number of interviews over the years, which can be found in newspapers, journals, online, on film and in blogs. A select group of these have been included in the bibliography and some are quoted in the body of the text.

Interviews

Among the important interviews three authors provide informative and perceptive commentaries. In 1979 Anthony Bailey wrote a discerning and extensive profile on David Hockney, whom he interviewed, and which was published in *The New Yorker*.[38] A filmmaker and artist, Paul Joyce conducted a series of 17 interviews from 1982 to 1999 in various locations on wide ranging aspects of Hockney's art. These were published in *Hockney on art: conversations with Paul Joyce*.[39] Cultural writer and teacher Lawrence Weschler also has produced over time an important and insightful contribution to understanding the artist and his ideas in a series of essays republished in *True to life: twenty-five years of conversations with David Hockney*.[40] This is essential reading for anyone interested in the art of Hockney in all its forms.

There have been several documentaries about the artist. Two outstanding examples of these should be mentioned. The first is Melvyn Bragg's interview with Hockney on the occasion of his major retrospective at the Tate, London in 1988, where artist and interviewer walk through the exhibition and there is much illuminating discussion on the artist's work. The second is the documentary film *David Hockney: en perspective*, by Monique Lajournade and Pierre Saint-Jean,[41] produced for the exhibition at the Centre Georges Pompidou, 1999, which provides an important visual account of Hockney's growing interest in Picasso and in depicting space.

---

[38] Anthony Bailey, 'Profiles: special effects', *The New Yorker*, 30 July 1979, pp. 35-36, 41-41, 44, 49-58, 60-69.

[39] Paul Joyce, *Hockney on 'Art': conversations with Paul Joyce*, Boston, New York, London: Little, Brown and company, 1999. Part of this was previously published in *Hockney on photography*, London: Jonathon Cape, 1988.

[40] Laurence Weschler, *True to life: twenty-five years of conversations with David Hockney*, Berkley: University of California Press, 2004.

[41] *David Hockney: en perspective*, by Monique Lajournade and Pierre Saint-Jean, Paris: Canal+/ Mirage Illimité/ Grand Canal, Centre Georges Pompidou, 1999.

METHODOLOGY

This thesis I prepared within the Department of Art History and Curatorship at the ANU. Therefore there has been some emphasis placed on curatorial methodologies when researching and developing my subject matter, drawing on a vast array of primary sources. In my role as Senior Curator of International Prints, Drawings and Illustrated Books at the National Gallery of Australia since 1989, I have been uniquely placed to take advantage of the collection of David Hockney's prints from 1966. This collection was considerably augmented when the National Gallery of Australia acquired through purchase and gift the Ken Tyler collection of prints and documentation in 2002. The National Gallery of Australia holds the most extensive public collection of David Hockney's prints, printed screens, illustrated books, faxes, trial proofs and colour proofs, lithographic stones and bound Mylar 'sketch' books, numbering 1283 works in total. As well as these holdings the National Gallery of Australia has also acquired by gift a rich collection of film and sound of Hockney in Tyler's workshops from 1973 onwards, most of which has not been published; a collection of candid photography of Hockney at work from 1965 onwards; and a collection of reference material such as paper pulp experiments, colour swatches, documentary photographs, and printers' and publishers' notes. Much of this is unique primary source material. Other than the artist's own collection of his work and documentation, this collection is without parallel. As the curator responsible for this collection I have had access to this substantial body of work, which spans over 40 years and provides the researcher with the opportunity to make an in-depth analysis of **how** Hockney created his prints. The National Gallery of Australia also owns the painting, *A bigger Grand Canyon*, which I refer to in the text, along with three preparatory drawings given to the National Gallery of Australia when the artist visited this gallery in Canberra in 1999.

I have also had important access to the artist during my researches. I first met David Hockney at the workshop of Ken Tyler at Mount Kisco in Westchester County, New York in 1990. Since then, I have conducted several interviews and discussions with Tyler in the years 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2003 and 2004 at his then home in Los Angeles and when he visited the National Gallery of Australia. During my visits to Los Angeles to see David Hockney, I have spent time researching his prints as well as viewing documentation at 'The Studio', as

his storage premises are known. I have also availed myself of transcripts of his lectures on art, which are listed in the bibliography, including his Qantas lecture of 1999 at the National Gallery of Australia.

To familiarise myself further with Hockney's prints, I have viewed collections of David Hockney's prints and paintings at the Tate Gallery, London; the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid; the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam; the Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf; the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; the National Gallery of Art, Washington; the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Washington; Los Angeles County Museum; the Art Institute of Chicago; the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne and the Art Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney. I have viewed exhibitions held in commercial galleries at the Annely Juda Gallery, London; the André Emmerich Gallery, New York and LA Louver, Los Angeles.

Together with these primary sources there are also the extensive oral histories and correspondence. David Hockney is the only artist who has worked with Ken Tyler in his four print workshops in Los Angeles, Bedford and Mount Kisco. The author first met Tyler when he visited the National Gallery of Australia for the first time in 1985 at the time of an exhibition of prints made by artists at his workshop up to that date. I first visited Tyler's Mount Kisco workshop at the time David Hockney was making prints there in 1991. Since then I have maintained a long-standing relationship with the printer/publisher by visiting his workshop, through his visits to the National Gallery and lengthy correspondence and discussions over 21 years.

Oral histories

If Tyler has been Hockney's printer for the major body of his print oeuvre, other printers have also worked with the artist. Hence I have interviewed Maurice Payne at his workshop at the home of Hockney in Los Angeles; paid several visits to Aldo Crommelynck in Paris and to Stanley Jones at Curwen Press in Cambridgeshire. All provided me with crucial details of the way they worked with Hockney.

I have also been in contact through personal visits and in correspondence with many of those who knew Hockney well, his fellow student and long standing

friend R. B. Kitaj, his family, most notably his brother John Hockney, his dealers Peter Goulds and John Kasmin, studio staff Karen Kuhlman, his teachers Richard Hamilton and Carel Weight, his editor Nikos Stangos, fellow student Ron Fuller and print publishers Stanley Felson of Gemini GEL and Paul Cornwall-Jones of Editions Alecto and Petersburg Press.

Sadly a number of those interviewed as part of my research are now deceased and so I believe it is timely to bring together all the primary documentation as a record in the history of Hockney's printmaking career.

These curatorial methods are integrated with biographical approaches as well as a broad sociological approach which is articulated throughout the thesis.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

Hockney often found that pursuing a new method of making prints provided a new focus for his art – a means of renewal. Printmaking techniques ranging from the highly technical, such as the colour Mylar lithographs, the paper pulp works to the simpler Xerox prints and more recently digital prints all provided Hockney with an alternative artistic life to painting and gave impetus to his own art practice. Painting on canvas was never enough for the artist and sometimes it was all too much. Hockney's engagement with theatre production and design was witness to this. So was his interest in 'joiners'; then photo-collages, leading to explorations in reverse perspective, his revisiting of art-history orthodoxies with his research into the *camera lucida* and the publication of *Secret knowledge*, the subsequent focus on the often overlooked, and unforgiving method of painting in watercolour and a renewed obsession with the drawing of Rembrandt, an artist he was 'moved by' as a young man,[42] and then a move to painting large-scale landscapes *en plein air*. All these explorations provided the artist with a catalyst for change.

In this thesis Hockney's developments in printmaking are examined in the context of the social and artistic developments in Bradford and the north of

---

[42] 'David Hockney in conversation with R. B. Kitaj,' *The New Review*, volume 3, number 34-35, January/February 1977, p. 76.

England, then in London and the United States, particularly in New York, Los Angeles and then east Yorkshire where he currently resides.

The thesis is divided into three sections arranged chronologically. Within these sections there are 17 chapters, which provide an account of Hockney's printmaking career; these are arranged mostly in chronological order, but when covering certain subjects these have been arranged thematically as in the case of the examination of the workshop system or Hockney's interest in portraiture.

Section 1: Student days

This section examines the makings of David Hockney as a printmaker in Bradford, the stylistic orthodoxies and developments in the United Kingdom at this time. Also homosexual life in the United Kingdom, the London art scene and the artist's studies at the Royal College of Art, which was a springboard for Pop Art in the United Kingdom. Hockney's very personal gay and literary iconography in his prints is also discussed in this section.

David Hockney began making prints while a student at the Bradford College of Art in lithography and he was taught by a commercial printer, who considered the technique principally having more business rather than artistic possibilities. Hockney's particular interest stemmed from his admiration of the Nabi artists, such as Pierre Bonnard and particularly Edouard Vuillard, who were becoming increasingly well known in Britain. During the period of Hockney's studies the major art styles that held sway were the Euston Road and Neo-Romantic artists, whose work dominated the art world at the time. Many involved in education or museums failed to comprehend the momentous events in art that had taken place in Europe since the beginning of the twentieth-century in Fauvism, Expressionism and most importantly Cubism. Initially Hockney had been under the influence of the rather meagre art emanating from home-grown art styles. Hockney gained a place in one of the major art schools in London, the Royal College of Art (RCA). By this stage Hockney as an artist was keen to develop his own personal style in art including expressing his sexual persuasion. This is particularly evident in the intimate prints he made with coded messages and 'Doll boy' iconography.

18

Adopting the approach as outlined on pp. 6-10, Hockney's evolution of a personal gay iconography is examined within the context of the Wolfenden Report and its aftermath, as well as the development of homosexual subjects in another form of the visual arts, film.

The RCA was linked to the burgeoning Pop Art movement and Hockney played a very original role in this style, so evident in his printmaking. This is considered within the context of the development of Pop Art in both Britain and the United States. His etchings reveal an unusual response to this most significant of art movements during his student days and place him as a truly original emerging artist. As well as making some deeply personal etchings, Hockney began making intaglio prints, which he combined with literary and artistic loves. He considered such themes well suited to printmaking technique which focused on line and is evident especially in the poetry of Michelangelo, C. P. Cavafy and Walt Whitman, as well as Grimm's fairy tales, all revealing the young man's originality, sense of whimsy, some with an underlying homoerotic edginess.

After his struggles with the RCA administration and then armed with the confirmation of his diploma, his gold medal and his prize money, Hockney set off to visit America for the first time. These travels abroad were to become Hockney's masterful adaptation of Hogarth's great visual narrative, *A rake's progress* and launched his art career.

Section 2: Hockney as an emerging artist

The new trend of heroising young artists by museum curators and equally young private gallery directors also played a part in Hockney's early success.

Hockney established himself as an artist at the same time as the post-war print revival. Printmaking was no longer seen as a kind of backwater in art and the preserve of minor artists. Major or gifted emerging artists such as Hockney were enticed by entrepreneurial print publishers, such as Paul Cornwall-Jones of Editions Alecto and Petersburg Press, and Ken Tyler of Gemini and Gemini GEL, into new print workshops with great technical apparatus and with skilled printers and their assistants. The result was that prints came to rival painting in

terms of scale, innovation and bravura. This, in turn, catered for a new market for collectors of the modern print.

During the 1960s Hockney was to experience this firsthand and during this decade he created a phenomenal body of prints working in collaboration with master printers who complemented his creativity and provided a treasure trove of techniques. In 1960 the Tamarind Lithography Workshop was founded in Los Angeles, which was established to nurture lithography and encourage artists to adopt this method of printmaking. On the east coast, Tatyana Grosman established her Universal Limited Art Edition (ULAE) workshop. Initially it was intended to print *livre d'artiste*; however it broadened to make original prints by artists. Printer Ken Tyler, who studied lithography at the Tamarind, first met the young Hockney there in the Los Angeles workshop, where the artist was creating a cityscape in lithography inspired by John Rechy's pulp novel. In 1965 the British print publisher, Paul Cornwall-Jones was keen to bring together the very gifted printer and equally talented artist. This was the beginning of a remarkable and long-standing collaboration between artist and printer.

Section 3: Collaboration and beyond

In 1979, when Hockney was effectively stranded in New York without a driving licence, Tyler enticed the artist to travel to Bedford to look at his new developments in papermaking. Hockney's love of new mediums meant he was happy to explore with Tyler new opportunities in working with paper pulp. This practice led him into new paths of artistic development. At the beginning of his stay in upstate New York, Hockney worked with several favourite motifs, but the new processes were to lead him into new imagery as his confidence grew in the new medium. This experience necessarily dictated to Hockney that he should also rethink his ideas on colour and on size and simplification of forms. This experience was to have a profound impact on his painting where he became more comfortable working on large scale canvases and with a brilliant palette.

For the next decade there was a noticeable shift in Hockney's art away from an emphasis on the figure, so central to his art of the 1960s and 1970s. It was now the viewer who became the human element in his depictions of space, whether

20

it was a landscape or an interior view. This was in part Hockney's response to the growing developments in installation art. Most importantly, however, it was Hockney's obsession with Pablo Picasso's art and his growing understanding of Picasso's Cubism that informed his print oeuvre.

Experimentations in photo-collage were to have an impact on developments in the artist's painting and in printmaking and helped further his understanding of the depiction of space. It became Hockney's view that for 300 years European painting had been dominated by single-point perspective, viewing the subject through a window, which delineated the separation between the viewer and the viewed. Chinese and Japanese art, in contrast, he argued looked 'out of doors' and Cubism breaks the window. Hockney began experimenting with photographic collages to break down the single-point perspective and to avoid the single moment of a 'snap shot'. This new obsession became the principal focus for Hockney's next series of prints, the innovative and spectacular series *The moving focus* 1984-1987, which combined new views of Picasso's Cubism and Matisse's colour range. In this Hockney was aided by Tyler's design of Mylar sheets bound in an album, which allowed the artist to think in layers of colour and work *en plein air*.

While some artists found the experience of working in a large print workshop a positive one, others were overwhelmed. Hockney ultimately found that the demanding nature of the print studio was unsatisfying. How could an artist be instantly 'creative' on cue for the numerous printers, assistants and presses? In response Hockney began searching for other methods to explore printing, such as his pioneering 'Home Made Prints', using a Xerox Machine, or his visually exciting faxes.

Keen to lure the artist back to his then 'state of the art' workshop at Mount Kisco, the indefatigable Tyler purchased a copier similar to the one Hockney had purchased. Hockney then began working with Tyler on a series of colour lithographs at the studio. In preparation, some of Hockney's images from his Xerox prints were enlarged and then transferred photographically onto lithographic plates, to begin the basis of new compositions. The experiments with faxes also informed other forms of Hockney's printmaking, replicating qualities of graininess and various textures.

Obsessed with developing new ideas on landscape painting, Hockney then began working on his *Grand Canyon* paintings. As a foil to this experience of working on a grand scale, using a brilliant palette and following Vermeer's painting technique, Hockney resorted to small scale and modest subjects, intaglio methods using crude tools and a limited palette of black, white and red, reserving his energy for painting grand landscapes.

From 1999 onwards there was a sharp decline in Hockney's interest in printmaking; something that until then had been an outlet for his creativity as well as providing a singular contrast and sometimes a welcome relief from painting. It is in recent years with his return to England and his painting of Yorkshire landscapes that Hockney has finally become a painter of maturity. His ambition is to be the Constable of Yorkshire. He has also turned to film. In the past printmaking had provided an emotional and artistic release from Hockney's perpetual need to be a painter and the struggle that accompanied this ambition. Added to this, his interest in experimentation with 'drawing in a computer' and the resulting digital prints, and with iPad and iPhone applications, has now provided an alternative means to maintaining his artistic momentum. This has led to Hockney's current exploration of digital processes and printing.

The thesis is arranged as follows:

VOLUME 1: TEXT

Title page, declaration of honesty and acknowledgments

Précis

Synopsis

Introduction

Section 1: Hockney's student days

Chapter 1: Bradford

Chapter 2: The art of lithography and a developing taste for the Nabis in Britain

Chapter 3: Hockney's first prints and current stylistic developments

Chapter 4: The London scene

Section 1: Hockney's student days

This section outlines the development of David Hockney as a young artist within the context of the various influences operating when he was a student, his breaking away from the current fashion in art schools following the Euston Road School and Neo-Romantic art styles and from the failure to comprehend the dynamic forces of early twentieth-century avant-garde art in Europe. The section provides an account of the social and art-historical milieu of post-war Britain up to the emergence of Pop Art as these relate to Hockney's experience and his art. Hockney's first excursion into printmaking was lithography and this is viewed in conjunction with the technique's growing acceptance as an art form since the 1890s. His student days in London, his gay iconography at a time when homosexuality was illegal, and the emerging years of Pop Art are also examined.

The prints of the young David Hockney cover his formative years in Bradford. Later, in London from the 1950s and early 1960s, he established a reputation as a gifted, flamboyant young artist, exploring themes concerning his personal life and loves. At the same time he experimented with different art styles rather than follow the prevailing vogue for abstraction amongst many young artists. Hockney was however guided initially by developments in avant-garde movements in Europe from the turn of the century. He rejected the then current influence of the tepid Euston Road and Neo-Romantic styles, which held sway in British art school education and in the broader art world of art galleries and museums.

Chapter 1: Bradford

David Hockney was born on 9 July 1937 in West Yorkshire, in the United Kingdom. Intent on becoming an artist from an early age, he undertook an art education, which was the product of both British society and the prevailing trends in art that existed in the 1940s to early 1960s. His strongly independent character required that in the face of these circumstances, he establish his own individual style and subject matter, once he gained confidence and technical facility. This constant searching for new ideas, techniques and subjects in his art over the years is the hallmark of this indomitable determination.

Hockney was born at St Luke's Hospital in Bradford to Kenneth and Laura Hockney (née Thompson). His father was a 'free thinker' and devotee of disarmament and his mother a gentle, devout Methodist and vegetarian. Both parents played an influential role in the upbringing of their five children – Hockney's two older brothers Paul and Philip, a sister Margaret, and younger brother John. Laura Hockney carefully looked after the modest finances of the large family. There was no room for extravagance. The English photographer Cecil Beaton, whom Hockney met later in his life, although not a close friend, once visited the family home in Yorkshire and noted, 'his mother never went for a walk in the country without picking everything she knew to be edible in the hedges. Nettle soup was a great favourite and in a huge yellow bowl she made very intoxicating nettle beer.'[1] Their father Kenneth Hockney, according to David's brother, John, 'was the most lovable eccentric I have ever known. He was a compassionate man and fought social injustice all his life. He was Chaplinesque in appearance and always wore a three piece suit, (even in hot Australia) – a trilby and a walking stick. Kenneth sported bow ties to which he would attach those round fluorescent dots you buy at stationers. "Just to brighten people's day" he would say. He was small of stature but appeared larger because his pockets bulged with items he carried "in case of emergency"...'[2]

David Hockney was taught at the local Wellington Primary School on Dudley Hill Road. According to the artist, though he was unsure what the word 'artist' actually meant, he decided he wanted to be one before the age of eleven when he was attracted by the generously illustrated *Children's encyclopaedia* and other publications. The books around the childhood home were mostly Dickens or picture books, not many in number because the house was so small. In a world without television, 'we were the last generation to be brought up without one. Books and the radio were ways of transporting you elsewhere, from the modest happy home in England's north to a world of news, music and drama

---

[1] Cecil Beaton, *Self-portrait with friends: the selected diaries of Cecil Beaton 1926-1974*, edited by Richard Buckle, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979, 'Reddish: Whitsun', 1969 entry, p. 400.
[2] John Hockney, lecture: 'David Hockney is only Interested in art', National Gallery of Australia, 27 November 2002. In his introduction John Hockney said of the title for the lecture, ' I did not mean to say David loves only art indeed he loves many things – family – friends – his dachshunds – discovery – music to name a few. It should be 'David Hockney pursues art'.

from around the world.'[3] The importance of books in the family home was recalled by John Hockney:

> We certainly had Arthur Mee's 'Children's encyclopaedia' and also a wonderful set of 'Lands and Peoples'. Especially on rainy days we would have to wash our hands and lie on the floor in the 'front room' to look at the books. David and I would be enthralled with so much wonder in the world. We considered ourselves 'rich' to have such treasures. We were also encouraged to use Public libraries which we did often.'[4]

Bradford, which was home to the British textile industry from the early nineteenth century, was still very much a Victorian city when Hockney was growing up. According to the artist, 'Where I was born and raised it was one of the smokiest cities in the world, until after I left. Every building was black.'[5] Outside of school, Hockney had access to many cultural experiences, for although Bradford was an industrial town in northern England, it was rich in other ways: 'There is a saying in Yorkshire', John Hockney recounted, "Where there's muck there's money", and there was plenty of both in Bradford. However, it was this wealth, which supported the arts. [There were] three live repertory theatres, a live music hall and a light entertainment theatre. [There were also] a concert hall, an art gallery and two museums – and the largest seating cinema outside London – as well as numerous small cinemas and dance halls. There were two grand parks donated by wealthy mill owners.'[6] Such a lively cultural scene provided Hockney with a sustained interest in many of the arts. Hockney developed a lifelong love of opera after attending a performance of Giacomo Puccini's *La bohème* at the Carl Rosa Opera. For the Hockney family visits to the picture theatre were also a treasured excursion and contributed to Hockney's longstanding enthusiasm for film, with the exception of some of Hollywood's more recent exercises. 'The cinema was a major event at the time, compared to the present day mass audience films built by mass marketing of today, which has meant that they were now stuck in a rut.'[7]

In 1948 David Hockney was awarded a scholarship to Bradford Grammar. On his arrival at Grammar School he was horrified to learn that art classes ceased after the first year, except for those considered less scholastically gifted. Art

[3] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[4] John Hockney, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman. 17 February 2004.
[5] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles. 8 April 2005.
[6] John Hockney, lecture, 'David Hockney is only Interested in art', National Gallery of Australia, 27 November 2002.
[7] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.

was considered a manual, not intellectual pursuit in the context of the school syllabus and so Hockney single-mindedly set out to fail all his subjects except for art in order that he would be included in a less academic stream. His indolence as a scholarship boy was noted and 'they told me off'. Despite these circumstances, where the strong-minded adolescent was at odds with the strictures of the education system, Hockney 'had a good time at Grammar, if I am to be honest'.[8] It was, however, a 'rigorous school' and he had to become very inventive to avoid working. One disadvantage with his strategy was that he experienced considerable boredom. He became involved in making posters, drawing for the school magazine or the local newspapers, which engaged him and revealed a growing obsession with becoming an artist. At the school, the art master, Reginald Maddox, recalled: 'He would do nothing willingly but draw'.[9] It was this love of drawing that set Hockney searching for a figurative style which had validity – a quest which has remained with him throughout his most of his artistic career to the present day. Printmaking in particular, initially in lithography and etching, was a means of developing a sense of a figurative style in innovative ways.

Hockney was keen to leave Bradford Grammar, but he failed in his first attempt at the age of 14 years. 'I wanted to get to art school as soon as possible and had no desire to continue school in an attempt to gain entry to Cambridge or Oxford universities.'[10] He continued at grammar school until he was 16 and completed six GCEs (General Certificates of Education). He failed French, with his teacher noting 'Negligible progress' in his final report, while he excelled in art, gaining first place and praised for 'Good work'. The form master of his year equated serious mindedness with academic interests other than visual ones and lamented that 'only in his last year has he shown his serious side', though adding, 'but we have enjoyed his company'.[11] In 1953 Hockney finally was of an age when he could enrol at Bradford College of Art. His sister, Margaret Hockney, later recalled the obsessive nature of her brother's interest in art. He alone in his family went on to tertiary studies:

---

[8] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[9] Peter Webb, *Portrait of David Hockney*, London, Chatto and Windus, 1988, p. 6.
[10] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman, 8 April 2005.
[11] 'Report for Term ending July 24th 1953', illustrated in David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 33.

He always had a sharp pencil and paper handy. If we were on a bus, he'd be drawing, even from a young age. David was the only one who went on to any further education. Probably the timing was right, but it was also due to his determination and the fact that he got scholarships. My parents certainly supported him, but I think my mother sometimes wondered, you know, is this going to lead anywhere?[12]

[12] Margaret Hockney, interviewed by Natalie Hanman, 'He can see deeper than the skin', www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2006/sep/08/art viewed 18 September 2009.

Chapter 2: The art of lithography and developing a taste for the Nabis in Britain

The Bradford College of Art had originally been founded as a Mechanic's Institute in 1832 and it continued to have a strong practical emphasis. The 'Fine Arts' were out of reach for most, except in the context of teaching. Hockney began a commercial art course, but then switched to painting shortly afterwards. This was despite advice that as he lacked a private income he should not study painting, 'but I didn't know what a private income was and you had to say you wanted to be a teacher'.[13] Hockney ignored the warning and proceeded to undertake a major in painting and drawing, with an emphasis on life drawing and life painting.

As well as painting, Hockney chose lithography as a subsidiary subject. Thus he began his career in printmaking, which often was to play such a pivotal role in his artistic development. It was a practical skill, a craft, as well as a printing technique, which allowed him to continue to draw, and drawing has remained a life-long passion. At the Bradford College, painting, drawing and lithography formed the basis for the National Diploma in Design and Hockney became such an enthusiastic student that not only did he attend all his classes for his Diploma throughout the day, but also the free tuition at night as part of the adult education programme run by the college.

Lithography had undergone a chequered history in Britain, France, Germany and the United States after its initial discovery by Bavarian-born Aloys Senefelder. By the 1950s at the time of Hockney's tuition, lithography and the printing process remained out of favour with many artists, particularly in the United States, later experiencing a revival in the post-war period as a fine art printing method. Along with etching, lithography was to become the principal printing method for much of Hockney's career.

Senefelder had invented the process of lithography, or 'chemical printing' at the turn of the eighteenth century.[14] Lithography was a process where the artist

---

[13] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[14] The most likely date is still either 1798 or 1799 according to the most authoritative research on this matter, Michael Twyman, *Lithography 1800-1850: the techniques of drawing on stone in England and France and their application in works of topography*, London: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 11, footnote 3; Clinton Adams, 'Nature of lithography', in *Lasting impressions; lithography as art*, edited by Pat Gilmour, Canberra: Australian National Gallery, 1988, p. 25.

drew directly onto a stone – or onto transfer paper, from which the image was transferred to a stone. In later years, a plate made of zinc or aluminium and then Mylar was used as the matrix. The medium for drawing was a greasy substance called tusche, in the form of a crayon or a liquid applied with a brush. To print the image, the stone's surface was dampened with water, which remained only on the unmarked areas, since water was repelled by the greasy tusche. Printing ink was rolled over the surface, adhering only to the drawn marks. Paper was placed face down onto the stone and substantial pressure was applied using a lithographic press.

From the time of its invention, lithography oscillated from being considered a practical application for making musical scores, a means of replicating artists' drawings, a fine art, and a poor quality commercial printing method. In the beginning, Senefelder and business partner Johann Anton André promoted the technique. At first it was used as a means of reproducing sheet music and later artists were encouraged to adopt the process as a means of making their drawings in multiple form.[15]

By the mid-nineteenth century colour lithography had fallen into disrepute and had become merely an instrument of advertising rather than an art form in its own right. French poster-maker Jules Chéret introduced fine art design to poster design, thus paving the way for a new acceptance of lithography as an art.[16]

---

[15] For example, German artists Wilhelm Reuter and Karl Friedrich Schinkel embraced the technique, as did Benjamin West, Henry Fuseli and other noted British Academicians, along with major French artists, among them Théodore Géricault and Eugène Delacroix. In 1817 Senefelder had begun experimenting with colour, and two decades later Godefroy Engelmann patented his 'chromolithographic' process. In 1837, two years after the German patent, Charles Hullmandel developed a system of colour tints in England for such publications as the scenic views by Thomas Shotter Boys.

[16] Jules Chéret was born in 1836, of humble origins. He was apprenticed to become a printer to a commercial lithography workshop at the age of 13, while undertaking drawing classes at night at the École Nationale de Dessin to satisfy a growing passion for art. After unsuccessfully trying his hand at poster making for composer Jacques Offenbach for his operetta *Orpheus in the underworld* in 1858, Chéret worked in London the next year, honing his skills as lithographer for Rimmel cosmetics in London. On returning to France in 1866, Chéret began his career making posters in earnest. Learning from his English experience Chéret devised a new method of colour printing working in large formats and simplifying the use of colour using separate stones. He was supported in this with funding from his then mentor Eugène Rimmel. Visits to the Louvre were an important part of his education and Chéret developed a great admiration for artists Watteau, Fragonard and Boucher of the Rococo period. A love of the 18th century was widespread with enthusiasts for that era including writers the Goncourt brothers and the caricaturist Gavarni. Rococo art was to become a key influence in Chéret's poster design where he married an in-depth knowledge of colour lithography with his own artistic leanings. Chéret's figures of sprightly young women with their golden, tumbling locks and frilly costumes inspired by the French Rococo came to be to be known as the 'Chérettes'. His poster designs were a world of brightly coloured gaiety, froth and escapism, which he applied to virtually any topic – consumer products, petrol, dance halls, hat shops, print dealers and healthy bowels.

For a critic of the day, Félicien Fagus, Chéret's art was like a character portrait made of 'a burst of multicoloured laughter'.[17] Chéret's role in the revival of lithography influenced a new younger generation in their adoption of the technique. This rich history of lithography encouraged Hockney's own embrace of lithography as an art form in the 1950s.

Later in the nineteenth century a group of artists known as the Nabis, including Pierre Bonnard, Edouard Vuillard, Maurice Denis, Kerr-Xavier Roussel and Paul Ranson, as well as artists such as Henri Toulouse-Lautrec and Alphonse Mucha were drawn to the medium. These artists created lithographs for a number of print portfolios. During the 1890s there were multiple publications whose focus was on original lithography (though not necessarily exclusively) including L'épreuve, L'estampe moderne, L'estampe originale and several albums published by Ambroise Vollard.[18] This was to cater for the growing art market among private collectors of prints and posters for the home.

However, publishers were becoming increasingly mindful of focusing on artists' originality in lithography at the expense of the technical support that it required. As a form of printing the advent of lithography meant immediate involvement for the artist, preparing a drawing to be transposed or directly executed onto the stone. The complexity of the lithographic process more than any other printing technique meant that an artist relied heavily on the printer's expertise. Lithography, therefore, encouraged the support of artists by printers in their artistic endeavours and paved the way for the collaborative printmaking ventures later in the twentieth century. Artists were reliant on the knowledge and skill of their printers and the materials and equipment they used for their work. Lithography as a fine art form probably required a far greater sense of collaboration than any other printmaking technique. While such collaborative effort was acknowledged initially, as lithography developed it was later downplayed because of a growing trend to consider originality as synonymous with artists working solo, without technical assistance. This trend, as noted by

---

[17] Félicien Fagus, 'Petite gazette d'art: les murs en fleur affiches', La revue blanche, vol. xxiv, January-April 1901, pp. 114-145, 308, 463-464, especially p. 308.
[18] See 'Quelques album d'estampes', in Janine Bailly-Herzberg, Dictionaire de l'estampe en France 1830-1950, pp. 351-362; Una E. Johnson, Ambroise Vollard editeur, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1977.

Pat Gilmour, was evident at the turn of century when the printer for so many French artists and publications, Auguste Clot, was active:[19]

> Clot was working at a time when the developing concept of originality in printmaking – the idea that artists should do all their own work – required the printer to keep a low profile. Ironically, the more complex colour printing became, thus increasing the likelihood that an artist would need the help of a professional lithographer, the less acceptable it was for such assistance to be disclosed. Prints of the mid 19th century were usually clearly captioned with the name of the artist, the lithographic draughtsman if someone other than the artist, and the printer.
>
> By the end of the century only posters and those images appearing in magazines like the Gazette de Beaux Arts were similarly lettered; in the second decade of the 20th century even magazines often dropped off printer attributions. Quite apart from equating unaided autography with originality, modernism in the graphic arts demanded an image be placed on a sheet chosen not simply as a neutral substrate, but for its calculated contribution to the overall aesthetic. So apart from an occasional and by no means guaranteed credit at the back of some of the books on which he worked, we might now be scarcely aware of Clot's existence had his contribution not been so dazzling that his contemporaries were unable to overlook him.[20]

For single coloured or black lithographs the printer's role was a less active one; some artists, such as Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, increasingly liked to draw directly on the stone or plate as he gained more confidence in the technique. Lautrec's great facility late in his career, and at a time his alcoholism was taking its toll, is clearly evident in such works as Le Promenoir [The promenade] 1899.[21]

In the twentieth century, lithography as a fine art printing technique underwent an uneven history as an art form. In the United Kingdom lithography had gained some acceptance as it was adopted by artists working in poster making or in private press illustrated books. At the time Hockney made his first lithographs, there was a renewed interest in French art in England. Nabi artists were one group who became popular with the British public following the conclusion of the war. Hockney as a student was particularly drawn to their art. He admired the

[19] Members of the International Print and Illustrated Books Department, 'Schedule of letters and provisional list of works printed by Auguste Clot', Lasting impressions: lithography as art, edited by Pat Gilmour, Canberra: Australian National Gallery, 1988, pp. 382-391. Listed by artist, this schedule outlines the correspondence between artists and the printer and the works printed.
[20] Pat Gilmour, Cher Monsieur Clot … Auguste Clot and his role in colour lithography', in Lasting Impressions: Lithography as art, edited by Pat Gilmour, Canberra: Australian National Gallery, 1988, pp. 129-130.
[21] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 2011.181.

style, which was characterised by modesty, intimacy and understatement, coupled with a decorative textured element in the composition. The choice of lithography by the Nabis also encouraged Hockney to embrace this printmaking method. It was they who adopted colour lithography as a means of producing art for a broader market and in forms other than easel painting. A key figure in the Nabi group, Pierre Bonnard, summarised this new approach, by saying: 'Our generation always sought to link art with life. At that time I personally envisaged a popular art that was of everyday application: prints, fans, furniture, screens'.[22] Such sentiments sit well with Hockney's approach in adopting printmaking to broaden the reach of his art.

In this, Bonnard and his contemporaries in the brotherhood were influenced by John Ruskin and the Arts and Crafts movement in Britain and the Applied Arts movement in Belgium. Aside from its profound sway on French decorative arts, the British Arts and Crafts movement exerted an important influence on printmaking and publishing. There was a growing trend for entrepreneurs and artists to incorporate high quality craftsmanship and materials in their work, counteracting the explosion of mass-produced prints of a poor artistic calibre.

The proliferation of portfolios of prints and artistic journals in the last decade of the century showed the change of attitude with the promotion of the beautiful print using the talents of gifted artists and printers and quality papers and inks. Prominent in the publishing of the print portfolios was Alexandre Marty's version of *L'estampe originale*. In this venture it was not Marty's intention to promote one print technique over another but rather to advance the notion of the beautiful impression. In keeping with a philosophy increasingly gaining currency amongst the Nabis and others, that there were no hierarchies in the arts, Roger-Marx wrote in the introduction to the 1893 portfolio:

> Whether this drawing be the stroke of a pencil, a pen, a paintbrush on paper, whether it is written on stone or even if the relief of an embossed design indicates it, little does it matter to us and further more, of what importance is it if the material actually inspires confidence bestowed upon it, as long as it transmits the force of action of the original thought once it is in print.[23]

---

[22] Pierre Bonnard correspondence, 7 January 1923, quoted in Claude Roger-Marx, *Bonnard: lithographe*, Monte-Carlo: Editions du livre, 1952, p. 11.
[23] Claude Roger-Marx, 'Preface to L'estampe originale', 1893 quoted in M. Stein and Donald H, Karshan, *L'estampe originale: A catalogue raisonné*, New York: Museum of Graphic Art, 1970, p. 15.

The first method of printmaking which Hockney explored was lithography. This was in 1954 and at a time when it had not been broadly re-established as a fine art printing technique, though in the years ahead it experienced a revival, particularly in the United States. Among the Nabi artists, who had embraced colour lithography in the last years of the nineteenth century, one notable early influence on Hockney was the art of Edouard Vuillard. Vuillard's intimate domestic scenes, combined with coloured patterning and textures, as seen in Hockney's 1954 self-portrait, served as an inspiration both in choice of style and adoption of printing method.[24] Vuillard's work had appeared in several major solo or group exhibitions in 1948 in Britain. It had been exhibited with that of Pierre Bonnard in an exhibition of 126 paintings, drawings and lithographs in *Pierre Bonnard et Édouard Vuillard* held at the Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh from 17 August to 18 September of that year and a further 66 paintings and drawings were shown in *Édouard Vuillard* at Wildenstein's, London in June 1948. The art of Vuillard was exhibited previously as part of the exhibition of the Kessler collection at the York Art Gallery in May 1948.[25] Several individual works by this French artist were also shown in London at the Tate Gallery, Hanover Gallery, the Institute of Contemporary Art and Wildenstein during that year. The following year, in 1949, further Vuillard works were shown at Lefevre Gallery, London.[26]

It is clear from so much activity that there was an increasing appetite for the Nabis masters, in particular Vuillard, and his work was shown in the early 1950s to cater for this interest. This included exhibitions in London and a travelling exhibition, *French paintings: a second selection from Mr Peto's collection* organised by the Arts Council of Great Britain to tour the provinces.[27] Further

---

[24] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.

[25] *Pierre Bonnard and Édouard Vuillard*, Edinburgh: Royal Scottish Academy, 17 August to 18 September 1948, drawn from the McAlpine collection. This was organised by the Arts Council of Great Britain for the second Edinburgh Festival; *Edouard Vuillard*, London: Wildenstein Gallery, June 1948; *The Kessler Collection*, York: York Art Gallery, May 1948.

[26] *Paintings by Dame Ethel Walker, drawings by Augustus John, OM, Selected works by XX century masters*, London: Lefevre Gallery, November 1949.

[27] *Pastels by Edouard Vuillard*, London: Wildenstein Gallery, 1-18 March 1950; *French Masters of the XIX and XX centuries*, second series, London: Marlborough Fine Art, August, 1950; *L'École de Paris 1900-1950*, London: Royal Academy of Arts, 13 January - 7 March, 1951; Paris, London: Arthur Tooth and Sons, London, 11 April - 11 May, 1951; *The School of Paris*, London: Lefevre Gallery, July 1951; *Recent acquisitions*, London: Arthur Tooth and Sons, London, 26 November - 29 December 1951; *French paintings: a second selection from Mr Peto's collection*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain, touring Exeter, Wolverhampton, Sunderland Carlisle, Eastbourne, 1951 to 1952.

exhibitions of French art, including that of the Nabis, held in London's private galleries and at the Tate demonstrate this developing taste.[28]

In 1954 Vuillard was shown extensively in the *Roussel, Bonnard, Vuillard* exhibition from 5 May to 12 June at Marlborough Fine Art, and at London's Wildenstein Gallery in the exhibition, *Paris in the nineties* from 12 May to 23 June.[29] One, two or three works by Vuillard were also included in exhibitions at the Tate Gallery, Lefevre Gallery and Arthur Tooth and Son in that year.[30] This further developed a growing enthusiasm for the art of the Nabis in the United Kingdom; and included the young student, David Hockney.

Hockney initially learnt of these artists through book illustration rather than viewing the works in galleries. Although he visited the local art galleries in Bradford, York, Manchester and Leeds, it was not until he was in his final year at the age of 19 that he visited London. Over the year Hockney made several train trips using a day return ticket or hitchhiking to the nation's capital. This he funded by working during the summer holidays in a commercial bakery, stooking corn and wheat in the Yorkshire fields and working for the Post Office at Christmas time. Hockney had access to the college library although initially this was rudimentary, 'Most of the art I saw was at the art school. In those days there were very few art books and the library was very small'. Such an experience changed with the arrival of newer publications, 'I can remember the arrival of the first big art books with colour pictures, the Skira books from Switzerland. I pored over them ...'[31] These catalogues included Jacques Mercanton's *Vuillard et le goût de bonheur* and Francis Jourdain's *Pierre*

[28] *Balthus and a selection of French paintings*, London: Lefevre Gallery, London, January 1952; *French Masters XIX and XX century*, London: Lefevre Gallery, June-July 1952; *French paintings of the XIX and XX* centuries, London: Matthiesen Gallery, 19 June - 25 July 1952; *French masters XIX and XIX century*, London: Lefevre Gallery, July-August 1952; *Recent acquisitions*, London: Arthur Tooth and Sons, 18 November - 29 December 1952; *Selected French paintings XIX and XX centuries*, London: Lefevre Gallery, June-July, 1953; *Paintings and drawings by European Masters*, London: Marlborough Fine Art, November-December 1953; *A group of French paintings of the XIX and XX centuries*, London: Lefevre Gallery, November 1954; *Recent Acquisitions*, London: Arthur Tooth and Sons, 15 November - 18 December 1954.

[29] *Roussel, Bonnard, Vuillard*, London: Marlborough Fine Art, 5 May - 12 June 1954; *Paris in the nineties*, London: Wildenstein Gallery, 12 May - 23 June 1954.

[30] *The Pleydell-Bourverie Collection of Impressionist and other paintings*, London: Tate Gallery, 26 January - 25 April 1954; *French painting XIX et XX Century*, London: Lefevre Gallery, February 1954; *Paris in the nineties*, London: Wildenstein Gallery, 12 May - 23 June 1954; *Masterpieces from the São Paulo Museum of Art*, London: Tate Gallery, 19 June - 15 August 1954.

[31] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 34.

Bonnard, ou, Les vertus de la liberté.[32] David Hockney became a keen admirer of Vuillard's artistic approach and was eager to learn from the French artist both in terms of subject and style – something evident in his first prints of 1954. The illustrations in Mercanton's publication of Vuillard's' paintings of interiors, and of his mother in particular, had a direct influence on Hockney in terms of pose, form and patterning.

This renewed interest in the Nabis in Britain encouraged Hockney to explore the technique of lithography as a means of learning about yet another way to draw. For him his studies in the lithography studio were also a means of acquiring useful knowledge of a complex technique, as well as fulfilling the requirements of the syllabus.[33] It also pleased his mother that her son was doing something practical and that Hockney was able to demonstrate a degree of skill – a craft, which she valued. At Bradford College of Art in the early 1950s classes in lithography were available and his teacher, Peter Parker, introduced him to the technique. At the college it was viewed more as a trade course rather than a fine art printmaking technique. It was a skill taught to printers and intended for the commercial world. Parker's trade background meant that he was conservative in his teaching methods and outlook, focusing on technique above all else, and had no real interest in lithography as a means of artistic expression. For Hockney, it was to become useful knowledge of a complex printing technique and would provide him with technical facility. Later in his career it was to assist him when making lithographs. Commercial lithography was taught using an offset rotary press with printing apprentices spending one day a week to hone their skills for the printing industry, wherein most imagined they would work as printers. In contrast, Hockney was a full-time student eager as ever to practise every kind of art.

As part of the syllabus, Hockney had to undertake studies in craft, and so he chose lithography since it was to do with 'picture-making'.[34] In conversation Hockney continued commenting that his teacher was quite eccentric as a printer, 'Parker was a bit of a character, he just loved his rotary press and his workshop was a bit of a shrine to Senefelder'. While the focus for lithography in

---

[32] Jacques Mercanton, *Vuillard et le gout de bonheur*, Paris: Albert Skira, n.d; Francis Jourdain, *Pierre Bonnard, ou, Les vertus de la liberté*, Geneva : Albert Skira, 1946.
[33] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[34] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 13 June 2004.

Bradford College of Art was primarily as a craft, Hockney was to bring to this printmaking technique a sense of artistic daring, revealing his response to the broader stylistic influences and developments that occurred in early post-war Britain. The role of lithography as a fine art in the broader world of printmaking at this time was in the process of evolving.

Chapter 3: Hockney's first prints and current stylistic developments

The lithographs that Hockney made during this time, he proofed and printed himself. They were traditional in format and technique and show that he was already skilled in drawing, with a practised sense of colour and ability to depict rich patterning. The first of Hockney's colour lithographs was the *Self-portrait* of the student artist seated at his home (illustration 1).[35] He was dressed appropriately for a formal portrait in formal clothes with a tie, white shirt, waistcoat and trousers. There are added touches of patterning and texture in the stripes of his trousers and his tie. The richly decorative wall paper and ornate carpet add to the intimiste style of the lithograph. The formality of the occasion is emphasised by the artist depicting himself in a frontal position, arms folded, at the centre of the composition; a whimsical asymmetry being provided by the dresser, where a small cup and saucer are placed to one side. Hockney was rather adventurous for this first print, using a relatively bright palette of five different colours; grey, red, purple, ochre and black, with as many zinc plates, and using both lithographic tusche and crayon for drawing. It was made in an edition of about five and was one of several self-portraits Hockney made in oils, collage and pencil in 1954. With the exception of the oil, where the artist depicts himself almost in profile, all the works are made in the more formal frontal position, with a dominating black fringe and round National Health glasses.[36]

At this stage in his career, there is no hint by the artist of self-analysis and characterisation. Such interpretative methods of portraiture did not appear until the 1980s. He was simply the most available sitter to be had. Reflecting on his choice of model as a young man, Hockney commented in 2006 that: 'The reason why you start painting yourself is that you are a cheap model – you've always got yourself.'[37] Of all the works, the most inventive was the collage with a remarkable placement of coloured papers set on the backdrop of *The Times* dated March 1954 and the inclusion of a deliberately jocular element with the

---

[35] Christie's, New York, 2 November 1998, lot 288.
[36] Sarah Howgate & Barbara Stern Shapiro, *David Hockney: portraits*, London: National Portrait Gallery, 2006. The works are listed as follows:
Catalogue 1 *Self-portrait*, c.1954, oil on board, Collection Mrs K. Terry Kirkbride.
Catalogue 2 *Self-portrait*, 1954, collage on newsprint, Private collection.
Catalogue 4 *Self-portrait*, 1954, pencil on paper, Collection David Hockney.
Figure 47, p. 62, *Self-portrait study*, 1954, pencil on paper, Collection David Hockney.
[37] Jack Malvern, 'It's just like old Times as Hockney makes headline news 50 years on', *The Times*, 12 October, 2006, reprinted at http://www.hockneypictures.com/current.htm.

headline 'Textile Trade Improves' in the lower right-hand corner. The sense of fun, along with written elements, was to characterise Hockney's early work.

Other lithographs followed during the same year and the intimate location of the interior of his home and the attention to patterns, textures and colours continues with Hockney's next lithograph. Using his mother as a model he produced *Woman with a sewing machine* 1954, where a gently smiling woman with grey hair and hands clasped, suggesting great composure, sits behind her machine (illustration 2).[38] At her back is a chequered mantelpiece set against ornamental wallpaper. The young artist has achieved a perfect balance by not allowing any one element, such as the sewing machine, to dominate, while the eye is drawn to the gentle figure of his mother, framed as she is in the checks of blue and white. Aside from himself, his mother was Hockney's most frequent sitter up until the time of her death. Technically the lithograph is slightly more complex than his first print and for the final editioned work Hockney drew on six different zinc plates with both lithographic crayon and tusche, using six coloured inks of red, yellow, blue, green, pink and black, as well as the white of the cartridge paper. This he made in an edition of five known examples. By way of preparation Hockney also made a set of six working proofs on four sheets with compositional and colour variations.[39]

The lithographs of his mother and his self-portrait are thoroughly accomplished work for a young man in his teens and reveal Hockney's grasp of key elements of French art from the 1890s. During the nineteenth century, French artists in growing numbers turned to imagery of the interior space as a subject relevant to their own times and experience and to a new clientele in art – the *haute bourgeoisie*. The nineteenth century witnessed an embrace of the notion of privacy and of the private, following the French Revolution.[40] Private feelings and sense of private space became a suitable subject for art and the familial home came to symbolise what was private. It became the stage where one's own intimate private life was played out. One artistic theme, the domestic interior, was both popular with the Nabis and their patrons alike. Like the Dutch

[38] Christie's, South Kensington, 2 October 2002, lot 67; a colour variant artist's proof exists, Christie's, London, 3 July 2002, lot 168.
[39] These will be auctioned at Christie's, South Kensington, on 17 February 2012 as a single lot (2).
[40] Lyn Hunt, 'The unstable boundaries of the French Revolution', in *A history of private life*: volume IV *From the fires of revolution to the great war*, edited by Michelle Perrot, translated by Arthur Goldhammer, Cambridge Massachusetts and London: The Belknap Press, 1990, pp. 13-45.

seventeenth-century humanist artists and the Japanese *ukiyo-e* woodblock artists before them, Vuillard, Bonnard and others used the imagery of the everyday and the ordinary, but imbued it with certain significance. The interior view in particular became the signature theme for the group. It was at once an excursion into the art of the decorative and a vision of peace – providing a social grounding away from the chaos of life, divorced from any social and political turmoil. Such sensibilities became the foil to a troublesome world, as well as a means of decorating the haven of the interior. Omission is as significant as inclusion and there was a conscious avoidance of any reference to the more chaotic and unpleasant aspects of life. In the same way, Hockney's images of warm and familiar interiors were foils for the post-war industrial life of Northern England with its deprivation and pollution and hard working life; and, just as with the art of Bonnard and Vuillard and other Nabis, where images of the external world emanating from personal experience were favourite subjects, Hockney also chose scenes that were part of his personal and family life.

A subject further afield than home, but very familiar to Hockney, was the local fish shop at the top of Eccleshill, near where the family lived in Hutton Terrace. This also appeared as a composition for another of his early lithographs. Initially Hockney made a drawing of the shop, which he later swapped for some fish and chips. The composition shows a bustling scene behind the counter where we see the proprietor and his wife hard at work. In front of the counter, depicted diagonally across the composition, is the enthusiastic figure of the youthful patron–artist eagerly awaiting the fish and chips perfectly fried in rich beef dripping. The darkness of an encroaching night can be seen through the windows, which reflect the interior lights suggesting warmth. *Fish and chip shop* date 1954, though more sombre in colour, still holds a warmth by the rich patterning of fabric and tiles, and the friendly appearance of the middle-aged couple happily preparing food for their eager patron.[41] Given their relative complexity in composition and technique, these were bold and accomplished colour lithographs for the teenage student and suggest considerable promise. For this work Hockney used one stone and one zinc plate to draw on in both crayon and tusche in black and grey, as well as the white of the cartridge paper. Like his other lithographs of this time he printed approximately five copies of the

---

[41] Christie's, London, 8 November 2001, lot 276.

composition. A landscape titled *Autumn* was also made at this time and was submitted as part of the assessment for his Intermediate Examination at Art School.

Fish and chip shop is another *intimiste* subject, but this work and the other lithographs from the mid 1950s also show a considerable debt to a style of English lithography favoured at the time. This was principally figurative and rendered in a Neo-Romantic or sometimes almost comic manner. Such a style had evolved in the tradition of the English populist book illustration, posters and school prints where artist-lithographers, such as Barnett Freedman, American born E. McKnight Kauffer, Edward Bawden, Ceri Richards, and John Piper created imagery intended for wide appeal and for series such as *The Coronation* of 1953, by artists including John Minton, Ruskin Spear, Edward Bawden and Barbara Jones were seemingly all pervasive.[42] These too played their part in the early development of the young man's art.

During his Bradford College days the kind of art that Hockney was exposed to was fairly limited. Students at this time were encouraged to work in the manner of the artist Walter Sickert and the Euston Road group – two particular favourites of art educationalists and like 'every other art school in England'.[43] According to Hockney, Sickert was regarded as the best English painter, with strong connections to France and French artists. It was this art that influenced the young artist. It was through Sickert that Hockney came across the art of Claude Monet and Edgar Degas and 'realised how good French painting was', particularly in the case of Degas. Hockney also realised that Sickert was not in the same league as that French artist.[44] He developed a view that instead Degas was a peerless draughtsman who created astonishing compositions, beautifully balanced, asymmetrical and who made canvasses with empty spaces. The draughtsmanship of Degas inspired Hockney throughout his career and many years later he was to write the postscript to A *Degas sketchbook* for the 2000 J. Paul Getty Museum reproduction of sketches by the French artist, outlining Degas' artistic practice:

[42] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 89.803 to 89.827.
[43] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney,* edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 34.
[44] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.

He has a fantastic visual memory, especially of his own drawings. Once you've drawn something, even [something] quite difficult, like somebody curtseying, making a bow from the back, very hard ... he'd got the shorthand in his head.[45]

Claude Monet, a dazzling colourist who brought light and life to his canvasses, was another artist Hockney admired. His initial admiration for Monet was to reappear much later and manifest itself in his later Yorkshire landscapes.

One of Hockney's tutors, Frank Johnson, was a devotee of the Euston Road School and encouraged his students to follow suit. This influence pervaded Hockney's early art style. The Euston Road School had developed as a body of like-minded artists from the late 1930s and it was to become a powerful influence on English art and English art education from this time onwards. This was an essentially inward looking group of artists, who espoused a modern realist style and subject matter, but had little understanding of or enthusiasm for developments in European avant-garde art in the first half of the twentieth century. In 1937 William Coldstream, along with Victor Pasmore and Claude Rogers had established a privately funded School of Drawing and Painting, which was to become known as the 'Euston Road' School, a term coined by Clive Bell in the following year, when reviewing the exhibition *15 paintings of London* at the Storran Gallery.[46] It was named after the artists moved from their first premises in Fitzroy Street to 314-16 Euston Road. The group's request for financial support was based on the failed model of the London Artists' Association and required ten donors to provide 200 pounds annually for each individual artist.[47] This was then sent to Kenneth Clark who supported the venture and approached potential donors.[48] The emphasis of the school was to develop beyond what was termed 'objective painting', taking their cue from the art of Paul Cézanne. It was considered a practical method of making art in order to develop what they considered to be an objective realism, through careful 'scientific observation'. Coldstream's working method was described as follows by a former student, Christopher Pinsert, many years later:

[45] Carol E. Armstrong, *A Degas sketchbook*, Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2000. The sketchbook was acquired by the Getty in 1995.
[46] Clive Bell, *New Statesman and Nation*, 5 November 1938, pp. 524-526. A two page summary by Bell from the Claude Rogers Archive is quoted in Bruce Laughton, *The Euston Road School: a study in objective painting*, Aldershot: Scolar, 1986, p. 7. Art critic Raymond Mortimer was incorrectly credited with adopting the term by Victor Pasmore http://www.victorpasmore.com/html/biography.htm viewed 7 October 2011.
[47] Tate Gallery Archive of British Painting, TGA 8922.9.3.
[48] Kenneth Clark, letter to Bruce Laughton, dated 29 May 1981, referred to in Bruce Laughton, *William Coldstream*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004, p. 45, note 37.

The brush is held at arm's length – care being taken that the arm is fully extended for each measurement – in such a way that it is in a plane at right angles to the line from the artist's eye to whatever part of the subject he is looking at ... The thumb should be nearest the end of the handle so that it can be moved up and down or along if the brush is laid horizontally and the nail act as an indicator. The index and remaining fingers clasp the stem of the handle in such a way that the right angle to the line of sight is positively maintained ...

The brush is held in this plane to appear either vertical or horizontal to the artist against the subject, and the thumb moved to record the measurement ... Such compared distances, as their verifications accrue, are marked on the canvas but a single measurement is not to be transferred direct, not only for the reason that the scale might be inappropriate, but because the process would be mindless. Appraisal of relative distances is fundamental to the art of doing pictures.

Coldstream has said that he began measuring from a concern to get things to look really like. But evidently he became fascinated with the business of finding exactly comparable or divisible distances. He has also said the he sometimes tried working without this method of measuring but on each occasion regretted it. His paintings are thus informed with a mesh of simpler proportions closely or sparsely knit according to the degree of the concentration on and the nature of any part of the subject.[49]

This approach provided a rather rigid appearance to the art. Euston Road, in addition, was a style that was anti-academic, circumspect in outlook and modest in its subject, palette and compositional style, with themes which were often related to social concerns. John Rothenstein in his memoirs described the Euston Road School as 'the sober, indeed in their low tones and sparing use of paint even puritanical, group of realists who had gathered around William Coldstream'.[50]

For many of the group the style was initially of figuration, including the founders Coldstream, Carter and Pasmore, and younger artists Lawrence Gowing, B.A.R. (Sam) Carter, Peter Lanyon and Rodrigo Moynihan. As it evolved, some participants in the Euston Road School, however, were to alter their views and the paths of the group diverged. Ben Nicholson, Graham Sutherland, John Piper and Victor Pasmore were influenced by a growing understanding of the art of Pablo Picasso and Henri Matisse. They became involved in the 1940s with a kind of organic abstraction which was at least quasi figurative, while the

---

[49] Based on notes that Bruce Laughton took in discussion with Christopher Pinsert, dated 10 February, 1982 and published in Bruce Laughton, *The Euston Road School: A study in objective painting*, Aldershot, Scolar Press, 1987, p. 157.
[50] John Rothenstein, *Brave day: hideous night: autobiography two*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966, p. 95.

style remained unpretentious and low key. One experience that liberated these artists was the 1946 exhibition of Picasso and Matisse, which was held at the Victoria and Albert Museum.[51] Victor Pasmore found the work astonishing, particularly Picasso's paintings from the 1940s and saw that 'There could be no more turning back. Whatever the problems and shortcomings of modern painting they had to be resolved in terms of both evolution and revolution of modern thought.'[52] Pasmore abandoned his residual figurative style, which characterised his work when he belonged to the Euston Road group and turned to a more abstract style – sometimes in the manner of the landscape compositions of the first decades of the twentieth century by Piet Mondrian, an artist who was a great influence on Pasmore.

The Neo-Romantics held an influential position in the British art world during Hockney's student days at Bradford. The rise of these Neo-Romantics from the mid 1930s to the mid 1950s also contributed to the cul de sac where much of English art found itself. Painters like John Piper and Graham Sutherland embraced the tradition of English Romanticism begun with Samuel Palmer and John Constable, as well as the visionary images found in William Blake and John Martin. The push towards a sense of national identity continued in the post-war period. As Anne Massey has pointed out, 'Britain was shattered by the war and the period of reconstruction, which lasted well into the 1950s [in] an atmosphere of insularity and xenophobia'.[53] The quest for a revived cultural identity peaked with the 1951 Festival of Britain, which was characterised in the visual arts with a failure to comprehend fully the significant, powerful and intractable developments in avant-garde art from the beginning of the century. This can be witnessed in the meagre and anachronistic contributions in the visual arts for the Festival of Britain. What was missing was an understanding of the modern art movement and the developments after the Post-Impressionists, found in the art of Picasso, Braque or Matisse.

In their later artistic development Graham Sutherland and John Piper both combined a sense of British Neo-Romanticism and figuration with an increasing

---

[51] *Exhibition of paintings by Picasso and Matisse*, London: Victoria and Albert Museum, December 1945, with essays by Christian Zervos and Jean Cassou.
[52] Victor Pasmore, quoted in Alan Bowness & Luigi Lambertini, Introductions, *Victor Pasmore: with a catalogue raisonné of the paintings, constructions and graphics 1926-1979*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 12.
[53] Anne Massey, *The Independent Group: Modernism and mass culture in Britain, 1945-59*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995, p. 5.

engagement with abstract forms. Sutherland, desperate to appear more artistically advanced, came to focus on organic shapes or insect forms drawn from nature. The artist composed these images using unusual viewpoints by placing the object in an upright position. He embellished his subject in a sketchily drawn, decorative and colourful manner, often inspired by the colours of the Mediterranean. John Piper's work in the mid 1930s was influenced by French abstract art. Later he produced poetic landscapes, which incorporated abstract elements within the composition. Piper had a life-long fascination with architecture, and architectural motifs were a constant favourite in his art. Piper's style with its adoption of a brilliant palette and semi-abstract, almost decorative architectural forms owed a debt to nineteenth-century English Romanticism. As well as producing landscapes and cityscapes, Piper made figure studies, which combined figurative and abstract elements with theatrical colouring. The results however were rather feeble interpretations of the powerful Modernist movements that had erupted in the twentieth century.

It was this tepid style and approach which Hockney was to rebel against. For David Hockney when he was an art student the second generation of English Romantics and the Euston Road group of artists were too circumspect and dull and had little to offer by way of inspiration for his own art. Keen to break out of this visual straight-jacket Hockney turned to other artists' work that was less conventional: 'I had become quite interested in Stanley Spencer, possibly because of the literary content; I knew he was regarded as a rather eccentric artist out of the main class of art by both the academics, who favoured Sickert and Degas, and by the abstractionists who dismissed him'.[54]

Spencer held a certain fascination for Hockney also because of his remarkable appearance. As John Rothenstein, the Director of the Tate from 1938 to1964 recalled: 'The tiny sweep-like figure of Stanley Spencer presently emerged … Stanley had dressed like a street urchin, but I had never before seen him wearing clothes so ragged and grimy. His overcoat was fastened at the neck with a huge safety-pin and on his head a battered but still jaunty Tyrolean hat … struck a ludicrous note.'[55] In his student days, Hockney came to model his own

---

[54] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 38.
[55] John Rothenstein, *Brave day: hideous night: autobiography two*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966, p. 36; the description of Spencer continues to p. 41.

appearance on Spencer, acquiring a bowler hat, a big coat and carrying an umbrella. Hockney would further accentuate his unusual appearance by the occasional peculiar action, such as jumping into the canal fully clothed, while painting with friends on the water's bank.

In the last years of his life, Stanley Spencer was to enjoy recognition as an important English artist, in part because of Rothenstein's support of the artist with his retrospective at the Tate Gallery, London in 1955.[56] References to the show appear in Hockney's sketchbooks of the time. Hockney admired the artist's work, considering him to be the initiator of modern painting in Britain; he also enjoyed the lacing of humour in some of Spencer's art. Hockney admired Spencer's bold figurative studies, overwhelming, almost vulgar nudes, and biblical subject matter in an English setting. His eccentric character also appealed.[57] This totally individual approach to art and life set Spencer apart from the norm, something which Hockney found immensely attractive.

At this stage in Hockney's development, the New York School had yet to gain supremacy in Britain. At Bradford College, Hockney considered both his painting tutors, Frank Lyle and Derek Stafford, to be talented painters and relatively free from the dull art promoted by the educational world and abreast of developments in British art.[58] The fact that Stafford was well travelled and from London was particularly impressive for the young provincial Hockney, as was the fact that he was the most versed in current English trends. Stafford was young, unconventional and painted in the manner of the 'Kitchen Sink' artists,[59] who all exhibited at Helen Lessore's Beaux Arts Gallery, at Bruton Place in London; the most bohemian of venues at this time and which has been described by critic Philip Oakes as 'one of the most individual and influential nurseries of talent in the country'.[60]

At Bradford College teaching included life classes with a model in set poses for two hours. What Hockney learnt from this experience was how complicated the human figure was. It also taught him to look, a skill he has honed over the years as an artist. Lyle and Stafford did their best to introduce their pupils to current

[56] John Rothenstein, *Brave day: hideous night: autobiography two*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966, Chapter 8.
[57] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[58] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[59] David Sylvester coined the term in his review, 'The kitchen sink', *Encounter*, December 1954, pp. 61-64.
[60] Tate documentation: https://www.tate.org.uk/servlet/ViewWork?cgroupid... viewed 1 October 2009.

British art by inviting artists to visit the college and organising visiting exhibitions of artists' work in the environs of the college: '[By] 1957 I'd certainly become aware of a lot of contemporary art, partly through the artists in Leeds, the Gregory Fellows. Alan Davie was a Gregory Fellow then and he had a large exhibition, I remember, in Wakefield, when I was still a student, I was very impressed with the works. That was the first abstraction; it confused me at first, but I could cope with it – I wasn't thrown into complete disarray.'[61] Hockney was beguiled by the painting, which he saw in Wakefield in 1957 by Alan Davie, an abstract artist. Davie had discovered Pollock's art earlier in Venice in the Peggy Guggenheim collection. The Scottish-born artist had then married an enthusiasm for Pollock with a palette bolder than the Fauvist's and his own vocabulary of forms: their energetic lines and unusual shapes. Hockney was attracted to their brilliance of colour and liveliness of forms which were to influence his own art.

At the conclusion of his four-year studies at Bradford College, Hockney was awarded First Class Diploma with Honours. During this time he did his teachers' bidding without any argument, but such an attitude changed dramatically in his later studies when he had acquired more confidence in his work. Before beginning any postgraduate studies Hockney was obliged to undertake two years of National Service. He followed in his father's footsteps (who was a pacifist during the Second World War) and registered as a conscientious objector, working as a medical orderly from 1957 to 1959. During this time he tried his hand at the more modest printing technique of the colour linocut, which did not require the elaborate press and process that was needed for lithography. Hockney adopted the technique of linocut, producing Christmas cards over a three-year period from 1957 to 1959.[62] The first of these was a four inked linocut in black, green, yellow and red; an image of a cat, starkly depicted in a semi-abstract manner in black with over-printing to create further colours (illustration 3). The cat itself recalls Hockney's early and rare foray into decorative arts, where he created a similarly styled cat in glazed earthenware in

[61] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 38.
[62] Bonhams, London, *David Hockney: works on paper*, 31 October, 2005, lot 1 for three cards, colour linocuts, one with collage, various sizes.

1955.[63] A more abstract venture was undertaken during the period of his work as a hospital orderly, with a second card in red, yellow and black and with an addition of newspaper collage of death notices listed from September to December 1957 and addressed from Cliff Cottage, West Hill, St. Leonards-on-Sear, Sussex. Another colour linocut in green, yellow, black and blue featured semi-abstract organic plant forms, their stalks, leaves, flowers and bulbs depicted in the manner of Sutherland and Piper.

[63] Bonhams, London, *The Hockney sale*, 20 April 2011, lot 1, earthenware cat glazed in white with black and yellow stripes.

Chapter 4: The London scene

When Hockney arrived in London the art scene remained in an almost perilous state after the devastation of war, as the notable British art critic and writer John Russell reflected:

> In 1945 … our artists had a merely local reputation. Our closed and empty museums were in the charge of caretakers. Our salerooms were cut off from what was left of the international market. There had not been a big new book or a major exhibition since 1939, and for our knowledge of Paris and New York we relied on censored letters and clandestine copies of reviews printed by hand in the French provinces.[64]

The Tate Gallery had suffered badly from the bombing of London. Its Director John Rothenstein lamented:

> How, I wondered, could the hard-pressed Ministry of Works be induced, in the face of bitter competition, to repair this vast and derelict building? And how, with our depleted and largely infirm staff, could the thousands of paintings and water-colours in the refuge-houses be repacked, brought back, reframed and rehung? How, in short, could the Tate even be restored to its former unsatisfactory condition, much less be made ready to play its proper part in the creative life of the country?[65]

The Tate, however, had problems other than its physical devastation and the dispersal of the collection and staff. It had become, in one commentator's words, 'A monument to the provincialism of British art and taste'.[66] Roger Fry's ground-breaking exhibitions prior to the First World War appeared forgotten. The excitement and the antagonism which he evoked with the two exhibitions he had curated, *Manet and the Post-Impressionists* in 1910 and the *Second Post-Impressionist exhibition* 1912 had startled the British art world, upsetting the establishment and delighting young emerging artists who had not been aware of the dramatic developments of the Post-Impressionists across the Channel. Fry continued this proselytising with many essays and lectures on the new French art. It was as if this recent history had passed by the Tate, its Director and trustees. Though Rothenstein was aware of developments in contemporary English art, Euston Road and New Romanticism, and had added work by Ben Nicholson, Henry Moore, and Victor Pasmore to the collection, he

---

[64] John Russell, Part 1, in Bryan Robertson, John Russell & Lord Snowden, *Private view: the lively world of British art*, London: Nelson, 1965, p. 6.
[65] John Rothenstein, *Brave day: hideous night: autobiography two*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966, p. 166.
[66] Roger Berthoud, *Graham Sutherland: A biography*, London: Faber and Faber, 1982, p. 167.

had failed to comprehend in any serious way the developments of Cubism and, more generally, the art of Picasso and Matisse, just as the artists acquired represented frail interpretations of these key movements. He was, however, an improvement on his predecessor J. B. Manson, who had advised British Customs that sculptures by Constantin Brancusi, Marcel Duchamp, Nikolaus Pevsner and Hans Arp intended for Peggy Guggenheim's gallery, established in 1938 as *Guggenheim Jeune*, could not be considered as art. Rothenstein, however, was accused by the collector of and writer on Cubism, Douglas Cooper, of mis-reading developments in modern art. In his memoirs, which included his personal relationship with Cooper, the art historian John Richardson recounted this view:

> Rothenstein's failure to do justice to such major twentieth-century art movements as fauvism, cubism, futurism and surrealism had the small, mutually mistrustful band of British modernists up in arms. Of these, Douglas [Cooper] was by far the most vindictive. Despite the Tate's refusal to employ him, he had tried to work with Rothenstein. He had lent the gallery paintings from his collection: he had helped him obtain loans for exhibitions and notified him whenever works of museum calibre came on the London market at an affordable price. But the director seldom if ever acted on his tips; and so Douglas passed them on to Alfred Barr of New York's Museum of Modern art. Barr was thus able to acquire the two greatest twentieth century landmarks in British hands: Matisse's magnificent *Red Studio* …. and Severini's tour de force, the *Bal Tabarin* …[67]

In contrast, there was some attempt in the post-war British art world to engage with major developments of the previous European avant-garde art century. This included the ground-breaking exhibition, *Forty years of modern art, 1907-1947. A selection from British collections*, consisting of 29 paintings, drawings and sculpture which went on display at the Academy Hall, in Oxford Street, London, from 10 February to 6 March 1948. At the behest of the Organising Committee of the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA), chaired by Herbert Read, Roland Penrose organised works by André Derain, Paul Klee, Joan Miro, Pablo Picasso, Henri Matisse, Giorgio de Chirico and Jean Arp, along with British artists Augustus John, Duncan Grant, Barbara Hepworth and others from private collectors in Britain including himself, Lee Miller and Kenneth Clark. This highlighted the extent to which modern art had been acquired by a few discerning people, and as a fundraiser hoped to establish a 'national art centre'

---

[67] John Richardson, *The sorcerer's apprentice: Picasso, Provence, and Douglas Cooper*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000, p. 160.

which in part could fill the gap where the Tate had failed and to establish an arts centre which related to contemporary society, something the Royal Academy had failed to address. In the introduction to the catalogue for the exhibition Herbert Read stated:

> This exhibition celebrates the Modern Movement in art, which may be said to have begun forty years ago with the first cubist paintings of Picasso–with the poetry of Apollinaire and the music of Stravinsky. At the same time with this exhibition we inaugurate a campaign to collect funds for the Institute of Contemporary Art. Our general purpose is to sustain the impetus of Modern Movement, so that forty years hence we may look back on creative achievements of even greater brilliance.

In addition Read considered:

> The joint stock company, the trade union, the municipal council – these typical institutions of modern life are not patrons of art. ... Culturally speaking, they are moribund and allergic to art. Our society must seek more spontaneous outlets for its aesthetic expression – or must remain culturally inert.[68]

In Read's view this was a public role the ICA should undertake. The period shortly after the war also saw a number of very influential exhibitions of the art of Mondrian (1955) and Pollock (1958) exhibited at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, and Braque (1956) and Picasso (1960), both organised by the newly established Arts Council of Great Britain. It also saw the development of improved art school education at the Royal College of Art and other teaching institutions, the revival of art history with monographs by G. H. Gombrich and Kenneth Clark and its teaching at the Courtauld Institute of Art. In the post-war era several new private galleries were established in London. Gimpel Fils was established in 1946 by Peter and Charles Gimpel, first on Duke Street in 1946 and two years later on South Molton Street. The gallery specialised in the more adventurous British artists of the time, such as Barbara Hepworth, Anthony Caro, Lyn Chadwick, Ivon Hitchens and Alan Davie, as well as major artists working in Paris from Edgar Degas to Piet Mondrian. These years also

---

[68] Herbert Read, 'Introduction', *Forty years of modern art 1907-1947: A selection from British collections*, London: Institute of Contemporary Art, 1948, n.p. Since the time of Read, notions about the Modern Movement and Modernism have changed considerably. For example, Pam Meecham and Julie Sheldon, in *Modern art: a critical introduction*, London and New York: Routledge, second edition, 2005, note that, 'Any certainties around modernism have been rendered unstable, especially since the 1970s and the arrival of a new term 'postmodernism'. The seemingly monolithic 'universals' of modernism – genius, essentialism, truth – have been called into question and subsequently revised' (p. 10). These scholars note that 'modernism' was a Western phenomenon and ... traditionally located in two centres: Paris from mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century and then contentiously, New York from 1950s onwards' (pp. 14-15). A radical revision of the concept of Modernism is presented by Bernard Smith, *The formalesque: a guide to modern art and its history*, South Yarra, Victoria: Macmillan, c. 2007.

witnessed the revival of a lively dealer scene, with private galleries and auction houses including Agnew's, Marlborough, the Beaux Arts Gallery, Sotheby's and Christie's.

As Hockney was developing as a young artist, British art was transformed with the evolution of modern figurative and abstract styles, which were not necessarily mutually exclusive. There was an attempt to address issues surrounding the lack of engagement of British art with dramatic developments in European avant-garde art that had taken place earlier in the twentieth century. A notion of a School of London emerged amongst certain artists and critics, who viewed this as a counterpart of the School of Paris. This latter art movement had dominated the interwar period and pre-dated the advent of the New York School. The term 'School of London' was identified by David Sylvester in 1948 in an article for the French press on the problems concerning French and English art in 1947.[69] This English art critic and Francophile had lived briefly in France after the war and was a great admirer of *L'École de Paris*; the dominating French modern art. It was while living in Paris that Sylvester coined the term *L'École de Londres*. He argued that the vivacity found in post-war English art was worthy of its French School precursor, and a generation of artists born mostly around the turn of the century were eminent exponents.

English artist and critic Patrick Heron also referred to the term the 'School of London' in England. At this time Heron considered some of his English contemporaries as worthy inheritors of the 'School of Paris', who embraced the cross-pollination of figurative and abstract art. Such cross-pollination became evident in Hockney's next stage of artistic development. 'The time has come', Heron wrote in a 1949 review, 'when it is no longer meaningless to speak about the modern School of London. Something like the beginnings of a renaissance in the visual arts in this country is now beyond a doubt.' While noting their artistic divergence, 'The School of London is remarkable for its variety', still, he argued that such a group of modern English artists held 'values' which 'ultimately derive from France'.[70] In a slight divergence of thought, Sylvester

[69] David Sylvester, 'Les Problèmes', *L'Age Nouveau*, nos 30, 31, 32, quoted in James Hyman, *The battle for Realism: figurative art in Britain during the Cold War 1945-1960*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001, p. 24 and note 76.
[70] Patrick Heron, 'The School of London', *The New Statesman and Nation*, 9 April 1949, volume 37, number 944, p. 351. Recent scholarship that has added considerably to our understanding of British art post-war includes Margaret Garlake, *New Art New World: British Art in Postwar Society*, New Haven and

wrote of a new movement in England, which 'partakes in the final phase of Cubism, as typified by the painting of Picasso and Braque since 1948'.[71] English art as exemplified by the 'School of London', therefore, generally speaking was no longer parochial but could be considered a worthy contributor to the world art scene. This premise was at odds with the growing American belief espoused by Clement Greenberg and others, who saw the artists working in the United States such as Willem de Kooning and Jackson Pollock as the true inheritors of the 'School of Paris', by their embrace of abstraction and in the art's formal properties. What is more, they were keen to consider art without the context of earlier movements and traditions. Art should be considered simply in terms of colour and form, devoid of historical baggage.

To further a career as an artist Hockney had realised that it was essential to undertake additional studies and the best opportunities would be found in London at one of the major art schools there, notably the Slade School of Fine Art or the Royal College of Art.

There was another factor which drew him to London. This was his growing understanding and recognition of his homosexuality. While in provincial Bradford, Hockney had a one-year relationship with a fellow student Terry Kirkbride during 1957. She was, 'Unlike quite a few of the girls at Bradford Art School, she was not one of the horsey types. She was quite attractive, even if she was a bit flashy.'[72] It was hardly surprising that a young student from the North of England was still ambivalent about his personal preferences. English social mores and the law dictated this. Since the late nineteenth century homosexual preferences was considered an illness or a failing of personality. In post-war Britain, in medical and philosophical journals, court proceedings and judgements, legal and social enquiries, broadsheet and tabloid newspapers, novels and film, the subject of homosexuality was increasingly explored. Provincial Britain of the1950s was more homophobic than the nation's capital. Many of those with same-sexual preferences would leave home and head for London in search of 'people like me' as one person in this post-war homosexual

London: Yale University Press, 1998, James Hyman, *The battle for Realism: figurative art in Britain during the Cold War 1945-1960*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001.
[71] David Sylvester, 'Portrait of the artist no. 85: Patrick Heron', *Art News and Review*, 3 May 1952, volume IV, number 7, p. 1.
[72] Jack Malvern 'It's just like old Times as Hockney makes headline news 50 years on,' *The Times*, 12 October 2006, reprinted at http://www.hockneypictures.com/current.htm, viewed 7 September 2008.

Diaspora described. Such migration was commonplace, as Mike Homfray has observed in his study of this subject published in *Provincial queens*, noting the 'frequent expressed theme ... the desire to relocate, to migrate'.[73] In this way an individual could 'go and be a gay man'.[74]

Despite London being more conducive as a place to live for a gay man than the provinces, homosexual behaviour, even between consenting adults in private, remained a criminal offence.[75]

In the mid 1950s these laws were re-examined. This followed concerns that London was undergoing a 'great purge' of homosexuals in the post-war period. In the Metropolitan Magistrates' Courts and City of Justice Rooms, proceedings numbered 251 in the year 1937. This dropped during the war to 211 and then almost tripled in 1947 to 637, falling to a slightly lesser figure of 583 in 1952.[76] It has been argued that this great increase in cases had been due to the active role of several prominent figures in law enforcement. These included the Director of Public Prosecutions from 1944 to1964, Theobald Mathew.[77] Another prominent figure was the Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis from 1953 to1958, John Nott-Bower. The third was the Home Secretary from 1951 to 1954, David Maxwell Fyfe. It has been argued that the convergence of these

[73] Mike Homfray, *Provincial queens*, Oxford etc, Peter Lang, 2007, p. 23. For a historic summary of homosexual politics in Britain up until the mid 1970s see Jeffrey Weeks, *Coming out: homosexual politics in Britain from the nineteenth century to the present*, London, Melbourne, New York: Quartet Books, 1977; for pioneering work on theories of sexuality see Michel Foucault, *The history of sexuality*, volumes 1-3, translated by Robert Hurley, New York: Pantheon Books, c. 1978-1986 and Judith Butler, *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*, New York: Routledge, c.1999 are key; for further analysis Jeffrey Weeks, 'Inverts, perverts and Mary-Annes: male prostitution and the regulation of homosexuality in England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries', in *Hidden from history: reclaiming the gay and lesbian past*, edited by George Chauncey, Martin Duberman & Martha Vicinus, Canada: New American Library, 1989 pp. 195-211; Henning Bech, *When men meet: homosexuality and modernity*, translated by Teresa Mesquit & Tim Davies, Cambridge: Cambridge Policy Press, 1997; Stephen Jeffery-Poulter, *Peers, queers and commons: the struggle for gay law reform from 1950 to the present*, London: Routledge, 1991.
[74] Mike Homfray, *Provincial queens*, Oxford etc, Peter Lang, 2007, p. 21.
[75] Antony Grey, a driving force in the Homosexual Law Reform Society, recalled at the time of his youth, 'There was a hideous aura of criminality and degeneracy and abnormality surrounding the matter', interviewed by Geraldine Bedell, 'Coming out of the dark ages', *The Observer*, 24 June 2007, htpp://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/jun/24/communities.gayrights/print viewed 11 May 2011. Grey worked in the role of volunteer, treasurer and secretary for the HLRS. As a consequence, Grey delayed engaging with a sexual partner until the age of 32. He recounted the couple's experience when a drunken driver crashed a bus outside their house in London. Grey was mindful of the tragedy that previously had befallen the Enigma Code breaker, Alan Turing. The latter had reported a burglary and the thief was his lover Arnold Murray. Turing was subsequently convicted of indecency in 1952 and ultimately was forced to undergo hormone therapy before committing suicide. Before calling the police, therefore, Grey remembered that: 'The first thing we had to do was to make up a spare bed. We knew from experience that if you called the police and they suspected you were homosexual, they would ignore the original crime and concentrate on the homosexuality'.
[76] These statistics are tabled in an appendix in Matt Houlbrook, *Queer London: perils and pleasures in the sexual metropolis, 1918-1957*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 2005, based on sources listed pp.273-274 and methodology outlined.
[77] Mathew gained notoriety in the prosecution in 1960 of Penguin Books for the publication of D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's lover*.

dominant anti-homosexual figures in key law enforcement positions, combined with a greater emphasis on entrapment by police, accounted for a rise in prosecutions. Matt Houlbrook in his study *Queer London* rejects this view, arguing that this thesis, first established by Montgomery Hyde in 1970 continued as an 'uncritical narrative' well into the 1990s. Houlbrook instead argues that the comparison between pre- and post-war experience was overstated.[78] However, whether this was an increase more perceived that actual or not, a number of well publicised homosexual prosecutions involving high profile people came to the public's notice. This, in turn, caused a growing disquiet amongst the public against the 'great purge' as it was known in the homosexual community.[79] Notable cases included those of actor Sir John Gielgud in 1953, journalist for the *Daily Mail* Peter Wideblood and Dorset landowner Michael Pitt-Rivers in 1954.

In response to the perception and perhaps in order to stifle the disquiet, Maxwell Fyfe established the Departmental Committee of 14 people to investigate the matter with the following terms of reference: 'the law and practice relating to homosexual offences and the treatment of persons convicted of such offences by the courts; and b) the law and practice relating to offences against criminal law in connection with prostitution and solicitation for immoral purposes and to report what changes, if any in our opinion desirable.'[80] The Committee met for the first time on 15 September 1954 and interviewed a wide range of people including several openly gay and articulate homosexuals, including Carl Winter, Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum, noted eye-surgeon Patrick Trevor-Roper and the now convicted journalist Peter Wideblood. The Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution, referred to frequently as the Wolfenden Report after its chair Lord Wolfenden, was published three years later on 4 September 1957. In the report the committee

---

[78] H. Montgomery Hyde, *The other love: an historical and contemporary survey of homosexuality in Britain*, London: William Heinemann, 1970, pp. 213-215. This thesis, according to Houlbrook, op. cit., p. 284, note 74, continued with Patrick Higgins, *Heterosexual dictatorship: male homosexuality in post-war Britain*, London: Fourth estate, 1966 and Hugh David, *On queer street: a social history of British homosexuality, 1895-1995*, London, Harper Collins, 1997.

[79] The term was adopted from the show trials of Joseph Stalin in 1936 to 1938 as part of his attempt to destroy his political enemies. See 'The purge', in Andrew Marr, *A history of modern Britain*, London: McMillan, 2007, pp. 134-139; Robert Conquest, *The great terror: a reassessment: 40th anniversary edition*, Place: Oxford University Press, 1990, which updated the original 1968 publication after the scholar had access to the archives of the former Soviet Union.

[80] 'Terms of Reference', for my research I viewed the authorised American edition, *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York, Stein and Day, 1963. As this edition included American spelling for an American readership, I have reverted to English/Australian spelling where appropriate.

considered 'the function of law was to preserve public order and decency, to protect the citizen from what is offensive or injurious, and to provide sufficient safeguards against exploitation ...'[81] The committee noted the growing tendency 'over recent years, to label homosexuality as a "disease" or "illness".'[82] The view that homosexuality was an illness or a character flaw which might be treated was widespread, as evident in an oral history study of gays and lesbians who grew up from 1940s onwards. A study of homosexuals growing up at this time in the United Kingdom was published in 2004 in the *British Medical Journal*. In this study participants complained about the great difficulties they had experienced:

> Those who confided in others were usually met with silence, condemnation, and rejection or told that their homosexual feelings constituted a temporary phase. Two who confided in their teachers were referred to psychiatrists for treatment. Although many had experimented with same sex partners, the legal and social risks involved were considerable. Isolation from other gay young people also drove several, as young adolescents, to engage in sexual experimentation with adults and vice versa, that might not otherwise have occurred. Growing up and realising that their sexual feelings were not a passing phase increased their sense of shame and isolation. A few requested help directly from mental health professionals to change their sexual orientation. Most, however, talked about their homosexual feelings with their general practitioners. However, doctors often lacked knowledge and were uncomfortable with the disclosure of homosexual feelings: He said he'd never had any experience with this and no one had ever raised this before. He said, 'If you come back next week I'll do some research'. I went back to see the GP and he said, 'well, I've been in touch with colleagues,' and he said, 'obviously you can't go on living with the stress and the way you are – it's wrong, it's perverse, it's a sickness.[83]

Behavioural aversion therapy was one of the 'treatments' to change homosexual orientation in the UK even as late as 1980. In the British Medical Journal's survey, this 'treatment' took place mostly at special National Health hospitals as the survey mentioned:

> The age at which people received treatment ranged from 13 to 40 years, with most being in their late adolescence and early 20s ... Those treated privately usually underwent psychoanalysis. The most common

[81] *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York, Stein and Day, 1963, p. 23.
[82] *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York: Stein and Day, 1963, Section 25, p. 30.
[83] Glen Smith, Annie Bartlett & Michael King, 'Treatments of homosexuality in Britain since the 1950s: an oral history: the experience of patients', *British Medical Journal*, volume 328, number 7437, 29 January 2004, www.bmj.com/content/328/7437/427.full, viewed 22 February 2011.

> treatment (from the early 1960s to early 1970s, with one case in 1980)
> was behavioural aversion therapy with electric shocks ... Nausea
> induced by apomorphine as the aversive stimulus was reported less
> often (four participants in the early 1960s).[84]

The Wolfenden Report noted at the time of its publication, 'It is certainly true that the whole subject of homosexuality is much more freely discussed to-day than it was formerly; but this is not in itself evidence that homosexuality is to-day more prevalent, or homosexual behaviour more widespread, that it was when mention of it was less common.'[85] It did, however note the upward trend in homosexual offences.[86] Arguing that 'when homosexual behaviour between males takes place in public it should continue to be dealt with by the criminal law,'[87] the Committee came to the conclusion, with one dissenter, that: 'We do not think that it is proper for the law to concern itself with what a man does in private unless it can be shown to be so contrary to the public good that the law ought to intervene in its function as the guardian of the public good.'[88]

Given the fact that Fyfe had established the Committee in the first place, his subsequent opposition to liberalisation as Lord Chancellor Lord Kilmuir appears curious. This has been noted and has led to the conjecture that:

> As Lord Kilmuir, Maxwell-Fyfe led the opposition to law reform in the
> Lords, so it was ironic that he started the process. Perhaps he thought,
> by handing over to a committee [he would be able] to shelve the issue.
> Perhaps he assumed Wolfenden would find against it.[89]

Fyfe may have hoped to bury the issue in a committee and it remains the belief of Allan Horsfall, a homosexual reform activist who established the North

---

[84] Glen Smith, Annie Bartlett & Michael King, 'Treatments of homosexuality in Britain since the 1950s: an oral history: the experience of patients', *British Medical Journal*, volume 328, number 7437, 29 January 2004, www.bmj.com/content/328/7437/427.full, viewed 22 February 2011.

[85] *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York: Stein and Day, 1963, Section 42, p. 39.

[86] Outlined in Table 1 in Appendix 1 of the Report.

[87] *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York: Stein and Day, 1963, Section 49, p. 42.

[88] *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York: Stein and Day, 1963, Section 52, p. 43.
The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution, with an introduction by Karl Menninger, MD, New York: Stein and Day, 1963, Acknowledgments, Section 10, p. 21. Section 49, p. 42; Mr James Adair, formerly Procurator-Fiscal in Glasgow, formed the contrary view. According the Glasgow *Herald*, 'Mr. James Adair *dissented* saying that if sanctions of the law were removed, this would remove from police opportunities to carry out important preventative work. He said that his training and experience as a Procurator-Fiscal in Scotland may have coloured his view on the importance of such sanctions.' Other committee members dissented on other aspects of the Report, notably those on medical issues, however, 13 of the 14 members supported the key conclusion of decriminalisation.

[89] Geraldine Bedell, 'Coming out of the dark ages', *The Observer*, 24 June 2007, htpp://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/jun/24/communities.gayrights/print, viewed 11 May 2011.

Western Homosexual Law Reform Society that it 'was tacked on to this committee's subject of deliberation which was prostitution at the last minute'.[90] The Committee's brief was to investigate the laws pertaining to homosexuality and prostitution and the possible decriminalisation of acts in the private domain. Despite the recommendation, the move to legalising homosexuality in private by consenting adults in Britain was very slow.[91]

It was not until 1967, a decade after the Wolfenden Report was issued, that the Sexual Offences Act, which allowed homosexual acts by consenting males in private, was passed by a vote of one in Parliament and shepherded by Leo Abse, a Welsh Labour Member of Parliament. Under the Act the age of consent for homosexuals was at 21 years, contrasting with the heterosexual consent age of 16 years. At the same time the Act provided an increased jail term from two years to five years for 'gross indecency' by men over 21 with 16- to 21-year-old males. Same-sex relations were also legal only in private, which was interpreted, as Tatchell says, as being 'behind locked doors and windows and with no other person present on the premises'.

There were further anomalies arising from contradictory aspects of the Act. While homosexual relations could take place lawfully in private, it remained illegal therefore for this to be negotiated in public, leading the Australian-born Gay Rights activist, Peter Tatchell to comment, 'It remained unlawful for two consenting adult men to chat up each other in any non-private location … It was illegal for two men even to exchange phone numbers in a public place or to attempt to contact each other with a view to having sex.'[92] The upshot of the law was that it was necessary to carry out an illegal act in order to practise homosexual activity in private, which was now a legal act.

It is with this backdrop that Hockney pursued his interest in exploring his own personal iconography in both painting and printmaking, dealing with subject matter. Though Hockney was a generation younger than many of the gay activists seeking a change in the law, the situation remained in Britain that being

[90] Alan Horsfall, interviewed by Geraldine Bedell, 'Coming out of the dark ages', *The Observer*, 24 June 2007, htpp://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/jun/24/communities.gayrights/print, viewed 11 May 2011.
[91] In response to the inaction to the Wolfenden Report's recommendations, the Homosexual Law Reform Society was established in 1958. Antony Grey, who worked for the Society and became its Secretary in 1962, worked unstintingly in furthering the idea of reform in the public domain.
[92] Peter Tatchell, quoted in Geraldine Bedell, 'Coming out of the dark ages', *The Observer*, 24 June 2007, htpp://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/jun/24/communities.gayrights/print, viewed 11 May 2011.

openly gay was not widely accepted. One solution by the artist was to create imagery with codes, symbols and humour. While the changing social scene of the more permissive 'Swinging London' culture was evolving in the 1960s, as Jeffrey Weeks in his history of British gay life observed, tensions at this time remained:

> If a David Hockney could be a luminary of the 'swinging London' scene, how to explain his (homo) sexual lifestyle? For most homosexual media stars of the period, the question was evaded, either in an ostensibly shining virginity and a glowing religiosity, or in nervous breakdown. But if sexual pleasure was a desirable goal, how could homosexuals be excluded? Especially as the Kinsey 'heterosexual homosexual rating' told everyone that most people had had some homosexual experiences at certain periods of their lives.[93]

By way of comparison it is instructive to observe how gay themes and a gay iconography were explored in another visual art form, that of film. The exploration of gay themes in film had two notable protagonists in the period until 1960. One was a series of very personal short experimental films by Keith Anger in the United States, beginning with *Fireworks* of 1947. This was a 15-minute erotic fantasy with Anger playing the lead character, combining iconic images of body builders and sailors with masochistic scenes and ritualistic imagery including that of a pietà, where Anger is held by a sailor. Jean Genet's short film *Un chant d'amour* was also is an early exploration in film in visual terms of gay iconography, where a voyeuristic prison guard takes pleasure in watching prisoners masturbating, only to lose out to the power of imagination over his brutal attempt to dominate.

At the time David Hockney began creating his Doll boy and coded iconography, it is relevant to consider development of the gay film genre in the British context, as it provides a further understanding of what it was like to be gay in the early 1960s. There was still a considerable resistance to an open way of living a homosexual life by some in the community. To illustrate this resistance it is worth considering, for example, the lengthy process of censorship of homosexual themes, for example, that took place in 1961 and the steps this involved. In 1961 the film *Victim* was released.[94] As the project moved forward

---

[93] Jeffrey Weeks, *Coming out: homosexual politics in Britain from the nineteenth century to the present*, London, Melbourne, New York: Quartet Books, 1977, p. 158.
[94] The film was directed by Basil Dearden and starred Dirk Bogarde. Bogarde played the character of Melville, who was a well-established barrister who is being blackmailed because of his relationship

Anne Field, one of the chief censors on the Board, advised that the subject was problematic because the film 'dealt with a world of "queers"' and little else. She added that 'cuts were required so that the 'the "queerness" must not be laid on with a trowel. The more we can see of various characters going about their daily life in association other people who are *not* queers, and the less we need have of "covens" of queers lurking about in bars and clubs, the better.'[95]

The revised script was re-submitted in June 1960 by the script writer Janet Green. Director John Trevelyan responded noting that while recognising the importance of the Wolfenden Report, he called for 'a reduction of the emphasis on homosexual practices and "nasty violent elements"', and urged to 'keep teenagers completely out of the film since I do not think they belong in this situation at all'.[96] As the Case Study report continued, 'Trevelyan also suggested that the script should be looked over by Lord Morrison, the BBFC's new President, following which further comments were made again regarding the general public's reluctance to accept homosexuality; and that the filmmakers 'should be careful also not to give ideas to potential blackmailers'. It was no secret that Morrison was a forceful, vocal disapprover of homosexuality and would probably ask for further cuts to the script.[97] The completed film finally received an 'X' rating in May of 1961, although this had been at the loss of one line of dialogue. The history of the development of this film in tandem with the Censorship Board reveals that widespread anti-homosexual views were held by the general public. This was both acknowledged and catered for by the censors.

Another film likewise contributed to the development of the gay genre – this time it was one with a working-class theme. Gillian Freeman had written the novel *Leather boys* under the pseudonym Eliot George, which was published in 1961. She subsequently wrote the screenplay for the film version directed by

---

(assumed to be sexual) with a working class boy. The potential censorship of this film was outlined in the Students' British Board of Film Classification Case Studies, where the members of the Board raised issues as the script development progressed. The Board's response in dealing with homosexuality in British cinema at this time reveals that it was contentious; for further discussions on imagery see Eliot George, *The leather boys*. London: Anthony Blond, 1961; John Lahr, 'Private lives / public theatre: Noel Coward and the politics of homosexual representation', *Representations*, volume 36, 1 991, pp. 43-63; Catriona Moore, *Indecent exposures: Australian feminist photography*, St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 1994; Catriona Moore (ed.), *Dissonance: twenty years of Australian feminist art writing*, St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin in association with Artspace Ltd, 1994; Henning Bech, *Who's a pretty boy then: one hundred and fifty years of gay life in pictures*, London: Serpent's Tail, 1997; John Hill, *Sex, class and realism: British cinema, 1956-1963*, London: BFI Publishing, 1997

[95] Quoted in http://www.sbbc.co.uk/casestudies/victim viewed 10 March 2011.
[96] Quoted in http://www.sbbc.co.uk/casestudies/victim viewed 10 March 2011.
[97] Quoted in http://www.sbbc.co.uk/casestudies/victim viewed 10 March 2011.

Sidney J. Fine which was released in 1964, exploring the subculture of rockers, bikers, café racing and homosexuality in 1950s and 1960s Britain. The narrative recounts the life of two working-class boys, who find solace and affection in their mutual attraction and love of motorbikes. *Leather boys* was another important early contribution to an emerging gay film genre, grounded in a gritty realism. As with Hockney's imagery, both *Victim* and *Leather boys* are testimony to the growing interest in exploring homosexual themes and imagery in the more liberal Britain of the day.

Hockney's move to London allowed him more freedom to acknowledge his homosexuality. This would become an important theme in his art and he was to develop a rich personal and quirky iconography exploring homoerotic subject matter. A figurative art, as opposed to an abstract one, allowed for a means of incorporating gay themes and developing an autobiographical iconography.

Aside from personal issues emanating from provincial life in Britain, Hockney was eager to become an artist. To this end he planned to pursue further studies in London. In Bradford there was no exposure to the art of Picasso or Cubism, except in reproduction. In London Hockney was to embrace this artist's work and Cubism was to become the most influential of styles for Hockey as he matured as an artist in later years. There, with a youthful exuberance and determination which led to an extraordinary openness to the art, Hockney set about selecting some aspects and discarding others in his pursuit of his own original idiosyncratic style, informed by the rise of the Pop Art movement. This was essentially a figurative style conducive to such themes.

Chapter 5: The Royal College of Art

In his first years in London, Hockney carefully looked at and absorbed many lessons from numerous artists to hone his skills and provide him with inspiration. He also became sufficiently confident as an artist to be able to develop his own personal style and autobiographical subject matter. Hockney had applied to both the Slade School of Fine Art and the Royal College of Art (RCA) in London to continue his art studies after graduation. He was keen to continue to learn more at a major art school in the capital city as well as have access to significant national institutions such as the National Gallery and the Tate in London. Hockney had been advised by his art teacher Derek Stafford to choose the latter institution which was more progressive in the 1950s. When first offered a place at the RCA, he accepted it.

The RCA had changed considerably since Robin Darwin had become Principal in 1948. He had implemented a total restructure of the college, its curricula and its teaching staff. In a summary of discussions in February 1947 that took place with Darwin at the Ministry of Education, it was agreed that the role of the RCA would not rival that of the Slade School or the Royal Academy. The Royal College, however, 'ought to provide facilities for the study of the Fine Arts, not as an end in themselves, but as a means of enlarging and enriching the background of design students, who would normally benefit from devoting some part of their time to drawing, painting and sculpture'.[98]

As it evolved in the post-war period, the liveliness of the RCA meant that many young artists chose to study there instead of the Slade School. With its history as the wellspring for developments in English art, the Slade traditionally was known as the place for young painters to train. The teaching institution had the benefit and prestige of belonging to University College, London. Following the First World War, however, the art school lost ground under the stewardship of the surgeon and minor artist Henry Tonks FRCS. In contrast the RCA flourished prior to the Second World War under its principal William Rothenstein. He was active in the embrace of Post–Impressionism and the School of Paris, while Tonks had no interest in these developments. Rather, Tonks was a great admirer of the Rococo and in particular Antoine Watteau and his sensuous,

---

[98] Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: one hundred & fifty years of art & design*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987, p. 132.

expressive drawing technique and totally out of touch with modern developments. From its inception in 1871, the Slade's primary teaching method was life drawing, based on the French Academy's teaching program and implemented by the first Professor of Fine Art, Alphonse Legros in the years 1876-1892. Born in Dijon in 1837 and a student at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Legros began his connection with England when he was introduced to James McNeill Whistler by Henri Fantin-Latour in October 1858. Legros was encouraged by Whistler to move to London and lived there from mid 1863, although the two artists subsequently fell out over the degree to which Whistler had influenced the French artist.[99]

In July 1949 William Coldstream was appointed as Slade Professor of Fine Art and established at the school his system of training in observation working directly from the model. Developed as a method of painting in his Euston Road days, his 'objective realism' method permeated art school teaching in Britain. With his appointment, the emphasis in Slade studies came to focus on the objective realism that Coldstream had devised and which held sway in Bradford at the time Hockney studied there. It was not something that a spirited student such as Hockney would particularly want to embrace by attending the Slade. By the 1950s the Slade, the institution that had taught such key figures in British art as Augustus John, Stanley Spencer and David Bomberg, was no longer at the forefront or artistic developments and had become moribund, inward looking, and out of touch with the times and the social developments occurring in post-war Britain. As Jeremy Hunt made the observation for the exhibition, *This is Tomorrow 1956-2006, Just what is it that makes today's artists so rich, so successful*:

> [T]he Slade School resonated with the depressing aesthetic and grey observations of Coldstream, Pasmore and the Euston Road School resonant of rationing and the Utility Mark.[100]

The Slade was backward looking in other aspects of its tuition. Women students, for example, were not allowed to attend the long-term rooms for six-week poses and life classes in general were segregated. In 1883 the Slade was

---

[99] In April 1867 they argued over Legros' debts to Whistler. This argument was itemised in a document with the final account date of 13 April 1864, now held at the Glasgow University Library, MS Whistler L41, letter from Whistler to Lucas Ionides.
[100] I have not viewed this exhibition catalogue, but received an electronic version with text by Jeremy Hunt, emailed to me by Gary Comenas, 13 May 2011.

considered as providing a progressive education in the fine arts.[101] However, women students attended life-classes in the basement, a fact noted in the University of London, Slade School calendar of 1895-96 and found in the floor plans for that academic year.[102] A joint drawing class was instituted in the basement from 1952, however, it was not until 1959 that classes ceased to be segregated for the six-week poses of the larger classrooms. And so the practice of segregation continued in the 1950s, despite the fact that life drawing was the primary teaching method of the Slade. A student at this time, the former Director of the National Gallery of Australia, Betty Churcher, remembered her experience in London at the Royal College of Art in the early 1950s, recalling that, 'My husband Roy [Churcher] was at the Slade, and there they segregated life rooms. Women were not allowed into the life room where they had six-week poses: this was for "serious" artists. The six weeks accommodated the carefully drawn "squint and put" style of Coldstream – who was the professor ...'[103]

The contrast of the more modern approach to tuition found at the Royal College and the unequal access to tuition amongst the sexes at the Slade continued well into the 1960s. Despite this, some students still found the Slade a worthwhile institution to attend. According to Jann Haworth who studied there from 1961 to 1963:

> The Slade was grey and dusty, full of in-articulate, proper bearded painters, and probably unchanged since the days of Stanley Spencer. By comparison, the Royal College was super cool at the time. They were very hip ... I liked the Slade's fustiness; it was another thing to push against. If you were 'cool', you worked on the landing. I loved every minute of it. I was left completely free to work. The social life was comatose, the males shockingly self-absorbed, and everybody felt superior to everyone else. The assumption was that, as one tutor put it, 'the girls were there to keep the boys happy'. He prefaced that by saying 'it wasn't necessary for them to look at the portfolios of the female students ... they just needed to look at their photos'.

---

[101] Charlotte Weeks, 'Women at work: the Slade Girls,' *Magazine of Art*, 1883, p. 325, quoted in Alicia Foster, 'Gwen John's Self-portrait: art, identity and women students at the Slade School', in *English art 1860-1914: Modern artists and identity*, edited by David Peters Corbett & Lara Perry, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, p. 171, note 16.

[102] University College Calender, 1895-96, University College Archive, quoted in Alicia Foster, 'Gwen John's Self-portrait: art, identity and women students at the Slade School' in *English art 1860-1914: Modern artists and identity* edited by David Peters Corbett & Lara Perry, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, p. 170 and note 10. In Paris, women artists sought to be accepted by the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and enter the Prix de Rome. This was granted in 1903.

[103] Betty Churcher, Director of the National Gallery of Australia, interviewed by Jane Kinsman, March 1993, published in 'Life class', *National Gallery News*, November-December 1994, p. 24.

Haworth's response to this situation was to consider the circumstances as a challenge, noting that:

> From that point, it was head-on competition with the male students. I was annoyed enough, and American enough, to take that on. I was determined to better them, and that's one of the reasons for the partly sarcastic choice of cloth, latex and sequins as media. It was a female language to which the male students didn't have access.[104]

Haworth subsequently went on to co-design the ground-breaking record cover for the Beatles album *Sgt Peppers lonely hearts club band* with her then husband, artist Peter Blake.

At the RCA, with 500 student applications Hockney was one of the very few students selected for the year of 1959. The total number selected was 80 in all. He first sent a portfolio of his work to the college and this was followed by a trip to London for an interview where he also attended a life-class and wrote an essay. Mindful of his provincial background, he was heartened by the fact that he was on par with the others, 'I had thought they'd be really good and then I realised that they were not that good'.[105] London beckoned and Hockney began his studies in the Painting School at the RCA in the new academic year for 1959. With his placement he was granted a modest stipend of 300 pounds annually which required frugal living. His brother, John Hockney, remembered these early days when David actually lived in a dog house in student digs to make ends meet.[106]

The school was under the Professorship of Carel Weight, who was more adventurous than Principal Robin Darwin, and who supported a freer approach to teaching and a degree of flexibility. In Weight's introduction to the catalogue for the exhibition, *Towards Art?,* held in 1963, which was a survey of students' work from 1952 to 1962, he noted that the artistic variety seen in the exhibition was due to the college's policy: 'which has encouraged every student to develop in his own way. Rodrigo Moynihan laid the foundations of this policy in the Painting School and it has developed in this way ever since ...' At the same time certain traditions in the Painting School were maintained, 'This freedom enjoyed by the student does not exempt him from a number of exercises which

[104] Artist Jann Haworth, quoted in http://www.tate.org/tateetc/issue1/article4.htm, viewed 7 October 2009.
[105] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[106] John Hockney in conversation with Jane Kinsman, 27 November 2002.

are set in order to make him aware of the technical problems of his craft; nor does it exempt him from constant work in the Life Room.' The success of such a policy Weight believed was evident with the emergence at the Royal College of 'two major art movements, New Realism and "Pop".[107] A fellow student at the Slade and the Royal College from 1959 to1962, which overlapped with the period Hockney attended, Frank Bowling, noted the importance of Weight in the evolution of Pop Art, although he was somewhat at odds with Hockney's increasing themes relating to homosexuality:

> Carel Weight … made the college a brilliant, rich place, and, in my opinion, was the biggest influence on the Pop artists. He encouraged people such as Peter Blake and many others. He was very good to me and Ron Kitaj. He was reasonably strict with Dave Hockney, but I think that was because of Hockney's proclivities, and I doubt his opinion would have had much effect on Hockney, anyway.[108]

In his early days at the college Hockney, newly arrived from Yorkshire, experienced a certain hostility from some students and was disconcerted by jokes about provincialism with 'Trouble at mill' jibes, but he soon realised that this humour was not matched by talent and took no further notice of such bluster. He was to recall many years later that when faced with this ridiculing, 'I used to smile and think, "They would have no idea what Yorkshire is like, these people."'[109] Hockney also experienced some confusion about what direction his art should take. There were other influences on Hockney at this time. There appeared to be two student camps. One was the students who worked in a traditional figurative manner and then there was a livelier group who were interested in new styles emerging post-war. On a personal level Hockney identified with this latter group, but artistically many appeared to be under the spell of Jackson Pollock – an artist and art style Hockney could not engage with at all. He had seen an Abstract Expressionist painting exhibition at the Tate Gallery in 1956 and two years later the first Pollock exhibition in England organised by Director Bryan Robertson for the Whitechapel Gallery. Hockney considered that Pollock lacked a human element. This contrasted with his opinion of Francis Bacon, whose work he had seen in a 1960 exhibition at Marlborough, which revealed how an artist could be both modern yet deal with

---

[107] Carel Weight, 'Introduction', *Towards art?* London: Arts Council, 1963, pp. 2-3.
[108] Frank Bowling, quoted in http://www.tate.org/tateetc/issue1/article4.htm, viewed 7 October 2009.
[109] David Hockney, quoted in Nigel Farndale, 'The talented Mr Hockney' in www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/33606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html, 15 November 2001, viewed 20 November 2009.

the human figure in such a powerful, visceral way, so much so that Hockney commented, 'You could smell the balls'.[110]

In his printmaking, Hockney was keen to escape the dull figurative style of the proponents of latter day Euston Road and New Romanticism that dogged much of British art, but still was unsure of the path to follow. A key figure in the *Art Brut* movement, Jean Dubuffet, was another important influence at this time with his 'naïve childlike' figures, graffiti lines and rough surface qualities. Much as such an influence was important to the young artist, the counselling provided to Hockney by a fellow college student R. B. Kitaj was of great consequence. Kitaj was American born, four years older than Hockney and had a serious and committed attitude towards art and to becoming an artist. He encouraged the younger Hockney to trust his own instincts and choose subjects and styles which related to his own interests and personal life. This Hockney did in a manner informed by Pop Art, although subsequently both he and were keen to relinquish any association with this emerging art style.

The Pop Art movement was the underlying current in Hockney's formative years as young man. It informed his art both in style and content. Hockney's unusually individual approach, particularly in printmaking, set him apart from other Pop Art enthusiasts at the RCA, and further afield in the United Kingdom and United States. The evolution of this movement and Hockney's response, therefore, needs to be examined.

---

[110] David Hockney in conversation with G. F. Watson in 'A consideration of David Hockney's early painting (1960-1965) and its relationship with developments in British and American art at that time', unpublished M.A. thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, London University 1972, quoted in Peter Webb, *Portrait of David Hockney*, London, Chatto and Windus, 1988, p. 28.

Chapter 6: Hockney and the Pop Art movement

Pop Art was a figurative, irreverent, up-to-the-minute style of art, which was growing ever more popular with young artists during Hockney's days at the Royal College of Art (RCA). Rich in borrowed source material, it was the perfect vehicle for Hockney's interests including the development of his own gay iconography. There was a particular brand of Pop Art that appeared in Britain, and the RCA environment nurtured such developments.

Preliminary steps towards the formation of Pop Art in Britain took place from 1951 with the establishment of the Independent Group (IG) in London. Consisting of young artists, architects and writers, the group was a rebellious offshoot of the Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA). They met regularly as an informal discussion group, reacting to what was thought to be the stuffy, conservative and upper-class nature of the British art establishment. In particular the leading figures at the ICA, art historian Herbert Read and artist Roland Penrose were European avant-garde enthusiasts and were thought to be out of touch with contemporary life, while the ICA was later described as their 'fiefdom'.[111] The IG considered institutions such as the Tate and Arts Council equally wanting.

The IG was an informal group of artists, critics, designers and architects who sought to develop new ideas about art, mass media and design, which were less academic and more related to the contemporary world. This world was in part fantasy, a means of optimism and a way of escaping the grim grey days of post-war London, austerity and rationing. It became associated with a rejection of what still remained as a rigid class system and allied itself with the new social liberalism, which found favour with the more avant-garde members of the British art scene. These dark days served as an impetus for art students interested in popular culture, who responded to their environment, as did as the self-described 'nineteen-year-old peach-fed Californian', Jann Haworth, who arrived in London in December 1961 in time for:

> [T]he last London fog, lamplighters, rag and bone men and three posts a day. The city was black-stained, coal-sooty, stone dark and Victorian, contrasted with the classic, clean design of the Underground. There was

---

[111] Jeremy Hunt, *This is tomorrow 1956-2006: just what is it that makes today's artists so rich, so successful?* http://www.thisistomorrow2.com/, viewed 7 October 2009.

a lot going on. London's new-edge culture was small enough for you to see all of it. I think the satirists took the lead (not The Beatles), then the playwrights and television (such as *That Was the Week that Was*) ... and the artists, fashion designers, photographers, gallery dealers caught the bug. And the music played on.[112]

In an effort to achieve a broader younger audience and at the request of the gallery assistant Richard Lannoy, the ICA Director Dorothy Morland had established the 'Young Group' under the auspices of the ICA, to explore new ideas and events. In 1952 about 35 people attended a presentation by sculptor Eduardo Paolozzi of mass-media images drawn from his collection of American ephemera of witty, exotic, colourful pin-up girls, food labels and pulp sci-fi magazines. A veteran hoarder, Paolozzi had squirrelled away these images which he had collected while in Paris from 1947 to 1949 since meeting American GIs, while a student in Paris after the war. These he showed using an epidiascope and in random order without commentary. This imagery was later to form the basis of his series of 45 colour screenprints, *Bunk!*[113] The IG identified the US as the new holder of the avant-garde mantle as well as becoming besotted with the seductive nature of American culture.

With Lannoy's departure to India as convenor, the mantle for the group was taken up by a student at the Courtauld Institute of Art, Reyner Banham, who organised meetings from August 1952 to September 1953 on modern design. Reyner was later to become an architectural historian and critic. An exhibition *Parallel of Life and Art* for ICA in September and October of 1953 was organised by members of the IG group, photographer Nigel Henderson, Paolozzi and architects Alison and Peter Smithson, and artist, designer and promoter of Surrealism, Tony del Renzio. In 1954 the *Collages and objects* exhibition opened at the ICA organised by art historian and critic Lawrence Alloway and artist John McHale, which recognised the importance of collage both in Surrealism and in contemporary art and where McHale produced collage imagery based on popular culture. For this exhibition Roland Penrose had generously lent his remarkable collection of Surrealist art.

At the end of 1954 or at the beginning of the following year, in the absence of Banham who was concentrating on his PhD studies, Morland invited Alloway

---

[112] Jann Haworth, quoted in http://www.tate.org/tateetc/issue1/article4.htm, viewed 7 October 2009.
[113] Published by Snail chemicals and printed at Advanced Graphics by Christopher Betambeau in 1972, Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 1980-2139. pp. 1-46. It is in an edition of 100.

and John McHale to reassemble the IG. One focus for the IG was on new technology, but not as an end in itself. As McHale recalled later:

> We weren't hung up on the technology but we were hung up on what the technology meant to people … We thought it meant a lot of things. On the one hand, positively, we saw that technology expanded the human range. The possiblity for increased numbers of choices for human beings, increased social mobility, the increase in physical mobility … through photography, television, movies, microscopes and telescopes … There was a feeling here of expansion, actually of what people were capable of feeling, of what people were capable of doing.[114]

The year 1956 witnessed an exhibition *This is tomorrow* at London's Whitechapel Gallery. Within this exhibition some of the Independent Group developed a display which was an optimistic celebration of popular culture, mass media and new technology.[115] Alloway's press release outlined the goals of the endeavour:

> *This is tomorrow* gives a startling foretaste of the diversity and enormous range of the Art of the Future. It ranges from orthodox abstract art, with its classical regularity and rational order, through room-size sculptures to walk through, to crazy-house structures plastered with pin-up images from the popular press. Behind this variety of appearances lies a whole gamut of aesthetic theories, from formal studies refined by two thousand years of enquiry and research, to spit-new approaches based on Communication Theory and the strange mathematics of Topology. And again and again, the visitor will find the emphasis and the pride of achievement thrown back on himself that the Art of the Future is for him to choose, for him to participate, the doors of the Ivory Tower will open.[116]

The impact of the exhibition was significant in the history of British Pop Art. The event drew crowds of up to 1000 visitors a day, with a total visitation of 19,341 and catalogue sales of 1445.[117] Subsequently it has been viewed as a key stepping stone in the evolution of Pop Art. Though the participants did not fully

---

[114] John McHale interviewed by Julian Cooper, 19 November 1977, an outtake of the film *Fathers of Pop*, directed by Julian Cooper, produced by Rodney Wilson, writer narrator, Reyner Banham Research: Penny Sparks, Arts Council of Great Britain, 1979, quoted in *The Independent Group: postwar Britain and the aesthetics of plenty*, edited by David Robbins, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: The MIT Press, 1990, p. 29.

[115] For the exhibition the IG contributed 12 installations out of a total of 36. Contributors to this project included artists McHale, Paolozzi, William Turnbull, Magda Cordell, Nigel Henderson, Richard Hamilton and Terry Hamilton. Lawrence Alloway and Reyner Banham were also contributors, as were architects Colin St John Wilson, Theo Crosby, Alison Smithson and Peter Smithson, Anne Massey, *The Independent Group: Modernism and mass culture in Britain, 1945-59*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, pp. 98-100.

[116] Lawrence Alloway, 'Press Release, This is tomorrow', 1956, quoted in *The Independent Group: postwar Britain and the aesthetics of plenty*, edited by David Robbins, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: The MIT Press, 1990, p. 37.

[117] Anne Massey, *The Independent Group: Modernism and mass culture in Britain, 1945-59*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, p. 97.

understand the significance of the exhibition, in retrospect, the importance of the installations lay in the emergence of several classic images, which later were incorporated in the art style which came to be known as Pop Art. For example, artists Richard Hamilton, Terry Hamilton, John McHale, Magda Cordell, along with the architect John Voelcker, created an installation which combined packaging, movie advertisements, images of a figure from a B-grade sci-fi movie (Robby the Robot from *Forbidden Planet*) and Marilyn Monroe. These were accompanied by Rock 'n Roll from a jukebox.

While the participants revered and celebrated popular culture, there remained a distinction between mass-media forms and an art that was inspired by mass-media forms. The search for a relevant name for this emerging art style saw other suggestions proffered but these were less successful in Amaya's view:

> Moulded into a movement by its detractors and its admirers, the new painting and object-making has been given a variety of other names none of them accurate, few of them in any way suitable: New Realism, Neo-Dada, *Le Nouveau Réalisme*, Sign Painting, New Vulgarianism and Commonism. Pop Art, its most catchy description, seems to have stuck.[118]

The term which first appeared in the mid-1950s as part of art criticism was initially, however, used as a synonym for 'popular culture' and it was considered to have its origins with a comment by the British art critic Lawrence Alloway.[119] As Alloway subsequently noted: 'The term "Pop Art" is credited to me, but I don't know precisely when it was first used. (One writer [Jasia Reichardt] has stated that "Lawrence Alloway first coined the phrase Pop Art in 1954", but this is too early.) Furthermore, what I meant by it then is not what it means now. I used the term, and also "Pop Culture", to refer to the products of the mass media, not to works of art that draw upon popular culture. In any case sometime between the winter of 1954-55 and 1957 the phrase acquired currency in conversation, in connection with the shared work and discussion among members of the Independent Group.'[120]

Alloway further elaborated:

---

[118] Mario Maya, *Pop as art: a survey of the New Super-Realism*, London: Studio Vista, 1965, p. 18.
[119] Lawrence Alloway, 'The arts and the mass media', *Architectural design*, volume 28, number 2, February 1958. See also Marco Livingstone, *Pop Art: a continuing history*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1990, p. 33 and note 2.
[120] Lawrence Alloway, 'The development of British Pop,' in Lucy Lippard, *Pop Art*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1966, p. 27. The article Alloway refers to is Jasia Reichardt, *Art International* (Zurich), volume VIII. number 2, 1963 p. 42.

The IG missed a year and then was reconvened in the winter of 1954-55 by John McHale and myself on the theme of popular culture. This topic was arrived at as the result of a snowballing conversation in London, which involved Paolozzi, the Smithsons, Henderson Reyner Banham, Hamilton, McHale and myself. We discovered that we had in common a vernacular culture that persisted beyond any special interest or skills in art, architecture, design or art criticism that any of us might possess. The area of contact was mass-produced urban culture: movies, advertising, science fiction, Pop music.[121]

The failure to distinguish an art style inspired by mass culture and manifestations of a growing mass culture has continued to dog debate about Pop's Art's evolution. This confusion was compounded by the fact that one of the precursor's was the Dada art movement (and hence the term Neo-Dada was a suggestion as a name for this new style), which was renowned for its 'ready mades', and source material and art were sometimes one and the same.

Controversy regarding the coining of the term and the contributions made in Pop Art's development in Britain continues to the present day.[122] Nowhere is this confusion and issue of attribution more in evidence that in the evolution of the design for the poster and exhibition catalogue, *Just what it is that makes today's homes so different so appealing?*, which was transformed into a work of art retrospectively. The original collage was not itself exhibited as a work of art. Terry Hamilton and Magda Cordell selected elements drawn from McHale's collection of American mass-media publications according to categories Richard Hamilton argued were devised and arranged by him.[123] It was not a collage of

---

[121] Lawrence Alloway, The development of British Pop,' in Lucy Lippard, *Pop Art*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1966, pp. 31-32.

[122] The son of John McHale, John McHale Junior has questioned Alloway's attribution in an interview with Gary Comenas, editor of the website Warholstars, published in August 2006,'My father, in the mid 1960s in Carbondale, Illinois, distinctly told me that he (John McHale) coined the term "Pop Art" in an ongoing conversation with Lawrence Alloway circa 1954. What my father neglected to mention, and what I surmised, was that my father was also assisted in developing his Pop Art theory with the crucial insights of his friend and colleague Frank Cordell who McHale shared an atelier with at 52 Cleveland Square. Alloway and my father had been having an ongoing conversation about aesthetics since the late 1940s and had not made the significant distinctions and some of the conceptual breakthroughs about the popular media until in 1952 my father started meeting and conversing with Frank Cordell who professionally knew the commercial popular media and the advertising industry inside out. I suggest that Alloway is being rather disingenuous and ambiguous in his statement. He is neither denying nor confirming his claim to the term "Pop Art". He certainly must have been fully aware of his ongoing conversations with McHale and about McHale coining the term. Alloway also knew about the strong artistic association between McHale and Frank Cordell. As you note, Alloway does not seem to be able to remember when he personally used the term Pop Art, but that it was used "sometime between the winter of 1954-55 and 1957". So Alloway confirms that "Pop Art" was being used in Independent Group conversations circa 1954. This corroborates my father's claim regarding the term being used circa 1954.' See
www.warholstars.org/articles/johnmchale.html, May 2006. viewed 11 May 2011.

[123] This has been a point of contention between Hamilton and McHale's son and in an interview with Comenas, McHale Junior claimed that it was his father who composed the collage for the poster for the opening of the exhibition *This is tomorrow*. Analysing the elements of the design, McHale Junior argued that Hamilton would not have been aware of some of the products, figures or logos that appeared in the

pop imagery as a work of art exhibited in the display. Years later, Hamilton was to visually lay claim to the design by producing an updated variant made as a colour laser print after a revised collage in 1994, *Just what is it that makes today's home so different, so appealing?*[124]

The notions of collage and of the found object and the surrealist inspired idea of placing works together in juxtaposition were taking hold in the new trends of British art when Hockney was developing as a young artist. Pop Art in Britain evolved as an art form shortly after these events. As a style it came to be a representational art, dealing with the external world, which self-consciously and wholeheartedly embraced the ideas, subject matter, colours and forms found in urban mass culture. Advertisements, packaging, movies, television, pop music, pulp novels, magazines, comics, commercial and industrial design were plundered as source material after the bleak years following the war. The latest technologies and modern commercial art practices, including photographic processes, and the incorporation of industrial materials, all were adopted in a fine art context. Such a brash and radical style was bound to cause uproar in more conventional art circles and in the wider community. Many people just could not believe that a mass-media inspired style such as Pop could be considered as art. Alloway saw the precursor to Pop Art in the work of Francis Bacon, noting, 'Bacon's use of mass-media quotations differs from earlier uses by painters, in that recognition of the photographic origin of the images is central to his intention'.[125] The art historian and critic added further:

> It should be remembered that Bacon was the only British painter of an
> earlier generation who was regarded with respect by younger artists in

---

collage. This contrasted with his father who was very familiar with the imagery. McHale's son also argued that the collage design was at odds with Hamilton's art practice at the time. This argument was then refuted by Richard Hamilton in November 2006, who provided the image of McHale's poster design and the one published, which he contended was his own. What Hamilton did not mention was that the collage was drawn from McHale's collection of mass-media imagery and these elements were then cut up by Terry Hamilton and Cordell for a design for a poster. See www.warholstars.org/articles/johnmchale.html, May 2006, viewed 11 May 2011.

[124] Published by Waddington Graphics, Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 94.1424. In his response to my query regarding the roles of McHale and Hamilton in the lead up to the development of Pop Art and prior to the death of Hamilton, Comenas remarked,' I do definitely feel that McHale's contribution to the *This is tomorrow* exhibition has been downplayed. It is difficult to say with certainty, however, how much input McHale Sr. had in the creation of the "Just what is it...." poster that was created for the exhibition, given the conflicting accounts in the interview and the statement. There was a real animosity between McHale Sr. and Hamilton which apparently continues today, despite the fact that McHale Sr. is dead.' Gary Comenas in correspondence with Jane Kinsman 13 May 2011.

[125] Lawrence Alloway, The development of British Pop,' in Lucy Lippard, *Pop Art*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1966, p. 28.

London. Moore, Nicholson, Pasmore, Sutherland ... were considered to be irrelevant to any new art in the 1950s.[126]

The failure to distinguish an art style from its source material led to hostile criticism by Herbert Read who publicly declaimed this new style in 1964 in a lecture given at Kassel for *Documenta III*. This was subsequently published in his book, *The origins of form in art* the following year, where he observed:

> It is sometimes said that we can express the self merely by the selection we make of available images – that the quest for originality is a vain one and in any case a waste of effort. This is one of the excuses to justify 'pop-art', or any kind of self-expression that dispenses with style. Such non-art has been called 'the art that looks sideways', which seems to be a confession of its evasiveness. We may agree that 'the label "pop-art" is misleading; that the art in it is far from pop' and that 'the pop is there precisely because it is anti-art.' What is meant by an art that is anti-art is really an art that is completely lacking in style, and it is this personal factor that certain artists now wish to sacrifice, without however, sacrificing the art market ...
>
> There is, we are told in this same context, 'a nostalgic admiration for the images that are undeniably common objects. Nothing is lower than a pictorial bubble-gum wrapper, yet it possesses, effortlessly and automatically, of its nature, the property that is most desired for art. The nostalgia mingles with another longing, the longing for material that will be genuinely unacceptable and stick in the cultivated gullet as real art should.'[127]

Read continued to discredit Pop Art by saying that the anti-art movements of Dada and Surrealism had currency 50 years ago but Pop Art is derivative and lacking currency:

> There is nothing new in pop-art, least of all its use of popular images taken from cigarette packets, and comic strips; exactly the same kind of débris exploited by artists like Kurt Schwitters, Picabia, Marcel Duchamp and Man Ray. But there is this difference: in their extreme revolt against cultivated art the Dadaists remained artists – that is to say, they retained their style.[128]

The critical reaction to the emerging style of Pop Art in the United States initially also confused the source material from the fine art creations. The response to Roy Lichtenstein's first exhibition at the Leo Castelli Gallery in New York from

[126] Lawrence Alloway, The development of British Pop,' in Lucy Lippard, *Pop Art*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1966, p. 29.

[127] Herbert Read, *The Origins of form in art*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1965, p. 179; the extensive quote is from the Introduction, *Painting and sculpture of a decade, 54/64,* London: Tate Gallery, 1964.

[128] Herbert Read, *The origins of form in art,* London: Thames and Hudson, 1965, pp. 179-180.

February and March 1962, for example, ranged from open hostility and non comprehension to bemused misunderstanding, coupled with an appreciation of the formal properties of Lichtenstein's art. Writing for *Artnews* Natalie Edgar complained that Lichtenstein 'disappoints our expectations that an absurd iconography would produce humor'. She continued:

> Why shouldn't the comic strips be the funny in 'serious' painting? ... Certainly they proclaim their intent to be ugly for they are careful blow-ups of their newspaper prototypes – Lithography dots, mechanical hatching, acidic color and primitive drawing and macrocephalic heads and BLAM (a direct hit on a plane) are all carefully reproduced. One could expect that a grotesque thing that had a comic content in itself would be doubly humorous. But we are doubly disappointed ... It is not transformed by esthetics, it replaces esthetics. So what was grotesque in the funnies, stays grotesque in its replacement – only doubly so.[129]

Less hostile but equally incapable of understanding Lichtenstein's work was Donald Judd, the artist, who published his criticism in *Arts Magazine*. Judd did not understand how comics could be used except in the context of some social comment, something Lichtenstein was not doing, and therefore in Judd's view, the art fell short of the mark:

> The funny papers have again caused outrage among the respectable; this time it is not morals but art that is being corrupted ... Lichtenstein's comics and advertisements destroy the necessity to which the usual definitions pretend ... It is not so usual to appreciate the directness of comics; they looked like Léger, as do these versions of them.

Likening the 'commercial' look to that of Léger's, but 'hardly as good', Judd, still admired the formal properties of Lichtenstein's art, noting, 'He has added slightly to the ways of being open and raw. Ironically, the composition is expert, and some beauty of it is quite traditional.'[130]

The hostility continued with Lichtenstein's next show (one of many) at the Castelli Gallery in September to October the following year in 1963. This time Lichtenstein was described in the *New York Times* as 'One of the worst artists in America', who, using a method of 'typewriter pointillism ... [made] a sow's ear out of a sow's ear'.[131] Such outrage inspired a *Life Magazine* article published

[129] Natalie Edgar, *Artnews*, volume 61, number 1, March 1962 p. 14,

[130] Donald Judd, *Arts Magazine*, volume 57, number 1, April 1962, p. 52.

[131] Peter O'Doherty, 'Lichtenstein: doubtful but definite triumph of the banal', *The New York Times*, 27 October 1963, p. 41.

on 31 January of 1964 entitled 'Is he the worst artist in the US?' The adoption of comic strip subject matter offended many.

In the United States Pop Art was initially received with little enthusiasm by many critics in the art world. The noted American art critic Hilton Kramer was openly hostile complaining in a Symposium on Pop Art held on 13 December 1962 at New York's Museum of Modern Art: 'Pop art does not tell us what it feels like to be living through the present moment of civilisation. Its social effect is simply to reconcile us to a world of commodities, banalities and vulgarities', concluding that it was 'indistinguishable from advertising art'.[132] At the same symposium, author and critic Dore Ashton lamented that: 'The artist is expected to cede to the choice of vulgar reality', that Pop Art 'shuns metaphor' and that 'far from being an art of social protest, it is an art of capitulation'.[133] During the symposium discussions, which came to be rather heated, only Henry Geldzahler, Assistant Curator of American Painting and Sculpture at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, who was to become a supporter and influence on Hockney as he emerged as an artist of note, felt able to embrace Pop Art as a legitimate movement and recognise its legitimacy as an art style. Geldzahler argued that, despite its obvious commercial origins, Pop was the art for the times:

> Pop art was inevitable. The popular press, especially and most typically
> *Life Magazine*, the movie close-up, black and white, technicolor and
> widescreen, the billboard extravaganzas and finally the introduction
> though television of this blatant appeal to our eye in the home — all this
> has made available to our society, and thus to the artist, an imagery so
> pervasive, persistent and compulsive that it had to be noticed.[134]

In Britain, many of the artists identified by Kitaj later in 1976 as belonging to a 'School of London', including Peter Blake, Patrick Caulfield, Richard Hamilton, David Hockney, Allen Jones, R. B. Kitaj and Eduardo Paolozzi, made their name in the 1960s in Pop Art. Both Hockney and Kitaj had been at the forefront of a new style of art in the 1960s in England both as rather eccentric and original members of the Pop Art movement, where new subject matter, albeit

---

[132] Hilton Kramer quoted in a special supplement, 'A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, pp. 38–39. The symposium was held at the Museum of Modern Art on 13 December 1962 and was published in full in the following year, pp. 36-45.
[133] Dore Ashton quoted in a special supplement, 'A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, p. 39.
[134] Henry Geldzahler, quoted in a special supplement, ' A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, p. 37.

idiosyncratic in the case of both, the idea of collaging imagery, the acceptance of appropriating sources and mixing styles had set them apart from earlier English traditions. Now, because of their continued focus on the human figure in art, they were considered old fashioned and out of step with the new trends in art.

Kitaj subsequently adopted the term School of London for this group in an attempt to dissociate himself and other fellow artists, including Hockney. Kitaj searched for a new term which would not so rigidly categorise this group and end an association with a Pop Art style in a personal attempt to disassociate himself with the colour screenprints he had made during the 1960s with Chris Prater at Kelpra, which years later he considered as 'potboilers'.[135] This group of young artists (a generation later than Moore, Bacon, Sutherland, Piper and William Scott) emerged in the post-war period adopting a style which came to be known as 'Pop Art', which rejected established traditions and took its forms from mass culture. Hockney too has dissociated himself from the art style. Like Kitaj, his art was remarkably original and he used the process of collage to create imagery. However, unlike Kitaj, as well literary or some quite obscure sources, Hockney did draw on mass-media imagery for his prints and painting in the first half of the 1960s. It was during this time that Hockney began developing his own iconography. Like many of the others who came to be associated with Pop Art, Hockney was to draw on everyday sources for his subject matter. But unlike many of these artists, his sources of inspiration were notable for their very personal, idiosyncratic, wide-ranging and inventive character. In this way he stood apart from so many other artists who were associated with Pop Art. Part of this was due to Hockney's personal drive to explore his own sexuality in autobiographical imagery, as well as adopting a range of styles and influences untrammelled by the Euston Road and Neo-Romantic orthodoxies that held sway in the mid twentieth century and so limited British art at the time.

---

[135] R. B. Kitaj, quoted in Jane Kinsman, *The prints of R.B. Kitaj*, Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994, p. 35.

Section 2: Hockney as an emerging artist

This section examines the originality, diverse interests and humour which inform David Hockney's personal and very individual appropriation of sources during the years when Pop Art held sway. It also notes the importance of Picasso in Hockney's artistic development, as well as the factors that played a part as he becomes known as an artist, particularly in his print *oeuvre* with the development of the modern print workshop and print publishing.

Chapter 1: Developments in Hockney's iconography

During his studies at the Royal College of Art (RCA) in London, Hockney's admiration for Picasso had increased dramatically when he saw the major Picasso exhibition which was held at the Tate Gallery in 1960 and which spanned the period from 1900 to 1959. Hockney found in Picasso an artist who was a master of multiple styles, sometimes within the one work and with multiple interpretations of subject matter coming from multiple directions. The experience was to have a profound effect on the young man of 23. Throughout the summer months of 1960, Hockney visited the exhibition of some 280 works on many occasions. The effect was dramatic and long lasting. It was a liberating experience and was to have a profound effect on the artist throughout his career. Picasso's art provided Hockney with a great sense of freedom and taught him that an artist need not be bound to one style. Such apparent limitless variation in style and interpretation was particularly evident in a series of 58 paintings within the exhibition which Picasso made in the summer of 1957 after a painting he was obsessed with for over 60 years, Diego Velàzquez's *Las Meninas*, 1656. This group of works dealt with, amongst other things, the problem of the relationship of the artist and model. Hockney was filled with admiration for the artist and was to adopt this theme later in his artistic development. As a student at this stage Hockney initially recognised the importance of Picasso; as a teenager he was particularly taken with Picasso's work from the thirties such as *Weeping woman* and *Guernica*, both 1937.[1] Hockney later, in 1990, said of *Weeping woman,* 'It was the first image I ever saw of Picasso's work. I can never get over it because it made me realise that

---

[1] Christian Zervos, *Pablo Picasso*, Paris: Cahiers d'art, 1937, volume 9, catalogue number 73, *Femme en pleurs* from the Roland Penrose collection, and *Guernica*, catalogue number 65, for the final (8th) state.

his Cubism somehow accomplished more than any other man's of depiction.'[2] This statement was made in the context of Hockney's growing interest in depicting space in the 1980s.

It was Picasso's openness to change and his interest in how one views people and objects that appealed to Hockney. In contrast, it was Picasso's absorption of Surrealist ideas and aggressive sexuality that appealed to another artist whom Hockney greatly admired, Francis Bacon. As a young man, Bacon developed an overtly male and sexually aggressive style in his art from the early 1930s after being exposed to the Spanish artist's work, probably from 1929.[3] In contrast to Bacon's vigorous and assertive approach, Hockney's own youthful embrace of sexual themes was quite different. Along with desire came humour and whimsy, which characterised his style from the early 1960s and is clearly evident in his etchings of this date.

The year 1960 was also the time when Hockney began making etchings in the College's Print Department. Such an interchange between schools was encouraged at the RCA, as Carel Weight recalled years later:

> Students had freedom to develop their own personal ways. They could move freely and work in other parts of the College such as Printmaking, Sculpture, Photography and Film Making. Life Drawing and Painting was always available...[4]

More importantly, the cash-strapped Hockney who had no money for paint was advised that the Print Department provided students with free materials and so he went along. Here he was fortunate to meet a student of Art and Theatre Design, Ron Fuller, who taught him how to etch: 'I was a technical assistant in printmaking at the RCA when David came along and wanted to do some etching... I set him up to do this but a lot of the students helped him as well –it was a good, free and easy place.'[5] Hockney's work as a printmaker flourished under these circumstances.

Shown the rudiments of how to etch and aquatint, Hockney made his first etching *Myself and my heroes* in 1961 (illustration 4) He was well on the way to

---

[2] David Hockney, *Picasso*, Madras and New York: Hanuman Books, 1990, p. 15.
[3] Olivier Berggren, 'Picasso & Bacon: painting the other self', in *Francis Bacon and the tradition of art*, edited by Wilfried Seipel, Barbara Steffen & Chrisoph Vitali, Vienna: Kunsthistorische Museum, and Basel, Fondation Beyler, 2004, pp. 71-83.
[4] Carel Weight in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 31 September 1991.
[5] Ron Fuller in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 2 October 2003.

developing his unique style and this was immediately apparent in his graphic oeuvre of this period, which saw him working directly on the plate for much of the time; a modus operandi which appealed and which, in turn, produced various proofs as part of the process. It was a figurative art of the imagination, of fantasy, rather than bound to perception. Issues about perception came later. It was also a very confessional method of making art – intimate, personal and almost secretive. From the beginning, Hockney set about creating a subject matter in his prints that had meaning for him; he included the people he admired; his own experiences and surreal juxtapositions, which were sometimes augmented with words or coded numbers. Literary sources provided stimulation such as the poetry of the Alexandrian Greek Constantine Cavafy and the nineteenth-century American Walt Whitman, both noted for their homoerotic verse. Michelangelo Buonarroti's poetry also was an inspiration. Later, the fables of the Brothers Grimm provided themes for Hockney's innovative use of narrative and very personal style. In such narratives (either in single compositions or in series) Hockney worked in the intimate and direct medium of etching. Because he tended to work directly onto a plate, sometimes without preliminary drawings, variant proofs and states exist for a number of these etching series, where Hockney explores his themes and compositions, indicating remarkable inquisitiveness and an ability to experiment.

Hockney initially had been hesitant about making prints arguing naively that many made prints for small ideas. For his own prints he became capable of introducing big ideas and important big subjects on a small scale. In *Myself and my heroes* the exalted states of the latter are indicated by haloes, contrasting with the dramatically dark background of aquatint. Walt Whitman is shown as a towering and powerful figure, his stature reinforced by the poet's line 'When I thy ports run out/ For the dear love of comrades', which Hockney included in the composition. The central figure in *Myself and my heroes* is the diminutive figure of the Indian Mahatma Ghandi, who preached the philosophy of non-violent protest to achieve Indian independence from British rule – a philosophy he considered more powerful than any military action. Hockney's own pacifist background meant he admired Ghandi for his courage and his strength, while he has included the word 'love' within Ghandi's halo and a note about his vegetarianism in the composition. Finally the artist portrays himself (in a manner

reminiscent of his father) as an awkward, comic figure, small in stature and demeanour and with a small baseball cap, in contrast to the hallowed idols. 'I am 23 years old and wear glasses', is his modest comment about himself. Like his earlier lithograph, this etched self-portrait is not one of in-depth characterisation. His heroes championed the values he aspired to; his self-deprecatory manner indicated a humble view of himself. This work was editioned by Ron Fuller and Peter Matthews at the RCA, as were the other prints that were produced at the college at this time.

The following year, in 1962, Hockney created another self-portrait with three images of himself. One was a bespectacled head, another showed him with glasses but as a rather scrawny full-length nude. There is a muscular torso in three-quarter view. In the third and largest image he had taken off his glasses and shown himself as an equally muscular nude with a smiling countenance – a self-portrait as a fantasy figure.[6]

Hockney made prints very slowly and methodically. This contrasted to the often spontaneous methods of painting at this time. He chose the technique of etching because it was more akin to drawing a line, noting that 'anybody who likes to draw would like etching'.[7] In his early prints Hockney used different techniques to cover the entire expanse of plate; a daunting sight for any young student: 'When I first did etching, at the Royal College of Art, they didn't like to just use lines. The other students thought that here you were using all this metal plate, so you'd have to use it all up to get your money's worth. You were supposed to put aquatint on, and this, that and the other. Just to use a simple line was considered uneconomical for getting the most out of a plate from the point of view of material.'[8]

Many of Hockney's subsequent prints of the early 1960s related to his homosexuality; a bold move for the young artist, given that homosexual acts remained illegal at this time and with tragic consequences for those who were accused of this criminal act, as discussed earlier in this thesis. It should not be

[6] *Self-portrait*, etching and aquatint, 48.0 x 26.0 cm, Collection David Hockney and Tate, London, auctioned 17 February 2012, Christie's South Kensington, lot 13, also in the collection Tate, London. Illustrated in *David Hockney 1960-1968: A marriage of styles*, Nottingham Contemporary, 14 November 2009 – 24 January 2010.
[7] David Hockney, 'Supplement: Lithographs and prints', *Studio International*, volume 176, number 906, December 1968, p. 278.
[8] David Hockney, 'Supplement: Lithographs and prints', *Studio International*, volume 176 number 906, December 1968, p. 278.

underestimated the degree to which the social taboo of homosexuality dominated English society, although less so in the nation's capital. To introduce gay themes, albeit in a relatively subtle coded way, was a cheeky but defiant personal statement by the young man. Homosexual topics were sometimes accompanied by a certain proselytising enthusiasm. He found that it was both exciting and liberating to develop homo-erotic imagery – a subject with a complex pictorial tradition, where style, subject matter and composition alluded covertly to the topic. Contemporary art required a new exploration and Hockney was keen for one to evolve in his own art. To this end he developed subjects such as his *Doll boy* and *Queen* series in both painting and print.

Jean Dubuffet and his Art Brut style had been introduced to the British public with an exhibition at the Institute of Contemporary Art, London from 29 March to 30 April 1955. Dubuffet had argued against any hierarchy of art and practitioners. He had set out to revalue and celebrate works which:

> are relegated to some sort of category, such as *children's art*, *the art of primitive people* or *the art of the insane*, which implies the very false idea that they are clumsy or aberrant mumblings situated at the very beginning of the path leading towards cultural art.[9]

Hockney saw three exhibitions of Dubuffet's art in London while he was a student – one in 1958 and two in 1960.[10] Nowhere is Dubuffet's powerful influence more evident in Hockney's art than in his 1961 *Doll boy* series, where he adopts the humorous, barrel-shaped figures with oversized heads and stick limbs rendered in a richly textured manner. In *A study for a doll boy*, also 1961, Hockney created a Dubuffet-like figure with Doll boy and the number 6 inscribed on his body and 'unorthodox love' added to the composition, alluding to a sexual theme.[11] At this time Dubuffet and his Art Brut style held great sway over the young man. In the etching *Fires of furious desire* of 1961, for instance, there is a male figure – a self-portrait – so overwhelmed by his passion that great sparks of fire leap from his head and heart and the words 'LOVE' hover in a cloud of smoke over head. A preliminary drawing with a huge ejaculating

---

[9] Jean Dubuffet, 'Let's make some room for uncivic behaviour in Valérie Da Costa & Fabrice Hergott, *Jean Dubuffet: works, writings and interviews*, Barcelona: Ediciones Poligrafa, SA, 2006, p. 103.
[10] Georges Limbour [introduction], *Jean Dubuffet: paintings 1943-1957*, Arthur Tooth and Sons Gallery, London 29 April - 23 May 1958; *Jean Dubuffet: Paintings, gouaches and lithographs*, Hanover Gallery, London, 3 May - 3 June 1960; *Eléments botaniques*, Arthur Tooth and Sons Gallery, London 31 May – 18 June 1960.
[11] Collection Tate, London, oil on canvas, accession number T12882. A further charcoal drawing of 1960 also a study for Dollboy is in the Tate collection, accession number T11898.

phallus, combined with Blake's words 'The flames of furious desire', is a quasi self-portrait expressing his own desire and made apparent with the numbers 4 and 8 standing for his initials DH beside the phallic form (illustration 5). This incorporates the hint of a phallus that appears in an earlier abstract painting *Queer* of 1960 and the *Third love painting* also of that year, which was notable for its large phallus forming the foreground and the inclusion of the word 'love'. In his etching *Fires of furious desire* we see a tiny figure, the object of his affections, to the left of the composition, with the words, 'The most beautiful boy in the world', etched along his back (illustration 6). A box of *Alka Seltzer*, a brand of digestive salts for overindulgence, completes the picture (illustration 7).[12] Hockney had adopted the idea of a code where numerals stood for letters from Walt Whitman:

> I ... used Whitman's rather childish little thing about playing with each letter of the alphabet: A as one. B two. C three and so on; so the painting has these code numbers on it. I liked the idea of putting numbers on it in just the same way the cubists put numbers on their work. The numbers really say 'DH' and 'WW' I remember the summer of 1960 I read everything by Walt Whitman. I'd known his poetry before but I'd never realized he was that good. There are quite a few paintings based on his work.[13]

In this way he indicated his interests and the objects of his desire. Blake's lines 'The flames of furious desire' inspired Hockney to inscribe his word-play on this within the composition. In doing so he was inventing a new vocabulary for the world of changing sexual mores in the 1960s. At this time Hockney's printmaking method of choice was etching on a copper plate. He could work on this alone in a confessional and very personal manner in contrast to the pressures of creating prints in a busy and very public print workshop.

It was Hockney's markedly individual and idiosyncratic response to Pop Art, which was one of the key influences amongst students of the RCA, which set him apart from the others. *Alka Seltzer* of 1961 is a variant etching of a large painting, *The most beautiful boy in the world* of the same year. Like the painting it contains a male figure in three-quarter view, nude except for a sheer dress, an image Hockney derived from a story about a cross-dresser from a gay

---

[12] *Fires of furious desire – the most beautiful boy in the world*, lithographic tusche on cartridge paper, signed and dated, *The David Hockney Sale*, Bonhams auction catalogue, London, 20 April 2011, lot 6.
[13] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, pp. 62-63.

magazine. He is watched admiringly by a young man – seen as a head in profile with a heart hovering above. The label for Alka Seltzer is included in the composition, as is the inscription 'The most beautiful boy in the world' and the coded initials D. B. [Doll Boy] with their homoerotic suggestion. Hockney continued with gay subjects in his homage to Clifford Richard, *ECR* (*Cliff Richard*) another textured experimental intaglio design incorporating the singer's initials plus the word 'Queen'. Richards was a pop idol who was much admired by Hockney for his good looks:

> Doll boy was a reference to the pop singer, who was very attractive, very sexy. I'm not a great pop music fan....but I am a lover of music and lover of songs and I like singing. Cliff Richard was a very popular singer and I used to cut out photographs of him from newspapers and magazines and stick them up around my little cubicle in the Royal College of Art, partly because other people used to stick up girl pin-ups, and I thought, I'm not going to do that, can't do that, and here's something just as sexy, and I stuck them up. He had a song in which the words were, 'She's a real live walking talking living doll', and he sang it rather sexily. The title of this painting is based on that line. He is referring to some girl, so I changed it to a boy.[14]

Hockney explored the gay themes in an early quasi-abstract painting with rapid brushwork and with additions of words on the support *Going to be queen for tonight* of 1960 is one such example that has 'Queen' repeated in the composition. 'Queen' reappears in an etching *Three kings and a queen* in 1961, derived from a collaged drawing which Hockney had given to Peter Blake. This print Hockney self-published in an edition of about fifty and was printed by Ron Fuller and Peter Matthews at the RCA. It was notable for its experimental use of line, as well as decorative style, which he hoped would add financially to his meagre student stipend. It reveals Hockney's original style with a procession of playing-card figures depicted in a crude but witty figurative manner and with a playful reference in the title to a 'Queen', the contemporary term for a male homosexual. Hockney was to make a further proof entitled *Queen* in 1961.

Hockney's early liberation and open homosexuality allowed him to introduce homoerotic themes in his art relatively early in his artistic development. While Francis Bacon had been a forerunner in exploring gay iconography, this contrasts with fellow Hockney's slightly older fellow British artist, Howard

---

[14] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 63.

Hodgkin. Hodgkin was only five years Hockney's senior, but it was not until the 1970s that Hodgkin openly composed homoerotic subjects. James Meyer, in an essay on Hodgkin where he compares the work produced by the two artists in their twenties, noted that Hodgkin's *Staff meeting, Corsham*, 1959-60 and Hockney's *We two boys clinging*, 1960 were worlds apart in conception and composition. Hodgkin's figure of the art teacher is conservatively besuited, suffering from 'boredom [and] a deadened eros, while Hockney's painting 'depicts a furtive sexual congress' coupled with the inscription of Walt Whitman's poetic lines of male-male desire.[15] Although Meyer points out that both paintings at the London group show would have been both 'daring and modern' in contrast to the other exhibits,[16] Hockney's painting is a grand proclamation for its time.

The artist's early ventures were rich in imagination as well as adopting multiple techniques and various surface and tonal values as exemplified in *Kaisarion and all his beauty* of 1961 (illustration 8). This is an initial homage to the poet Constantine Cavafy, which mixes techniques and styles, and includes stamps of Britannia, hands, and a coat of arms from metal blocks found at the print studio, revealing the experimental nature of Hockney's intaglio techniques at the time. A central figure of Kaisarion, the son of Julius Caesar and Cleopatra, is combined with an exotic image of Cleopatra, a military procession and the words, ALEXANDRA, CLEOPATRA and (a deflating) MUM beside the portrait of the exotic Egyptian queen with her signature long straight hair and fringe. Lilliputian figures in a procession frame the composition at the base and side, adding an element of whimsy, as well as the politics of the untrustworthy crowd. The Alexandrians proceed out of their city, while the armed Romans with helmets and shields and a banner with Cleopatra's name on it line up for the proclamation of the kings. The work was inspired by Cavafy's *Alexandrian kings*, where a fabulously bejewelled young man is decked out in coloured silk, flowers and ribbons to meet the kings at the Alexandria Gymnasium. The theme of a procession of figures intrigued Hockney in terms of the pictorial problem of how to create a crowd – a complex visual challenge – using the simplicity of composition required for his etchings. The figures in a line appear elsewhere in

---

[15] James Meyer, *Howard Hodgkin*, edited by Nicolas Serota, London: Tate, 2006, pp. 27-28.
[16] James Meyer, *Howard Hodgkin*, edited by Nicolas Serota, London: Tate, 2006, p. 28.

a drawing from c.1960, *Procession of dignitaries*.[17] This was a preliminary drawing for the painting of the following year *Grand procession of dignitaries in the semi-Egyptian style* (illustration 9).[18] Hockney also produced three additional and more finished preliminary drawings for this large-scale oil.[19]

In his poem Cavafy conjured a picture of great beauty as he describes the scene amongst the Kaisarion, the courtiers and the Alexandrians with their trickery. This was visually compelling for Hockney:

The Alexandrians turned out in force
to see Cleopatra's children,
Kaisarion and his little brothers,
Alexander and Ptolemy, who for the first time
had been taken out to the Gymnasium,
to be proclaimed kings there
before a brilliant array of soldiers.

Alexander: they declared him
king of Armenia, Media, and the Parthians.
Ptolemy: they declared him
king of Cilicia, Syria, and Phoenicia.
Kaisarion was standing in front of the others,
dressed in pink silk,
on his chest a bunch of hyacinths,
his belt a double row of amethysts and sapphires,
his shoes tied with white ribbons
prinked with rose-colored pearls.
They declared him greater than his little brothers,
they declared him King of Kings.

The Alexandrians knew of course
that this was all mere words, all theatre.

But the day was warm and poetic,
the sky a pale blue,
the Alexandrian Gymnasium
a complete artistic triumph,
the courtiers wonderfully sumptuous,
Kaisarion all grace and beauty
(Cleopatra's son, blood of the Lagids);
and the Alexandrians thronged to the festival
full of enthusiasm, and shouted acclamations
in Greek, and Egyptian, and some in Hebrew,
charmed by the lovely spectacle—

---

[17] Pen and ink drawing on cartridge paper, The Hockney Sale, Bonhams, 20 April 2011, lot 5,.
[18] Oil on canvas, Private collection, Los Angeles.
[19] *First dignitary* 1961, charcoal and watercolour, Museum no CIRC 535-1968; *Second dignitary* 1961, charcoal and watercolour, Museum no CIRC 536-1968; *Third dignitary* 1961, CIRC 537-1968, Victoria and Albert Museum.

though they knew of course what all this was worth, what empty words they really were, these kingships.[20]

Cavafy's lines were visually most evocative and Hockney's response was equally evocative. In his poem Kaisarion, the poet wrote: 'Because we know so little about you from history, I could fashion you more freely in my mind.'[21] Similarly, so many years later, Hockney felt free to conjure his own very rich and ornate composition. It was up to his imagination: 'There were only a few lines of history, so I was free to invent it in my mind. I made him handsome and sentimental.'[22] The emerging style of the Pop Art movement, with its borrowing and eclecticism provided a context for Hockney to mix sources and ideas. Hockney, however, provided his very individual personal and literary influences, which injected a degree of profundity as well as humour in his compositions – more than a Campbell's Soup Can or a Brillo Box ever could.

Hockney had become aware of Cavafy when he read Lawrence Durrell's novels *The Alexandria quartet*; which includes Cavafy's 'The City' in *Justine*: 'I read more of his poems and I was so struck by their directness and simplicity.'[23] Directness and simplicity were qualities that Hockney came to emulate in his printmaking when he later returned to Cavafy as a literary source for a cycle of prints in 1966. By then Hockney's more mature style had evolved in his prints, where the emphasis was on the beauty of the etched line and less on patterning, texture and decorative elements.

In *Mirror, mirror on the wall* of 1961 Hockney portrays Peter Crutch, a student from the Department of Furniture and the object of one of his 'crushes'. He shows Peter dancing the Cha Cha, a subject which directly relates to his painting *The Cha Cha was danced in the early hours of 24th March*. The etching also has Crutch dancing at the college bar, while holding his girlfriend's handbag in a gesture of joie de vivre. In the print version Crutch (identified by the inscription 'Peter') is dancing before a mirror with his reflection and the lines

[20] 'Alexandrian Kings' in C. P. Cavafy, *Collected poems*, translated by Edmund Keeley & Philip Sherrard, edited by George Savidis, revised edition. Princeton University Press, 1992, http://www.cavafy.com/poems/content.asp?id=4&cat=1 viewed on 3 June 2011.
[21] 'Kaisarion' in C. P. Cavafy, *Collected poems*, translated by Edmund Keeley & Philip Sherrard, edited by George Savidis revised edition. Princeton University Press, 1992, http://www.cavafy.com/poems/content.asp?id=4&cat=1 viewed on 3 June 2011.
[22] David Hockney, 'Supplement: lithographs and prints ', *Studio International*, volume 176, number 906, December 1968, p. 278.
[23] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 63.

from *Snow White*, where the wicked queen/witch asks 'Mirror mirror on the wall, who is the fairest of them all'. Beneath the mirror are lines from Cavafy's 1930 poem, 'The Mirror in the front hall', which tells of a beautiful young man who brings joy to an old mirror by appearing in its reflection:

The luxurious house had a huge mirror
in the front hall, a very old mirror,
bought at least eighty years ago.

A good-looking boy, a tailor's assistant
(on Sundays an amateur athlete),
stood there with a package. He gave it to one of the household
who took it in to get the receipt.
The tailor's assistant,
left alone as he waited,
went up to the mirror, looked at himself,
and adjusted his tie. Five minutes later
they brought him the receipt. He took it and went away.

But the old mirror that had seen so much
in its long life-
thousands of objects, faces-
the old mirror was full of joy now,
proud to have embraced
entire/ total beauty for a few moments.

Hockney again provides a richly visual response to Cavafy's poetry. To reiterate the idea of a mirror absorbing the beauty of a young man, Hockney has included the lines in his etching 'Proud to have received upon itself, that entire beauty for a few minutes' – lines that reinforce Hockney's keen but unrequited obsession with Peter Crutch. The print also reveals Hockney's early fascination in solving pictorial problems, of 'how to depict' objects or ideas. In this instance it is how to depict mirrors, reflections and mirror images. The composition is notable for its inclusion of an image within an image, recalling the *bodegón* of Velàzquez and certain Renaissance iconography. The interest in pictorial problem-solving was to remain with the artist through out his career. Hockney continued the theme of Peter Crutch dancing for a lithographic poster for a *Bar party: gay time* (the subtitle being a suitably ambiguous reference to homosexuality), which was planned for the Friday 12 May 1961 in the Junior Common Room of the College. This time he holds hands with two other young men, one identified as Cliff [Richards] who was another object of Hockney's

desire at this time. Richards is shown in drag and with a heart on his chest. Two phallic figures with unclear intentions, with a heart and a question mark above them, are included and the entire composition is set within a huge smiling self-portrait. The subject of homoerotic love was to entice, arouse, but also to amuse.

Poetry continued to inspire Hockney with *In memoriam Cecchino Bracci*, a unique etching and aquatint experiment exploring the death of Michelangelo Buonarroti's young lover who died at the age of 15 years (illustration 10). For this intaglio print made in 1962, Hockney created an asymmetrical but balanced composition showing a three-quarter view of a young man with a beautiful dreamy face, his long eyelashes and curly locks evoking the sadness and beauty of the mournful text. He lies in a coffin outlined simply in thin lines. In an endeavour to show the young man's hands resting on his chest, the artist has experimented by leaving three hands in repose. Also experimental is Hockney's attempt at aquatint, which is rudimentary and uneven. Over the body of Cecchino Bracci are the poignant words of Michelangelo's poem:

If, buried here, those beautiful eyes are closed
Forever, this is now my requiem.
They were alive and no one noticed them
Now everyone weeps for them, dead and lost.

In the same year Hockney made a more finished composition of *In memoriam Cecchino Bracci*, painted in oil on a grand scale, most probably after Hockney's excursion in etching. Hockney depicts a ghostly full-length figure of the young man lying in a coffin. His hands are crossed over his chest, the issues of the placement now resolved, and he wears a top hat.[24]

If the poetry of Cavafy, Whitman or Michelangelo inspired Hockney in his search for themes for printmaking, so too did fairy tales and fables. Hockney had made friends with American student Mark Berger. Berger, who was openly gay, wrote a fairytale for his Italian boyfriend. To accompany the fable Hockney produced *Gretchen and the Snurl* 1961, which was a humorous and inventive visual narrative of five images telling of the two lovers Gretchen and Snurl, escaping the Snatch [nasty], who devours a city while the lovers live happily

---

[24] *In memoriam of Cecchino Bracci* 1962, oil on canvas, El Museo de arte Thyssen Bornemisza, Madrid, accession number 1978.12.

ever after.[25] Hockney was also a great admirer of the Brothers Grimm and he created imagery relating the tale of Rumpelstiltskin. In one instance, *Study for Rumpelstiltskin* 1961, he produced another visual narrative of four images recounting the tale of Rumpelstiltskin, the goblin-like figure shown to be rotund in the etching with the letter R engraved on his person.[26] The fable tells of a miller who had promised a greedy king that his beautiful daughter could spin gold from straw. The daughter was threatened with death, if this proved false. Rumpelstiltskin tells the terrified young woman that he will carry out this feat and creates rich tangles of gold, indicated by curling etched lines. The greedy king becomes greedier and asks for more gold. The young woman then agrees that her first-born will be his. She marries the king (shown in profile with a crown) and is seen in one image surrounded by all the gold; she has become his princess. In the final image we see the evil manikin threatening the princess, indicated by an etched legend and 'prince' written on her pregnant figure. Hockney pursued the subject with a second more elaborate, more technically proficient intaglio print with a single image, *Rumpelstiltskin*, 1962. The very rotund (in the manner of a Dubuffet) and very evil Rumpelstiltskin threatens the princess who is wearing a medieval gown and elaborate headdress. A silhouette of a male figure and a castle in the background complete the composition.[27] Hockney's creativity as a figurative artist is clearly evident in these highly personalised, whimsical images.

In 1961 Hockney had been one of the Royal College students who exhibited in the *Young contemporaries* exhibition at the RBA galleries. Their works were grouped together, opposite the Slade School entries, and were noted for their combination of both abstract and figurative styles and the use of every day subject matter. Hockney was singled out for a forty-pound prize and came to the attention of the young gallery director John Kasmin, then working for Marlborough Fine Art. Kasmin recalled the impact of Hockney's work: 'In the student group show I admired his wit, cheekiness, unlikeliness at the time. Then

[25] *David Hockney: prints 1954-1995*, 9; Museum of contemporary art, Tokyo, 1996, 9, with a unique proof at auction on 17 February 2012, Christie's South Kensington, lot 11.
[26] *David Hockney: prints 1954-1995*, 11; Museum of contemporary art, Tokyo, 1996, 11, with a working proof with an additional panel of Rumpelstiltskin and in a different order, entitled *Rumpelstiltskin, the king & princess*, at auction 17 February 2012, Christie's South Kensington, lot 18.
[27] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, illustration no 37.

his delicate line and quirky imagination.'[28] Kasmin went on to become Hockney's London dealer and an artistic advisor in the early days of his career. In this role, Kasmin, 'discussed David's work often. Acted as an early eye/critic/judge but [was] never an "editor"'.[29] In his capacity as his dealer Kasmin made an important contribution to Hockney's evolution as an artist early in his career – providing the artist with his opinion of Hockney's work and gently chiding and encouraging him on occasions in order to deal with an increasing demand as Hockney's popularity grew. The young artist was now able to supplement his meagre student grant with sales and prize money. The important role of Kasmin and a group of other young dealers should be acknowledged in the change of art marketing during the 1960s. Carel Weight quoted the observations of emerging artists of this time, 'if you hadn't hit the jackpot at twenty-five you'd had it', leaving the head of the RCA Painting School to reflect on the change in the gallery system:

> The sixties have produced a very different picture; there are at least a hundred galleries and the hunt for the young genius has until recently been the order of the day.[30]

After the *Young contemporaries*, Hockney received a string of other prizes beginning with five pounds awarded by Richard Hamilton, an artist who was a part-time tutor at the RCA's School of Interior Design[31]. Hockney was also awarded first prize for *The Cha Cha was danced in the early hours of 24th March* in the John Moores Junior Section. To Hockney's great surprise he won another award for his print *Three kings and a queen*, This print appeared in the exhibition *Graven image,* which has held at Robert Erskine's gallery. It had been submitted not by Hockney but by Alistair Grant, the Head of the Printmaking School, who had found it in the workshop and assumed the work, was by one of his students.

The unexpected financial bounty from the prizes helped pay for a cheap airfare of forty pounds and enabled Hockney to set off to visit the United States arriving

[28] John Kasmin in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 4 December 2003.
[29] John Kasmin in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 4 December 2003.
[30] Carel Weight, 'Retrospective', *Queen*, June 1967, quoted in Simon Faulkner, 'Dealing with Hockney', in *David Hockney*, edited by Paul Melia, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995, p. 12.
[31] According to the catalogue prepared by Richard Hamilton and Dieter Schwarz, *Exteriors, Interiors, Objects, People*, Stuttgart, London: Edition Hansjörg Mayer, 1990, p. 121, from 1957 Richard Hamilton 'Began to teach Interior Design at the Royal College of Art to 1961 (Teaching appointments were never in painting, his principal professional involvement.)' Hamilton was invited to teach one day per week by Hugh Casson.

in New York in the summer of 1961. The young man found the experience invigorating: 'it was totally thrilling, an utterly free city, running 24 hours a day. It was totally classless, sexy and free.' Familiar now with American painting Hockney could see how such a lively city would be perfect for artists. In comparison London seemed asleep and he felt few ties to that city as all his childhood and youthful experiences had been provincial.[32] Prior to Hockney's trip abroad, Erskine had advised him to visit Bill (William) Liebermann, who was then the Curator of Prints at the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) and an important figure in the American art scene. The reticent young artist did nothing about it, but by chance Hockney met the curator socially. He then went on to make an appointment with Lieberman to show the collection of his prints that he had brought with him. Lieberman purchased *Kaisarion in all his beauty* and *Mirror mirror on the wall* for the MoMA's collection, while selling the rest in the United States and making Hockney US$200 the richer.

As in the case of Henry Geldzahler, Lieberman's support of Hockney as an emerging young artist was crucial in his success. At the suggestion of Lieberman, Hockney also visited the Pratt Graphics Center in New York. The print curator was a board member of the centre, which had been established in 1956 with the intention of providing access to a print workshop for artists, for amateurs and to edition artists' prints for publication by in-house master printers.[33] It was there that Hockney made the autobiographical etching, *My Bonnie lies over the ocean*, taking its title from a popular song referencing the object of his desire, Peter Crutch – still regrettably in London – referred to by the letter 'P'. The work also includes a self-portrait as a little figure with DH attached to it.

[32] Transcript of David Hockney's interview by Jane Kinsman, Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[33] Amy Slaton, 'Pratt Graphics Center 1956-1981', *Print Review*, volume 13, pp. 15-24. This volume, entitled *American prints and printmaking 1956-1981* was the Pratt Graphics Center Anniversary issue and celebrated 25 years of the activity with seven essays and a select list of works produced over the period.

Chapter 2: Graduation and new horizons

The debate over the use of photographic processes in art also raged within art teaching institutions. Many students in the late 1950s and early 1960s disclaimed the need for life classes. They considered the realistic, painstaking drawing of the human figure unnecessary. Despite Hockney's many successes at college, all was not well for him when a student. The Royal College of Art (RCA) considered the intake of 1959 students as problematic, and this included Hockney. Principal Robin Darwin believed that the earlier and older generation were more mature and acquiescent because of their experience of war and national service. He contrasted this with Hockney's generation who were overly independent, questioning and critical of the values he was trying to establish in the institution. In Darwin's view teaching was made difficult for the college staff because the typical student from the 1959 intake had 'chips on his shoulder', which he added, 'in some instances are virtually professional epaulettes'. What made matters worse was their rejection of tradition, logic, which he dismissed because it was illogical, while 'their philosophy for life and work was one of "travelling light"'.[34] Matters at the college were made worse by the students' clothes sense and their links to the beat generation. This rankled with Darwin and permeated the views held by the leading staff at the College. Cecil Beaton recalled when he visited the RCA that, 'David and his friends were referred to by the professors as "the naughty boys upstairs"'.[35] There was little love lost between many staff and their students – although there were obvious exceptions. Hockney was well aware of the antagonism towards his year, when he recalled later, 'They thought we were the worst for many years' and 'a little bolshy'.[36] The ensuing experience and conflict tended to mar the artist's view of the college as well as his student days.

Two issues brought conflict to a head, both relating to the RCA curricula for the Painting School. The first was the insistence that students undertake life classes, which had been the principal method of teaching in the Painting School since its introduction at the College in 1922, at the time thought to be a radical

---

[34] Robin Darwin quoted in Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: one hundred & fifty years of art & design*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987, pp. 160-161.
[35] Cecil Beaton, *Self portrait with friends: the selected diaries of Cecil Beaton 1926-1974*, edited by Richard Buckle, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979,'Redish: Whitsun' 1969 entry, p. 400.
[36] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 42.

move. By the mid 1950s some of the students considered the notion of life classes as old fashioned and had little to do with cutting edge Abstract Art, which some considered the way of the future. Photography too was thought to be able to be assist in the making of art. Peter Blake remembered during his days at the RCA from 1953 to1956 that:

> The best thing about the three years there was that you were actually taught. You sat at the donkey and there would be two or three staff and they would say, "May I sit down". They'd draw either on your drawing or beside it, and would have no hesitation about rubbing out your work and adjusting it. Johnny Minton would sit down and show you how to use the paint, which was very good.

> It was all more or less life rooms then – very much in the Victorian tradition. We'd avoid standing next to Frank Auerbach or Leon Kossoff, because we'd get showered with charcoal in an area of three feet around where they were working. One thing that you just didn't do, which is now common practice, was work with photographs. So if I was working from a photograph when staff came round, I'd hide it; I'd sit on it and pretend I was making up the picture.[37]

Others who had become absorbed with the new movement of Pop Art, including Allen Jones, considered that the camera had taken over the need for students to learn to draw and photographic elements could be and were being adopted in the art of the day, rendering the life class redundant. The incorporation of photographic imagery in printmaking caused a sensation. Because of his refusal to undertake classes, Jones was put on probation and then expelled for his trouble, along with other students in the year's intake.[38] In 1968 he recalled the controversy with his portfolio of 22 lithographs, entitled *Life class*, which consisted of a series of figure studies, mostly of photographs of a mini-skirted model, with interchangeable upper and lower body parts, in the manner of a child's card game.[39]

Until the mid 1960s photographic printmaking processes, screenprinting, etching and lithography were seen as suitable for advertising and packaging. The adoption of such methods in a 'fine art' context provoked uproar. For example, Peter Blake's print *The beach boys*, which was included in the Institute of Contemporary Arts portfolio of 1964, was also selected for the Paris

---

[37] Peter Blake quoted in http://www.tate.org/tateetc/issue1/article4.htm viewed 7 October 2009.
[38] Notes taken from discussion with Pat Gilmour in preparation for the acquisition of this series on 14 February 1984.
[39] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 84.187.1-8.

Biennale of the following year. Blake's obvious use of photography, combined with tri-chromatic half-tone printing, was given a cool reception by the exhibition's organisers. Blake and the printer, Chris Prater, developed a process at Kelpra Studio in London which was based on commercial printing, where only three colours – red, blue and yellow, plus black – were used in dot combination. At a distance these colours fuse (something noticed by nineteenth-century Impressionist painters) and so considerable variation in colour and tone can be produced. Almost as if there was a fear of contamination from a work made in this manner, Blake's *The beach boys* print, along with several others, was separated by the organisers at the Paris Biennale from what they deemed 'original' prints at the exhibition.

Hockney and his friend Kitaj (who had previously studied at Ruskin School of Drawing, at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford) differed from others of the Pop generation as they still considered drawing essential – a belief that has stayed with both of them throughout their careers. Hockney, however, did encounter problems in life painting by including a photographic element in his figurative painting. Advised that he had not fulfilled the requirements of this subject for his Diploma, he was required to provide a painting as part of his studies for a degree. His response was *Life painting for a diploma* of 1962, where he copied 'a muscle man out of a magazine'. His source was emphasised by the bold wording 'PHYSIQUE' across the composition, alluding to *Physique Pictorial,* an American homoerotic magazine, which he had begun collecting since coming to London. He also added a beautifully articulated drawing of a skeleton as a collage, as if proving his great talent as a draughtsman. Hockney had created two other drawings of skeletons, which Kitaj much admired, acquiring the first as a student but having to wait many years to acquire the second, which he bought from Kasmin Gallery in London.[40] *Life painting for a diploma* was a bold, brash and crude image, tempered by his characteristic humorous style. The combination of the fleshy pink muscular body builder, nude except for a tiny loin cloth and wearing a cheesy grin, juxtaposed with a smaller black and white drawing of a skeleton in profile under the bold and large red banner which reads PHYSIQUE in capital letters, provides for an amusing take on his contribution

---

[40] Both drawings were sold after the death of Kitaj at Christie's, London, 7 February 2008; lot 319 was *Skeleton # 1* 1959, a charcoal and gouache drawing. The estimate was for £15,000-£20,000 and it sold for £84,500 (including premium). Lot 320 was *Skeleton # 2* 1959, oil and pencil drawing estimate £25,000 - £35,000 and sold for £144,500 (including premium).

for his studies. The raison-d'être for the exercise is made clear with the legend in Hockney's handwriting, which covers both 'bodies' with the words 'life painting for a diploma'. Though Hockney produced an accomplished picture, the gesture was bound to offend the more staid members of the teaching profession. The act of appropriation was not considered valid and worse still, the source vulgar. Moreover, it was a brilliantly witty and notably very public display of gay imagery presented in an institutional context, rather than the more personalised, coded or veiled images found in his etchings or in his paintings like his *Doll boy* series. At the same time he made another painting. This was a gentler, more intimate, less brazen composition of the nude male. A figure is standing and sitting, with the words Mo, identifying the model as his then lover. Hockney included on the work the legend 'Life painting for myself', which is the title of the painting.[41] Advice written on the canvas by another unknown hand when it was left unattended at the college, 'Don't give up yet?', was left on the canvas by the artist as he came to view this inscription as part of the history of the work.

The second controversy affected Hockney even more directly and placed his Diploma at risk. Darwin had been horrified by the conditions he had found at the college when he had become Principal in the immediate postwar period. He proceeded to develop a library at the RCA and compulsory scholastic studies (known as General Studies), which were intended to be comparable to those at university. This was in order that his students develop 'amused and well-tempered' minds.[42] The fact that the Slade was part of London University would also have been an incentive for Darwin. It appears that Hockney saw this as a distraction from what he should be doing, that is, making art. Having completed one essay on Fauvism with a modest mark of C+, he refused to participate any further in the studies. In his final year, Hockney was therefore advised by the Registrar, John Moon, 'You have failed the Final examination in General Studies which means that irrespective of the result of your professional work you will not be eligible for the award of the College Diploma'.[43] When the embarrassing fact was discovered that Hockney was about to be awarded a

---

[41] Collection: The Ferens Art Gallery, Yorkshire.
[42] Robin Darwin quoted in Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: one hundred & fifty years of art & design*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987, p. 162.
[43] John Moon correspondence with David Hockney dated 11 April 1962, quoted in Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: one hundred & fifty years of art & design*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987, p. 163.

Gold Medal from the College and yet would not have a diploma, this ruling was quickly rescinded. In a complete about-face, the same Registrar who had written to Hockney to tell him that he was to fail his Diploma, wrote to him again in bureaucratic doublespeak 'that deviations had occurred in the computation of the numbers ...'[44] Hockney was reinstated and his diploma salvaged. His views of the college and its teaching methods, however, remained negative.

Hockney was not alone in his rejection of university style studies for an art college. Ideas of what was appropriate in the teaching of young artists were a matter of debate. The notion of transforming a school of art into something akin to a university, according to the Director of the innovative and trend setting Whitechapel Gallery, Bryan Robertson, was as silly as it was dangerous. In Robertson's view, the role of an art school was to provide for its students with their physical needs, such as studio space and equipment, technical advice and encouragement, along with access to artists and galleries. The imposition of liberal studies was problematic:

> Artists need Shakespeare, or Rimbaud, or Panofsky or Sartre, at certain phases in their lives when they need to read them ... an artist's education is an intuitive process, and best left to him to develop in his own way and in his own time. To study some basic course in philosophy or English literature as part of a prescribed and unavoidable course, is, I believe an irrelevance and an imposition ... A student needs in my view, a studio to work in, decent equipment, a certain degree of technical instruction, an amiable and encouraging atmosphere. Occasional direct contact with an older, completely mature artist, information from the outside world in the form of lectures and discussions with visiting pundits, and plenty of time for informal contact with museums and galleries.[45]

One response by Hockney to these circumstances was to make his own etched diploma. In *The Diploma* we see the two faced teacher of General Studies, Michael Kullman, propped up by the corpulent figure of the Principal Robin Darwin and the moon-shaped Registrar John Moon. Beneath the framed diploma are the figures of the cowering downtrodden students with heads bowed – revealing the young artist's deeply felt anger over the issue. Years later in an interview with art critic and writer Peter Fuller published in 1977, the issue still rankled when Hockney criticised these changes in English art schools

[44] John Moon quoted in Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: one hundred & fifty years of art & design*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987, p. 164.
[45] Bryan Robertson quoted in Bryan Robertson, John Russell & Lord Snowden, *Private view*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1965, p. 141.

and the academic entrance requirements, describing them as: 'Totally insane. It means you get people going to art schools because it's their second or third choice, whereas a lot of those with real passion for drawing and painting are excluded automatically'.[46] His concern was that working class youth in particular would be excluded by these changes.

On graduation Hockney and some friends holidayed in Europe, travelling through Italy and then to Munich and Berlin. He had been attracted to Berlin by Christopher Isherwood's essays of decadent life in that city in the 1930s, particularly *Goodbye to Berlin*, published in 1939, but recounting young homosexual life from his own experiences from 1929 to 1933. While in Berlin, Hockney visited the Pergamonmuseum. There he chanced on an extraordinary sight. His friend Jeff Goodman was standing beside an Egyptian sculpture. Both he viewed in profile and both facing the same direction. The strange combination of figures, the highly stylised seated Egyptian female form with torpedo breasts standing next to a young man dressed in scruffy clothing, and a palm tree behind them. These visual experiences lead to a series of marriage themes in drawing and painting. The canvas *The first marriage* (*A marriage of styles I*) 1962, was followed by another *The second marriage* 1963.[47] Hockney also prepared another work, an etching which was a simplified version of the 1962 painting in the same year, where his friend is shown simply as a silhouette (illustration 11). It was not until 1968, however, that this print was published. This followed Hockney's meeting with Paul Cornwall-Jones when he made his series of lithographs for Editions Alecto. Subsequently Cornwall-Jones established the Petersburg Press and it was this publisher that funded the project. The Swedish-born artist and noted printer Birgit Skiöld editioned the work. An important figure in English printmaking history, she established The Print Workshop in London in 1958 and worked with many of the emerging artists of the day who were keen to be part of the renewed interest in printmaking taking place.

Most significantly in Hockney's development in printmaking was his summer experience of 1961 in the United States. This then became the subject for his next innovative print project, the series *A rake's progress* of 1961-63. For this

---

[46] Peter Fuller, 'An interview with David Hockney', Part I, *Art Monthly*, November 1977, number 12, pp. 5-6.
[47] Collection Tate, London, accession number T00596 and the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, accession number 1525-5 respectively.

Hockney selected an eighteenth-century pictorial narrative as inspiration, William Hogarth's *A rakes progress*: 'What I liked was telling a story just visually. Hogarth's original story had no words, it's a graphic tale. You have to interpret it all.'[48] This proved an inspirational source of subject matter for the young artist. Hogarth had come to prominence as an artist through his paintings and engravings of moral tales. In doing so he satirised the conceits, fashions and foibles of English society. His *Rake's progress* tells the story in eight scenes of the downfall of Tom Rakewell. After receiving an inheritance, this gauche young man leaves for the city, where he leads a lavish life of excess and debauchery. Indebtedness leads to 'a marriage of convenience', but gambling brings Rakewell undone. Now ruined, he is thrown into prison. From there he ends up in a madhouse – Bedlam.

Following Hogarth's example, it was Hockney's original intention to have a series of eight scenes. RCA Director Robin Darwin was keen for the Royal College to publish the series under their Lion and Unicorn Press and proposed a much larger production of 24 plates. The huge effort required for the project and the problem of spreading the story too thinly meant that Hockney balked at the proposal. The idea seemed to add a lot of padding to what would be a rollicking visual tale, and the young artist just could not consider the idea as worthwhile. Finally, a compromise of 16 plates was agreed upon. The project dragged on over months and was nearly abandoned. Even after graduation the series had still not been completed and Hockney was allowed access to the College print workshop.[49]

At the end of the exercise Hockney prepared a lithographic poster for the exhibition of his etchings. For the introduction to the suite and the exhibition he wrote:

> These etchings were begun in September 1961 after a visit to the United States. My intention was to make eight plates, keeping the original titles but moving the setting to New York. The Royal College, on seeing me

---

[48] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 91.
[49] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 73.824.1-20.
The full published series was as follows: 1 *The arrival*; 1a *Receiving the inheritance*; 2 *Meeting the good people (Washington)*; 2a *The Gospel singing (good people)(Madison Square Garden)*; 3 *The start of the spending spree and the door opening for a blonde*; 3a *The seven stone weakling*; 4 *The drinking scene*; 4a *Marries an old maid*; 5 *The Election Campaign (with dark messages)*; 5a *Viewing a prison scene*; 6 *Death in Harlem*; 6a *The wallet begins to empty*; 7 *Disintegration*; 7a *Cast aside*; 8 *Meeting the other people*; 8a *Bedlam*.

start work, were anxious to extend the series with the idea of incorporating the plates in a book of reproductions to be printed by the Lion and Unicorn Press; accordingly I set out to make twenty-four plates, but later reduced the total to sixteen, retaining the number from one to eight and most of the titles in the original tale.

Altogether I made thirty-five plates of which nineteen were abandoned, so leaving these sixteen in the published state.[50]

For this semi-autobiographical series Hockney took the Hogarthian theme and recounted a story loosely based on his experiences in New York. This he did as a witty contemporary repost, which captured the element of humour present in the original Hogarthian compositions. The series begins with the tale of the young Hockney arriving on a cheap charter flight, 'Flying Tyger' [in actuality Flying Tiger] in New York (Plate 1) (illustration 12). On arrival, the artist, like Hogarth's Rakewell, discovers a vibrant, crowded city. The artist's fascination with the foreign nature of this country across the Atlantic Ocean is highlighted by the brilliance of the sun and the tallness of the buildings.

In the next stage of narrative, Hockney creates a scene of *Receiving the inheritance* (Plate 1a) (illustration 13). However, unlike Hogarth's Tom, the Hockney figure does not inherit his money from his miserly father. Instead the young artist meets the influential curator, a suave Bill Lieberman, who is shown haggling over the price of Hockney's prints. Hockney's invoice for *Myself and my heroes* is clearly marked with the price of twenty pounds, but unmoved and unperturbed the curator responds with '£18', indicated by an inscription within the composition. The unequal relationship of the urbane curator and the callow, youthful Hockney is made abundantly clear by the size of scale of the figure of Lieberman, seated at an equally large and impressive desk, with a huge and dominating indoor pot plant to match. The Hockney figure is diminutive and without limbs, but has tiny wings like a small sparrow and a deflating cloud floating over his head. The young artist is no match for his guileful opponent.

The Rake then sets off on his adventures, travelling to Washington to view the great sightseeing monuments. In *Meeting the good people [Washington]* (Plate 2), the tiny form of the Hockney Rake is now only indicated by a bespectacled head without a torso, and shown in silhouette as he visits the capital's

[50] David Hockney, 'A Rake's Progress and other etchings', quoted in Tessa Sidney, *Editions Alecto: original graphics, multiple originals 1960-1981*, Aldershot, Hampshire: Lund Humphries, 2003, p. 135.

monuments, commemorating Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. Next the Rake is back in New York, a small weedy figure in an audience of big bodies and loud ties who are hearing gospel singer Mahalia Jackson in *The gospel singing, good people, Madison Square Garden* (2a).

Keen to be fashionable and to stand out amongst the crowd, the Hockney figure decides to make his appearance more attractive and debonair, as we saw with the Hogarthian anti-hero. To this end, in *The start of the spending spree and the door opening for a blonde* (Plate 3), the twentieth-century Rake dyes his hair blonde (something Hockney did while in America). Immediately his experience of this new world changes, the sun shines and doors open (and Hockney includes the message of the Clairol hair colouring advertisement which assures you that 'Doors open for a blonde'). The vain young Rake, following the Hogarthian predecessor then sets out on a spending spree but his attempts to look dashing fall short of the mark. Crestfallen and ashamed, the weedy figure of the artist compares himself unfavourably with the athletic and muscular joggers of Central Park in New York. The title for this print *The 7 stone weakling* (Plate3a), is derived from advertisements for body building found in pulp magazines and comics at the time.

Marco Livingstone has since published three further etchings which were working proofs for the series and which he describes as 'early drafts' for the *The rake's progress*.[51] These etchings specifically relate to the subjects of the editioned works – *The arrival* (Plate 1), *The gospel singing* (*good people*) *Madison Square* (Plate 2a) and *The start of the spending spree* (Plate 3). All three are smaller in size than the final versions and shed light on Hockney's working methods as he transforms his ideas into more simplified yet bolder compositions.[52]

The decline begins in *The drinking scene* (Plate 4) (illustration 14). This time, because of Hockney's sexual preference, the artist has chosen a gay bar and recalls some of his own experiences when first travelling to the United States. Hockney depicts a male couple embracing at the bar, while another couple

[51] Marco Livingstone, 'Three Hockney prints rediscovered', *Print Quarterly*, volume XXIII, part 4, December 2008, p. 417.
[52] Marco Livingstone, 'Three Hockney prints rediscovered', *Print Quarterly*, volume XXIII, part 4, December 2008, pp. 417-420, figures 220 – 222, courtesy of The Fine Art Society; sheet size is 15.0 x 19.9 cm ; 15.0 x 19.7 cm; 15.0 x 19.9 cm respectively.

venture forward to the viewer and the picture plane, shown as heads in the foreground and creating the effect that they are leaving the premises. As in Hogarth's narrative, the rake is then forced to try and save his situation by acquiring a rich spouse and is seen *Marrying an old maid* (Plate 4a) (illustration 15). The obvious unsuitability of the nuptials is made clear with the weedy Hockney figure, dressed in a T-shirt and jeans and sporting sunglasses, escorting a fierce figure with startling torpedo breasts drawn in the Egyptian manner. This image has an equivalence with the painting referred to earlier, *The first marriage* (*Marriage of style I*) of 1962, and also appears in the etching *The Marriage* of the same year, printed by Birgit Skiold.[53]

By way of an interlude in the series – and outside the parameters of the eighteenth-century original story – the excitement of American politics with the primary elections taking place has obviously captured Hockney's imagination. This subject has more to do with the artist's new experiences in a foreign country rather than a reference to the Hogarth narrative. In *The election campaign* (*with dark messages*) (Plate 5), a politician stands on a podium speaking hot air and empty words in a large bubble, while silhouetted members of the crowd look on without inspiration or enthusiasm, in what appears to be a sullen or rather dejected manner, indicated by their downcast looks and hunched shoulders.

Hockney then returns to Hogarth's story and in the next plate we see our rake in serious decline as he appears in *Viewing a prison scene* (Plate 5a). Hockney, however, does not find himself in prison as a debtor; rather he views the scene in a film, yet this is a stark omen for the young foolish rake and foretells of bad things to come. Like Tom Rakewell, young Hockney loses his money in *The wallet begins to empty* (Plate 6a) where both the curator and gospel singer send Hockney packing because of his spendthrift ways. He descends a staircase under a cloud on his way downward to inevitable rack and ruin.

In between this sequence is an American scene, *Death in Harlem* (Plate 6), derived from a work by a photographer in Harlem. Hockney was open to all kinds of inspiration for his subject matter and the photograph which inspired the

---

[53] National Gallery of Australia, accession number 76.83. The etching was published in 1962 by Petersburg Press in an edition of 75.

artist appears in Cecil Beaton's *New York*.[54] Beaton wrote of the Harlem photographer that: 'he is called upon to capture the tragedy as well as the happiness in life, turning his camera on death or marriage met with the same detachment'.[55] Hockney has taken the image of apotheosis signalled by the corpse and the angel and, with a flower instead of the inscription which tells of 'mysterious realms', adds to this composition his own self-portrait; a detached head of a passer-by.

During this process, with the artist making a number of variant proofs and progressive proofs and in order to complete the series, Hockney felt the need to return to the United States to develop his ideas further, making two more plates at the Pratt Graphics Center – *Disintegration* (Plate 7) and *Cast aside* (Plate 7a). *Disintegration* tells of the rake's self-destruction from excessive alcohol. He falls apart physically with his head wrested from his shoulders, his nose wrested from head. The tantalising billboard encouraging people to imbibe has taken its toll. He is no longer the excitable blonde with high aspirations and great hopes who first began his great journey. The tiny rake now falls headlong into the open jaws of a fiend, about to be swallowed into the belly of an elaborately tattooed monster.

In *Meeting the people* Hockney's character is fast descending into hell (illustration 16). The ideas of both depth and speed posed pictorial problems for the artist to solve. The lines of the stairs indicate the depth to which the rake has plummeted; the line signifying the flow of displaced air indicates the swiftness with which he travelled. At the very bottom of the stairs is a faceless moronic figure virtually devoid of any human qualities or expressions; even he fails to acknowledge the appearance of this pathetic newcomer to Bedlam. The two solitary figures stand alone, each surrounded by dark ominous clouds suggesting the hellish future the young rake will face.

The final scene in *A rake's progress* shows the young man in *Bedlam* (Plate 8a). Instead of the cacophony associated with the mental asylum found in the Hogarthian version, Hockney's rake finds himself with rows of identical automatons listening on transistor radios to the local radio station. These are

---

[54] 'Death in Harlem' in Cecil Beaton, *Cecil Beaton's New York,* Philadelphia & New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1938, p. [178]
[55] Cecil Beaton, *Cecil Beaton's New York*, Philadelphia & New York: J.B. *Lippincott* Company, 1938, p. 179

the same kind of expressionless creatures that he first met on his way to hell in *Meeting other people.* Continuing the autobiographical element of the series, the artist drew from his own experience when he first visited New York. He had been thoroughly shocked by the number of apparently deaf youths on the street: 'When I first saw them I thought they [the transistor radios] were hearing aids and was horrified by the deafness among young people'.[56] Hockney's idea of hell is now a line of robotic figures that are all plugged into transistor radios, swinging with WABC.

All in all the narrative of the rake and his experiences in the United States reveal Hockney to be a young artist of immense sensitivity and wit, with growing skills in drawing on a copperplate. The character of the etchings he had produced was less overly worked and less aesthetically complex than the early etchings; as if now he was more confident of his ability as an artist and of his technical skills in making prints (illustration 17). After a second visit to New York, and back in London, Hockney was introduced to Paul Cornwall-Jones, who offered to publish the series with the Editions Alecto print publishing house. In 1960 Cornwall-Jones, who had been a student of architecture at Cambridge University, abandoned his studies to establish Editions Alecto, along with fellow student Michael Deakin. The plan was to publish prints by emerging artists. Editions Alecto moved to London two years later keen to be involved in the lively contemporary arts scene that was developing there and expanded to include art critic Mark Glazebrook and Joe Studhomme, who changed careers from working in the City. The art historian David Alan Mellor commented on the importance of this initially small publishing house:

> They moved – like the band of early 1960s satirists – from Cambridge to a London whose culture they would help modify. There was something epic and something shared with other young cultural producers in this shift towards a modernised metropolitan scenography.
>
> [I]n company with the genius of Brian Epstein, Editions Alecto broke into the American market. As well, this dynamic had a reciprocal aspect: the company's successful inveigling of American artists to come to work in London at a time of the unparalleled prestige of London's Pop culture, exemplified by *Time* magazine's 'Swinging London' issue... Brute economics as well as London's emergence as a renowned centre of cultural production dictated the situation: for American artists and dealers, just like the film-makers of the United States, 'we were cheap' –

---

[56] David Hockney quoted by Robert Wraight in *Tattler*, 18 December 1963, n.p.

as the doyen of English printmakers, Gordon House, has recently said. And although Editions Alecto was wedded to an exceptional 'idea of quality', by the direction of Paul Cornwall-Jones and the skills of Chris Prater, it was vulnerable, like all other commercial ventures, to recessional pressures.[57]

Cornwall-Jones considered Hockney's *A rake's progress* to be an ideal publishing venture for Editions Alecto and Hockney was paid the princely sum of five thousand pounds. Once the final plates were selected, they were editioned by a conventional printer, C.H. Welch, who worked on the series for several months but who declined Hockney's generous offer of a set, as the printer had no sympathy for Hockney's series and its gay subject matter. Four years after the publication of the print series *A rake's progress*, the images were reproduced for an illustrated book version in 1967 and were printed by the RCA's Lion and Unicorn Press in a deluxe edition of 200.

By 1963 *A rake's progress* was completed and perfect for the publisher's aspirations. The series was at once witty, innovative in its subject and technically experimental, and it further established Hockney as an important emerging artist. It also funded Hockney's desire to return to America – a country he felt drawn to. During this time British art was transformed with the evolution of modern figurative and abstract styles, which were not necessarily mutually exclusive, and a notion of a School of London, whose emergence was compared by some to the Schools of Paris dominating the pre-war period and the advent of the New York School.

Hockney's travels to the United States in the 1960s provided the young artist with a sense of freedom: freedom to experiment and to explore and freedom to ignore conventions. While in the States, Hockney was to experience first hand the major post-war changes there in printmaking and the growth of a system of key print workshops. These were established to pursue a new age of innovative print publishing. Hockney's contribution and experience in printmaking at Ken Tyler's workshops were major factors in his own artistic development. The artist's obsession with California became evident in his art. It had as much to do with Hockney's own invention, as it was based on a reality. The period from the mid 1960s and over the following decade witnessed Hockney's growing

---

[57] Foreword by David Alan Mellor in Tess Sidey, *Editions Alecto: original graphics, multiple originals 1960-1981*, Aldershot, Hampshire: Lund Humphries, 2003, pp. 9-10.

admiration of Picasso, leading him to follow the ghost of Picasso by retracing the Spanish artist's steps and adopting his printing techniques.

Chapter 4: Hockney in America and the development of the modern print workshop

It was during the period from the mid 1960s to the mid 1970s that Hockney emerged as a gifted and more complex artist. The focus on figurative art, his absorption of earlier artists' styles and his adoption of imagery from sources which ranged from old masters to muscle magazines, stood him apart from mainstream Modernism, something he increasingly railed against. His unconventional subject matter drawn from disparate styles and from hybrid sources and influences sets him apart from many of the young artists associated with the Pop Art movement of the late 1950s and early 1960s. His experimentation and varied and sometimes obscure sources were in contrast to other Pop artists. This is particularly evident in his printmaking where Hockney conjures a pictorial fantasy land, wherever his subject leads him, be it in Los Angeles, Alexandria or the Rhine, and where his imagination takes over from the reality of personal experience.

In December 1963, Hockney set off once more to America, with the intention of spending a whole year there. Arriving in New York, he met the American artist Andy Warhol, and, more significantly in terms of Hockney's personal and artistic career, Henry Geldzahler. Geldzahler was a graduate of Yale University studies in 1957 and had begun doctoral studies in art history at Harvard. He became the first Curator of Twentieth Century Art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York in 1960. His role in this position, as an intelligent observer and critic, was pivotal in acknowledging as well as understanding new developments in contemporary American art. This culminated in Geldzahler's insightful and ground-breaking exhibition *New York painting and sculpture 1940-1970* at the Metropolitan Museum in 1969.

This exhibition led one critic to comment that it would make Geldzahler, 'the most powerful and controversial art curator alive'.[58] Slightly older than Hockney, Geldzahler was a dominating figure. He was described in an obituary following his untimely death in 1994 as follows:

---

[58] Barbara Goldsmith, 'How Henry made 43 artists immortal', *New York*, volume 2, number 41, 13 October 1969, in dlhttp://www.nytimes.com/1994/08/17/obituaries/henry-geldzahler-59-critic-public-official-contemporary-art-s-champion-dead.html?pagewanted=print&src=pm, viewed 26 September 2011.

Mr Geldzahler could be both charming and undiplomatic, often at the same time. He was fiercely sure of himself, and was as blunt in his dismissal of work he did not like as he was in his approval of art that pleased him. He seemed free of the anguish that possessed so many critics, and rarely took a middle ground: art either met his standards, in which case it received his effusive praise, or it did not.[59]

Hockney was to become a close friend of the slightly older Geldzahler, who in turn was to become a guiding and influential mentor in the artist's life from this time onwards. Some trustees of the Metropolitan Museum had viewed Geldzahler's love of contemporary art and his associations with many of its practitioners with concern. However, his appointment in 1966 as the Commissioner for the United States for the Venice Biennale brought him considerable prestige. Over the years and until he died, Geldzahler became someone with whom Hockney could discuss art on a constant basis and someone who advised Hockney about his art, acting on occasions as a sounding board with considerable clout for the artist. This had led to the criticism that Geldzahler had become overly influential in Hockney's decision making.[60] Hockney admired the curator's eye, a special eye, and the curator's intelligence and forward thinking.

Hockney stayed three weeks in New York and took the opportunity to make prints at the Pratt Institute there, creating *Jungle boy* and *Edward Lear* [*The acrobat*], both 1964. He used the techniques explored in London at the RCA, those of etching and aquatint, while still working with quite complicated designs. In *Jungle boy* we see a hairy nude male figure in profile with a snake (inscribed SNAKE) standing before an exotic palm. As well as a spoof about images of muscle men found in pulp journals, this was a humorous portrayal of his friend Mark Berger (who had returned to live in America after his student days at the RCA), who was noted for his hirsuteness and for keeping a pet snake. The etching of Edward Lear is a homage to that great Victorian and writer of 'Bosh', delighting many an English child with his nonsense. For this work, Hockney adopted the motif of a drawn curtain revealing the scene behind. It was a favourite device of Hockney's and appeared in several of his paintings, notably the full-standing portrait of John Kasmin, *A play within a play*, with Kasmin's

[59] Paul Goldberger, 'Henry Geldzahler, 59, critic, public official and contemporary art's champion, is dead', *New York Times*, 17 August 1994, in dlhttp://www.nytimes.com/1994/08/17/obituaries/henry-geldzahler-59-critic-public-official-contemporary-art-s-champion-dead.html? pagewanted=print&src=pm, viewed 26 September 2012.
[60] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 23 May 2002.

nose up against a window pane – physically included with a sheet of plexiglass – as well as *Closing scene* and *Two friends and two curtains*, all of 1963.[61] It is the pictorial device of the curtain with a standing portrait of John Kasmin, again with his nose up against what is now an invisible pane of glass, which is found in the lithograph of 1964. All works reveal the enormous range and constant variation of subject matter Hockney was able to employ as he explored his ideas about composition. There was now an attempt to work in a sequential series devoted to a particular subject, such as he had created in *The rake's progress* earlier and which he was to create at a later time inspired by the poet Constantine Cavafy or for the fables of the Brothers Grimm.

Hockney's only excursion in screenprinting as the sole technique began with his contribution for *The Institute of Contemporary Arts Portfolio* published in 1964 and printed by Chris Prater at London's Kelpra Studio. Prater had set up a screenprinting business in 1957, working on his kitchen table at home. He later moved to commercial premises at 31 Healey Street in London NW1, producing good-quality screenprinted posters, ephemera and advertising material for companies such as the large food chain Sainsbury's. Prater's undoubted talent in screenprinting saw him move into the realm of artists' prints. This began when the artist Gordon House approached the printer in 1960 to screenprint posters for the Arts Council.[62] The care and time required to produce artists' prints meant that Prater was never able to make Kelpra Studio a profitable business. Prater's commercial premises, however, became a popular venue for many of the younger generation of artists. Eduardo Paolozzi and Richard Hamilton, for instance, began making prints at Kelpra in 1962, both artists involved with the Independent Group, which as discussed earlier was a youthful and rebellious offshoot of the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London.

In an effort to raise funds for the ICA in the early 1960s, the Director, Dorothy Morland, had approached Hamilton for ideas. Hamilton suggested that the ICA should produce a portfolio of screenprints at Kelpra Studio. The proposal was innovative and financially without great risk, and was of mutual benefit to the students and to the ICA. The institute in turn, according to Hamilton, was 'a

---

[61] *A play within a play* 1963, oil on canvas and plexiglass, Collection Mr and Mrs Paul Cornwall Jones; *Closing scene* 1963, oil on canvas, Private collection; *Two friends and two curtains* 1963, oil on canvas, Collection Pierre Janiet.
[62] Conversation between Gordon House and Jane Kinsman, October 1991, quoted in Jane Kinsman, the *Prints of R. B. Kitaj*, p. 14, note 3.

good platform for sales'.[63] Hamilton nominated Prater as the printer because of the renowned quality of Prater's printing. He considered that the project:

> Would provide an opportunity for many artists to make contact with Chris and possibly develop a continuing relationship. It would help Chris to emerge from his profession as a printer of high quality posters and move into the craft of art printmaker.[64]

Hockney was on the list of artists selected by Hamilton (with a few further additions from Morland) to represent a group of young and upcoming artists active in the London art scene. The final selection of contributors as listed on the *ICA Screen-print Project* blurb as issued by the Institute of Contemporary Art in 1964 were the following artists: Gillian Ayres, Peter Blake, Derek Boshier, Patrick Caulfield, Bernard Cohen, Harold Cohen, Robyn Denny, Richard Hamilton, Adrian Heath, David Hockney, Howard Hodgkin, Gordon House, Patrick Hughes, Gwyther Irwin, Allen Jones, Ron Kitaj, Henry Mundy, Eduardo Paolozzi, Victor Pasmore, Peter Phillips, Bridget Riley, Richard Smith, Joe Tilson and William Turnbull.[65] With the exception of Paolozzi, the other artists including Hockney had no experience in screenprinting. It was based on Hamilton and Moreland's ideas about who were the most talented emerging artists in the British art scene. It was not until the mid 1960s that screenprinting was considered in art schools or in the wider art community to be anything other than a commercial printing technique for advertising. Until then, this method had been confined to the applied departments such as graphics or fabric printing, which was where Paolozzi had been introduced to the process.

While it is one of the more recent methods of printmaking, screenprinting is based on the age-old principle of stencilling. Using a rubber blade known as a squeegee, ink is pushed through a mesh stretched on a frame. In this way coloured inks can be deposited on a support, usually paper or canvas, where the mesh has not been blocked out either by a paper stencil, liquid block-out or a film of gelatine, which has been photographically exposed and hardened. For the IG screenprint series Hockney recycled a photograph from *Physique Pictorial* of a youthful, naked and smiling 'Fred Wiggins' showering in the tiled shower cubicle of the AMG (Athletic Models Guild), a favourite prop for Bob

---

[63] Richard Hamilton in correspondence with Jane Kinsman in a letter, 14 August 1991.
[64] Richard Hamilton in correspondence with Jane Kinsman in a letter, 14 August 1991.
[65] The details of the contribution of each artist can be found in Pat Gilmour, *Kelpra Studio: the Rose and Chris Prater Gift: Artists' Prints 1961-1980*, London: Tate Gallery, 1980, pp. 68-69.

Mizer's photography. The image appeared in *Cleanliness is next to Godliness* of 1964, which Hockney made at Kelpra Studios in London (illustration 18).[66] He also made a variant, with multiple images of showering youth in the manner of Andy Warhol.[67] Compared to intaglio or planographic techniques, stencilling, in this case screenprinting, was not conducive to Hockney's *modus operandi*. Drawing for him was pre-eminent. The motif of the shower and the shower curtain was a pictorial favourite of Hockney's at this time suggestive to the artist of the American experience, something modern and something glamorous, an element of luxury, of modern life, as well as possessing a sexual element. The idea of a separate shower or even a shower at all was not widespread in domestic housing in the United Kingdom of the 1960s and the subject suggested indulgence. The motif of the shower also appeared in Hockney's painting of this time, drawn from images found in the *Physique Pictorial* magazine either directly or indirectly, such as *Boy about to take a shower* of 1964 and *California*, 1965; these likewise celebrate the American experience.[68] Later Hockney was to install a luxurious shower in his London premises at Powis Terrace, which captured all the extravagance of the Californian lifestyle and which was featured in the film, *A bigger splash,* the strange semi-fictional documentary made over the years 1970-1973.[69]

The technique of screenprinting never really suited Hockney's great love of drawing. Considering the various printing techniques that were available to him, this was the least suitable method of printmaking he might adopt:

> How you do it, which always interests me. I mean I'm an artist who likes to draw, I like drawings, I like looking at drawings, there are people now, I mean there are a great number of artists now who probably never make drawings, as there is no need for them to make drawings. But it is my method of working ... I think on the whole prints, the print really, and lithograph to me, what's interesting about it is that is it a drawing medium ... in some form or other. And etching is even more of a drawing medium; etching is difficult to work etchings without drawing. [This] is probably why etchings are even done by less people, because there is

[66] *The Institute of Contemporary Arts Portfolio*, number 10, Tate, London, Pr (ICP) 1975 DP,4334.
[67] Auctioned 17 February 2012, Christie's, South Kensington, lot 33; 57.0 x 90.0 cm.
[68] Paul Melia, 'Showers, pools and power', in *David Hockney*, edited by Paul Melia, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995, pp. 49-67 for a discussion on this subject.
[69] *A bigger splash*, 1974, directed by Jack Hazan, featuring David Hockney, Celia Birtwell and Peter Schlesinger as themselves.

[*sic*] not many people interested in drawing anymore. So if you can't really draw much you would never do etchings.[70]

Drawing was central to Hockney's art practice and it was for this reason that Picasso and Matisse were such great artists. It was Hockney's theory that, 'It's possible to teach anybody to draw as good as, do you know an English artist who … still is very well thought of as a draftsman, Augustus John. I think it's possible to teach anybody to draw as good as that.' This contrasted with Hockney's view of the artists whom he greatly admired, such as Picasso or Matisse: 'I'm not saying you can teach anybody to draw like Picasso or Matisse or somebody like that,' he continued:

> [Augustus John's work is] quite a good academic level, as an academic draftsman he was quite good, he's not as good as Picasso … Mind you the virtue in it I don't know I mean how important is it? Is it necessary? But the thing is I suppose to draw you have to have a training of some kind.[71]

The facility to draw with great skill also enabled Picasso and Matisse, not to mention Hockney, to embrace printmaking and produce a rich oeuvre of prints, particularly in the case of all three artists in the field of etching and lithography. Each was a gifted draughtsman, which could not be said of another gifted artist, Jackson Pollock, who in turn, never seriously embraced the idea of making original prints. Unlike other Abstract Expressionist artists, such as Robert Motherwell or Helen Frankenthaler, Pollock was not drawn to the idea of printmaking and the attempts he made in this field were unremarkable, as is evident in the posthumous edition of a suite of six intaglio prints he made in about 1944 and which were printed in 1967 by Emiliano Sorini.[72]

During his 1964 trip to the United States, Hockney did not stay long in New York. Arguably that would have been a better career choice for establishing himself as an artist, although his particular emerging style would have been at odds with the current vogue for Abstraction in some avant-garde circles there, and the later movements which followed: Color Field, Minimalism and Conceptualism. Instead Hockney set his sights on California and in particular Los Angeles, where he settled in 1964. The sheer physicality of the city was

[70] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN449_IRN134680+CAN449_IRN134681.
[71] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN449_IRN134680+CAN449_IRN134681.
[72] National Gallery of Australia, accession number 84.1176.1-6.

inviting and was to become an important source of inspiration for his art. The new location became a major factor in how he was to develop as an artist for physical, sexual and social reasons. Occasionally a place is mediated by an artist's vision, both J. M. W. Turner and James McNeill Whistler for Venice, for example. For Los Angeles, it was Hockney. When asked almost a decade later in 1973 whether California was the inspiration for much of his art, Hockney responded:

> I suppose so. I mean the thing is in California you see, its one of the few places I've been and worked at where I actually, I take it as a subject. London I never paint. I don't really paint pictures of London, California I found visually very inspiring. So I made pictures of it. I think London the kind of pictures I've made that is of London, or life in London are interiors because I've done pictures of friends and so I've painted the rooms, never been an outdoor scene. [I] never painted a picture of a building or a street.[73]

Hockney's vision of California and the dominant place it had in much of his art was a subject he was often asked about and often contemplated: 'It sometimes takes a foreigner to come and see a place and paint it. I remember someone saying they had never really noticed the palm trees here until I painted them.'[74] On first arrival he found the location immensely agreeable. The sun, swimming pools and the burgeoning and increasingly open gay culture of California proved attractive. So did the lack of a British class system; a characteristic of British life which still irked the young man, whose background was of modest means in Yorkshire.

Hockney's graphic oeuvre from the 1960s is replete with memorable imagery of this location – the cityscapes, notable figures, friends, the brightness of the light, and the physical nature of the place. Recalling the attraction of the city, Hockney later remarked that it was the sun which, 'drew me to Los Angeles, because it is nice and warm and it is always sunny, which means it is always sexy, which means light, full of colour. And I just had a hunch it was a place I'd

---

[73] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN449_IRN134680+CAN449_IRN134681.
[74] David Hockney quoted in Nigel Farndale, 'The talented Mr Hockney' in www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/33606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html 15 November 2001, viewed 20 November 2009.

like. I just went there; I didn't know a soul there. I thought it was three times better than I imagined when I got there.'[75]

This was in contrast to the cold and rainy Yorkshire days of Hockney's youth, and even then the sun was inviting. At this time in Bradford he would watch Laurel and Hardy movies in black and white and noticed that in these films, 'Even although Stanley was wearing a rather large overcoat, there were strong cast shadows in the streets, which meant the sun was shinning quite a lot'. On learning that they were made in Los Angeles, he said, 'I realised that's Los Angeles and you saw the suburbs ... I felt attracted to it.'[76] The great sense of space was another factor which drew him to Los Angeles. Some thirty years later when revisiting why he was so attracted to California, Hockney was convinced that another element was also at play, although he was not initially aware of its pull: 'I was attracted to California for another reason, though, one which I didn't realise at the time and that was the sense of space. I'm claustrophobic, you see.'[77] The obsession with how to depict space was later to become a primary focus in the art of David Hockney. His landscapes from the 1990s to the present are testament to this.

It has been observed that if Hockney had belonged to an earlier generation of homosexual men he might have sought the Mediterranean option to avoid the strictures of a sexually repressed English society, perhaps choosing Capri over Los Angeles.[78] Hockney was drawn to Southern California and Los Angeles in particular because of its growing gay scene. More generally, the comparison between the English and American gay scenes was made by the English art historian John Richardson, who wrote irreverently about the contrast across the Atlantic in the late 1950s:

> After the [New York] uptown festivities were over, I would race back home and change from a black tie into a T-shirt and go out on the town. A wild, new permissive spirit was already in the air, and I proceeded to explore all facets of it. Patrick O'Higgins took me to spectacular drag

[75] David Hockney interviewed by Melvyn Bragg in *David Hockney at the Tate*, edited and presented by Melvyn Bragg, London: A London Weekend Television 'South Bank Show/RM Arts Co-Production, 1988.
[76] David Hockney interviewed by Melvyn Bragg in *Hockney at the Tate*, edited and presented by Melvyn Bragg, London: A London Weekend Television 'South Bank Show/RM Arts Co-Production, 1988.
[77] David Hockney quoted in Nigel Farndale, 'The talented Mr Hockney' in www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/33606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html 15 November 2001, viewed 20 November 2009.
[78] Paul Melia, *David Hockney*, edited by Paul Melia, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995 p. 52.

balls in Harlem, where I was amazed at the elaborateness of the boys' beaded gowns. Truman Capote – an old friend of Douglas's [Cooper] took me to a lesbian bikers' hangout, which we had to leave in a hurry: Truman said he was frightened of getting raped. And a gifted albeit unsuccessful painter friend of mine, Onni Saari, introduced me to some amazing downtown bars – a great improvement on London's gay clubs, where an old thing at a white piano would play versions of Cole Porter – "You stepped out of a drain" – and a lot of shy young men in three-piece suits waving cigarette holders would eye each other, nervously bridle, or pout.[79]

One particular drawcard of Los Angeles for Hockney was that the homoerotic photographic magazine, *Physique Pictorial*, was produced there. Photographer Bob Mizer had established the Athletic Models Guild (AMG) in 1945, photographing male models whom he found at gyms and at Venice Beach; some were acting hopefuls who had gravitated to Los Angeles in the hope of establishing a movie career in Hollywood, some were young men from the services, some were sports-interested locals, some were lured there by the promise of homosexual activity. It was in complete contrast to the English gay scene, which for the time still remained stultifying, secretive and guilt ridden.

Later, in 1951, Mizer established *Physical Pictorial* to supply the growing demand for his pictures of muscular young men – which was one important source for Hockney's art. The magazine developed a series of gay characterisations. It presented photographs of the male figure in ways that might appeal to a male, chiefly to the homosexual eye, and according to the research of Tracy D. Morgan there were about twenty magazines like *Physique Pictorial* catering to a readership of about 60,000 to 70,000 people from the mid 1950s.[80] The magazine's emerging 'house style' showed models as various masculine 'types', such as Grecian wrestlers, Roman gladiators, young artisans, wandering sailors, cowboys, prison inmates and house-proud domestics. Hockney paid a visit to the AMG in downtown Los Angeles and delighted in the experience, 'I went to visit the place where *Physique Pictorial* was published in a very seedy area of Los Angeles. It's run by a wonderful complete madman and he has this tacky swimming pool surrounded by Hollywood Greek plaster

[79] John Richardson, *The sorcerer's apprentice: Picasso Provence, and Douglas Cooper*, New York: Alfred A. Kupf, 200, p. 260. Richardson had left England on the liner the Queen Elizabeth ten days before Christmas in 1958. Of Finnish descent, Saari was born in America in 1920.
[80] Tracy D. Morgan 'Pages of whiteness, physique magazines and the emergence of public gay culture', *Queer studies: a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender anthology,* edited by Brett Beemyn and Mickey Eliason, New York and London: New York University Press, 1996, p. 286 and note 27.

statues. It was marvellous! To me it had the air of tackiness of things.' Los Angeles also reminded Hockney of the city of Cavafy's poetry and he continued:

> The hot climate is near enough to Alexandria, sensual and this downtown area was sleazy, a bit dusty, very masculine – men always; women are just not part of that kind of life. I love downtown Los Angeles – marvellous gay bars full of mad Mexican queens, all tacky and everything. The Physique Pictorial people get men, boys, when they've just come out of city gaol: Do you want to earn ten dollars? Take your clothes off, jump in the pool, that sort of thing. They're all a bit rough-looking, but the bodies are quite good. The faces are terrible, not pretty boys, really. I must admit I have a weakness for pretty boys; I prefer them to big, butch, scabby ones. I was quite thrilled by the place, and I told the guy. I bought a lot of still photographs from him, which I still have.[81]

Los Angeles was a place where fantasy could become the youthful Hockney's reality. Hockney learnt of the gay beats of Los Angeles, featured in John Rechy's recently published *City of light* of 1963, which he had read in London that year. In the novel, Rechy described downtown Pershing Square. This was a notable gay pick-up scene located in a park surrounded by modern buildings. The narrator recounts the experience of walking: 'About the teeming park for the first time – past the statues of soldiers, one on each corner of the Hill Street side – past an ominous cannon on Olive aimed defiantly at the slick wide-gleaming windowed buildings across the streets: the banks, the travel agencies …'. The park there was: 'locked in a block square sunny asylum among the flowers and the palm trees, fountains gushing gaily, … Male hustlers ("fruithustlers" / "studhustlers": the various names for the masculine young vagrants) like flitting birds move restlessly about the park – fugitive hustlers looking for lonely fruits to score from, anything from the legendary $20-up to a pad a night and breakfast in the morning and whatever you can clinch or clip …'[82] On his arrival in Los Angeles, Hockney immediately set off by bicycle to the Square only to find that the distance was enormous and it was night when he finally arrived there and by then disappointingly empty. He painted the location shortly afterwards – a cityscape, which had the appearance of a romantic wasteland, devoid of any humanity and empty but for its shiny buildings and beguiling palm trees. This image was to reappear in the lithography Hockney made during his visit to the Tamarind workshop.

---

[81] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, pp. 98-99.
[82] John Rechy, *City of light*, New York: Grove Press, 1963, reprinted 1984, pp. 91-92.

The use of lithography had experienced a chequered history in the annals of art in the United States. In 1896 the editor of *Art Amateur*, Montague Marks, had attempted to revive lithography as a fine art in America by establishing a Society of Painter–Lithographers, but without success.[83] In the twentieth century a lack of widespread interest and union hostility meant only a few individuals such as Bolton Brown and George C. Miller were active in lithography as talented and capable artist-lithographers. As late as 1947 the Society of American Graphic artists had finally agreed to have lithographs on display in their exhibitions. This was in distinct contrast to the history of lithography in Britain, France and Germany, where artists periodically embraced the technique, albeit at the same time having subjected it to periods of great neglect. In post-war America lithography continued to flounder because printers would not embrace it and major artists were not attracted to working in the field, especially many of those associated with Abstract Expressionism and notably Pollock.[84] However there was a renewed interest in reviving this printing technique from several quarters, which changed matters in the post-war era.

During the period of the mid 1960s, Hockney was to embrace a new personal lifestyle, as well as a new artistic style including new developments in printmaking, especially in lithography. His arrival in the United States coincided with the revival of lithography and the developing skills of the printer and later publisher Kenneth E. Tyler, who was keen to establish his own print workshop. In post-war America, this planographic printing technique had floundered as an art form because printers had not engaged with social change where the artist and the printer need to work collaboratively. Moreover, lithography was not a technique that attracted artists of quality, as there was little engagement with the process and it appeared primarily to be a reproductive method of printing. It became clear to those who recognised the value of lithography as an art form that whatever skills remained at this time, these had to be nurtured and the technical know-how preserved and passed on. Artists were enticed back to working with lithography, to again consider it as an art form.

Hockney's own progress as an artist and he was to later participate fully in this evolution.

[83] Frank Weitenkampf, *American graphic art*, New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1912, p. 199. Marks had proposed this in *Art Amateur*, 1896 p. 105.
[84] Clinton Adams, *American lithographers 1900-1960: the artists and their printers*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1983, especially chapter 5.

In 1960 the artist June Wayne and printer Clinton Adams co-founded the Tamarind Lithography workshop in Los Angeles with a Ford Foundation Grant. The intention was to revive lithography as an art form. At the suggestion of the Director of the Ford Foundation's Humanities and Arts Program, W. McNeil Lowry, Wayne had applied for a funding grant to revitalise printmaking in post-war America. To June Wayne's astonishment, the Ford Foundation agreed to her proposal, and funding was provided to establish the Tamarind Lithography Workshop in Los Angeles in 1960, co-founded with Clinton Adams. For Wayne the art of lithography was in a particularly parlous state; she considered it as an endangered species:

> In my mind, lithography has been linked to the great white whooping crane, which like lithography, was on the verge of extinction when the Tamarind workshop came into being. In all the world there were only thirty-six whooping cranes left; and in the United States there were no master printers able to work with the creative spectrum of our artists.
>
> The artist/lithographers, like the cranes, needed a protected environment and a concerned public so that, once rescued from extinction, they could make a go of it on their own. If lithography could be revived, all the print media would benefit – as indeed they did. And the Tamarind 'preserve' could become a model for other art forms – as indeed it has.[85]

Later the Tamarind workshop moved to Albuquerque, New Mexico, in 1970. This institution was an essential instrument in the American print revival at this time and many talented artists and printers honed their skills at Tamarind. It was a place where quality and technical skill took pride of place; the workshop's educational role was also a prime focus. Expertise in lithography came to be widely disseminated with many Tamarind-trained lithographers working in the field in the history of printmaking later in the twentieth century.

Another key figure in the development of American post-war printmaking was Russian-born Tatyana Grosman, who established the workshop Universal Limited Art Editions (ULAE) in West Islip on Long Island, South Counties, New York, in **1957.** After fleeing the drama of the Russian revolution, Tatyana Auguschewitsch and her family reached Japan. Later, with the married surname of Grosman, she found the country 'very calm and beautiful, and I think I

---

[85] *June Wayne: A retrospective*, edited by Lucinda E. Gedeon, New York: Neuberger Museum of Art, Purchase College, State University of New York, 1997, p. 42, quoted in Jane Kinsman, *The art of collaboration: the big Americans*, Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 2002, p. 2.

learned a certain kind of meditation'. [86] It was this atmosphere that Grosman strove for in her own workshop, ULAE, which was formally established as a company in 1956. In the following year Grosman approached Bill Lieberman at the Museum of Modern Art, with some reproductive prints. Lieberman's response was to comment, 'I can think of no great work of art that was not described for itself, but designed to have a reproduction made of it'.[87] Recognising the truth of the curator's comments Grosman entered into the making of original prints, particularly in the form of illustrated books in the initial period of the workshop.

It was Grosman's goal to develop a studio for fine art lithography (later an etching studio was added), and she was particularly interested in the *livre d'artiste*. These artists' books had their origins in nineteenth-century France, with artists not simply illustrating a text, but contributing inspired imagery that was the creative equal of the text. One of the formative examples was the deluxe edition of Edgar Allan Poe's *Le corbeau: Sous la lampe,* which was published in Paris by Richard Lesclide in 1875.[88] In this publication Edouard Manet's dark compositions were combined with the powerful imagery of the verse. The Paris art dealer and publisher Ambroise Vollard furthered this idea at the beginning of the twentieth century, producing luxury books of great beauty. From 1900 Vollard became obsessed with publishing *livres d'artistes* with varying degrees of success. His interest was first and foremost with the artist and his knowledge of literature a limited one, as witnessed by his selection of Paul Verlaine's poetry for publication. After failing to entice Lucien Pissarro to illustrate *Parrallèment*, Vollard was successful with Pierre Bonnard, who created a series of exquisite images for the publication. Vollard and a number of other publishers, including Daniel-Henri Kahnweiler, oversaw the production of limited editions of exquisite original prints on beautiful papers, where image and text were treated as harmonious components of carefully laid out pages.[89]

[86] Tatyana Grosman, quoted in Amei Wallach, 'Tatyana Grosman: A memoir' in Esther Sparks, *Universal Limited Art Editions: a history and catalogue: the first twenty-five years*, Chicago and New York, The Art Institute of Chicago and Harry N Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1989, p. 11.
[87] Esther Sparks, 'Lieberman Interview, 1985', quoted in Esther Sparks, 'A history of Universal Limited Art Editions', in Esther Sparks, *Universal Limited Art Editions: a history and catalogue: the first twenty-five years*, Chicago and New York, The Art Institute of Chicago and Harry N Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1989, p. 18.
[88] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 1972.509.1-6AB.
[89] Una Johnson, *Ambroise Vollard, editeur: prints, books, bronzes*, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1976, pp. 23-27; Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, *My galleries and painters*, translated from the French by Helen

To pursue the idea of the *livre d'artiste,* Tatanya Grosman developed a program of bringing contemporary artists and poets together for a collaborative venture. As Esher Sparks noted in her history of ULAE:

> Although none of the artists had ever worked in tandem with a poet, most of them were aware of the historic precedents of such collaborations and were intrigued by the prospect of experimenting and creating with contemporaries they admired. In the relatively small New York art world of the 1950s, it was possible to know most of the other artists (at least those of one's own stylistic persuasion), to see their shows, to read the books and columns that everyone was talking about. Like the Parisian avant-garde of the 1920s, New York's avant-garde in the 1950s represented a convergence of many kinds of artists: writers, painters, dancers, as well as people in theater and film.[90]

Lieberman had mentioned the name of the artist Larry Rivers to Grosman and had fortuitously met him when both were travelling to Paris by boat on the *Vollendam* in 1950. In another fortuitous event, the poet Frank O'Hara was staying at Rivers' house when the project was first mooted and so he came to collaborate with the artist on *Stones*, Grosman's first *livre d'artiste*. This was a 12 lithographic publication, which unfortunately and expensively, took two years to produce, with artist and poet swapping stones to add their contribution to the other's work.[91]

The concept of collaborative ventures was an approach that Grosman aspired to, and she continued this tradition with her commitment to fine printing, the use of good quality papers, inks and materials. Grosman's persuasive manner and the atmosphere of her workshop encouraged many artists to work at ULAE. For Robert Motherwell it was 'her integrity, tenacity, endless patience, extravagance with time and materials ... as rare as is the ambience of her workshops, where it is simply assumed ... that the world of the spirit exists as concretely as, say, lemon yellow or woman's hair.'[92] ULAE had a delightful air of amateurism about

Weaver, new material translated by Karl Orend; introduction John Russell, Boston: MFA publications, 2003.

[90] Esther Sparks, 'A history of Universal Limited Art Editions', in Esther Sparks, *Universal Limited Art Editions: a history and catalogue: the first twenty-five years*, Chicago and New York, The Art Institute of Chicago and Harry N Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1989, p. 21; for a further account of the ULAE workshop, see Tony Towle, 'A few selected memories of Tanya Grosman and ULAE', in *Proof positive: forty years of contemporary American printmaking at ULAE 1957-1997*, Washington: the Corcoran Gallery of Art, 1997, pp. 13-29.

[91] Esther Sparks, *Universal Limited Art Editions: a history and catalogue: the first twenty-five years*, Chicago and New York, The Art Institute of Chicago and Harry N Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1989, 'Larry Rivers', catalogue numbers 11-24, pp. 471-475.

[92] Stephanie Terenzio editor , *The collected writings of Robert Motherwell*, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 213.

it. It was like 'somebody had found a press and opened a shop in a garage'.[93] Indeed, that was the case. Luck also played a part — the first lithographic stones were discovered in the pathway leading to the Grosman's' modest house adjoining the studio.

A less favourable view of Grosman's involvement in America's print revival came from another artist, Jim Dine, who recalled that although that she was the first publisher he worked with:

> I stopped working with her in 1975. It wasn't for me, finally what she advocated. She put together Johns and Becket, and Rauschenberg and Robbe-Grillet, both of which are extremely artificial collaborations, just famous people working with famous people, so it sells well.[94]

Tatyana Grosman had a fine critical sense and a great awareness of her materials, but not a deep technical understanding of the printing processes, unlike Ken Tyler. When she established ULAE, she felt that the printer should just begin in the morning and whatever was printed that day would be the edition. She believed that each day the circumstances of the printer and the environment in which the printing took place changed, so if an edition continued on another day, it would look different. Making a profitable business was not a priority. In contrast, the Tamarind workshop's approach was more oriented to mass production: different artists arrived every month and the technique of lithography was the dominant concern, over and above the art that was produced.

While marrying big names together for print publications, Grosman was not particularly interested in the notion of collaboration between artist and printer. It was up to the printer to solve problems. That was his/her role. 'The way we work is very simple', she said in an interview for *The New Yorker* in 1976, 'The artist makes his drawing on the stone, the printer makes a proof, and then the artist decides what he likes or doesn't like, and makes changes, and maybe I make some suggestions, and we select the paper, and that's how it is.'[95] She established a small 'family' of artists who were invited to work at West Islip. Belonging to a generation earlier than that of printer and publisher Ken Tyler,

---

[93] Ben Berns in Stephanie Terenzio (editor), *The collected writings of Robert Motherwell*, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 49.
[94] Jim Dine quoted in Susie Hennessy, 'A conversation with Jim Dine', *Art Journal*, volume 39, number 3, Printmaking, the collaborative art, Spring 1980, p. 168.
[95] Calvin Tomkins, 'Profiles: The moods of stone', *The New Yorker*, 1 June 1976, p. 45.

Grosman pursued many of America's Abstract Expressionist artists but with little success. For Grosman, there were exceptions with the Abstract Expressionists, such as Robert Motherwell and Helen Frankenthaler, who both produced important editions at ULAE. Most of their artistic generation, however, were not interested in printmaking and had little or no understanding of the philosophy of the beautiful book.

Ken Tyler was to become another key figure in the revival of printmaking in the United States and a key collaborator with David Hockney in many of his print ventures. As we shall see in this study, much of the history of Hockney as a printmaker is closely intertwined with the history of Tyler, as well as the print revival that took place from the 1960s onwards in America. In 1963 Tyler had taken up a Ford Foundation fellowship to work at Tamarind under the master printer, Irwin Hollander. Tyler's initial forays in printmaking were in lithography, and he was keen to have this technique accepted as an art form. His notions of a working partnership with an artist meant Tyler became an active figure in the next era of Hockney's advance in making prints. Tyler was to become a major collaborator with David Hockney in many of the artist's lithographic ventures in the ensuing decades.

Following his time in the army, Tyler undertook further studies, receiving a Bachelor of Art Education from the Art Institute of Chicago in 1957 and has been an ardent educator ever since. Tyler then studied lithography under Garo Antreasian at the John Herron School of Art, Indiana, graduating with a Master of Art Education. Following his 1963 grant at Tamarind he studied under Marcel Durassier, the French master printer. Durassier was noted for his technical skill and had worked at the French lithography workshop, Mourlot Frères, with some of the great artists of the School of Paris, including Picasso and Juan Miró. Durassier understood the demands of working in lithography, once describing it as a 'stubborn old goat' — Tyler noted that this could also be said of Durassier himself. 'Marcel was a difficult man', Tyler recently recalled, 'but not with me. He gave me his roller the first week at Tamarind and made me his apprentice. [I] learned a great deal from him. Most of all [it was] his rub-up technique for stone lithography, which I have practised with great success over the years.'[96] It was Durassier's belief that, no matter what the imagery, the printer should always

---

[96] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 June 2002.

provide the artist with the very best technical expertise. This attitude had a profound effect on Tyler. It was a philosophy he adopted throughout his career as a printer.

Tyler's approach in collaborating with an artist and his ideas about what a workshop could and should do was not to say no or it was not possible. This was in stark contrast with the approach of Kathan Brown, master printer and proprietor of Crown Point Press workshop in Oakland California. She too was active in the years when printmaking was experiencing an expansive and technically advanced revival, rivalling other forms such as painting or sculpture for primacy amongst artists and propelled further by new ideas of making and marketing prints.

Brown's attitude and philosophy is evident in her personal account of working with Chuck Close. In 1972 when faced with a difficult task such as the Chuck Close publication, Brown needed to be cajoled by publisher Robert Feldman of Parasol Press into making the large-scale mezzotints for the portfolio *The Chuck Close Mezzotint "Keith" 1972*, which included documentation with ten photographic etchings of the work in progress. In a six-page confessional introduction to the print project, Brown tells of her 'ordeal' when undertaking this most ambitious venture. It began when Feldman approached her and asked if she would work on a publication with Close. Initially the idea was that Close would make a large-scale etching: 'I'd need to work large,' the artist said, 'Three by four feet at the minimum.'[97] Brown's response was negative, it couldn't be done and the idea was, in her words, 'Impossible. Besides, who ever heard of an *etching* three by four feet!' Unperturbed Feldman pursued the idea with Brown, calling from New York, 'You know my feeling about these things – you get the right artist and the right printer together and then you give them every possible financial support and leave them alone, right?' Brown replied that it was going to be a costly venture. The problems then grew commensurate with the artist's ideas and sense of adventure. Then there was a change of plan and Brown recalled, 'I had just started to get used to the idea of working with plates

---

[97] This quotation and all subsequent quotations relating to the Keith project are by Kathan Brown, published in the preliminary text of six pages for *The Chuck Close Mezzotint "Keith" 1972 – A documentation with ten photographic etchings of the work in progress*, Oakland California: Crown Point Press. Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 76.81; 76.82.1-21; see also Kathan Brown, *Ink, paper, metal wood; painters and sculptors at Crown Point Press*, San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1996.

36" x 45" when Chuck called again. He said he'd been looking at a lot of prints and he'd decided that mezzotint was the medium that would best suit his images. Mezzotint! Only a few people have done them in the past hundred years, and even a hundred years ago when they were popular their size range was about 9" x 12".'

Close's style with his interest in minute detail was well suited to the mezzotint. This was an intaglio technique, which enabled a great tonal variety to be achieved by applying a rocker to the plate, and the surface serrated by many multiple dots. This printing method was a negative process, where the more copper you removed from the plate by applying a rocker, the whiter the print would become. However, to try making a mezzotint on a large scale was both technically demanding and difficult. Publisher Feldman's attitude to this new idea of working in mezzotint was one of *laissez faire*, 'That's up to Chuck. If he thinks he can do one he can probably do one,' Brown remembered. Her own response was one more of anguish and despair, noting that mezzotints, 'wear out very fast because the whole thing depends on a delicate burr. It will take him a long time and you'll be able to get only a very small edition.' Brown's anxieties grew and were further explained in her introduction. Despite misgivings all parties agreed that the project could go ahead and the artist and the printers at Crown Point Press went to work. With the pulling of the first plate, Brown recalled: '[it] turned out solid white, with a few black wiggles on it. I remember at the end of the project Chuck pulling that forlorn little print from under a foot high stack of proofs and saying, "This is a very important print. This is where we started." But at the time we made it, it was discouraging, the first of many discouragements.'

Chuck Close, Brown and three assistants lurched from one problem to another. The artist's working methods also needed to be taken into account according to Brown, for Close 'didn't like preparatory drawings – they somehow for him sapped the excitement and spontaneity of the real thing. It was time to try the big one, ready or not.' There was mass confusion and the workshop looked like a scene from the "The Marx Brothers coat a plate", one observer of the workshop quipped. The first printing result was in Brown's words, 'Big plate failure number one'. This was followed by 'Big plate failure number two'. She continued 'On my way home I thought, "This is the absolute low point. There's

no place to go up but up. Things couldn't get any lower than this". But they did'. In order to keep the artist's spirits up Brown and an assistant Gwen Guegell worked through much of the night and early morning preparing and etching the plate. Then Close arrived in the workshop and saw the plate, according to the printer, 'it was almost etched. He was ecstatic, "No more scrubbing, no more squeegeeing, no more chemicals, no more lugging that thing around wet and dripping!" he shouted. And as I printed the plate the atmosphere of excitement and expectancy was back to the level of our very first big plate.'

Technical problems continued. For this mezzotint Brown continued:

> [T]he light area in the center, where he had first started work, was too light for the rest. This may have been because he simply overdid it at first; it may have been because of our problems with the press (in building up under the center we caused excessive wear there); or it may have been that this was the first area done and so was proofed more than any other part. It was probably a combination of all three. We stewed a lot about what to do about it. Chuck suggested we block out everything else, re-coat the plate and put the black on again just there, so he could do the whole area again. Be we discarded that idea as too risky ...
>
> He would have loved it to be perfect. But the fact that he had done it at all is so monumental that most people who see it aren't too bothered by the "mistake". In a way, the "mistake" is a record of the struggle put into the print.

Having achieved an artist's proof approved by Close, Brown now had the task of editioning the work, something the master printer agonised over:

> I was nervous because I knew there would not be very many good prints in the plate, which was already worked by the fifty or so proofs we had taken – so if I messed one up that would be one less for the edition. I did mess up a few – minor faults; a smudge on his lapel, a wrinkle in the paper, and in two cases a hair fell on the plate just before printing. These were labeled 'Studio Proof' and divided among us.

Aside from four artist's proofs, the venture ended with a small edition of ten. The plate could not carry any more examples after the wear and tear of the mezzotint printing process. The whole exercise exemplified the drive to make extraordinary prints in the art world at the time, pushed by an ardent publisher, an enthusiastic market, a keen and usually talented artist and a printer (desperately in this case) striving to achieve technical masterpieces comparable to the artist's and the publisher's ambition. Inevitably as this set of

circumstances continued and grew, where even publishers were selling prints that had not been made, the art market in prints became untenable and the years 1989 and 1991 witnessed a 'crash' in prices as evident in the *Gordon Print Price Annual* for those years.[98]

This revealing account by Brown of the Chuck Close project was completely at odds with Ken Tyler's *modus operandi*. If there were technical issues, Tyler would seek to solve them away from the artist's gaze. He would then return triumphant or with options or other solutions for the artist to consider and then proceed. Tyler's experience at Tamarind allowed him to develop skills, through research and practice, which earned him a reputation for technical wizardry, and he became a notable player in the development of printmaking in America. A brilliant and creative printer, Tyler was to become the technical director of Tamarind in 1964-65.Tyler had worked extraordinarily hard to establish a successful workshop from the early days at Gemini and then Gemini GEL; the latter company was established as a fine print publishing house intended for collaborative ventures with various artists Tyler desired to work with.

Hockney had first met Tyler in March 1964, when the latter was still the Tamarind Technical Director. For the newly arrived Hockney, his studies in the lithography studio at art school had been an invaluable means of acquiring useful knowledge of a complex technique, as well as fulfilling the requirements of the syllabus.[99] As a student at the Bradford College of Art, Hockney had proofed and printed several colour lithographs. Since that time he had made only an occasional lithograph such as the proof for the poster *Bar party* of 1961 and the reproductive photo-lithograph *Man* (based on a drawing) of 1964, which was published on the occasion of an exhibition at Galerie Krugier in Geneva. Generally speaking at this stage of his career, Hockney much preferred etching as he found the technique more intuitive as a means of expression – one suitable for his sometimes naïve, intimate, autobiographical or at other times literary style. It was not until Hockney began making further lithographs with Tyler that he could explore its potential in a more concentrated and extensive way, finding the printer both innovative and equally energetic.

---

[98] *Gordon's Print Price Annual*, volume 3, New York, New York: Martin Gordon Inc, 1989 and *Gordon's Print Price Annual*, volumes 4 and 5, Naples, Florida, Martin Gordon Inc, 1990 and 1991.
[99] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.

On his arrival from Britain, Hockney was now able to participate in the revival of lithography in America and more broadly speaking a growing interest in printmaking in the art world in the decades that followed the Second World War. As a guest artist at the Tamarind Workshop, Hockney made a lithograph of the gay beat of Pershing Square, referred to in Rechy's book, which related to the painting he made of the subject. This he did with the printer Aris Koutroulis. Later when he was filmed for an interview at Gemini Gel in 1973, Hockney remembered his first experience in lithography at the Tamarind Workshop being totally different from his brief time working in ateliers in Paris and Zurich:

> I will never forget how organised it was, completely. They said would you come and do one print, and I thought it would be nice. So before I went, I thought of what to do, and I thought I would do this picture of Pershing Square. When I got there, there was a beautiful stone all laid out on the table, there was all the pencils sharpened, there was even a little glass with cigarettes in it, ready. There was everything you could ask for; a coffee machine, although I never drink coffee ... I mean I had never been there, I had never seen that treatment.[100]

Hockney entitled the lithograph *Pacific Mutual Life with palm tree* (illustration 19). Without knowing its importance in homosexual life in Los Angeles, on face value the composition looks to the viewer like any simple understated cityscape of Los Angeles, devoid of content rather than the gay beat it actually was, which was only known to the select group.

The young artist was overwhelmed by this first experience in a lithography workshop in the United States, which contrasted with his European experience; the conduct and philosophy of the ateliers were poles apart. Hockney thought afterwards that the occasion of his visit with everything laid out for him would have made a wonderful composition in itself:

> My only regret is that I didn't draw the whole scene. That is what I should have made, as a print. I should have simply looked at it, I was so amazed. I should have simply drawn the empty stone, the cigarettes, and the sharpened pencils and the coffee machine. But ever since you rarely still get that kind of treatment. Nobody sharpens your pencils anywhere else. [I've] never had anybody sharpen my pencils before.[101]

---

[100] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973 held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN429_IRN134682+CAN429_IRN134683.
[101] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973 held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN429_IRN134682+CAN429_IRN134683.

Paul Cornwall-Jones was also to play a part in Hockney's formative years making prints. At this stage in Hockney's career, Cornwall-Jones of Editions Alecto had signed an exclusive contract with the artist for his prints and proposed that Hockney work with Tyler; someone who was fast establishing a reputation as an accomplished lithographic printer. Shortly after, Hockney met Tyler, who was now in his thirties and was very keen to have his own independent print workshop. In September 1965 Tyler set out to establish the first incarnation of the Gemini print workshop. The venue was the rented backroom of a frame shop owned by Jerry Solomon on Melrose Avenue, with the support of his wife, Kay. The meeting of Hockney and Tyler was fortuitous and they would soon work together at Gemini. Over his entire printmaking career, Hockney was the only artist to work at all four of Tyler's print workshops. Asked why he liked working in this environment, Hockney joked: 'I suppose one reason is Ken does egg you on.' Adding that, 'If he thinks there is no stone ready, then it's suddenly there in front of you. I mean there is never any likelihood that you couldn't do anything because there is no equipment there.'[102]

Pondering further on why he found working in Los Angeles and with Tyler in the workshop productive, Hockney continued:

> I like working in Los Angeles, really, occasionally. I always find it kind of inspiring. I can always do a lot of work here. Probably because I know less people, you don't get interrupted as much. It's a terrific place I mean I really enjoyed working here …The main thing is they take away all the chore of having to … prepare the plates, and do all that gum stuff, and put the gum on and everything. And if I had to do it myself I'd get all mixed up and then I'd have to redraw them all and I'd do something wrong.

He noted that, in the past, this was the reason 'I got put off making lithographs'.[103] The circumstances were quite different now he was living in the United States.

At Gemini Hockney went on to make his lithographic print using crayon and tusche from three aluminium plates in October 1965. The composition was a simple still life and inked in a muted palette of grey, blue and black. *Still life* consisted of an image of flowers in a vase shaded in an old-fashioned manner

---

[102] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973 held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN429_IRN134682+CAN429_IRN134683.
[103] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973 held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN429_IRN134682+CAN429_IRN134683.

of chiaroscuro and placed on a table in front of a wall backdrop, which has been pared down to an almost cartoon-like rendering of the subject, particularly the flowers with their more than regular cut-out shapes (illustration 21). Hockney has added some subtle touches, like the delicate shadows of the flowers and the vase on the backdrop. For the vase itself Hockney adopted the traditional method of shading, chiaroscuro. A reference to the current interest in Color Field is made by the angular and flat colouring for the table and the wall, while a crumpled napkin appears more like a modest homage to Cézanne, with the forms simplified and shaded.

From the beginning of his public career, Hockney was to find an interested market for his work including his printmaking. His early family and student life had been one of considerable frugality and he was keen to pursue such ventures. This lithograph, *Still life*, was to prove popular because the edition of 50 sold out in the following year even after the price of $100 was increased by a further 25 per cent. Having made one print with Tyler, Hockney was keen to continue working with him and he brought along Cornwall-Jones and his London dealer John Kasmin to visit Tyler's workshop. The relationship between Hockney and Cornwall-Jones was a symbiotic one. As Cornwall-Jones subsequently commented after the major success of *A rake's progress*, which drew attention to Hockney and other emerging artists while at the same time signally to them that having their prints published was advantageous, 'We began to work with artists who had galleries .. There was the benefit of getting the artist known throughout the world. No one else was doing it … providing the opportunity to work with print seriously and to produce a body of graphic images.'[104]

Having established a name for itself in England as a foremost publisher of young artists in Britain, the publishing house of Editions Alecto wanted to develop an international role. Quite clearly there was going to be a strong market for Hockney's prints internationally, as well as in the British market.

According to Tyler, Kasmin and Cornwall-Jones 'were the key players in David's graphic work at the time along with Henry Geldzahler … who served as editor

[104] Paul Cornwall-Jones interview with Tessa Sidey, 24 September 1998, quoted in Tessa Sidey, 'Editions Alecto: a fury for artist's prints, in *Editions Alecto: original graphics, multiple originals 1960-1981*, Aldershot, Hampshire: Lund Humphries, 2003 p. 14.

and advisor to David. Paul wanted David to work with me so he could get more prints of David's to sell. Knowing that David and I most likely would work in colour, Paul was keen on David doing a serious project with me ... At the time, I only had facilities for lithography. David liked the idea that he was supporting a young printer and the atmosphere in the "Art Services" building was for him interesting.[105]

A Hollywood collection was to be the result of the collaboration of artist and printer, supported by an ambitious Cornwall-Jones and encouraged by Geldzahler, and was an important milestone in Hockney's printmaking career. Hockney returned to the Gemini workshop accompanied by his friend Patrick Proctor and began the Hollywood cycle of prints on 7 October 1965, continuing until mid December (illustration 20). After making several preliminary studies, the artist produced a witty set of six colour lithographs, which was *A Hollywood collection* (illustrations 22-25), in bold colours inspired by the strong light of Los Angeles not seen before in his printmaking. The combination of bright colour and the mixture of flat and rounded forms owed something to his painting style, which he had developed since he began painting in acrylic after moving to Los Angeles. Each print is in a different genre – a still life, a landscape, a portrait, a cityscape, a nude and an abstract. This was another critical and financial success, unlike the experience of his friend and fellow artist Proctor who made two lithographs for Gemini during this time, but never really embraced the medium in the way Hockney was able to.

This next excursion into lithography in the Hollywood cycle enabled Hockney to explore colour and the making of more technically complex prints. For this series he used both crayon and liquid tusche, and used multiple aluminium plates and up to seven colours. The still life continued the style of the lithographic print he had made a year earlier with Tyler, but with flatter shapes and a flatter sense of space. The composition is more complex with an arrangement of two sets of flowers in two vases and now with two shadows. There is no real shading this time, which amplifies the two-dimensional nature of the objects, although this effect is countered by the more angular shape of the table and backdrop. The second composition of a landscape continues the idea of simplified forms; in this case a solitary tree is set among fields and hills

---

[105] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 29 May 2002.

seen low on the horizon. Hockney has experimented with texture more, as evident in the stylised almost pattern-like foliage. The artist then turned to the idea of a portrait. He shows a besuited man close to the picture frame, whose appearance still echoes the Dubuffet figures he liked earlier in the decade, but with less of a cartoon-like appearance. Hockney has continued to experiment with the application of wash and crayon, which is evident in the shadows of the sitter's face and in the texture of the suit. Growing bolder with colour, Hockney has set his figure on a brilliant blue background, as if celebrating the warmer Californian climate he now so enjoyed.

The next composition for the Hollywood series was a cityscape. For the colour lithograph Hockney has created flat anonymous shapes for the buildings, for reasons both of his own style at the time and because he was still learning about the potential of the planographic technique. More experimentation is evident in the view of the clouds billowing in the blue sky above. A tiny figure saunters down the street and Hockney adds a humorous touch by picturing this only as a head, a pictorial device he had adopted before in the bar scene of *A rake's progress*. This cityscape reveals another of Hockney's solutions to pictorial problems: how to represent a specific location when not creating an image of great specificity. Hockney's answer is to include the street sign for Melrose Avenue; a pictorial resolution he had adopted for two acrylic paintings of cityscapes at this time, *Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles* 1964 and *Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles.*[106] *A Hollywood collection* continued with a nude in the modern manner. Rather than depict a nude in the classic manner of Jean-Léon Gérôme, Hockney has adopted the appearance of a female figure more likely to be found in a work by Matisse or Picasso. The nude is large in scale, monumental in form, and not highly finished in appearance. The series ends with a *Picture of a pointless abstraction under glass*; Hockney pokes fun at the current vogue for Abstraction, Clifford Still and Color Field painting.

Within *A Hollywood collection,* each genre is shown in a different style and mixtures of styles – from naturalism to naïve, from cubist variation to abstract, a painterly tree set against a flat sky, a painterly sky behind the flattened form of a cityscape with its flattened building and road sign. Despite the mix of styles the

---

[106] Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, acrylic on canvas, Private collection; Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, acrylic on canvas, sold at Christie's, New York, 9 November 2005, Sale number 1574, lot 254.

compositions are unified by the absence of margins. Instead, Hockney 'framed' each work with a differently designed frame ranging from the ornamental to the simple, inspired by the frame shop next door to the studio. Hockney said of this series: 'It's a kind of joke thing, kind of home-made art collection with bits of everything in it, a nude, and a landscape and so on. I was working with a printer [Tyler] whose workshop was behind a framer's. He had all these marvellous frames in the window. I got interested in this trompe-l'eoil … a picture of a thing within something else within something else.'[107]

Meanwhile Tyler had progressed from the modest backroom of a frame shop and, in 1966, with his new partners Stanley Grinstein and Sidney B. Felsen, he began a workshop with the intention of publishing state-of-the-art prints. Tyler had attended a lecture by Bill Lieberman at the University of Southern California, where the latter had expressed the view, 'that great art is made by great artists' and therefore 'great prints are made only by great artists'.[108] Such a comment profoundly influenced Tyler in his future as a printer and publisher. Tyler's response was immediate and he realised that he should not simply approach printmakers for his print publications. He should aim to work with the most talented of visual artists. Lieberman, in turn, had been inspired by the observation from the turn of the century French publisher Ambroise Vollard, who wrote in his memoirs:

> De tout temps, j'ai aimé les estampes. A peine installé rue Laffitte, vers 1895, mon plus grand désir fut d'en éditer, mais en les demandant à des peintres. 'Peintre-graveur' est un terme dont on a abusé en l'appliquant à des professionnels de la gravure qui n'étaient rien moins que peintres. Mon idée, à moi, était de demander des gravures à des artistes qui n'étaient pas graveurs de profession. Ce qui pouvait être pris pour une gageure fut tune grande réussite d'art. C'est ainsi notamment que Bonnard, Cézanne, Maurice Denis, Redon, Renoir, Sisley, Toulouse-Lautrec, Vuillard produisirent, pour leur coup d'essai, ces belles gravures qui sont aujourd'hui si recherchées.[109]

---

[107] David Hockney, 'London Life', quoted in Mark Glazebrook, *David Hockney: paintings, prints and drawings 1960-1970*, Whitechapel exhibition catalogue, London and Bradford: Lund Humphries, 1970, p. 83. See also David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos: London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 101.

[108] Ken Tyler in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer*, Avery Tirce productions, 1976.

[109] Ambroise Vollard, Fernand Mourlot, *Gravés dans ma mémoire: cinquante ans de lithographie avec Picasso, Matisse, Chagall, Braque, Miró …*, Paris: Editions Robert Laffont, 1979, p. 298.

Vollard went on to publish prints and livre-artiste books by many artists of the day including Henri Toulouse-Lautrec, Pierre Bonnard, Maurice Denis, Odilon Redon and later Pablo Picasso.

To understand the opportunities afforded to Hockney to develop his career in making prints at Tyler's state-of-the-art Gemini and Gemini GEL workshops, one should consider a brief history of the evolution of the workshop and issues which were then current regarding what can be considered as an 'original print'. Inspired by Lieberman, from the very beginning Tyler also wanted 'to go to the very top' and sought to collaborate with some of the post-war greats in the America art scene. He first set his sights on the émigré artist, Josef Albers – an artist obsessed with form and colour since his Bauhaus days. German-born Albers had been a key figure at the Bauhaus. At the age of 32 Albers responded to the call delivered in the manifesto of the Bauhaus's first Director, Walter Gropius: 'Come back to the guild; come back to hand work'. Albers began a new chapter (one of several) in his life and 'threw all my old things out the window',[110] and in 1920 he became a student at Weimar Bauhaus, subsequently establishing its glass workshop. When the Bauhaus moved to a purpose-built site at Dessau in 1925, Albers was made a master of the school. He remained with the school and moved with the Bauhaus to Berlin until its demise in 1933 following rise of the National Socialists. With the onset of Nazi Germany, Albers had to make a further drastic change in his life. He, with his Jewish wife, the artist and textile designer Anni Albers, left Germany for America at the behest of the architect Philip Johnson, who proposed Josef Albers accept an appointment to a teaching post at Black Mountain College. Not only was Albers a great teacher, he was also an artist's artist and became influential in certain art circles in America and a contributor to developments in art in the United States.

Albers, like Hockney, had met Tyler at the Tamarind Lithography Workshop in Los Angeles when both were granted fellowships to the workshop in 1963. While at Tamarind the artist and printer worked on two series of Albers' prints relating to *Homage to the Square, Day and night* and *Midnight and noon*.[111] Initially, Albers had been sceptical about using lithography, as he believed the

---

[110] Neil Welliver, 'Albers on Albers', *ARTnews*, volume 64, number 9 January 1966, p. 48.
[111] Brenda Danilowitz, *The prints of Josef Albers: a catalogue raisonné 1915-1976*, New York:Hudson Hills Press, in association with the Josef and Anni Albers Foundation, 2001, catalogue numbers 156, 157,158.

process could not match the luminosity that he achieved in his painting series of *Homage to the Square*. These paintings, begun in 1950 and continued throughout his life as an obsession, consisted of what the artist called 'platters to serve color' which in different combinations would have different 'readings' because of the different interactions.[112] Working with Albers at Tamarind, Tyler experimented with thinning the inks and blotting the printed surface, bringing a new subtlety which satisfied the artist.

Having taken on partners to form Gemini GEL, Tyler sought out Albers, promising excellent registration in printing and Albers proposed that they work on a series of lithographs, which came to be known as the seminal series *White line squares*. Having mulled over the technical problems of obtaining perfect registration for *White line squares*, Tyler promised Albers that there would be no accidental printing of one colour over another, which would have distorted Albers' carefully selected colours. The exercise required that a perfect white line be created; this was achieved by actually exposing the white of the paper, but without any bleeding of the inks. The series became the visual expression of Albers' thesis that if one places a white line within one of two colours, it would take on the appearance of a third colour. A 'white line within a color area instead of as a contour', he wrote, 'may present a newly discovered effect: When the line is placed within a so-called "Middle" color, even when the color is evenly applied, it will make the one color look like two different shades or tints of that color.'[113]

Tyler visited Albers at his New Haven home in Connecticut to discuss the idea and then returned to Los Angeles. Thereafter, Albers sent back to the workshop detailed instructions and colour samples in the post. Proofing followed until Albers was perfectly satisfied. The samples and proofs with the notations of Albers and Tyler are now housed at the National Gallery of Australia and are testament to the utmost care that the artist and printer took in their collaborative efforts. In a discussion with Tyler and Henry Hopkins of the Los Angeles County

---

[112] According to Albers, 'Color deceives continually ... [and] 'The same color evokes innumerable readings. Instead of mechanically applying or merely implying laws and rules of color harmony, distinct color effects are produced – through recognition of the interaction of color.' Josef Albers, *Interaction of color*, New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1975 p. 1.

[113] Josef Albers quoted in *Josef Albers: White line squares*, Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum and Gemini GEL, 1966 p. 19, cited in Brenda Danilowitz, *The prints of Josef Albers: a catalogue raisonné 1915-1976*, New York: Hudson Hills Press, in association with the Josef and Anni Albers Foundation, 2001 p. 25.

Museum in 1966, the artist outlined his method of working with the printer, admitting that 'I never touch the stone, never the rule, never the ink, it's all done by my friend Ken, but I watch him like hell'.[114]

Such an approach brought criticism from certain quarters, such as the American Print Council, which had published *What is an original print?* by Theodore Gusten in 1961. Gusten insisted that the artist had to create the image on the matrix for a print to be considered original. This was at odds with the views of the noted curator of prints at France's Bibliothèque Nationale, Jean Adhémar, and the French printer/publisher Fernand Mourlot. Both recognised that an artist may not always draw directly on the lithographic stone or plate because of the technical complexities of this technique and printers and *chromistes* would sometimes convert the designs of the artist into a printable form. 'I fully share his opinion', Mourlot wrote of Adhémar, that 'if the artist assisted in the realisation of his lithography, even if he did not do it fully himself, if he approved it, if he did his corrections, if he gave his *bon à tirer*, followed the proofing and signed the lithograph, it is an original lithograph.'[115] The American Print Council, in contrast, failed to recognise the necessity of artist and printer collaboration, attacking Tyler and Albers for their collaborative efforts at Tamarind. Such a view, however, could not be sustained and reflecting on the Council's role, Tyler wrote recently that 'By the end of the 60s one never heard about the Print Council'.[116]

Albers became both a friend and a mentor to Tyler. The influential series *White line squares* became Gemini GEL's first print publication – a *tour de force* of colour lithography. Albers further assisted the workshop by donating some of the proceeds to fund future projects. *White line squares* became Tyler's calling card and he took the set when he visited artists on his wish list, saying 'If I could do that for Albers, just think how far I could go for you.' This series, according to Tyler, were the 'First notes on the piano' and 'Whatever symphony was to follow

[114] Josef Albers in conversation, about June of 1966, quoted in Pat Gilmour, *Ken Tyler master printer and the American print renaissance*, Canberra: Australian National Gallery, 1986 p. 39.
[115] Fernand Mourlot, *Gravés dans ma mémoire: cinquante ans de lithographie avec Picasso, Matisse, Chagall, Braque, Miró ...*, Paris: Editions Robert Laffont, 1979, pp. 99100.
[116] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 21 June 2002.

was because of them'.[117] It is this 'symphony' of extraordinary innovation, scale and technical virtuosity that forms the collection from Tyler.

One artist who was successfully enticed to work at Gemini was Robert Rauschenberg – one of an emerging group of artists who was making a name in the American art world. He was from a stable of artists at the New York gallery of Leo Castelli, which also included Roy Lichtenstein, Jasper Johns, Frank Stella and Claes Oldenburg. Rauschenberg had a deep admiration for Albers and was a student of his at Black Mountain College in North Carolina. Although the teacher/pupil relationship was a fraught one, Rauschenberg recalled years later in 1972 that 'Albers was a beautiful teacher and an impossible person … He wasn't easy to talk to, and I found his criticisms so excruciating and so devastating that I never asked for it. Years later, though, I'm still learning what he taught me … I consider Albers the most important teacher I've ever had.'[118] What Albers imparted was a broad notion of 'seeing', as Rauschenberg remembered, 'What he taught had to do with the entire visual world'.[119]

Tyler travelled to New York early in 1966:

> During our meetings I showed them the Albers' *White line squares* and John Altoon prints that I was working on for the last six months. They were impressed with the work and it helped that Leo Castelli had already visited my small workshop and was keen for Bob (more so than for Jasper) to work with me. My take on this was that Bob was having a rougher time financially. The 'cast of players' who all knew what I was up to, were Leo [Castelli], David Whitney [who was working at the Castelli Gallery] and Philip Johnson. All very close to these two artists at the time. It's interesting for me to now reflect on whom I was trying to work with in January and February of 1966. I visited Mark Rothko, Hans Hofmann, Edward Hopper and Ben Shahn in January. The same month I talked with Andrew Wyeth, Larry Rivers, Bill de Kooning and Mark Tobey, who I visited in February.[120]

Tyler also visited Johns and Rauschenberg on 2 and 4 February respectively. The printer had used his visiting card to great effect, along with the promise that scale was not a problem. Tyler promised that 'I would do whatever

[117] Ken Tyler in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer*, Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[118] Robert Rauschenberg interview with John Stix, Black Mountain College Project Papers, North Carolina State Archives, Raleigh, no 179, May 8, 1972, quoted in May Emma Harris, 'Josef Albers: art education at Black Mountain College', in *Josef Albers: a retrospective*, New York: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, 1988, p. 55.
[119] Mary Lynn Kotz, *Rauschenberg/art and life*, New York: Harry N Abrams, 1990, p. 66.
[120] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 21 June 2002.

Rauschenberg needed to do ... And he kind of got turned on by the idea that somebody was saying he could do whatever he wanted to do and he could get to any size he wanted to.' In response Rauschenberg decided to make a 'life-size' self-portrait and promptly took himself off to the Kaiser Medical Group where he had himself x-rayed in the nude, except for a large pair of boots. This x-ray became the key element for the print, *Booster.* Photographic elements, the artist's drawing and some offset rubbings helped to complete the image. The groundbreaking size of *Booster* required the use of two lithographic stones placed in a press and running the paper in each direction, both top and bottom, to achieve such scale. Such an astonishing text meant many in the art world took notice and Tyler gained a reputation as a talented master printer. The printer/publisher later was to articulate his philosophy for the newly configured Gemini GEL, where he, with his partners, set out to entice talented artists of the day to the workshop, promising them: 'Here is a workshop, there are no rules, no restrictions, do what you want to do'.[121]

Booster became a key stepping stone in the history of post-war American printmaking where imagination and scale seemed limitless and it remains one of the most recognised and ground-breaking prints made in the twentieth century, helping to bring printmaking into a new era where prints were to rival painting in invention and size. Not all responded favourably, the French printer Durassier, who taught Tyler at Tamarind and who was working at Gemini, asked Tyler why he let the artist make such a big print. Coming from a more European workshop tradition it was incomprehensible that such leeway should be given, 'When I made Robert Rauschenberg's *Booster*, I sent him (Durassier) a photograph with great pride'. Durassier responded by criticising Tyler 'for pushing lithography past its natural scale and giving in to the artist'.[122]

What was also notable about *Booster* was the mixing of different techniques such as the combination of lithography and screenprint on handmade paper. Recalling the mixing of techniques, Tyler noted: 'It was a first for us ... *Booster* was supposed to have been a lithograph – the biggest pulled to date – it finally needed to be silkscreened. The problem ... was printing an opaque grid on top of black. You can't print white or color over black with lithography. Lithography

[121] Ken Tyler in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer*, Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[122] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 June 2002.

is not opaque.'[123] The combination of printing methods was a radical departure from the established practice of not mixing techniques. Tamarind specialised in the particular process of lithography and Crown Point Press mostly etching. Subsequently, Tyler went on to offer artists an almost limitless range of techniques. This possibility he combined with mould-made papers of a quality, shape and size never seen before. Such an approach was to be a major factor in the success of the Tyler workshops and led to major contributions in advances in post war printmaking in the United States.

Rauschenberg's next project with Gemini GEL was a revolutionary print series called *Stoned moon* of 1969-70. This too was ground-breaking in the history of American printmaking, with Rauschenberg's aspirations and inspirations matched by the skill and inventiveness of Tyler and the workshop team. The artist had been invited by the National Aeronautical Space Administration (NASA) to witness the launch of the rocket to land a man on the moon from the Kennedy Space Center in Florida. The artist was then commissioned by Gemini to make a series of prints drawn from this experience. Along with photographs and documentation provided by James Dean of NASA, the artist set himself the task of working on a series of lithographs using his material and adding hand-drawn tusche and crayon. Rauschenberg found the occasion astonishing in the combination of the hi-tech event with the human struggle to support the venture. He also found the juxtaposition of technology and the ordinary inspiring, such as the nest of birds on a NASA building while human beings were beavering away on the ground. The prints are almost surreal in character with their strange combinations of imagery, recycling and reconfiguring. Rauschenberg later wrote of his experience describing the strange scene of the launch. 'The birds nest bloomed with fire and clouds. Softly largely slowly silently Apollo started to move up. Then being lifted on light. Standing mid-air, it began to sing happily loud in its own joy and solidified air with a sound that became your body. For that joy pain ecstasy. There was no inside, no out. Then bodily transcending a

[123] Ken Tyler quoted in Ronny Cohen, 'The medium isn't the message', *ARTnews,* October 1985, volume 84, number 8, p. 76.

state of energy, Apollo 11 was airborne, lifting pulling everyone's spirits with it.'[124]

Aside from the originality of the *Stoned moon* series, technically they were ground-breaking and the scale of several of the works, including *Sky garden*, had implications for the future history of collaborative printmaking: 'We kept increasing in scale', Tyler noted, 'Not just because we wanted to, but the artists were actually asking for it. The results were fantastic. We were having some very good results with increasing the scale, because as you increase scale you also increase the other problems that accompany printmaking and that is that the processes have to change, the timing and everything else has to change. And of course what has to happen is that you need more than one person. It is the beginnings of what I reflect back now was the team relationship in the workshop … [For] *Sky garden* I laminated three stones together on some honeycomb backing and then built a press that big to print it. Each and every impression required about two pounds of ink. To wipe that stone needed four people just to keep it moist so they could roll the roller across it and traverse back and forth. That's five people, five people around a press all day, for many many days until it was done.'[125] Some of the other great artists of the time were seduced by what was on offer to them by Tyler at his workshops and were pleased to spend time in an environment of extraordinary possibilities.

Compared to Rauschenberg, Hockney was less interested in scale, or the new methods of making imagery, including photo-lithography, or the mixture of print techniques. For him technique was there to support and inform his imagery and his posing and solving pictorial problems. This approach would the case for Hockney's art practice through out his career up to the present day. Tyler's role in Hockney's development was to provide him with the technical expertise and know-how that would allow Hockney to draw beautifully on a stone or a plate. It was such experiences that increased the symbiotic relationship of the artist and the Tyler workshop to achieve the most innovative work. Artists formed attachments to favourite stones, and on a personal level worked well with certain printers. Rauschenberg was very demanding and the workshop was flat

[124] Robert Rauschenberg, "Notes on *Stoned moon*,' *Studio International*, volume 178, number 917, December 1969, p. 247, quoted in Edward A. Forster, *Robert Rauschenberg: prints 1948/1970*, Minneapolis: The Minneapolis Institute of Arts, 1970, n. p.
[125] Transcript of Ken Tyler, Qantas Birthday Lecture, National Gallery of Australia, 14 October 1999.

out trying to provide technically what the artist required. If the artist was not interested in the technical side of printing, he did become aware of the rich possibilities using Tyler's treasured lithographic stones. These surfaces, or 'skin' as Rauschenberg called them, were sensual, 'sexy' objects to draw on, to experiment with. According to Tyler, Rauschenberg was, 'A very organised artist' and Rauschenberg had:

> Worked from a large collection of photographs that we would blow up to his predetermined sizes. Make either negative or positive films of these enlargements, then make photo printing plates from which we generally made paper transfers that he would use to rub onto stones. These rubbings were usually embellished with tusche washes and crayon drawing and then the stones were processed for proofing. Rubylith was used to create flats and solid shapes and for masking out areas in image films during plate making. Rauschenberg was the consummate collaborator who loved to have everyone involved for long days (often all day and all night with printers eating at the presses during our marathon proofing and drinking sessions). He liked to push the endurance equation and was very engaging, often succeeding in getting what he wanted. He loved inventing his images on the spot with only the tools and materials around him. His wit, quick eye, hand agility and ability to drink and drink and work was amazing.[126]

The success of Rauschenberg's *Booster and Seven studies* series, along with an enthusiastic and convivial sales pitch from Tyler (drawing on his experience as the travelling salesman for Thompson Wire Co), convinced Jasper Johns that he should work with Gemini GEL. Johns arrived with a clear idea of what he had in mind and was another who wanted to work on Tyler's 'gorgeous' stones, ferreted out by Tyler from an old building site and carted away in an elderly Volkswagen with broken springs.[127] He selected all the large stones that could be found and started drawing on every one of them, making a series of numerals that were printed in black. In Tyler's view Johns had, 'an innate relationship with the stone and the materials he's working with. That is, as a surface which will give certain results under certain circumstances, he used very well to his advantage ... although he approached lithography as a painter ... He wanted a better understanding of the medium he was working with.'[128]

It was these skills and *modus operandi* which contributed to the collaborative efforts of Hockney and Tyler for over two further decades, before Hockney all

---

[126] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 11 June 2002.
[127] Ken Tyler in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer*, Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[128] Ben Berns quoted in Stephanie Terenzio, *The prints of Robert Motherwell: catalogue raisonée* by Dorothy C Belknapp, New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1991, p. 48.

but abandoned the notion of the big print workshop and the highly technical, very complex, and therefore more expensive prints. This was to the great dismay of Tyler. It was the large scale atelier which would contribute to Hockney's extensive graphic oeuvre and which enabled Hockney to produce an extraordinary range of prints and paper-pulp works. This would then have a great impact on the artist as he developed as a painter. He became emboldened, confident in adopting a brilliant palette and working on a larger scale. At the same time, Hockney could not envisage working in this fashion in an open-ended way: It was an attempt by the artist to retain his independence. These conflicting factors ultimately led to Hockney abandoning Tyler as a partner in collaborative printmaking.

Chapter 4: Literary imagery and intaglio prints

After living a fairly peripatetic life, Hockney settled in London in 1968. In the latter half of the 1960s, as Hockney developed as an artist, he ceased including literary references in his painting but continued such themes in his prints. Hockney noted in the mid 1970s, 'I never gave them up in the prints much. It seemed to me much easier to respond to them in a graphic way; it probably still is.'[129] Again the notion of printmaking as a confessional process for Hockney allowed the artist to delve into his literary loves, as well as his personal intimate interests. At this time, and still based in London, Hockney was experiencing some difficulties painting and turned to a new print project, which was a welcome relief – a series of prints inspired by the poetry of Constantine Cavafy, 'I wanted to do it also, perhaps to counteract all that formalism in my recent pictures'.[130] His current manner of painting added limitations to his artistic advance and lacked the familiar, intimate and informal working process he had developed in printmaking, particularly when using the intaglio method, which emphasised the personal for Hockney. It also was a technique which was

[129]David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 64.
[130] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 102.

conducive to storytelling, where the artist was comfortable working on separate plates which could form a narrative.

A compulsive reader since he was at school, poetry as an art form has always had a particular appeal for Hockney. In the early 1960s he developed themes and ideas from Cavafy's poetry in his prints, *Kaisarion in all his beauty* and *Mirror, mirror on the wall*, for example, as well as his painting. By mid decade he wished to do something more substantial and worthy of the poet he so greatly admired and conceived of making a series of prints to accompany Cavafy's poetry. Years ago in the Bradford Library Hockney had discovered a book of his poems translated by John Mavrogordato and 'read them over and over again'.[131] With this new project in mind Hockney visited Mavrogordato at his home in London, but the translator was suffering from dementia and was incapable of discussing his translation, the possible republishing of it, or, indeed, remembering who the publishers were. The experience was very disappointing and briefly deflating for Hockney.

Paul Cornwall-Jones was keen to publish Cavafy in the form of a *livre d'artiste* for Editions Alecto, which was to become *Illustrations for fourteen poems from C.P. Cavafy* (illustrations 26-33). Hockney was very much taken by the romantic notion of Cavafy's Alexandria. In October 1963 he visited Alexandria, along with Cairo and Luxor in Egypt, after being commissioned as an artist for the newly established colour magazine for *The Sunday Times*. On his travels there he produced 40 or more drawings of cityscapes, landscapes, interiors and monuments, drawing directly from life.[132] Now several years later in preparation for his Cavafy prints, when it came time to conjure the cosmopolitan, mysterious and exotic city of Cavafy poetry, Hockney chose not to revisit Alexandria, but rather Beirut in January 1965, which he considered might prove its modern day equivalent, more hopeful that he would find a romantic city which would evoke the wonder of Cavafy's poetry. With the need for another translation, Hockney's friend the English writer Stephen Spender then proposed that he and a young Greek poet, Nikos Stangos, make a new translation for a Cavafy print project. According to Stangos:

[131] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 63.
[132] Marco Livingstone, *David Hockney: Egyptian journeys,* Cairo: American University of Cairo Press, 2002.

I met David Hockney through Stephen Spender in 1966. D[avid] H[ockney] had been obsessing about Cavafy and had been doing prints based on some of the poems … Spender told him of my translations and that I had been working on them for a long time and suggested DH use them rather than the existing ones. DH agreed and carried on with the etchings … The final, printed version of the poems in the book was done to some extent in collaboration with Stephen Spender.[133]

Though W. H. Auden expressed his doubts that poetry could ever be translatable, he made an exception with Cavafy, which 'survives translation and excites' because the poetry was immediately recognisable' as Cavafy's poetry.[134] The translations by Spender and Stangos were extraordinarily evocative and contributed to a result that was to be both a visual and literary success.

For the Cavafy prints, Hockney concentrated on beautifully observed figure studies, etched in simple lines and devoid of anything extraneous, unlike his earlier etchings, which mixed styles and techniques. The small gesture, the eye contact, the turned head, and a tiny detail within an interior, all provided a visual counterpart to the Greek poet's elegant and subtle observations. In 1968 Hockney referred to this development: 'Looking back at my early etchings, it seems to me that they were very cluttered with irrelevant things or things that were ornamental in a not very interesting way. First you've got to know that it was ornamental. Now, as I say, two and half years later, I think these could have been done simpler.'[135]

While Hockney had been in Beirut with the Cavafy project in mind he made a number of drawings, four of which provided the backdrops for his prints. For *Portrait of Cavafy II* (plate 13) for instance, Hockney combined a portrait of Cavafy –then in his forties and without the swashbuckling moustache of his youth, wearing tiny spectacles and dressed in a modern suit from the 1920s and a soft collar and tie – with a drawing of *Police building, Beirut* of 1966. *Portrait of Cavafy I* (plate1) is of an older, more solemn Cavafy towards the end of his life, whom Hockney has set before a backdrop of part of the Beirut cityscape flanked by a line of palm trees. For two other etchings, Hockney has used drawings of Beirut streetscapes. Unfamiliar with Arabic lettering, the artist used a mirror and transcribed the lettering onto the etching plates in reverse from his drawings in

[133] Nikos Stangos in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 20 November 2003.
[134] W. H. Auden, Introduction, *The complete poems of Cavafy,* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961, reproduced in Http://greece.poetryinternational/org/cwolk/view/18297, viewed 23 September 2007.
[135] David Hockney, 'Supplement: Lithographs and prints', *Studio International*, volume 176, number 906, December 1968, p. 278.

order that when printed they would be the correct way round. At this stage Hockney no longer felt he was required to present intimate scenes of young male lovers in a humorous, playful manner inspired by the clumsy asexual figures of Dubuffet. His etched forms of lovers needed no longer to be veiled in humorous disguises. These are very intimate and passionate almost confessional images.

Hockney also used several preparatory drawing for the double figure compositions of two men either in or beside a bed for the Cavafy portfolio. This included the drawing of Dale Chisman and Mo Mc Dermott. For the etching cycle Hockney also drew on photographs found in *Physique Pictorial*. Hockney's selection of images from this homoerotic publication also was less focused on the bellicose rough and tumble variety of male nudes and semi-clad figures to be found in its pages. Instead Hockney was drawn more towards imagery of male bathers, both showering and poolside, or reclining figures, which were positively modern day odalisques in their tantalising delicacy.

For the Cavafy etchings inspiration also came from 'found sources' and in this Hockney was not alone in his art practice. Many young artists appropriated or were inspired by imagery from popular culture; be it movie stills, advertisements, pulp novels or magazines in the Pop Art movement as discussed previously. What stood Hockney and also Kitaj apart from other artists associated with this movement, and why both distanced themselves from this style, was the often idiosyncratic sources both artists drew from. Certainly some motifs came from mass culture for Hockney. In the case of the Cavafy publication, Hockney reinterpreted directly or indirectly imagery from Mizer's pulp magazine. The humorously titled image 'Prisoner's revenge', for example becomes a visual inspiration for *The beginning* (Plate 9).[136] Similarly the young nude male figure with his muscular arms raised above his head and looking directly at the viewer in the work, *In an old book* (Plate 6), is derived from a standard body-builder's pose found in photographs which pepper the issues of *Physique Pictorial*.[137] Overall, a certain magazine aesthetic permeates many of the prints for the Cavafy series, where the artist has adopted and adapted favoured poses, gestures and compositional devices. As Cavafy's poetry

---

[136] 'Prisoner's revenge', *Physique Pictorial*, May 1962, volume 1l, number 4, p. 20.
[137] For example, 'New Model candidates V67 BH', *Physique Pictorial*, April 1961, volume 10, number 4, p. 28; 'Kenneth Stencin', *Physique Pictorial*, volume 12, number 1, July 1962, p. 9.

evokes a gay way of life of a certain time, so Hockney's images relate to homoerotic iconography of the late 1950s and 1960s. These prints became iconic imagery in the homosexual culture: less beefcake than the original iconography of a pulp magazine and more subtle depictions of male nudes.

For the Cavafy publication, Hockney prepared about 20 plates with printer Maurice Payne over a three or four month period setting up a print workshop at his London flat in Powis Terrace, with an acid bath on the balcony to avoid the fumes. A final selection of 13 plates was made in concert with Payne, Stangos and Cornwall-Jones. The remainder of the prints were shown some years later at the Michael Parkin Gallery in London in 1982 and many proofs remain with the printer. Hockney's compositions were selected independently of the poetry and chosen because of the evocative nature of the imagery. Hockney made a selection of poems, which then were narrowed down. He returned to the poem of Kaisarion and to the theme of mirrors with the inclusion of 'The mirror to the entrance', themes of earlier works, but which also now included poems relating homosexual passion, fleeting affairs, obsessions, chance encounters and romantic memory. The prints were never intended to be simply illustrative and those not linked with a poem were matched with images after the event. Nikos Stangos described the process, 'When he [Hockney] had finished, we laid them down on the floor to assign poems to the etchings for those that did not explicitly illustrate a poem'.[138] The compositions with their restrained and delicate charm did evoke the sensibility of Cavafy, whose poems according Hockney were, 'slightly old fashioned. They never described sex or anything.'[139] Nevertheless, English writer E. M. Forster, who had been a close friend of Cavafy, found the images shocking when he was shown them.

Back in London Hockney continued his interest in etching, drawing inspiration from literature – this time it was Grimm's Fairy Tales. This was a subject that had intrigued him earlier, but it was not until 1969 that he completed his new project. In the early sixties, in 1961 and 1962, the artist had completed several etchings relating to *Grimm's Fairy Tales*. In 1968 Hockney wanted to work on something considerably more substantial and planned to produce an illustrated

[138] Nikos Stangos in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 20 November 2003.
[139] David Hockney, 'Supplement: Lithographs and Prints', *Studio International*, volume 176, number 906, December 1968, p. 278.

book, following on from the Cavafy publication, using the fairy tales as inspiration:

> I wanted it to be a real book, not in the French sense of an artistic book with loose pages. Therefore, on each page there had to be a picture, never a whole page of type. At first I'd no idea how to get round the problem of how to print an etching on the back of an etching. We did it by simply doubling over the paper. George Lawson suggested that: it's an idea which comes from Japanese books. When we solved this problem I was very thrilled, because it meant that we could make the books so that each time you turn a page you see the picture on the next page fits, before you read the text it's illustrating.[140]

For this major exercise, Hockney had to abandon other forms of art including painting in order to focus on the one project. In the 1973 interview filmed at Tyler's workshop in Los Angeles, Hockney recalled, 'I did take a whole year off, in 1969, I spent the whole year etching. I did 70 or about 75 etchings and destroyed all but 39 for [The Brothers Grimm] that book ... it took me ... 10 months. I did not do any painting for 10 months, I did nothing but etching and drawing and drawings for the etchings.'[141]

The subject matter of the Grimm's tales held great appeal for Hockney:

> They're fascinating, the little stories, told in a very very simple, direct, straightforward language and style; it was the simplicity that attracted me. They cover quite a strange range of experience, from the magical to the moral.[142]

The Grimm Brothers book raised different issues for the artist than that of Cavafy. According to Hockney: 'As far as I know, it [Cavafy's poetry] has not been illustrated before, but the thing about Grimm's Fairy Tales is that it's been very well illustrated before by very many people, and many of the illustrations are well known ... I have been thinking of starting on Grimm's Fairy Tales, but I keep having reservations about it. I like the grotesqueness of some of the tales, and their simplicity.'[143] In preparation for this series Hockney returned to the Rhine accompanied by his partner at that time Peter Schlesinger, 'I knew all those fairy-tale castles were there on the rocks, so I thought just to get me

---

[140] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 195.
[141] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN403_IRN136497+CAN403_IRN136498.
[142] David Hockney, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 195.
[143] David Hockney, 'Supplement: Lithographs and prints', *Studio International*, volume 176, number 906, December 1968, p. 278.

going, I'll go and take photographs of the castles. So we went the slow way and took the boat from Mainz to Cologne.'[144] For some details of composition and dress, which were appropriate to the stories, Hockney drew on the Italian masters Paolo Uccello, Vittore Carpaccio and Leonardo da Vinci. Carpaccio in particular, in Hockney's view, was 'especially good for costumes'.[145] Hockney's own sensibility, with his admiration for Renaissance art of the Quattrocento, seen in his incorporation of elements of Fra Angelico's painting, also informed his choice of Uccello and Carpaccio for this series.

The ability to draw on the historic, the obscure, as well as the present day and the popular, sets Hockney apart from most of his contemporaries in the realm of Pop Art, who chose motifs of the day and the everyday. Andy Warhol drew from images of celebrities, automobile or aeroplane disasters splashed across tabloid newspapers or the humble Campbell's soup can, for instance. Roy Lichtenstein celebrated romance and war comic imagery of the day, and later re-batched his cartoon imagery with the *Reflections* series made with Ken Tyler. Jasper Johns took his numerals, flags, bull's eyes or light bulbs from the world around him. Hockney's appropriations were less obvious.

Two of the illustrators of Grimm that Hockney particularly liked were Arthur Rackham and Edmund Dulac.[146] The issue for the artist was less about how to improve on previous versions, which he admired, but rather which stories to choose. He had envisaged a picture book with an illustration for each page, but too many stories would make the publication huge and expensive. Of the 350 stories or so that Hockney had read, he selected 25 that were then whittled down to 12. The problem still remained that the print venture would be of a size that few could afford. Hockney was more interested in solving visual problems than simply focusing on the dramatic narrative of the tales and this aided in the selection.

Problems such as how to draw a glass mountain, as evident in *Old Rinkrank,* Hockney found tantalising, 'I remember breaking a sheet of glass and piling up

[144] David Hockney, quoted in Mark Glazebrook, 'An interview', *David Hockney: Paintings, prints and drawings 1960-1970*, Whitechapel exhibition catalogue, London and Bradford: Lund Humphries, 1970, p. 11.

[145] *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p.196.

[146] The Brothers Grimm, *Fairy tales*, translated by Edgar Lucan, illustrated by Arthur Rackham, London: Constable, 1909.

and then drawing it so it was jagged'.[147] How to show straw changing to gold for *Rumpelstiltskin* was another problem that Hockney found irresistible. As well as these pictorial issues, Hockney also liked certain tales for their titles, such as *The boy who left home to learn fear*; their strange sexual connotations, seen in *Rapunzel* or *The little sea hare*; or because of their romantic location, as with *Fundvogel*. Some stories like *Snow White* were rejected because the Disney compositions were too well known and the tale would almost automatically remind the viewer of an image in existing popular imagery and which had a wide currency in the contemporary world of film and comic books. Hockney settled on a final number of six stories, for which he made over 80 prints, which were then reduced to 39.

Hockney's *Illustrations for six fairy tales from the Brothers Grimm* is a strange amalgam of the artist's own invention, and of figures and motifs he devised, combined with an astonishing array of varied sources. Many had their origins in early Renaissance iconography, a period he was particularly fond of and one which visually seemed appropriate for ancient tales. The combination makes for an almost surreal work and the qualities were further augmented by an obvious debt to the art of the Belgian Surrealist René Magritte. It is a world of fantasy, where figures and forms appear suspended in space and where the natural and bizarre combine to inhabit the same world.

There also exists in Hockney's fairy-tale illustrations a debt to Max Ernst and his strange concoctions drawn from the nineteenth century. Living in France in the 1920s and 1930s, Ernst had become a foremost Surrealist, delighting in collage as a method of making art. Ernst would combine strange, haunting and provocative imagery in the one composition, with startling effect, as seen in his visual novel in five volumes, *Une semaine de bonté* or *Les sept elements capitaux* published in Paris in 1934. Ernst took the title for the composite work from posters seen in the streets of Paris in 1927 advertising 'A week of kindness' by a welfare association. His title in its new context remains nonsensical and enigmatic – perfect for a Surrealist publication. In the northern summer of 1933 the artist made a series of 184 collages while holidaying in Italy. These were subsequently printed as wood engravings in five booklets in

---

[147] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p.196.

the following year. Ernst culled his imagery from a variety of mainly nineteenth-century sources including popular illustrated novels, *Fantômas,* scientific journals and sales catalogues. Then, with great precision, he pieced them together to make weird, tumultuous, violent, extravagant and poetic imagery. The results are cataclysmic, voluptuous and totally incomprehensible compositions – perfect examples of Ernst's art during his Surrealist phase.

For the frontispiece of *Six fairy tales from the Brothers Grimm*, the artist chose to depict *Catherine Dorothea Viehmann*, the woman who told the brothers 200 stories. Hockney's own composition is derived from an early nineteenth-century engraving made shortly before her death in 1815. Hockney has varied the tonal values and the line work in order to develop further what was a rather modest composition. The first of the six stories chosen, *The little sea hare*, was a 'strange sexual story' according to the artist. Then began a selection of strange juxtapositions; for instance, in *Boy hidden in a fish* (illustration 34) we see a young man posed by his friend Mo McDermott, who had modelled for Hockney since his student days at the RCA. He is hidden in a reclining fish (which again recalls Magritte), which floats above weirdly shaped rock-like forms. For the next story, *Fundvogel,* the etching *The wooded landscape* (illustration 35) was derived from a photograph Hockney had of vineyards on the Moselle River. Hockney's choice of the cook's head came from a pen and ink drawing of *Eight grotesque heads* by Leonardo da Vinci held in the Windsor Castle Collection, although now seen in reverse.[148] In the last etching for *Fundvogel*, the *Lake* – shown empty to evoke the tragedy of the old lady pulled into the water – was taken from a German guide book.[149]

For the tale of *Rapunzel*, Hockney wanted a thoroughly modern interpretation of the fable and 'just made up the garden' in the first print, *Rapunzel growing in her garden*[150] and achieves a thoroughly twentieth-century look. In the next etching the peculiar figure of the *Enchantress* (illustration 36) – a term the artist preferred to 'witch' as it was less harsh – is shown ugly and old, sweeping-up in her desolate garden devoid of any growing thing, but sporting a headdress of

---

[148] Kenneth Clark, *Leondardo da Vinci drawings at Windsor Castle,* London: Phaidon, rev. 1968, catalogue number 12491, illustrated, pp. 82-83.

[149] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.

[150] See David Hockney, interviewed for the exhibition catalogue *David Hockney: Grimm's fairy tales, suite of etchings,* London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1970.

the kind found in a Brueghel painting.[151] The *Enchantress* (illustration 37) reappears in the following work, which alludes to the virgin birth as she appears incongruously as a Madonna with a Christ child, derived from a painting by Hieronymus Bosch of the *Adoration of the Magi* in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum.[152] A further allusion to the Renaissance is evident in the landscape where the figures are seated and which is dotted with trees in the manner of Leonardo. Another Renaissance reference can be found in *Rapunzel, Rapunzel, let down your hair* (illustration 38). Hockney has borrowed the image of the soldier on horseback from a detail of Paolo Uccello's painting *Hunt in the forest* of 1546 at the Ashmolean Museum.[153] Hockney also based compositions on interior drawing, such as with *Home,* the first etching for the fable, *The Boy who left home to learn Fear*, which was derived from a drawing Hockney made of the library in Sheridan Dufferin's house in Ireland. For many of the castles included the Brothers Grimm publication, Hockney derived the details from sketches and photographs he took in his travels down the Rhine. This included *The bell tower* and *The haunted castle.*[154]

The inspiration of Magritte, another artist Hockney admired, is evident in several of the etchings, including *The sexton disguised as a ghost,* which Hockney composed by drawing a handkerchief over a pencil, and which recalls the Belgian Surrealist artist's compositions of masked figures, such as *L' invention de la vie* of 1926, *L 'histoire centrale* of 1927 and *Les Amants* of 1928.[155] The figure then becomes stone in *The sexton disguised as a ghost stood still as stone*, recalling Magritte's penchant for stone motifs. A further composition, *A room full of straw* (illustration 40) in the fable *Rumpelstiltskin*, continues Magritte's inspiration and is derived in particular from his painting *Le tombeau des lutteurs* of 1960,[156] where the artist has painted a large red rose in the confined space of a room. Hockney's response was to draw in a flurry of etched marks a huge pile of hay in a room. Hockney continued the pictorial problems of how to depict gold and straw in the etchings, *Gold, A room full of straw* and

[151] Kunsthistorische Museum, Vienna, *The battle between Carnival and Lent* 1559.
[152] Collection Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, n.d. accession number 13.26.
[153] Collection Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, accession number WA1850.31.A79.
[154] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[155] Collections Marcelle Marbille; Rhode-St.-Genèse, Belgium; National Gallery of Australia, accession number 90.1583; and Louis Scutenaire, Brussels, Belgium.
[156] Collection Marcelle Hoursy Torczyner-Siva; David Sylvester (editor), *René Magritte, catalogue raisonée: oil paintings, objects and bronzes*, 1949-1967 volume III, Antwerp, London: The Merrill Foundation, Philip Wilson Publishers, 1993, catalogue 912.

Straw on the left, gold on the right, which he had previously explored in 1961 with his first foray into the subject of Rumpelstiltskin.

For *Cold water about to hit the prince* (illustration 39), a painting by Carpaccio from Galleria dell' Accademia di Venezia, *Il martirio dei pellegrini e funerali della santa* served as inspiration.[157] Further sources for this story are stills from a horror movie, while for the fable *Old Rinkrank*, the building appearing in the glass mountain was taken from a photograph. The princess with her hands clasped as if pleading as she is threatened by old Rinkrank is drawn from Uccello's *Saint George and the dragon* at the Musée Jacquemart-André in Paris.[158] The final source for Hockney for the Grimm Tales is himself, and in the three last images relating to Rumpelstiltskin he recycled his own figure of this evil character from his earlier 1961 etching. The Grimm publication provides a clear visual indication of Hockney's method of appropriation when he was most active in creating such compositions. His eye was drawn to a plethora of disparate elements in terms of medium, chronology and style and yet the young artist was able to synthesise these elements to produce a coherent, albeit unusual body of work related to tales all too familiar. Overall the Brothers Grimm publication revealed the richness and the depth of Hockney's sources and inspiration, which sets him apart from his Pop Art colleagues. His experimental use of the etched line, his idiosyncratic selection of found sources, combined with an equally quirky and individual style allowed Hockney to produce a major print narrative of his time.

In order to have an image on each page without having to print a sheet twice, the paper for the book was folded double in the Japanese manner. Because of the nature of the stories and the need for details, the prints are more complex in the use of line compared to the Cavafy etchings, although some of the images are startling in their simplicity. The series was published by Paul Cornwall-Jones for the newly established Petersburg Press, in which John Kasmin had a small interest.[159] Multiple editions were made, along with a reproduction of the book produced for Oxford University Press. Like the preceding Cavafy project, it was innovative in its conception and in its execution. It was also an inventive combination of ideas and inspiration, which clearly engaged the artist and

---

[157] Collection Galleria dell' Accademia di Venezia, *Il Martirio del pellegrini e funerali della santa* 1493.
[158] Collection Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris, accession number 1038.
[159] John Kasmin in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 4 December 2003.

resulted in an important contribution to the tradition of the *livre d'artiste* – unusually so for the times. The exercise shows Hockney's spirited amalgam of ideas and his delight with all things visual no matter what kind of pictorial source he engages with.

The two publications of Cavafy poetry and Grimms fairy tales are important as they are transitionary, marking a move away from drawing on existing imagery towards drawing from life. This was to become the next major focus for the artist as he matured as a printmaker.

Chapter 5: Figuring it out – Portraiture

In the mid 1960s Hockney developed a growing interest in portraiture, slowly abandoning the whimsical, the unexpected and the imaginative for a more naturalistic style. As Hockney's engagement with figurative art had evolved, he was increasingly at odds with proponents of emerging contemporary art movements such as Minimalism and Conceptualism. The figurative movement of Pop Art was at the forefront of modernity in the late 1950s and into the sixties. Hockney, with his gift of appropriation, synthesis, literary and art-historical inspiration, as well as inclusion of popular references, could be seen as part of this style. Once considered a figure in the avant-garde, now his art appeared to have little to do with newly emerging styles. When abstract and theoretical ideas became fashionable in the sixties and seventies, Hockney was at odds with their aims, especially with his own constant references to the past, including the adoption of longstanding artistic devices such as the double portrait or images within images. His obdurate focus on the human form as subject matter was also considered by some observers in the art world as old fashioned and out of line with new artistic developments. The *enfant terrible* who burst onto the artistic world stage in the early sixties had no place in new strands of contemporary art practice as it was now developing. This suggests the original classification of Hockney as an artist at the cutting edge was miscast; considering his extraordinary sense of originality, his drive for independence of approach, he would never be an artist who would follow new styles and new movements as they occurred in the recent history of art.

In the mid 1960s Hockney developed a keen interest in making portraits from life, with a drawing of his father *Kenneth Hockney* 1965 and a painting *Portrait of Nick Wilder* 1966, of his friend, the art dealer. Wilder is shown as a ready likeness and chest-high in his pool at home in Los Angeles. The water remains schematised in the manner of Hockney's earlier style of organic flowing forms coupled with the occasional spaghetti-like line. Overall the composition is a fusion of naturalism and artistic device. Noting the change, 'There'd been portraits but they weren't real people', Hockney said of the intervening period between his Bradford days and the mid sixties. Instead he had created types and fantasy figures and, if there were individuals, they were made in the manner of caricaturist *portraits charges*, or in the British tradition of caricature

belonging to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Friends like the long-legged, free-wheeling and dancing Peter Crutch had their features exaggerated to suggest their personality and to add a whimsical flavour to the composition. In his etched self-portraits found in *A rake's progress* and elsewhere, Hockney depicts himself in a caricaturist manner as a self-deprecating young man awkwardly negotiating the world around him.

Hockney's art then changed. The new approach of working from life went hand in hand with Hockney's move towards Naturalism. It allowed the artist to concentrate on the specific and the detailed and to introduce the personal and sentimental in his art, something he considered absent in much of abstract art and which he wrestled with in his etchings from the early 1960s. Hockney wanted to add the human touch. In his move towards naturalistic portraiture Hockney was able to develop his skills as a draughtsman. In this change Hockney had both as example and inspiration Picasso's switch from Cubism to Classicism in the 1920s, a move for which the Spanish artist was frequently criticised as a 'call to order'.[160] Picasso, who was not interested in academic art, saw Classicism both as part of his Mediterranean cultural heritage, and a tradition favoured by artists he admired like Ingres and, much later, Emile-Antoine Bourdelle. In Picasso's eyes, Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, not Jean-Léon Gérôme, was the true inheritor of the classic tradition. Ingres showed the twentieth-century generation of artists that Classicism could be sexually appealing and explore passion. Hockney now chose a style of Naturalism to explore personal themes and experiences.

In Hockney's move towards Naturalism, he too was not interested in academic classicism, but rather saw his new style as liberating, which allowed him to work in a figurative manner 'to me, moving into more naturalism was a freedom. I though if I want to I could paint a portrait, this is what I meant by freedom ...'[161] For Hockney, it mattered that he could render human experience using the

---

[160] For discussions on this subject see Ulrich Weisner (editor), *Picasso's Klassizismus: Werke 1914-1934,* Stuttgart: Edition Cantz, 1988; Elizabeth Cowling & Jennifer Mundy, *On classic ground: Picasso, Léger, de Chirico and the New Classicism 1910-1930*, London: Tate Gallery 1990; Rubin, William (editor), *Picasso and portraiture: representation and transformation*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1996. For the French artist André Derain's early and formative role in this *rappel à l'ordre*, see Jane Lee, London, New York: Phaidon Press, 1990. For a more substantial bibliography on the topic see William Rubin, 'Reflections on Picasso and portraiture,' *Picasso and portraiture: representation and transformation*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1996, note 59, p. 103.
[161] *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p.104.

figure, and portraiture was a perfect genre to develop this interest. Hockney considered he was a natural portraitist and could aspire to be a gifted and perfective portraitist. This was something he believed was a skill and that could not really be taught:

> Obviously it is important that a portrait looks like somebody. In the long, long run it probably doesn't matter because ... who knows what they look like. But yes, when you are doing it, I think it does ... In a way portraiture is an instinct, not every artist is a good portraitist, it is an instinct, it is something you can't quite teach, I don't think ... You couldn't teach portraiture. I think certain people are interested in it all the time ... I'm always interested in doing portraits, I have periods when I do a lot and periods when I don't.[162]

As well as making portraits in painting and drawing, Hockney also made portraits in print. From the latter half of the 1960s and early 1970s Hockney had made a series of etchings of close friends and lovers, as well as the occasional still life and interior view. The intimate nature of the etching process was most suited to this technique. In the manner of James McNeill Whistler, Hockney was in the habit of taking his etching plates with him on his travels. Whistler had in his time ruffled English etchers' feathers by such a casual approach, as well as his 'artistic printing'. Inspired by this, Hockney continued the tradition of the wandering etcher. Many of Hockney's etchings were drawn directly onto the plate in a style which replaced the complexity of hatching, aquatinting and reworked line, with a newly found simplicity.

Acknowledged as an extraordinarily gifted draughtsman, Hockney became noted for his sensitive, beautifully rendered portraits of lovers, family and friends. In portraiture, Hockney continued the more simplified depictions, also seen in his Cavafy etchings, but at the same time he subtlety captures the characters of his sitters. For *John Kasmin twice*, for instance, the dealer is shown in a double portrait, the one in a more formal pose, dressed in a tie, coat, hat and spectacles, alert and ready for action; the other as a casual figure on holiday in little more than a singlet. In *Ossie and Mo*, we see the modest, smiling and gentle figure from the waist up of Hockney's assistant and model Mo, seated behind the more anguished character of fashion designer Ossie Clark, whose dissipated look and flamboyant clothing suggest an unhappy

---

[162] David Hockney interviewed by Melvyn Bragg in the documentary *Hockney at the Tate*, edited and presented by Melvyn Bragg, London, A London Weekend Television South Bank Show/RM Arts Co-Production, 1988.

future. Clark's wife, Celia Birtwell, is shown big-eyed and dainty, dressed in one of her husband's creations made from one of her exquisite fabric designs.

The object of Hockney's affection at this time was the tousle-haired and handsome Peter Schlesinger, whom he had met while teaching at the University of California in 1966. Standing nude with his hands on his hips, his body radically foreshortened, Schlesinger stares out with a certain arrogant air. Artist Richard Hamilton, who taught at the Royal College,[163] is seated and smoking a cigar and looking directly at the viewer with considerable authority, perhaps indicating the teacher–pupil relationship. Further depictions of Mo have the feeling of holiday snaps, with Mo sleeping (illustration 41) on a richly decorated sun chair, or casually dressed in a singlet and seated on a chair with leaves on the ground, suggesting Hockney has made these etchings *en plein air.*

All these portraits and still lifes were published by Petersburg Press and were editioned either by Payne in London or by Shirley Clement at the Print Shop in Amsterdam. One final print, it seems, was required by Petersburg, and so Hockney produced an image of a lithographic stone over which was a sheet of paper with an image of the artist's desk and the legend 'An etching and a lithograph for Editions Alecto 1973'; thus fulfilling his obligations to the publisher. This mischievous retort reminds us of Hockney's creation of *Life painting for a diploma* of 1962, which was the prerequisite for the then student to graduate. Such personal portraiture of the kind found in these etchings of the late 1960s and early 1970s had little in common with the work of the later generation abstractionists, such as Helen Frankenthaler, Frank Stella or Morris Louis, or Minimalists Donald Judd and Sol le Witt. Hockney was in the process of developing a singular art style and a figurative one, with the emphasis on the human form, which had few if any links with the developing art trends of avant-garde artists.

Rarely did Hockney make portraits of those he had not met. For this reason he has only accepted two portrait commissions in his life time. The first of these was *Portrait of David Webster*, 1971, which was commissioned for the Royal Opera House, Convent Garden after Webster's retirement as Chief Executive Officer in 1970. More recently Hockney portrayed Sir George and Lady Christie

---

[163] See details of Richard Hamilton's employment at the RCA in footnote 55 of this section.

who directed and managed the Glyndebourne Opera Festival.[164] Hockney spoke of his reluctance: 'It's more difficult in a pointless way I think, because first of all I feel obliged to get a likeness, which in a sense is easy to do, it's easy to draw a likeness, but it may not be that easy to capture a certain mood of somebody or things like that, which in a way is more interesting ... You know all you need to do to draw a likeness is to be able to measure the proportion of the face accurately with your eyes, that's all. It's not that difficult.'[165] Hockney had never met Auden and when he visited the great English poet on 28 October 1968 to make some drawings the experience had not been a success. The meeting with Auden, who was responsible for so much tender, insightful, heroic verse was in fact the opposite. Auden had not liked that Hockney was accompanied by R. B. Kitaj and Peter Schlesinger and the poet played 'a role, the grumpy man ... he gave me an impression of being rather like a headmaster of an English school'.[166] His etching, derived from one of three drawings of Auden, reflected this lack of mutual understanding.[167] There was no empathy in the portrait, no special understanding revealed in a visual way of this most influential poet. Sadly, despite Auden's brilliance as a literary figure and the admiration a young homosexual might have for this aging gay icon, the viewer and the viewed did not connect on anything but the most basic of levels. Hockney depicted Auden in only the most superficial of manners.

Familiarity did not always ensure that Hockney's portraits were a success, however, as Hockney observed when filmed at Gemini GEL in 1973:

> I promised I'd paint a picture of my parents, and that's a lot more difficult than I thought, at first ... I kind of started it two years ago. And I've not started the painting yet, but I've done a lot of drawings and ... everything and I ... still can't quite figure out how to do it. Because ... your relationship with your parents is something ... that you'd really have to figure out before you do it. That's what it's about, and ... I still don't.'[168]

In tandem with the exploration of portraiture in etching in the United Kingdom, Hockney experimented further in lithography when in the United States with

[164] Marco Livingstone and Kay Heymer, *Portraits and people*, London: Thames and Hudson, 2003, pp. 112-113.
[165] David Hockney in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer,* Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[166] *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p.194.
[167] Ulrich Luckardt & Paul Melia, *David Hockney: a drawing retrospective,* San Francisco: Chronicle Books in Association with Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1995, cat. 66 and p.128.
[168] Transcript of the film of David Hockney interviewed at Gemini GEL in Los Angeles, 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN403 _IRN136497+CAN403_IRN136498.

Tyler. Hockney's embrace of lithography and his recognition of its potential, as well as issues arising from collaboration in a print workshop, will be explored later in this chapter. It was the print technique of lithograph that was suited to his naturalistic drawing style. Although lithography was more technically complicated, it offered a different range of lines, textures and tones from etching. Hockney had already worked in lithography with Tyler at the Tamarind and Gemini workshops and he then returned to work at Gemini GEL for a later exploration of the medium. For Hockney:

> It's the best workshop to work in. I think [for] ... lithography, I tried to do them in London, I have not done many ... since I worked here which was [in 1965] ... I've only done about 6 lithographs, in between. I don't think I have done any more than 6. And they're all just done singularly; I mean I've just done one. And I have never really got into it because I think to do them, lithographs; you've to really stop everything else and spend a lot of time, all the day, doing them. And they do take quite, especially if you've drawn them the way I do, they take a long time to do.[169]

Hockney was one of the artists encouraged to come to the Tyler workshop, producing in 1967 the experimental double portrait of Henry Geldzahler and partner Christopher Scott seated at a hotel in Hollywood, the Château Marmont (illustration 42). Hockney had a growing interest in the idea of a double portrait because the form introduced the interaction between the two sitters and their emotional attachments. For the double portrait of Geldzahler and Scott, in an edition of fifteen, Hockney added further personal hand-drawn elements, in contrast to the Stella reproductions, such as Geldzahler's red glasses and a beard. He added different coloured lines in crayon and watercolour, which linked the two sitters and emphasised their personal relationship. The following year he produced an equally experimental proof exploring the effects of a lithographic wash of Rolf Nelson (a 'hip' gallery owner in Los Angeles).[170]

From the late sixties Hockney embarked on a series of double portrait paintings, including a further portrait of Geldzahler and Scott in 1969. In this he followed a rich tradition of portraiture, harking back to the Renaissance, with notable

---

[169] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN449_IRN134680+CAN449_IRN134681.
[170] John Baldessari interviewed by Christopher Knight, 4 April 1992, Smithsonian: Archives of American Art, http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/oralhistories/transcripts/baldes92.htm viewed 12 October 2009.

examples such as Jan van Eyck's *The Anolfini Portrait*.[171] Hockney also wished that the two figures be shown in a clearly defined space, 'Like Piero della Francesca's figures in a clear space, or Fra Angelico's figures in a clear space. I like painting like that. I liked Italian painting like that and that was what I was trying.'[172] Hockney was to abandon this kind of portraiture after struggling with the painting of Wayne Sleep and his partner George Lawson. This he began in 1972 and he wrestled with the composition for over six months until he finally gave up. He had become disenchanted because of the twin problems of both painting in acrylic and his growing dissatisfaction with his naturalistic style, something noted by the art historian Marco Livingstone in his monograph on the artist.[173] Having pursued the path of Naturalism, Hockney realised his painting was at a dead end. All he was creating were empty compositions, which lacked the human touch and seemed facile.

As he had developed as an emerging artist he had moved towards depiction of the perceived world, rather than the imagined one, and he now seemed trapped in obsessive naturalism with no clear way forward. He later commented on his predicament, when asked about his use of the terms 'realism' and 'naturalism' in reaction to his art, noting that:

> The terms are not absolutely clear. Cubist painting is about realism, but it's not naturalism. Naturalism is making a representation of a chair as we actually see it. Cubism is making a representation of the chair as we know it as well.[174]

It was Hockney's view that Naturalism did 'not get the feeling across' that an artist aspired to. It instead overemphasised skills and lacked an emotional quality, which Hockney felt he too easily succumbed to at that time. In a discussion with the writer Lawrence Weschler in 2007, Hockney recalled this lost period in his development in painting in the context of a review by Mark

[171] *The portrait of Giovanni (?) Amolfini and his wife Giovanna Cenani (?)*, 1434, NG 186, *The National Gallery: complete illustrated catalogue*, compiled by Christopher Baker & Tom Henry with a supplement of new acquisitions and loans 1995-2000, London: National Gallery Company, 2001, p. 220.
[172] David Hockney interviewed by Melvyn Bragg in the documentary *Hockney at the Tate*, edited and presented by Melvyn Bragg, London, A London Weekend Television 'South Bank Show/RM Arts Co-Production, 1988.
[173] Marco Livingstone, *David Hockney*, revised and updated, London: Thames and Hudson, 1987, p. 161.
[174] David Hockney quoted in Peter Fuller, 'An interview with David Hockney', *Art monthly*, November 1977, number 12, p. 8.

Johnson in the *New York Times* of 17 March 2006.[175] He acknowledged the fallow period:

> I *did* reach a crisis with my painting there in the late seventies – partly one of sheer boredom: I mean, I knew how to paint that earlier kind of image, I'd cracked that code, and while I could have gone on quite happily making more images like that, and a lot of people, especially including a lot of dealers, would have been very happy if I had, they were no longer presenting a challenge to me. But the crisis was in fact more serious than that, because I began to notice that there was something wrong with those paintings, something which in retrospect I now realise had to do with the straitjacket asphyxiation bought on by the one-point perspective of their photographic source materials and the similarly optical vantage to which they themselves likewise aspired. This became devastatingly clear to me ... with that painting I kept trying to complete of the view across the street from my studio on Santa Monica Boulevard ... precisely around that time, in the late seventies, the one I never was able to finish – because I couldn't seem to bring it alive. It kept feeling dead. ...[T]he past twenty-five years for me have been a consistent struggle through all sorts of other media with that single fixed problem of how to depict an image in a lively way, one, that is, that is true to life...[176]

Hockney's use of photography at this stage seemed to limit his ability to paint. For much of Hockney's art practice, photography had not really been an art form per se; rather it has been a facilitator and an *aide memoir* for painting or printmaking:

> When I'm doing a big painting often as well I take photographs. But I don't really like working from photographs much. Because they don't tell you enough. You don't get enough view to simplify. But they are good for jogging the memory. You know you can remember things with them. So I take photographs as memory.[177]

The problem that arose at this time in his artistic development was that the photographic look was taking over the look of his own style. Although this pervading photographic naturalism affected some of his print compositions, he managed to avoid in his printmaking some of the worst excesses of this 'straightjacket' in his painting style of the early 1970s.

Later in Los Angeles Hockney had continued making prints at Gemini GEL after Tyler had left the partnership with Stanley Grinstein and Sidney Felsen. In 1974

[175] Lawrence Weschler, ' A return to painting (2007)', *True to Life*, University of California Press, 2008, pp. 204-222.
[176] Lawrence Weschler, ' A return to painting (2007)', *True to life*, University of California Press, 2008, pp. 206-207.
[177] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN449_IRN134680+CAN449_IRN134681.

Tyler established Tyler Ltd at Bedford Village on the East Coast of America. At Gemini GEL in the post-Tyler era, Hockney returned to the workshop and produced a series of formal portraits in lithography from February to May in 1976 and later that year in November produced a series of portraits drawn from life with many well-known identities and friends trouping into the workshop to sit for the artist in a space especially reserved for Hockney to draw. This included Nicholas Wilder, Joe McDonald (illustration 57), Gregory Evans (who had been introduced to Hockney by Wilder), Henry Geldzahler, a self-portrait, Brooke Hopper, photographer Don Cribb, writer Michael Crichton, Mo McDermott, Maurice Payne, and Hollywood writer and director Billy Wilder. With the exception of two powerful portraits of Geldzahler, the works, which are mostly formal portraits, do suffer from a certain glib photographic naturalism, although technically they are drawn with great skill on lithographic stone using a tusche crayon.

In contrast, however, *Henry at table* shows Geldzahler seated at a table in profile (illustration 58). Hockney's careful eye for detail is apparent in his facial features, the clasping of the hands and the beautifully rendered, decoratively patterned tablecloth with a pot plant. *Henry seated with tulips* depicts this powerful and influential figure in Hockney's life seated looking straight at the artist, whose reflection appears in a mirror, in the manner of a picture within a picture (illustration 59). This recalls the compositional device that was so favoured by Diego Velázquez and other Spanish Baroque artists, where complexity and enhanced depth was added to the composition. Hockney has paid attention to the detail of Geldzahler's facial features and stance, along with a beautiful rendition of a pot of tulips, showing how his skill in lithography had evolved. For this more complex portrait of Geldzahler, Hockney combined crayon and wash drawn on stone and plates, the artist in experimental mode and producing 21 trial proofs before the final RTP.

Hockney also made a double portrait of artist Don Bachardy and his partner the writer Christopher Isherwood, which he drew at the couple's house, and a single portrait of the artist Man Ray, whom he had met and drawn in Paris. The Bachardy and Isherwood double portrait was drawn on transfer paper, but this was the exception to the usual method Hockney employed at the time as he usually preferred to draw or paint directly onto a lithographic stone or plate

(illustration 60). For another portrait of Geldzahler and the portrait of Payne, Hockney drew directly with a brush and liquid tusche onto aluminium plates in a freer drawing style (illustration 61). In that year Hockney produced several studies of Gregory Evans, including two sensitively and eloquently drawn male nudes, *Gregory reclining* and *Gregory with gym sock,* which were published by Gemini in the following year. Hockney had met Evans though the art dealer Nick Wilder in 1974 and they became sexual partners. As examples of homoerotic subject matter, they are remarkable for their beauty and their tenderness and intimacy (illustrations 62 and 63). Evans remained a favourite subject for Hockney's portraiture over the decades.

Section 3: collaboration and beyond

Chapter 1: The art of collaboration

On occasions printmaking proved a welcome relief for Hockney when the direction of his painting was faltering. In the early 1970s Hockney had used an opportunity to escape from the artistic cul de sac in his painting career and accepted an invitation to Tyler's workshop, working in another medium. In January 1973 he returned to Gemini GEL. 'I had been trying to get David to work again over the years', Tyler remembered of this period, 'and at long last he decided to work ... The last time we worked together was in 1971 on a single lithograph titled *Sofa 8501 Hedges Place*.'[1]-Hockney was accompanied by Celia Birtwell and Henry Geldzahler and they stayed both at the Château Marmont and at Malibu. During the months of January to April 1973 Hockney attended the new Gemini GEL workshop and 'worked off and on' there with Ken Tyler. The experience of the regular development of ideas, of images and exploration of the possibilities of the lithographic process paid considerable dividends and Hockney was to produce some of his finest lithographs there.

In the double portrait of Geldzahler and Scott, Hockney had wittily placed a collage of Frank Stella's lithograph *Club Onyx* from the *Black series* of 1967 in the background, hanging on a wall. For his double portrait of Geldzahler and Scott, Hockney had playfully reproduced Stella's reproductive prints, taking just one of the two geometric forms by Stella and placing this upside down – a reproduction in an original lithograph. Stella was also working at Gemini at about this time – another 'catch' of Gemini GEL. Tyler had cajoled Stella into making prints at the workshop and had made many overtures to persuade the artist to work with him. Initially, Stella rejected Tyler's approaches, responding that he couldn't work by drawing with tusche because he only drew with felt-tipped pens. Tyler took this as a challenge, as always, and disguised lithographic tusche as ink in a marker pen — and that, according to Tyler, 'seduced him'.[2]

Stella remembered resisting 'as hard as I could', but Tyler persisted and Stella found himself 'chained' in the studio surrounded by aluminium plates and left to

---

[1] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 26 June 2002.
[2] Pat Gilmour, *Innovation in collaborative printmaking: Kenneth Tyler 1963-1992*, Tokyo: The Yomiuri Shimbun and the Japan Association of Art Museums, 1992, p. 168.

draw on them with lithographic crayon.[3] Thus began the collaboration of these two dynamic figures that was to last for over 30 years, and which was described by the art critic and author Robert Hughes as 'one of the great partnerships in modern American art'.[4] At the beginning of the relationship, Stella was lukewarm about making prints:

> I could only see it as a reproductive medium, as in making reproductions of images – you make a print of a painting … I could see prints for their own sake but they were sort of like drawings to me. … I made some in the beginning, but they were basically about making drawings and reproducing those drawings as prints.[5]

Black series represents the reproductive approach by Stella at that stage, drawn as they were from his earlier black painting series. In contrast Hockney did not see printmaking initially as a reproductive art form. His understanding and valuing of prints as an art form enabled him to produce significant prints from the beginning, unlike Stella, who took some time to recognise the potential of printmaking and how he could best make use of Tyler's considerable talent. Instead, and from the very beginning, Hockney saw the experience of working in a lithographic workshop as a means to produce a different kind of art. Working at Gemini GEL with Tyler provided him with an extraordinary opportunity to take full advantage of what the technique of lithography could offer him and the considerable skills Tyler could provide. The collaborative method of printing enabled him to produce some major prints in his oeuvre. However, the print workshop experience also had a down side. It limited the artist's sense of spontaneity and his control.

In the past and at the prompting of Paul Cornwall-Jones, Hockney had made lithographs with Atelier Desjobert in Paris. The technicalities of lithography as a printing process usually required that artists needed a skilled printer to work with them. This tradition of printing was catered for in Paris particularly well with several important workshops. Edmond Desjobert had established his lithography workshop in the 1930s and, like Fernand Mourlot and before him Auguste Clot, worked with the leading artists of his day. At the Desjobert workshop in 1968 Hockney produced three composed landscapes harking back to his earlier style, Tree, Rocks, Nevada and An imaginary landscape. He also produced an examination of surface and form in Glass table with objects of

---

[3] Frank Stella, 'Melrose Avenue', Frank Stella at Tyler Graphics, Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1997, p. 33.
[4] Robert Hughes, Frank Stella: the Swan engravings, Fort Worth: Fort Worth Art Museum, 1984, p. 5.
[5] Frank Stella, quoted in Siri Engbert, 'Imaginary places and the art of the everyday', in Frank Stella at Tyler Graphics, Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1997, p. 10.

1969, but there was never the collaborative momentum he found with Tyler's workshops. That year too, Hockney made two portraits of the photojournalist, collector and writer on lithography, Felix Man,[6] and *The connoisseur* of 1969 with Stanley Jones at Curwen Press. A graduate of the Slade, who had also trained in Paris, Jones established the lithography workshop at Curwen Studio in 1956. In an unassuming way this gently spoken master printer provided artists with sound advice and a wealth of knowledge. This contrasted with the *modus operandi* of Tyler, who delighted in providing artists with newly developed technical innovations, almost like a magician.

Hockney has remained an artist who is often process driven as a way to explore new directions further and the experience assisted him in his desire for change. At this time at Gemini he honed his skills in making lithography. Hockney was to become more adept at using this technique and Tyler was able to give skilled technical assistance, providing the artist with a 'complete palette of colour' and a 'complete palette of drawing techniques'.[7] This was something Hockney had never been offered so comprehensively before. At the early stages of their collaboration, Hockney welcomed the environment of the Tyler workshop, noting that:

> I think making say a six colour lithograph; I think it is almost impossible to do on your own. [It's] really very difficult … It takes a long time. Whereas if you do them here, the way they organise everything, at least you know your pencils are always sharpened. When you've done one stone another is ready instantly. And you can make the tracings easily and quickly. I mean it's terrific. … All the chore of it is taken away from you, so you can concentrate on just making the drawings, which is terrific. It does make life easier … My original intention I came with was to do six colour lithographs. And I calculated it would take me two months to do six colour lithographs. Which I suppose it would have done. And then I kept stopping and breaking off from the *Weather* [series] and doing other things. -But I suppose those prints did take two months to do.'[8]

At Gemini GEL Hockney went on to produce a group of innovative, eclectic and amusing prints, the *Weather series*. With this series Hockney explored the pictorial problem of how you depict the weather, as he had previously sought to solve the problem of how you depict water or reflections in a mirror. He began with *Rain*, inspired by the Japanese woodcut (illustration 44). The theme of rain

---

[6] The National Gallery of Australia holds an extensive collection of Man's lithographs, including rare and unique proofs belonging to the incunabula.
[7] Ken Tyler in the documentary *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer*, Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[8] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive,

had already been explored in his painting *The Japanese rain on canvas* of 1972. The particular painting was his response to a visit to Japan in November 1971. Once again the fantasy world of Hockney's notion of Japan bore little resemblance to the reality of his experience; he would find the country to be 'extremely ugly'.[9] The Japan he depicted was his dream of Japan and the Japanese aesthetic was not based on his travels there. The visit to Japan did provide him with the opportunity to see an exhibition *Japanese in the traditional style*, and in particular a painting called *Osaka in the rain*, which appealed to him, 'I thought it exceedingly beautiful. The misty clouds over the river and street were suggested only by the thin bars of rain, and the little cars and people walking about all had just the slightest suggestion of reflection under them, making the whole thing look extremely wet.'[10]

On his return to London in 1972 Hockney painted *The Japanese rain on canvas*, which, according to the artist, 'is painted in thin washes of colour soaked on to the canvas and, because I was anxious to make the heavily stylised falling rains stand out, I filled a watering-can and let it drip all over the canvas'.[11] Another response was the *Weather series* of colour lithographs he made at the Gemini GEL workshop beginning with *Rain*. Instead of dripping paint on a canvas, Hockney had ink dripping onto a lithographic stone. 'I did it kind of as a joke really. I loved the idea of the rain as it hit the ink it would make the ink run. The moment I thought of the idea I couldn't resist it.' The playful nexus of subject and technique was something that had great appeal to the artist.

Hockney then turned his attention to other ideas relating to the theme of the weather, inventing the series as he proceeded, drawing directly on his personal experience of Californian weather and exploring different kinds of lines, tones and colours as he investigated the sun, mist and storms. The exception was for *Snow* where he drew on the Japanese *ukiyo-e* print tradition of masters like Hiroshige. For *Sun* Hockney drew the bright Californian sun streaming through an open shuttered window, falling on – and almost disappearing through a long shadow onto a table (illustration 43). For the various versions of *Mist* there are the unmistakable palm trees of Los Angeles shrouded in softly coloured fog, an element that was seemingly ever present in that city. In this context, Hockney

[9] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 242.
[10] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 242.
[11] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 247.

explained how often he set out to solve visual problems and that much of his art develops from his interest in how to solve a problem. The *Weather series* exemplifies his artistic process: 'The point really was that as the prints grew, the subject matter which on the surface is the weather, but the other subject matter is really the weather drawn. Because in each one the problem was not just making a representation of the weather … but how to draw it. I liked the problem of how to draw a mist. The one thing I didn't really want to do was spray it: you know, it's too easy … At first I wanted to do it with light, just ruling the light. And it didn't really quite work. In the end we designed some ways to do it. But it was finding out just ways of doing it. It means that the subject of the prints is not just the weather: the subject matter is drawing.'[12]

Drawing the weather was the problem he had posed himself and the series proved successful in solving this problem, although it took time for the artist to find solutions. For the composition of *Wind*, 'I couldn't quite figure out how … to make a visual representation of wind, because normally only the effects of wind show themselves (illustration 45). So I kept thinking of palm trees bending and everything and it all seemed just a little bit corny or ordinary.' Hockney found a solution to this problem one day at Malibu beach when he noticed paper being tossed in the wind, 'It suddenly it dawned on me, I'll simply do all the other prints I've done blowing away across Melrose Avenue'.[13] In this composition he included the new address for Gemini GEL just as he had for the old workshop address for the *Hollywood Collection* in 1965. At the same time as making the series Hockney also made variants continuing the exploration of weather and lithography. The whole experience of a slow consideration of ideas and an evolution and selection of appropriate techniques at the workshop allowed Hockney to create a body of work of great consequence coupled with technical ingenuity.

Following the *Weather series* prints, Hockney began making portraits again. A special 'studio' was set up for him at the Gemini workshop, where his subjects could sit so that the artist could draw directly onto a plate or stone. 'I take the old fashioned view of a print', he remarked in amusement, 'you should actually draw it.'[14] His close friend Celia Birtwell was a particular favourite when she visited Hockney from London. She became a special muse. In February 1973, Hockney had rented a house at Malibu and Celia and her two sons, Albert and

[12] Ken Tyler in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer,* Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[13] David Hockney in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer,* Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[14] David Hockney quoted in Ruth E. Fine, *Gemini GEL: art and collaboration,* Washington: National Gallery of Art; New York: Abbeville Press, 1984, p. 146.

George from her marriage with Ossie Clark, came and stayed with him there. Hockney began a series of extraordinary lithographic portraits of Celia – someone whom by now he had drawn many times for almost four years. These portraits are of a woman of great beauty, exquisite in dresses designed by her husband and using her own fabric designs.[15] Hockney's portraits reveal the great tenderness of feeling the artist has for Celia. In *Celia smoking*, for instance, Hockney captured the essence of his sitter with detailed and delicate facial features, framed by tumbling locks of hair. The nod of her head and the shrug of her shoulders add to this gentle rendition of his close friend (illustration 46). In *Celia*, the facial features, tumbling locks, turn of her head all contribute to a similar portrayal; although this time she is dressed in a diaphanous gown reminiscent of a rococo painting (illustration 47). Only in *Celia 8365* is the spell of this artist and model relationship less fanciful, as if the artist and model have come back to earth, and Celia in an elaborate dress looks directly at the viewer with a blank stare.

The range and subtlety of washes Hockney could achieve at the Tyler workshop was something he had never before been offered so comprehensively; and the lithographic process-ideally suited an artist who liked to draw from life and who did so in such an accomplished manner. Drawing with tusche directly onto a stone could have its problems and in the case of *Celia smoking*, three months of careful drawing during the process was put at risk as Hockney felt he had drawn the shoulder incorrectly. When this was being filmed, Hockney seemed overwhelmed by Tyler's enthusiasm to help. Celia who was extremely close to Hockney, noted the discomfort and the following exchange took place:

> Tyler. This is quite beautiful
> Hockney: Can I have that mailed?
> Celia: David doesn't like it
> Tyler: You don't like it?
> Hockney: No …
> Tyler: We should print it anyway
> Celia: Is that sufficient?
> Hockney: Yeah
> Tyler: That is lovely.[16]

---

[15] For his designs see Judith Watt, *Ossie Clark 1964-74*, London: V&A Publications, 2003. The relationship of Celia and her husband was a major theme in his diaries. See Ossie Clark, *The Ossie Clark diaries*, edited and introduced by Lady Henrietta Rous, London: Bloomsbury, 1998.
[16] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN429_IRN134682+CAN429_IRN134683.

Despite the workshop scene being one that to a degree was staged, there was an obvious tension, with Tyler's overwhelming enthusiasm, Hockney's reticence and Celia 'reading' the artist's concerns in these circumstances.

However, when Hockney made an error in his drawing on the stone for *Celia smoking*, Tyler's great talent as a printer came to the fore. At the risk of entering the private world of artist and model, Tyler proposed that this portion of the drawing could be patched and the offending lines of lithographic tusche be washed off, allowing the artist to redraw that part of the composition. Hockney, according to Tyler, 'Happens to be somebody who put a tremendous amount of effort into making the best lithographs we could, and he's capable of doing just a simple drawing and it's brilliant'. When a problem arose with the artist's drawing on the lithographic stone, Tyler was able to assist: 'So what you do is you just pull out your reservoir of techniques and say, "'Wash it off, because we can add it here, we can do this, you can do that, we can cut the shoulder-blade off because you can redraw it again five times if you want to. You know, there's a lot of things that you can do ... I just had to volunteer the information, regardless of how he was going to accept it ... And unless we did that little surgical operation, I don't think there would have been a *Celia smoking.*"'[17] This portrait, despite the technical problems, remains one of the artist's finest. Hockney was greatly appreciative of Tyler's support. The printer's keenness to please, to encourage the artist to proceed in directions that he thought would be fruitful, however, grated with the artist and this can be seen in the unedited filming of the workshop during 1973.

Generally speaking, in the collaborative atmosphere of Gemini GEL and along with the *Weather series*, Hockney was able to produce some extraordinary portraits made up of 'delicate washes' and 'thin crayon lines' which would not disappear.[18] Subsequently Tyler spoke of this kind of collaboration at his various workshops: 'I have always thought of myself as a facilitator taking the artist's needs and trying to come up with solutions. Often, this meant re-inventing something to accommodate a new idea. As disciplines are blurred in collaboration, the creative flow loses all of its edges and often there is no clear distinction between who did what. I intentionally preferred this approach so no one person dominated the new processes or techniques over the art work. It worked most of the time!'[19]

[17] Ken Tyler in the documentary, *Reaching out: Ken Tyler, master printer*, Avery Tirce productions, 1976.
[18] David Hockney quoted in Ruth E. Fine, *Gemini GEL: Art and Collaboration*, Washington: National Gallery of Art; New York: Abbeville Press, 1984 p.146.
[19] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 29 October 2003.

During his stay at Gemini GEL, Hockney made other lithographic portraits; Tyler sat for him, along with Henry Geldzahler. Hockney drew a small lithograph executed in a rapid fashion of Geldzahler who was visiting Los Angeles. In contrast, the artist prepared a formal portrait of Tyler, who eagerly sat for two days in a pose for the artist. It amused Hockney that his printer, usually a human dynamo of activity, so enthusiastically sat still for his portrait and that he would sacrifice all this time for such a venture. The result was *The Master Printer of Los Angeles*, where the artist has captured the contained energy and great willingness of his sitter to please (illustration 48). Hockney has included the artistic conceit of an image within an image. This was a traditional artistic device used notably in Spanish Baroque painting and known as a *bodegón.*][20] In this case behind the sitter there is the proof of the colour lithograph *Rain* on the wall. In an example of stunning dexterity, to replicate the composition as it appears in the *Weather* series, the artist had to draw it in reverse. Similarly, the Hiroshige-inspired landscape of 'Snow' appears in the background in one Celia portrait, again drawn in reverse to achieve the correct view when printed. It was a fitting conclusion to the series of works he made with Tyler at this time. In the end the time at Gemini GEL for Hockney proved fruitful; he was able to create an important body of lithographs: 'Some much more complicated than others. I think there is one of two of them that are about eight stones each of them. And some are just one … just black and white drawings.'[21]

In a discussion with Tyler during his 1973 visit to the workshop, Hockney compared the etching process to the lithographic technique: 'You can draw on the plate and you can leave it for a bit. I mean I do those [etchings] at home … You don't need a great number of people to help you … really, one person. You can even do them yourself if you've got one person who helps prepare your plates which I do in London. Whereas to proof a lithograph, a six colour lithograph, just to proof, it is going to take at least a day … to get one print. To proof an etching would take 20 minutes.' Tyler responded, '[A] good example, is your nine colour *Snow* has taken us a week and ten days to print it in proof form for you. And it's taken us two months to print the edition.' Hockney replied, 'I think, I mean the only way to do lithographs is to break off doing everything else and just decide to devote a month to it, or two weeks, or well like in this case I've spent [90 days].'[22]

---

[20] For example, Diego Velázquez's tour de force portrait painting, *Las Meninas*, 1656.
[21] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, 98.
[22] Transcript of David Hockney filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN449_IRN134680+CAN449_IRN134681.

For much of his career in the next decades of his development as an artist making prints, Hockney would move from lithography to intaglio printing and back again. He would also seek the benefits or be cajoled into working in a collaborative manner in a print workshop. Hockney would then retreat to make prints on his own, developing his own techniques and skills in printmaking.

Chapter 2: *The human clay* and the ghost of Picasso

By the early 1970s Hockney possessed an ability to draw the human figure that was uncanny, born of years of practice, which honed a remarkable natural ability. He also was becoming increasingly vocal in his public advocacy of contemporary figurative art. With his focus on the human figure and the value he placed on drawing, Hockney, like his friend R. B. Kitaj was at odds with certain quarters of the art world at this time that subscribed to the idea of a permanent avant-garde. Hockney considered it 'absurd' that such a notion was still held in the 1970s: 'Ron Kitaj was telling me about an argument he was having with someone at the Tate Gallery who was saying how they should support advanced art, as though it was a fight. It sounds as though it's 1910, not 1975.'[23] Once the *enfant terrible* of the London art scene, Hockney and Kitaj, who had taken this world by storm, now appeared to some to belong to the old guard in art, out of step with their time, and linked to an older generation of artists working in Britain.

In 1976 Kitaj prepared an exhibition, *The human clay*, for the Arts Council of Great Britain. Kitaj took the title of the exhibition from a poem by W. H. Auden, *Letter to Lord Byron*, which incorporates this Byronic term and includes the line, 'To me Art's subject is the human clay', which was a favourite quote of Hockney's. Kitaj referred to a 'School of London', which included Hockney. Although the term had been coined by David Sylvester and Patrick Heron in the late 1940s, Kitaj broadened the interpretation. For Kitaj, the importance of the School of London was its focus on the figure and less about the dichotomy of the abstract and figurative traditions – requesting only that contributing artists 'should point to where the head was, the arms, the legs etc. in case I couldn't make it out easily'.[24] In his introduction to the catalogue, Kitaj also argued that the figure remains 'the most basic art-idea from which so much great art has come',[25] and the exhibition of some 45 artists' work, including Hockney's, was testimony to this.

Subsequently in early 1977 Hockney and Kitaj appeared nude on the cover of *The New Review* (dubbed *The Nude Review*) and in an accompanying article argued for the return of the human figure in art. 'It's perfectly clear that you cannot ignore form in art', Hockney argued, 'But in the last fifty years form has

---

[23] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 129.
[24] R. B. Kitaj, *The human clay,* London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976 pp. [2-3].
[25] R. B. Kitaj, *The human clay,* London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976 p. [1].

been made everything and that is as bad as making content everything, when you finish up with banal illustration. In making form everything you finish up with a formalist art that disappears in on itself.'[26] Later that year and early in 1978 *Art Monthly* published in two issues Hockney's interview with art critic and writer Peter Fuller, where he continued to be highly critical of what he termed 'official avant-gardism'. Here he complained that:

> The official art world in England is run by middle-class people, who have a certain view of art. That's why they side with a certain view of modernism, because it covers it up.[27]

Hockney added that as a figurative artist he was 'very conscious' of the early developments in modern art. For Hockney a major source of inspiration was Picasso and by the mid 1970s the lessons learned from this artist assisted him in new developments in his own art. The fusion of figurative and modernist elements became increasingly appealing. Such an approach recalls the arguments put forward by Sylvester and Heron in the late 1940s; who considered British art could be enlivened by the fusion of the figurative and the formal, under the influence of artists such as Braque and Picasso. Hockney was now developing a new course for his art, with a new inspiration and new mentor, as well as a new proficient printer to work with.

If printmaking provided a lifeline for Hockney's artistic development on occasions, his great love of Picasso consistently provided him with new ideas and experimental approaches to his art. Hockney's passion for Picasso grew during the 1970s with his budding interest in portraiture and advocacy of figuration in contemporary art and of the value of drawing in providing new directions for the artist. The ghost of Picasso was to act as a mentor for Hockney and provided a path forward in his artistic development. After working in Los Angeles at Gemini GEL in 1973, Hockney was still unsettled in his personal life because his relationship with Peter Schlesinger had ended. He was also unsettled artistically because of problems he was experiencing in painting and he could see no immediate solution at hand. On the 8 April of that year Pablo Picasso, noted for his remarkable artistic ability, his influence and his longevity, died. Hockney felt that with Picasso's death he might be better able to evaluate the lifetime's achievement of that great twentieth-century artist. Since seeing the Picasso retrospective as a student, Picasso had held a particular place in Hockney's world. He constantly sought to emulate the master

[26] 'David Hockney in conversation with R. B. Kitaj' *The New Review*, volume 3, numbers 34-35, January/February 1977 cover, pp. 75-77.
[27] Peter Fuller 'An interview with David Hockney', Part I, *Art Monthly*, November 1977, number 12, p. 6.

artist. Sometimes Hockney absorbed lessons studying Picasso's technique, especially in printmaking, retracing Picasso's steps and choosing to work with master printer Aldo Crommelynck in Paris, who along with Piero Crommelynck was responsible for printing almost half Picasso's graphic *oeuvre*. Sometimes Hockney has observed and absorbed Picasso's imagery – rarely replicating it, often re-interpreting it and always, always studying it carefully. He also admired Picasso's wide repertoire of styles. Most importantly perhaps, it was Picasso's attitude to art that Hockney has sought to emulate, for that supremo of twentieth-century art delighted in taking risks, changing directions and eschewing any artistic straight-jacket.

It was with Picasso's death that Hockney began to appreciate better the great artist's lifetime of achievement; reconsidering Picasso's contribution was a means to avoid his own concerns about how he should develop his painting. Hockney also was one of several artists selected by Propyläen, a Berlin publisher, to contribute to a print portfolio *Homage to Picasso*. The necessity of having to re-consider Picasso was timely for Hockney. So, later in 1973, Hockney put aside thoughts of painting for the time being and went to live in Paris. The time in Paris was a way of escaping his current personal and artistic situation and an opportunity to see some of the great masterpieces at the Louvre, including works by Jean-Honoré Fragonard and Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, two artists whom he much admired. It was also a way of discovering more about Picasso and, for his homage to Picasso in print, Hockney decided that he wanted to work with Aldo Crommelynck, and the French master printer encouraged him to visit him in Paris: 'He wanted me to go there; we'd never met and I didn't know if he knew my work, so I was surprised when I first turned up there.'[28] Hockney was following directly in Picasso's footsteps.

Aldo Crommelynck had been an aspiring artist early in his career. He, and later his brother Piero Crommelynck, were originally trained by the French printer, Roger Lacourière, who had worked with Picasso since 1933. Lacourière was a skilled draughtsman himself and excelled in the use of intaglio printing, especially aquatint. The master printer had worked with Picasso on the *Vollard Suite* in the 1930s amongst other things. This was a series noted for technical experimentation. Lacourière was no journeyman but rather a facilitator and was flexible in what might be required of him as a printer. Lacourière provided technical innovation and assistance to an artist whose natural bent was to

---

[28] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney,* edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 288.

break the rules, and whose techniques changed as often as Picasso varied the forms of his compositions. The suite is therefore an example of technical virtuosity as well as inspired compositions. When the prints are placed in chronological order according to the time the artist completed working on each plate, the *Vollard suite* becomes a remarkable artistic diary for Picasso.

Lacourière's approach to printmaking was in distinct contrast with some of the traditional and more rigid printers that Picasso had worked with in the past, such as Louis Fort. This printer had worked with Picasso on his first *livre d'artiste* after the young publisher Albert Skira commissioned Picasso to create a series of etchings for Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The artist originally agreed to create 15 images inspired by the Latin poet's text, and translated by Skira. The story is about mythological figures that are miraculously transformed or expire by acts of the gods or their agents. As he became engrossed in Ovid's poetry, Picasso agreed to make a further group of 15 intaglio prints for the publication. The imagery was made sporadically and with no deadline. This new edition of *Metamorphoses* finally appeared in 1931. While this series of delicate line drawings enlivened Ovid's themes, the printer was no match for the artist in his execution of etchings of Picasso's imaginative compositions of abandonment, savagery, lust and betrayal.

In the late 1940s Aldo and Piero Crommelynck came to work at the Lacourière workshop and it was there that they met Picasso and began working with him. Lacourière's health was failing from old age and alcoholism, compounded by the tragic death of his daughter. In 1956 the Crommelyncks set up their own workshop and went on to print about 45 per cent of Picasso's graphic *oeuvre*. Aldo Crommelynck recalled a day in Paris working with Picasso, when the artist advised him that he was planning a visit to the South of France that weekend. Picasso would leave but never returned, requiring the brothers to establish a workshop there in close proximity to him.[29]

Lacourière had taught Aldo Crommelynck a 'special recipe' for aquatint and he duly passed this on to Hockney.[30] According to Aldo Crommelynck, Hockney already had a good grounding in intaglio processes and 'he knew a lot'.[31] Collaborating with Crommelynck was different from other artist and printer relationships. As artist Jim Dine noted, Crommelynck:

---

[29] Notes from Aldo Crommelynck interviewed by Jane Kinsman, 16 December 2003.
[30] Notes from Aldo Crommelynck interviewed by Jane Kinsman, 16 December 2003.
[31] Notes from Aldo Crommelynck interviewed by Jane Kinsman, 16 December 2003.

[R]eally teaches technique more than anyone else ... but it was the training that Crommelynck had with Lecuriere [sic] and his experience in printing with Picasso that make him unique. He showed me how he made reproductions of Picasso paintings, for instance, which Picasso later signed. In that way, he taught himself etching, so he has a vast vocabulary of the *process*. He has these nineteenth-century presses that he rebuilt himself. They pull out of a plate more than anything I have ever seen, anywhere ... I sit with Crommelynck and the collaboration is where he teaches me technique.[32]

For Hockney working with Aldo Crommelynck was exhilarating. 'I discovered more in three months about etching than in all the years I'd been doing it. I discovered many, many techniques that I just hadn't been able to do before.'[33] Crommelynck's atelier was relatively small and he did not keep a group of printers in the workshop, but preferred to work one-on-one with an artist. The French printer's great facility was in laying down rich aquatints, evident particularly in the extraordinary body of intaglio prints he produced with Richard Hamilton, including *Picasso's Meninas* 1973.[34] Traditional aquatint requires the artist to work negatively. One method for the artist to work positively is where an artist paints with acid onto a resin-coated plate. The problem arises that the acid eats into the brush rapidly, destroying it and making the whole process very difficult and unwieldy. To counteract this, Maurice Payne, developed a method, whereby the brush is dipped into Polycell glue before being dipped in the acid, thus slowing down the destruction of the hairs; he had shown Hockney this process in London.[35] Hockney experimented with the technique with Payne and produced two portraits, published by Petersburg Press. They were of notable historical figures, an unusual choice for Hockney given his preference for knowing his sitters, as previously discussed. These portraits were derived from two photographs, one of Gustave Flaubert, the other of Georges Sand, taken by the nineteenth-century French photographer Félix Nadar.

Hockney had always been a great lover of literature and this often served as a prompt and inspiration for his prints. He had renewed his interest in Flaubert when he read the French writer's last novel *Bouvard and Pécuchet* at the

---

[32] Jim Dine quoted in Susie Hennessy, 'A conversation with Jim Dine', *Art Journal*, volume 39, number 3, Printmaking, the collaborative art, Spring 1980, p. 168. Following Aldo Crommelynck's death Marco Livingstone interviewed Jim Dine at length on the important role that this printer played in the history of printmaking as well as the influence he had on him personally, in Jim Dine & Marco Livingstone, *Talking about Aldo*, London: Enitharmon editions, 2008. The gates at Crommelynck's house and atelier provided the subject of a colour lithograph by Dine, *Blue Crommelynck gate*, 1982. A drawing using synthetic polymer paint on paper, *The Crommelynck gate* (*The sandpaper*) and a painting on canvas, *The Crommelynck gate* (*Hiroshima clock*) followed in 1986. Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 86.1062; 86.1065; 86.1060 respectively.

[33] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 202.

[34] Richard Hamilton, *Richard Hamilton: Prints: a complete catalogue of graphic works 1939-1983*, Stuttgart, London: Editions Hansjörg Mayer, 1984, catalogue 88.

[35] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 287.

beginning of 1973 in Los Angeles and, while at Gemini GEL, had made a lithographic homage to it in *Still life and book*, a delicate five-colour lithograph of irises in a glass vase, with a book featuring a portrait of Flaubert on the cover. The composition, though modest, reveals a masterly perspective of the portrait and title of the book, suggesting a growing ease in working with lithography. Hockney continued to use Flaubert as an inspiration for *My mother at the age of twenty (from a photograph) as a study for Félicité in 'A simple heart' of Gustave Flaubert*. This etching in black, like those of Flaubert and Sand, was printed by Payne in London.

Hockney's rekindled enthusiasm for Flaubert continued when he moved to Paris. Once there he had in mind making further prints, once more inspired by Flaubert's *Un Coeur Simple* from *Trois Contes* and he began working on this project at the Atelier Crommelynck. There was a double etching, one in colour and one in black and white, again using his mother as the subject, combined with Flaubert's parrot. This time it is an etched contemporary portrait, *My mother today: as a study for Félicité in 'A simple heart' of Gustave Flaubert*. - Hockney also had his mother as the model for the sleeping Félicité etched in black with the brilliantly coloured parrot Lou Lou watching over her. Perhaps in the choice of mother as the model for Félicité's character, Hockney acknowledged her own qualities of modesty, thrift, loyalty and living a simple life.

However, the subject was not pursued as Hockney became seduced by Crommelynck's extraordinary technical knowledge, which he was keen to try out. Crommelynck taught Hockney an ingenious method of sugar lift. Instead of using acid, the French master printer used ferric chloride, which did not eat into the brush. And so the artist could keep on working without interruption and achieve a great tonal variety: 'I was amazed', recalled Hockney, '… you can keep painting the plate – [the] darker it gets, you can have light and dark'.[36]

The artist characteristically could not help but become enraptured with new technical methods and Hockney produced several etchings at Crommelynck's Paris workshop. He made four etchings related directly to Picasso using the sugar lift technique that he had just been taught. Two were editioned and two abandoned. Of the editioned works one was *The student: homage to Picasso* of 1973 for the Berlin portfolio and, following this, a further work *Artist and model* of 1973–74 (illustrations 49 and 50). Both were inspired by one of Picasso's

---

[36] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 288.

favourite themes, namely the artist and the model, which appears in the *Vollard suite*. If one principal theme for the *Vollard suite* prints was Picasso as the Minotaur, another had been that of Pygmalion – the artist's obsession with his model. The origins of this theme can be traced back to a classical literary tradition and is one which many artists adopted, most notably in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Book X), which Picasso had read for his *livre d'artiste* with Skira. Ovid's account tells of a King, Pygmalion, who lived in Cyprus, the home of Venus. As he was beset by problems with women, the king resolved to sleep alone. Instead, he developed an interest in art as a distraction. Pygmalion was a talented sculptor who created an ivory statue more beautiful than any young woman the king had known and he became so besotted with this sculpture that he fell in love with it. As the story is recounted in Ovid, Pygmalion was overwhelmed with his passion for the sculpture of Galatea, as 'he had made it lovelier than any woman born, and fell in love with his own creation'. The artist king embraces the sculpture and she becomes warm in his embrace; blood flows through the stone transforming her into a human being. It is the ultimate fantasy for an artist. *The Vollard suite* is one of many variants of the artist and model theme that Picasso pursued with passion and inventiveness. Picasso's interpretations of the artist and model are quite evidently autobiographical to some degree, with his lover Marie-Thérèse Walters as the subject. In print after print we see permutations and transformations of the Pygmalion story and the notion of metamorphosis. Sculpture, artist and living model become interchangeable. Hockney was ambitious in choosing this theme to pay his respects to one of the major artists of the twentieth century.

In the first of Hockney's homages to Picasso we see the artist as the young student wearing the broad-brimmed hat of a nineteenth-century Romantic artist and carrying his portfolio of work. Hockney portrays himself in the etching looking at a sculptured head set on a plinth. As with the *Vollard suite* – inspired by the earlier classical tale of Metamorphoses in Pygmalion – the issue of whether the sculpture is made of cold stone or has transformed into a living figure is ambiguous. This ambiguity in Hockney's *Student* is emphasised further because Picasso's head is derived from one of the many photographs taken of him in Paris in the first decade of the twentieth century. The sculpture's alert eyes and enigmatic smile heighten the ambiguity of what is living and what is stone.

Hockney made two further proofs which included the head of Picasso on a plinth, but his use of freely brushed aquatint failed and they were abandoned. In these two compositions there is no such ambiguity. Picasso is represented as a

sculptural head of Picasso; imposing in his stature, scale and dignity.[37] In the first of these proofs we see Hockney in a suit and hat standing before the sculpture, gesturing to the great man as if in conversation. In the second he is bare-headed and seated, holding a pencil in his hand as if trying to mark the measure of his idol.

The second of the editioned etchings, and the fourth of the Picasso homage series, was a further variant of artist and model, with Hockney as the eager student, shown naked, vulnerable and impressionable and seated before the master as if in awe. Hockney also took this much later image of Picasso from a photograph by Robert Doisneau taken in 1952, where the artist is shown in his favourite striped top of the period.[38] The nude Hockney model is smaller in scale than the more majestic and clothed Picasso; making clear the role of both artist and model. However, such ambitions did not go without criticism and one critic considered these homages were overly assertive. -In his acerbic review of the Hockney retrospective curated by Maurice Tuchman and Stephanie Barron originally for the Los Angeles County Museum, which then travelled to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York and later the Tate Gallery, London,[39] Hilton Kramer wrote:

> There is, I suppose, something poignant about the spectacle of the poor boy from Bradford going into the ring, as Hemmingway might have put it, with Picasso, and seeing how many rounds he can last. And it must be said, too, that Mr Hockney brings a certain humor to the enterprise: his etching of 'The artist and model' (1974), which shows us a nude Mr Hockney seated across the table from a fully clothed Picasso, is great fun. Bur unfortunately, Mr Hockney's assault on Picasso territory isn't, for the most part, either much fun or very good. Its principal effect is to remind us of the vast distance that separates a great artist from a merely facile one.[40]

While Hockney's ambition was certainly in evidence with his etchings, the unusual combination of male artist and male model adds a very original, personal and witty homoerotic twist to the established pictorial tradition of heterosexual eroticism.

---

[37] These were viewed by the author at the Atelier Crommelynck in 2003.

[38] Les Pains de Picasso, reportage for Le Point 1952. Doisneau did a series of photographs of the artist in his striped top in Vallauris in 1952.

[39] Maurice Tuchman & Stephanie Barron, David Hockney: a retrospective, Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1988.

[40] Hilton Kramer, 'Hockney show at the Met: over celebrating a light talent', The New York Observer, 20 June, 1988, pp. 1, 11.

In both lithography and linocut, Picasso had worked in colour. In his last years Picasso had often turned to making linocuts as this was more suited to his late style. In this later period he had worked with printer Hidalgo Arnéra in Valluaris in the South of France. In 1954 printer and artist worked together making linocuts and perfecting the linocut reduction method, which Arnéra had originally learnt in a printing company in Germany at the beginning of the Second World War.[41] As the printer recalled:

> Our first collaboration was for the bullfight of 1954. At this occasion, Picasso got frustrated with the printer he was working with and, whilst he was discussing this matter with his friend, Pierre Schneider, the latter suggested making the poster with the linocut technique. Schneider also advised Picasso to collaborate with me, as he was satisfied with my work ... Picasso was thrilled by the idea that I was both a linoleum engraver and that I was able to draw ... Yes, of course he carved his plates. Picasso was an artist, yet a craftsman to the core. I was astonished by the way he instinctively felt and understood linoleum. He seemed to have always worked with it. He knew engraving and adapted at everything, any situation ... truly unbelievable. In particular, when you think that he cut away the plate directly. He never did any preparatory drawings or studies. For sure, he was a great artist, the greatest in linocutting.[42]

Even so there were problems in inking and registration initially with making coloured linocuts; this was evident in the *Bust of a woman after Cranach the Younger*. Following this experience, according to Arnéra:

> Picasso asked me how to circumvent these problems. I suggested to him to use the single-plate technique ... it had been around for a certain time already. I first came across it in Germany ... You carve the same plate state after state, and between each state you pull out an impression with a new colour over the former one. You have as many carving sessions for as many colours you wished.[43]

While using the reductive method Picasso produced an extraordinary body of colour linocuts. In intaglio printing it was a different matter. Throughout his printmaking career, Picasso avoided using colour in his etching and worked only in black ink. This was because for each colour a separate plate was required, which then would have to be carefully registered. Using colour in

[41] Arnéra had been sent to Germany at 18 years old under the *Service du travail organise* established by the Vichy government where young French people were sent to work in German industry.
[42] Anne-Françoise Gavanon, 'Picasso's linocuts: the story of collaboration', transcript of an interview with Hidalgo Arnéra on 11 June 2004 in Vallauris, translated by the author, pp. 48-49.
[43] Anne-Françoise Gavanon, 'Picasso's linocuts: the story of collaboration', transcript of an interview with Hidalgo Arnéra on 11 June 2004 in Vallauris, translated by the author, pp. 51-52. This contradicts Brigitte Baer's account, where she credits Picasso as the 'inventor'. This according to Arnéra was, 'part of the Picassean myth making', p. 52.

etching, therefore, was inhibiting and antithetical to the spontaneous way Picasso made his etchings. Aldo was keen to change Picasso's view on the subject; Crommelynck had developed for him a new system of using four identical plates covered in soft ground on which several coloured inks could be used at the same time, with tissue paper cut to plate size and a fitted cardboard frame to ensure perfect registration. Once the artist had decided what colour to use, the printer would select the plate accordingly.[44] It was a system where the artist could draw directly using colour pencils and a soft ground etching technique. Sadly for both printer and artist, Picasso died before he was able to use the invention. When told of this by the printer over lunch, Hockney abandoned his meal at Crommelynck's local restaurant and returned immediately to the workshop. To explore the new technique devised for Picasso by Picasso's printer was an opportunity that could not be missed.

Hockney eagerly took up the process, working with Aldo and experimenting with the possibilities. On learning of Crommelynck's method, and after one abandoned attempt with a portrait of Celia, Hockney continued with a humorous homage to Cézanne and his often quoted comment 'treat nature by the cylinder, the sphere, the cone ... '; *Simplified faces I* (illustration 51) and *II* are two colour variants showing two-dimensional geometric faces, behind which are three-dimensional geometric forms. He then went on to make a colour etching of Gregory Evans rapidly from life, using red and blue inks.

Hockney's visits to the Crommelynck's atelier were a great success. There was a professional and personal rapport between the two. 'David is a very caring, very friendly person with a good sense of humour', Crommelynck recollected of their time together in Paris, 'It was a very enjoyable sequence of making prints', also adding that the artist was a 'great, great draughtsman'.[45] At the time of working together the printer humoured Hockney by saying that 'it's a pity you didn't come earlier, you'd have really liked Pablo ... and he'd really have liked you.'[46] After he was shown Crommelynck's colour etching method, Hockney contacted Maurice Payne by telephone. Issues of pride and rivalry had meant the printer had been reluctant to accompany Hockney on his visit to Crommelynck's atelier and in the end refused to visit the French workshop in Paris. So it was that later, once Hockney had returned to London, the artist made a demonstration piece for Payne, *Showing Maurice the sugar lift,* which by its title was a slight dig at his friend for his lack of generosity of spirit –

[44] Notes from Aldo Crommelynck in conversation with Jane Kinsman, 16 December 2003.
[45] Notes from Aldo Crommelynck in conversation with Jane Kinsman, 16 December 2003.
[46] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney,* London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 288.

equally ungenerous, although lively and skilled in the use of colour and form (illustration 52). Because of the favourable comments, the proof was subsequently editioned by Payne.

Hockney began exploring the potential of Crommelynck's technique further and soft ground portraits of Celia followed. He also made two rather stately interior views, which were proofed and editioned by Maurice Payne, *Contrejour in the French style* (illustration 53) and *Two vases in the Louvre*, published by Petersburg Press. Hockney's eye for detail, sense of proportion and ability to create textures and patterns was clearly evident in these masterful works on a grand scale. Both prints relate to three paintings of this time and all were inspired by a window at the Pavillon de Flore at the Louvre Museum. When he was living in Paris Hockney had passed the window on several occasions while visiting an exhibition of French drawing from the Metropolitan. He delighted in the view of an outside formal garden seen through the window with the blind half-drawn, 'It's a wonderful subject and it's very French', he thought. In fact the *contre jour* theme of viewing a light-filled exterior from a darker interior was a device loved by many French artists including Pierre Bonnard and Henri Matisse, whose work he much admired. Hockney further developed the reference to French art by adopting a pointillist method of combining tiny dots of pure colour, which are fused by the eye – brilliantly incorporating Crommelynck's new printing technique. Technique, style and composition were perfectly aligned.

On summer holidays with Henry Geldzahler on Fire Island in 1975, Hockney read Wallace Stevens' poetry for the first time and was 'thrilled': 'I wasn't sure what it was about; it seemed to me to be about the imagination in some way … it is also about Picasso, about the imagination transforming things, they way you see.'[47] In the latter part of 1976 and the first months of 1977 in London, Hockney went on to use Aldo Crommelynck's method for a series of 20 coloured etchings and aquatints working with Payne for the Petersburg Press publication, *The blue guitar*, which was accompanied by Stevens' poem, *The man with the blue guitar*, Hockney's initial inspiration. According to the accompanying text this poem, in turn, was Stevens' own homage to Picasso and inspired by the artist's famous Blue Period painting, *The blue guitarist* of 1903. The publication therefore became a homage to a homage, as well as an opportunity to explore Hockney's ideas about Picasso and Crommelynck's colour intaglio technique. The combination seemed irresistible and Hockney

---

[47] David Hockney, That's *the way I see it,* London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 31.

produced an inventive series to match the poet. This was in contrast to the lithographic portraits from life he had just completed. Hockney adopted an experimental mixture of styles and mixing of colours, of lines and textures, while at the same time playing with perspective inspired by Picasso (illustrations 54-56). At this stage in his career Hockney's exploration of Cubist space was not a consistent one; rather it merely evoked the 'look' of Cubism rather than revealing a thorough understanding of the style.[48] Also very important about *The blue guitar* etchings was that they were instrumental in freeing Hockney artistically, as he noted, 'The ideas for the etchings quickly started developing and moving about, and I got excited and realised I was breaking out of naturalism.'[49]

As part of the sequence, Picasso and his painting from the Blue Period was replicated by Hockney in coloured aquatint and etching in the second print of

---

[48] For a recent summary of primary source material relating to Cubism see Mark Antliff & Patricia Leighten (eds), *A cubism reader: documents and criticism;1906 to 1914*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008. This follows the authors' historical account of the art movement in *Cubism and culture*, New York: Thames and Hudson, 2001. As well as providing new source material or newly translated texts, in their 2008 publication, the editors examine the history of scholarship relating to this art movement. They also raise the issue of the original coining of the term. Antliff and Leighton reject the customary attribution given to Louis Vauxcelles in his review of Braque's exhibition for *Gil Blas*, 14 November 1908, on the grounds that it is 'descriptive' (p. 48). Vauxcelles actually had written, 'Il méprise la forme, réduit tout, sites et figures et maisons, à des schemas géomtrique, à des cubes.' Antliff and Leighton also provide a useful summary of the history of the interpretation of Cubism as an art movement. They note the important role the art dealer, Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, played and the influence he had on the subsequent scholarship of Alfred Barr, Clement Greenberg, Robert Rosenblum, Douglas Cooper, John Golding and Edward F. Fry (see bibliographical details in thesis bibliography). The editors, however, consider these post-Kahnweiler art historians were too influenced by the art dealer's interpretation with the adoption of the analytical and synthetic forms of Cubism and the separation of 'major' and 'minor' Cubists. Antliff and Leighton's criticism of Fry is that he is 'ultimately ahistorical' (p. 2) and noted the criticism that was made of the 'sometimes overdetermined nature of his translations, [that] were indicative of the formalism of the 1960s and were therefore out of step with methodologies that were reshaping the study of cubism and modernism in general' (p. 3). They note that 'this formalist interpretation of Cubism emanating from Kahnweiler then continued with the following writers Douglas Cooper and Gary Tinterow, *The essential Cubism: Braque, Picasso and their friends*, London: Tate Gallery, 1983; William Rubin, *Picasso and Braque: pioneering Cubism*, New York: Museum of Modern art, 1989. To this one should add the publications edited by William Rubin, *Pablo Picasso: A retrospective*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1980 and *Picasso and portraiture: representation and transformation*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996; as well as Anne Baldessari, *Picasso Cubiste*, Paris: Réunion musées nationaux, 2007. In his published lecture, 'The semiology of Cubism', Yves-Alain Bois in *Picasso and Braque: a symposium*, organised by William Rubin, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1989, pp. 129-208, provides an alternative interpretation of Cubism which he defines as '"my" Cubism', which he draws from his own various readings of the art movement in different contexts. (He also argues that Kahnweiler actually varied his view of the art movement over time). The publication by Jeffrey Weiss in *The popular culture of Modern Art: Picasso, Duchamp, and avant-gardism,* New Haven, London; Yale University Press, 1994, also examines Cubism in a non-traditional way, noting Cubism's absorption into broader cultural contexts, including humour, and the absorption of popular culture by the avant-garde and Cubist artists. In this way, he avoids the 'formalist' tradition criticised by Antliff & Leighten. This thesis takes as a focus Douglas Cooper's interpretation of the Kahnweiler tradition given his key role proselytising for Cubism in the United Kingdom of the post-war period. Hockney's own interpretation of Cubism, I propose, can be viewed as a pictorially inspired version of Bois' 'my Cubism'. This thesis notes the changes of Hockney's interpretation of Cubism as he considers alternative artistic depictions of three dimensions, breaking away from one-point perspective, examining Chinese and Japanese landscape and cityscape art, which, Hockney argued, looked 'out of doors', while Cubism breaks the Renaissance window (see Section 3: Chapter 4: The modern day Cubist in this thesis). When Hockney experimented with photographic collages in the early 1980s, he was able to break down the single-point perspective in his own art in a considered manner. From this time onwards, Hockney would value more the potency of multiple viewpoints in Cubism and developed 'his Cubism'.

[49] David Hockney, That's *the way I see it*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 32.

this series, *The old guitarist*, around which he added further coloured marks in the manner of Picasso – working in the method conceived for Picasso. The plates for *The blue guitar* are whimsical combinations of motifs inspired by and illustrative of the Wallace's poem and Picasso's art. They are peppered with anthropomorphic forms, Cubist references, still lifes, guitars (a favourite motif of the Cubists) and geometric forms, along with plays of spatial arrangements and a marriage of styles, including Cubism coupled with Surrealism; something that Picasso had already done in the *Vollard suite*.

Hockney drew images and ideas from many sources. In *Figures with still life* an image of the American comedian Chico Marx, of the Marx Brothers, for example, was transformed into a geometric shape. Seated across the table and still life is a female figure with a guitar in the manner of a Cubist painting. Hockney's depiction of the table itself was more an experimental reinterpretation of Cubist space, rather than a serious incorporation of the style.

In his series, Hockney may also have made a passing reference to the Tate's purchase in 1972 of a sculpture by Carl Andre with the inclusion bricks in several of the intaglio prints, which the artist considered was a misguided addition to the gallery's collection. This Minimalist sculpture consisted of 120 untreated firebricks, which the Andre had entitled *Equivalent VIII*. Four years after its purchase on 15 February 1976 and just before Hockney began working on his Picasso/Stevens series, an article by Colin Simpson, 'The Tate drops a costly brick' ridiculed the acquisition in *The Sunday Times*. The controversy that ensued meant that the Arts Minister, Hugh Jenkins felt the need to defend the purchase noting that 'The Trustees and the Gallery have every right to spend a little on experimental art. I do not question their judgment'; a few days later this was quoted in the *Daily Mail* of 18 February 1976.[50] The Deputy Keeper of the Modern Collection at the Tate Gallery, Richard Morphet sprang to the defence of Andre, writing in response to a critical editorial in the *Burlington Magazine*, noting rather obtusely, 'As Andre remarked, the presence of 120 firebricks is very different from the idea of 120 firebricks'.[51]

Hockney has adopted Picasso's imagery in some instances, as in *A picture of ourselves*, where he combines an image from plate 50 of the *Vollard suite*, with a Surrealist sculpture and a monstrous form derived from a Picasso drawing of

---

[50] Hugh Jenkins quoted in http://www.tate.org.uk/archivejourneys/historyhtml/people_public.htm viewed 30 September 2011.
[51] Richard Morphet, 'Carl Andre's bricks, *Burlington Magazine*, volume 118, number 884, November 1976, p. 764; complete article, pp. 762,765,767; for a critical view of the artist's works see Jeffrey Inaba, 'Carl Andre's same old stuff, *Assemblage*, number 39, August 1999, pp. 36-61.

1937 – a further reference to the suite.[52] In *What is this Picasso?* a curtain is drawn to one side to reveal Hockney's copy of one of his favourite Picasso paintings, *Weeping woman*, the artist's portrait of Dora Maar.[53] This portrait and various still-life components are revealed by the open curtain. This was a favourite pictorial device for Hockney, allowing the excitement of the disclosure of further imagery and occurs within several compositions for the series.

In *The blue guitar*, it is evident that Hockney had observed and absorbed Picasso's imagery, re-interpreting rather replicating it after careful study. At this time, however, he had not fully grasped the lessons of Picasso's Cubism. This was to come later.

Hockney admired Picasso's approach to Cubism compared to that of his fellow Cubist, Juan Gris, who had lost his way pursuing Cubism endlessly with diminishing returns. 'Picasso had the courage anyway, and said I'll quit this; and when he quit, what he returned to was so staggering: classicism … Well Picasso can do that, but lesser artists can't. They get trapped. And in the end the only way, probably, to get out is to make a complete change, stop, and just think again. When you stop doing something, it doesn't mean you are rejecting the previous work; that's a mistake; it's not rejecting it, it's saying I have exploited it enough now and I wish to look at another corner.'[54] Picasso, therefore, held a particular place in Hockney's world and his development as an artist. Following Picasso's lead, Hockney had felt encouraged to mix styles, to mix subject matter, to break the rules. Hockney was to become comfortable with looking back to great masters of the past along with Picasso himself, just as in the past Picasso had drawn inspiration from the great masters such as Rembrandt van Rijn, Eugène Delacroix and Edouard Manet. However, Hockney's appeal did not sit well with many in the art world at this time. It was thought to be backward looking. Forty years later he continued to absorb the inspiration of the old masters with a series of landscapes exhibited at the Royal Academy.[55]

[52] Gert Schiff, 'Moving focus: Hockney's dialogue with Picasso' in *David Hockney: a retrospective*, organised by Maurice Tuchman and Stephanie Barron, Los Angeles: Museum Associates, Los Angeles County Museum, 1988, pp.40-53, especially pp. 44-46. For recent scholarship on the subject see Didier Ottinger et al, *David Hockney: dialogue avec Picasso*, Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1999.
[53] Christian Zervos, *Pablo Picasso*, Paris: Cahiers d'art, 1937, volume 9, catalogue number 73, *Femme en pleurs* from the Roland Penrose collection, and *Guernica*, catalogue number 65 for the final (8th) state.
[54] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976 p. 123.
[55] *David Hockney: a bigger picture*, Royal Academy, London, 21 January – 9 April 2012.

Looking back on the importance of Picasso, one decade after he had died, David Hockney gave a lecture at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, in January 1983. The artist spoke of his obsession with Picasso, which by that time had lasted well over twenty years. For this lecture Hockney chose to discuss about 30 paintings that Picasso had made in a 10-day period in 1965. He explained that the choice of title for this lecture, *Important paintings of the sixties* was a deliberate attempt to bring to attention the real subject of his talk. His thesis was that although Picasso's art was a powerful force that had continued throughout the decade of the 1960s, he had been ignored by many artists, art critics and art historians. Some of the audience, however, would come to this lecture believing that Hockney was going to talk about a totally different subject – something on Minimalism perhaps or Conceptualism or even something on Pop Art. It was Hockney's view: 'The art world had viewed Picasso as though he'd died about 1955 whereas he lived almost 20 years after that and as far as I can see he did not decline at all, but it's harder to see what he was doing'. After all, Hockney argued: 'by common consent [Picasso was] a very great artist that has lived in our time and on the whole the only people you can compare him to are Rembrandt or Goya or Velasquez; you go to the very top to find comparisons. And if you think of comparisons like that, very great artists do not spend the last 20 years of their lives repeating themselves; you see they've just not the time to do that. Picasso locked himself away perhaps to have a dialogue with himself and I think, probably couldn't care less whether the work was seen, enough had been seen already, and he was much too busy.' [56] [

Picasso's art, therefore, according to Hockney, was the best thing happening in the 1960s and, he concluded, the greatest painting during that decade was done in France and by one man. One of the 30 paintings Hockney referred to in his Los Angeles lecture belonged to him. It was Picasso's small *Artist and model*, reclining nude and man in profile dated 29 March in 1965. Hockney is not an avid collector of art, happy for the most part to keep postcards of his favourite works. This little painting, however, he acquired by swapping his own work for it. The rest of this group of late Picasso paintings was made in the

[56]According to Peter Goulds, David Hockney's dealer at L.A. Louver in Los Angeles, 'Such an approach is reminiscent of Hockney who, in recent times, has obsessively pursued the art of watercolour, double portraits produced over a two-day sitting period, and latterly returned to large landscape painting, while cutting back on some of his public involvements.' Peter Gould's notes on the artist for Jane Kinsman, undated, received 6 April 2004.

phenomenal time of only ten days, in March 1965. Hockney praised these works for their invention. Despite so many variations of the artist and model theme, Hockney considered that there was no repetition, there was looseness in the composition yet this was combined with remarkable draughtsmanship. There was no crudity – no crude marks, he observed. Always a very visually perceptive person, Hockney had counted the brushstrokes in his painting – there were 52. These paintings, Hockney observed, were playful, lively, the figures had weight, and there was nothing static. Such an appreciation by Hockney of late Picasso was at odds with his friend Douglas Cooper. This collector and writer had been an obsessive devotee and rigid interpreter of early Cubism. For an exhibition opening on 23 May 1973 a group of works by Picasso from 1970 to 1973 had been chosen to be on display as part of the Festival d'Avignon. The artist died on 8 April before the exhibition. Cooper could not bring himself to appreciate the last decades of Picasso work, describing an exhibition of paintings made in the years 1971 and 1972 in a letter to the editor in *Connaisance des arts*, published after Picasso's death:

> I trust that I may count myself as a genuine admirer of Picasso's art and believe that I am capable of judging it. And so I looked at the paintings for a long time. But these are random daubings, executed by a raving old man in the antechamber of death. This simply has to be said. Respectfully[57]

Anthony Blunt was also critical of this later work in his essay shortly after Picasso's death, writing that:

> There has been a growing tendency among even his firmest admirers to feel that, unlike the work of Titian and Michelangelo, who went on to reach greater heights at the end of their long lives, Picasso's work since the Second World War has fallen off. Not in vitality or productively, but there has been a lowering of imaginative level, a lack of seriousness which is essential for all great art (although it may be veiled under an affectation of light heartedness)…[58]

These were judgments that Hockney did not share, and Picasso was to be a pivotal figure later in his printmaking career. His interpretations over the years changed, as you would expect, while his own art developed under the influence of Picasso. As it developed so Hockney's own interpretation of Picasso changed.

---

[57] Douglas Cooper, Letter to the editor, *Connaissance des Arts*, number 257, July 1973, quoted in Werner Spies editor, *Picasso: Painting against time*, Osfildern, Germany, Hatje Cantz Verlag, English edition 2007, p. 298.
[58] Anthony Blunt, 'Looking back on Picasso,' *The New York Review of Books*, 14 June 1973, p. 31.

Hockney's love of new mediums once again led him into new paths of artistic development. The catalyst for this was his growing interest and experimentation with paper pulp. Initially he worked with several favourite motifs while adopting new methods.[59] However, as his confidence and technical capabilities grew, he allowed the new processes to lead him into new imagery. This experience necessarily dictated to Hockney that he should also rethink his ideas on colour and size. He necessarily had to simplify his compositions because of the process.

---

[59] David Hockney *David Hockney: Paper pools,* edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 100.

Chapter 3: Paperwork

Hockney's venture into making paper pulp works in the late 1970s produced extraordinary results through the artist's obsessive exploration of this new process with Ken Tyler. As discussed previously, Tyler played a key role in the growing interest in and development of handmade papers to complement developments in modern printmaking methods. This was initially evident when working with Robert Rauschenberg. Tyler had set out to create mould made papers of a quality, shape and size never seen before. The logical step that followed was Tyler's growing interest and development of paper pulp works and he was keen to interest some key artists in these new ventures. The support in modern printmaking, therefore, was to become a key component that contributed to the composition. In the case of a move to create paper pulp works, the inked component was now imbedded in the paper, rather remaining as a layer on top of the paper support, as in the case of screenprinting; in the case of intaglio prints, the ink is held in the incisions made in the paper using etching, engraving or aquatint.

When in the latter part of the 1970s, Hockney began working in paper pulp; the experience changed his style as an artist. His palette became more vivid and he moved to working on a bigger scale. Issues about how to depict water also came to the fore. Whereas Hockney's experience in etching and lithography was dependent on line, working with paper pulp was a totally new experience, 'Here line meant nothing. It couldn't be line; it had to be mass, it had to be colour', Hockney reflected.

In 1978 Hockney continued his involvement with theatre design, completing his second sets for the Glyndebourne Festival Opera in Sussex in collaboration with John Cox and both productions had proved most successful. The first of these had been Igor Stravinsky's *A rake's progress* performed in 1975:

> I guess one reason I was asked to design *The Rake's Progress* was because I had one my own *Rake's Progress* in 1961-63, a series of sixteen etchings in which I had updated the story and placed it in New York. John Cox didn't want to impose his own schemes on me, unlike the traditional director of an opera who tends to choose a designer who will carry out whatever scheme the director has in mind. Many opera directors do that: choose what you'd call a professional designer, who is prepared, in a sense, to take orders. Well, I don't have a personality

quite like that. I am willing to collaborate with people, but I'm not interested in illustrating someone else's ideas.[60]

His interest in Hogarth's printed version of the Rake narrative and his own excursion into the topic meant that Hockney was focused on a 'print like' appearance for his sets:

> With Hogarth, of course you've got a rich area of visual references. I got all the big Hogarth books on engravings and I came to Hollywood with Mo ... I borrowed a record player from a friend to play the opera and we got to work rather quickly. Once I had the idea of doing crosshatching for costumes and sets, I had even gone down to Glyndebourne to decide what scale the crosshatching should be for the theatre. If it was too small you wouldn't see it, if too big it would be a dominating pattern – it had to be a certain scale.[61]

The immediate success of this venture meant that John Cox was keen to work with Hockney on another opera and Hockney was equally keen to do so. The choice was the *Magic Flute* by Amadeus Mozart, a composer who was particular favourite of Hockney's. The artist's intention now was to return to Los Angeles from England and begin painting again. 'I was working on an opera and I finally began to get a little frustrated because, working in the theatre is a lot of compromise with a lot of people.' Such collaborative ventures limited the artist's need for spontaneity and individual creativity. In contrast with theatre design, painting was a solitary affair, especially in California 'where they leave you alone'.[62] Hockney was also keen to leave England, particularly his home in London:

> When I walked out of Powis Terrace and pulled the door to I said to myself, I never want to come back again while I own it. When I got to New York I called up my brother and said, sell Powis Terrace, I do not really want to live there any more, I think I'll stay in California for good, I'll find a place to buy here. I always felt kind of impotent in England; I never felt in control of things myself. There are aspects of English life that have always irritated me greatly. People never seemed to get anything done. And I felt not quite at home in London. After all, I'm not a Londoner.[63]

[60] David Hockney, *That's the way I see it*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 21.
[61] David Hockney, *That's the way I see it*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 23.
[62] David Hockney Lecture to the San Francisco Institute, 1979, transcript p. [1].
[63] David Hockney, *That's the way I see it*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 45.

Hockney arrived in New York only to realise that he had lost his driver's licence and it would be impossible not to drive while living in California. Earlier in 1974, Tyler had moved to the East Coast after a dispute with his Gemini GEL partners Sydney Felsen and Stanley Grinstein. Prior to this Gemini GEL had achieved major success in the publication of print series by Albers, Johns, Rauschenberg, Lichtenstein and Ruscha. However, an exhibition of Gemini works at the Museum of Modern Art curated by Riva Castleman in 1971 was not well received. There was a sense of East Coast superiority in some of the comments. Hilton Kramer, for example, writing in the *New York Times*, complained that Tyler had worked with artists who were 'not exactly undiscovered', and he also objected to the accompanying publication which was 'a catalog-object-coloring-book sales brochure'.[64] The fact that these comments were made when Kramer had not actually viewed the exhibition would have irked Tyler. Art historian and curator Judith Goldman, too, had been critical but more measured in her comments about Gemini GEL's print publications, noting the workshop's flashy image as 'The Metro-Goldwyn Mayer of lithography workshops', whose emphasis on technology made it 'the Cadillac of the expanding print and publishing industry'. Offered this kind of support, some artists could embrace the Gemini workshop, 'while others fail completely'.[65] Hockney was in the former category and continued to create an extraordinary body of work with Tyler.

Since moving in 1974, Tyler had repeatedly encouraged Hockney to visit his new workshop, which he had established at Bedford Village in New York State. Fortuitously for Tyler, Hockney was now stranded in New York waiting for the reissue of his licence and he made repeated phone calls urging the artist to visit. Hockney found himself in a bind: 'I am not very good at saying that I don't want to come here'.[66] Tyler was keen to show the artist new paper works made at Bedford Village and finally the artist agreed to visit for three days. From his time at the Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Tyler had harboured a passion for and developed a growing expertise in the art of handmade papermaking. To ensure that the momentum of his workshop was maintained, Tyler sought new ideas to entice artists to return for new projects, knowing 'you couldn't just keep inviting them back to make a lithograph or inviting them back to make a silk screen. You have to keep giving them something new to chew on.'[23] It wasn't sufficient to offer scale: handmade paper was something he also wanted to

---

[64] *New York Times*, 2 May 1971, section 2, p. 21.
[65] Judith Goldman, 'Gemini Prints at the Museum of Modern Art', *Print Collector's Newsletter*, 2, May-June 1971, p. 30.
[66] David Hockney Lecture to the San Francisco Institute, 1979, transcript p. [2] in possession of the author.

offer the artists. Tyler had completed a papermaking course at Cranbrook Academy of Art, Michigan, and considered the possibilities exciting for the artists he worked with.

In discussion with Marius Peraudeau, from a French papermaking mill that dated back to the thirteenth century – Moulin à Papier Richard de Bas, in Ambert – it was agreed that an artist would be taken to France for an experimental project in paper. Tyler thought immediately of Rauschenberg, whom he considered game for almost anything, extremely creative and fast on his feet. The result was a group of twelve paper works with collage, *Pages and fuses*, of 1973–74[67]. The *Pages* were delicately shaped works in combinations of pulp, made of natural coloured rag with additions of cords and tapes – from two vats. These became new notes on a new piano for a new symphony — the future of handmade paper. For *Fuses*, Rauschenberg incorporated combinations of brilliantly coloured inked pulp, collaged with screenprinted tissue, to form unusual shapes such as can be seen in *Link*, a late twentieth-century version of a luminous medieval manuscript.

So many of the artists with whom Tyler worked over the years were able to explore new ways of printmaking. He saw that another important role was to assist in providing the kinds of paper which would support these exploratory ventures. Since moving to the East Coast Tyler had worked with John Kroller at his HMP mill in Connecticut, but the constant focus on experimentation using paper pulp and large scale meant, 'We knew our days were numbered' as the workshop had outgrown this small mill. Tyler had then established his own paper-making facilities in the garage of the Bedford workshop, mixing different fibres and Eastern and Western paper techniques. Nowhere was experimentation and innovation at Bedford more evident than in the paperwork Hockney produced.

When visiting Bedford, Hockney saw the works made of paper pulp by Ellsworth Kelly and Kenneth Noland and thought 'they were stunningly beautiful, especially Ellsworth Kelly's'.[68] Up until his visit Hockney considered that most paper pulp works had the look and texture of porridge. At this time the artist had not been interested in making further graphic works. He was keen to paint and to be working on his own again, after having experienced the disruption of working on set designs and musical productions. However,

---

[67] Collection: National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 75.604-75.614.
[68] David Hockney *Paper pools*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 10.

Hockney was intrigued by what he saw at the studio and so decided to stay for a few days, becoming increasingly curious about the possibilities of paper pulp. He was to become captivated by the process of making paper from a watery concoction:

> I had never seen a piece of paper made before … Its all done with these chewed up rags and water and you put it in a vat … [Y]ou have this thin mould which is all made of wire and as you dip the mould in the vat … the water runs through the wire and this thin layer of mush stays and you tip it out on a piece of paper … and it becomes a piece of paper.[69]

Unsure of the potential working with paper pulp, Hockney initially was very tentative, 'I said, I love using lines, Ken, I'm not very good at using colour, bold colour, I'm too timid with it really, but gradually I realised you could work with moulds, as if "drawing" the form with little metal moulds, pour all the colours next to one another. I was drawing sunflowers, treating the exercise more as you would a drawing.'[70]

Hockney had always been partial to flowers as a motif and the first subject he chose was sunflowers, inspired by a Vincent van Gogh *Sunflowers.*[71] A reference to this painting had been included in Hockney's recent painting of his friend Henry Geldzahler in *Looking at pictures on a screen* from July the year before.[72] Van Gogh's *Sunflowers* was one of the artist's favourite paintings at the National Gallery in London, which was one of four treasured reproductions from the Gallery featured in Hockney's painting of Geldzahler. This artist ranked highly in Hockney's view. Speaking in an interview shortly after he completed his paperwork essays in 1979, Hockney remarked:

> [W]hen I first began studying painting, Monet was regarded as only an Impressionist, Cézanne was much more important, and Degas. But then I saw Monet move up much higher. I personally tend to think that van Gogh is a little underrated as a giant artist. He is a giant artist – nobody says he is not, but he is really more important than we think. Cézanne is more in tune with a lot of things we are interested in today, and therefore we look at him with respect. But I find myself being more and more drawn to van Gogh. That is through Matisse, you see. I have always thought van Gogh was a wonderful artist, but now I think that he is a

---

[69] David Hockney, Lecture to the San Francisco Institute, 1979, transcript p. [3], in possession of the author.
[70] David Hockney *Paper pools,* edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 21.
[71] Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers*, 1888, oil on canvas, 92.1 x 73.0 cm. Collection National Gallery, London, accession number NG3863.
[72] Subsequently, the National Gallery, London went on to exhibit this Hockney painting, the van Gogh painting and Hockney's other favourite works by Piero della Francesca, Vermeer and Degas; and the artist wrote an essay on these much loved works, which was published in 1981; Hockney, David, *Looking at pictures in a book,* London: The National Gallery, 1981.

very, very *great* artist. An incredibly rare artist who did a lot more than art history credits him for. He approaches Rembrandt in intensity.[73]

At Bedford, Hockney first made a rudimentary paper pulp work based on an image of a sunflower in colours of black and red on a blue background.[74]   The artist then began to experiment with variations of his idea for a composition, making four trial proofs of this motif (illustrations 64 and 65). Initially Hockney had planned to make an edition in paper pulp similar to that of editioning a print. One sunflower was set in glass and with a backdrop of purple and cream. Another was set on a pale blue backdrop, without a vase and dedicated to Ken Tyler. A third was a more simplified version and a fourth was set in a vase on a table with a purple and cream backdrop with the words 'on purple paper' and 'sunflower' included in the composition. These proofs are now all housed at the National Gallery of Australia.[75]

Hockney ultimately made a further 17 works of *Sunflower* (*Paper pool 1*), A to Q, choosing a brilliant yellow colour for the backdrop. The coloured paperworks were then sandwiched in between two sheets of felt and pressed using a hydraulic press. As it evolved, version A was a sunflower in-a vase sunflower, B was a simplified form of the flower, the leaves and nothing else, and the final group of almost identical works, C to Q, were of a simplified form of a blue vase and its shadow with a brilliant red flower with no stalk. [76] Hockney realised at this stage that each paper work was going to be individual because of the process and so the making of it could not be handed over to a printer. By the end of the *Paper pool 1* series, Hockney had become emboldened in the use of colour and developed in this excursion a strong sense of simplification of forms. This would assist him as he proceeded further with this medium.

Hockney then made two coloured press-pulp trial proofs of a large tree surrounded by lawn, *Ken's garden,* which grew on the lawn by the garage and driveway. This proved to have little traction. The medium did not inform the motif and so the artist abandoned the subject. Hockney then began experimenting with colour, working with Ken Tyler and printer Lindsay Green, who prepared swatches and samples of various colour pulps. As Tyler recalled:

---

[73] David Hockney quoted in Jan Butterfield, 'David Hockney: blue hedonistic pools, *The print collector's newsletter*, volume X, number 3, July-August 1979, p. 76.
[74] Ken Tyler's composition is in a PDF attached to Ken Tyler's correspondence to Jane Kinsman, 17 November 2009. This includes David Hockney's notes in his handwriting.
[75] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 2001.1.1225.1-4.
[76] Five of these A, B, C and 2 other variants of C are illustrated in David Hockney, *Paper pools,* edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, pp. 22-23.

After making the *Sunflowers* we started to make test strips/charts for all the colors that were mixed for each paper pool. You can see some of these charts in background of many photos we took during the project.[77]

Tyler and Green then began as series of 14 paper-pulp tests during August and early September in the early stage of the artist's stay in Bedford. This included explorations in using blues, browns and greens in tests, Hockney later creating compositions of a figure, a swimming pool and finally his signature hat and tie, a shorthand self-portrait.[78] These experiments then served as the basis for making the single sheet compositions. For example, *Paper pool 2* drew from experiment Pulp test III and *Paper pool 3* was based on Colour test 1.[79] The entire *Paper pool series 1* to *4*, by their very manufacture, were variants in their colouring.

As the days passed Hockney allowed the process to lead him into new avenues, painting with paper pulp, which opened up enormous possibilities. Hockney continued his exploration and the idea of water emerged as a suitable theme. As the days continued Hockney's work increasingly became a marriage of medium and the motif. His long time friend and editor Nikos Stangos noted:

> Hockney's fascination was in using a watery medium for the representation of a watery subject, bringing together many of the themes he most loves: the paradox of freezing in a still image what is never still, water, the swimming pool, this man-made container of nature, set in nature which it reflects, the play of light on water, the dematerialised diver's figure under water.[80]

The subject then became the swimming pool at Tyler's house at Bedford. Or rather, how you depict a pool and what you choose to look at, such as the water, figures diving and gliding, flickering light and shadows during the cycle of the day, the steps and the diving board. Some of these motifs are evident in early *Paper pool* studies (illustration 66). Just as with Claude Monet almost a century earlier, Hockney became captivated with how you view a motif in changing circumstance, at different times of day and with seasonal changes. The compositions he created in the mid 1960s with his earlier pool and lawn paintings were essentially static and lacked movement, such as the spaghetti-

---

[77] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 November 2009. These works are in the National Gallery of Australia collection, accession numbers 2002.1.704 and 2002.1.705.

[78] *Colour pulp tests I-XIV* in the National Gallery of Australia collection, accession nos 2002.1.1046.1-14. The colour charts were for the 6 & 12 panel pools: 2002.1.1219.9; 2002.1.1219.1; 2002.1.1219.8; 2002.1.1219.10.

[79] Collection the National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 2002.1046. 3 and 2002.1046.1.

[80] Nikos Stangos, Preface in David Hockney, *Paper pools*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 6.

style rendering of water in *Peter getting out of Nick's pool* 1966, or the gauze-like spray of water in an almost geometric form in the almost minimalist composition, *A lawn being sprinkled* 1967.[81] Now Hockney was attracted to the subject with a more complex approach in mind and considered the elements within a swimming pool provided a rich and diverse range of surfaces for his compositions:[82]

> I kept looking at the swimming pool; and it's a wonderful subject, water, the light on the water. And this process with paper pulp demanded a lot of water. I thought really I should do, find a watery subject for this process and here it is; here, this pool, every time that you look at surface, you look through it, you look under it. [83]

During this venture Hockney took multiple Polaroids of his subjects, as well as making preliminary drawings of the pool and water. As he often found himself waiting for Tyler and Green to complete their preparatory work of pulping and mixing colours, Hockney took to drawing the activity of the people involved at the Bedford studio. For these drawings he used a reed pen and bisque ink, in the manner of many of van Gogh's drawings and as homage to the Post-Impressionist. In preparation, swatches of different coloured inks were made, along with samples of pulp pages exploring how to depict water. 'It dawned on me', recalled Hockney, 'that the swimming pool was a much more interesting subject, I tried to figure out how to begin it, how to do it. I had been taking some photographs with a SX70 camera. In the late afternoon the shadow began to fall on the pool steps. I was taking photographs of that and of bold patterns in the water. And after this, I began to try this idea out with the paper pulp process: the mould was at first very simple; the blues, where the colour changes to a different shade, are just pouring in pulp and then making it stronger by adding more to it, making it denser, or changing the colour.'[84] By comparing the photographed image and the paper pulp composition there was a correlation but not a literal translation. Hockney likened his use of the camera to that of Degas' practice:

> I use photography the way Degas used photography. He used photographs a lot to make his paintings. He thought paintings were more interesting, and I think paintings are? more interesting, but you can in

---

[81] Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, acrylic on canvas; Private Collection, Germany, acrylic on canvas.
[82] David Hockney quoted in Jan Butterfield, 'David Hockney: blue hedonistic pools, *The print collector's newsletter*, volume X, number 3 July - August 1979, p. 76.
[83] David Hockney, *Paper pools*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 21.
[84] David Hockney, *Paper pools,* edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 25; the SX70 camera refers to is a Polaroid single lens land camera in production between 1972 and 1981.

your own imagination, use photography to make much more interesting paintings.[85]

The Polaroid photographs acted like prompts – momentary frames of a continuous sense of movement over time, evoking the life of the pool, the lighting, the water, the reflections and, on occasions, a swimmer. This becomes clearly evident in the photographs Hockney took and their relationship with the subsequent paper pulp compositions.[86]

As the days went by the artist no longer considered papermaking a graphic medium; with Tyler and Green Hockney developed a process whereby he began to 'paint' with his colour paper pulp. Metal moulds were placed on coloured pulp sheets and filled with coloured papers and dyes. Then the moulds were removed and, following this, Hockney 'painted' the surface using all sorts of implements including turkey basters, brushes and dog combs. The sheets were subsequently half pressed, squeezing out some of the water and leaving them moist so that Hockney could add further colour. The method allowed Hockney to enlivening his images, darting back and forth like a painter touching up a canvas. Any later additions by Hockney required further pressings and then finally the works were dried. The whole exercise signified and highlighted a constant in Hockney's working methods, solving problems in depiction.

At the beginning of the project Hockney concentrated on details. He made *Steps with shadow* (*Paper pool 2*), in 16 variants, changing the colour of the water and the light, which was falling on the steps and on the bottom of the pool. Then came 15 variants of *Green pool with diving board and shadow* (*Paper pool 3*) (illustration 67), where the diving board hovers over the side of the pool and casts a shadow in the water. Wanting to a include figure in his composition, Hockney followed with *Gregory in the pool 1* (*Paper pool 4*), which shows Gregory Evans in the water leaning on the side of the pool beside the handrails at the waters edge, in 20 colour variations.[87] The artist had already experimented with the idea of a male figure being central in the composition with the water behind him in *Paper pool test XI*; however, in this composition

[85] David Hockney quoted in Jan Butterfield, 'David Hockney: blue hedonistic pools, *The print collector's newsletter*, volume X, number 3 July-August 1979, p. 76.
[86] A selection of these are illustrated in David Hockney, *Paper pools,* edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, pp. 26-27; 30-31; 34-35; 48-50; 54-55; 62, 66-67 84-91.
[87] The 6th version of this is in the collection of the National Gallery of Australia, accession number 79.2888.

there was little connection between the subject and his watery surrounds.[88] By placing his subject in the pool he was able to make that connection.

The artist was keen to work on a larger scale but this raised the problem of the need for an oversized vat and press. The solution was to make his imagery on a number of sheets. This was a method he later returned to in his *Grand Canyon* paintings of the 1990s as well as his Yorkshire landscapes of this century. Finding the medium such a bold one, Hockney began to envisage works on a bigger scale and thought to place a number of mould-made sheets together, first six and then twelve. Colour charts of pulps in buckets were prepared to provide as great range as possible to allow for the artist to explore an astonishing range of hues.[89] Hockney began this process using a series of six sheets per composition and varied the colours of the pool in separate works to suggest different times of the day (*Paper pool 5, 6, 7, 8* and *9*). Another issue Hockney noticed was the different way to look at water under different circumstances. Following work one evening the artist was by the pool and after Tyler had switched the lights on under the water, Hockney noticed that, 'You don't look at the surface at all; all you can do is look right under it, because the light from within the pool stops at the surface of the water and everything above it is black.'[90]

This led Hockney to explore further depictions of the pool. He first made a series of six trial panels, which showed the corners of the pool, the centre of the pool meeting the shadow from above, the movement of water-like ripples emanating outwards and a diving board from above and lit from below (illustration 68).[91] Then using the same moulds as before but with the addition of steps, as if lit from underneath the water, as well as showing the springboard in shadow, Hockney created paper pulp works of a truly dramatic appearance (*Paper pool 10, 11, 19* and *30*). These compositions can be compared to his recent powerful theatrical sets for the *Magic flute*. They also prefigured and informed his later stage design, notably the stark black and blue sets for Stravinsky's *Le Rosignol* of 1914, which opened at the Metropolitan Opera House on 3 December 1981.

For an artist who was interested in figurative art, it was natural that Hockney turn his attention to the problem of how to depict a figure in water. This was the

[88] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 2002.1.1046.11.
[89] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 2002.1.1219.1-10.
[90] David Hockney, *Paper pools*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 48.
[91] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 2002.1.1153.A-F.

further and more interesting development than the stationary figure of head, shoulders and arms of Evans – *Gregory in the pool (Paper pool 4)*.[92] His new interest required his assistant to dive tirelessly into the water and swim below the surface, resurfacing again and then diving once more into the pool. This would have been most taxing for the subject, although the artist seemed oblivious to the physical human effort that was required by his model:

> [I]f somebody is swimming, and I got Gregory to keep jumping into the swimming pool, underneath the water, the distortion of the figure becomes very interesting. And if you photograph the distortion, it freezes it; the arms become long, the body goes odd and you begin to look like a lobster or a crab.[93]

Subsequently, the frenetic activity of the subject of Evans swimming in a pool in Los Angeles was captured in the composite Polaroid composition that Hockney made of Gregory Evans in 1982 and witness to Hockney's continuing interest in the subject.[94]

With the introduction of the figure swimming beneath the water, Hockney moved to a bigger scale. He first made a composition of the diving board and the diver separately (*Paper pool 15* and *16*); he then combined the two elements and doubled the size of the multiple sheet compositions from six to 12 sheets for (*Paper pool 17, 18* and *27*). These revealed Hockney's interest in depicting a figure as it moves through water and the splash of the body as it enters the pool from the board. For the 'splash' Hockney use a cardboard cut-out to act as a stencil, which he placed on the sheet of pulp and which prevented the colours penetrating below (illustration 72).

The process of using multiple sheets meant that Hockney was eventually working on a grand scale, 'painting' with paper pulp in a brilliant palette. The artist ended up staying with Tyler for 49 days, working 16 hours a day with one day off. Tyler counted the days; Hockney did not. After creating preparatory paper pulp tests, colour samples and trial proofs, from August to October o1978, Hockney, with the assistance of Tyler and Green, completed the phenomenal number of sixty-eight single sheet, one three-sheet, twenty-three six-sheet and three twelve-sheet paper pool images at Tyler Graphics in Bedford. The paperworks produced during this time bring to light how far

---

[92] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 79.2888.

[93] David Hockney, *Paper pools* , London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 62.

[94] Collection David Hockney, *Gregory swimming in Los Angeles, 31 March 1982*, 1982, composite Polaroid.

Hockney had surpassed many talented artists who had become involved in working in this field at the time. This body of work was testament to Hockney's relentless exploration of the medium, his skill and imagination. At the conclusion of this burst of activity in paper pulp works, Hockney reflected that they were less like prints, because of their unique nature and not having been editioned. Rather he considered them 'like giant watercolours'.[95] Watercolour was another medium which was to engage Hockney some two decades later, leading him into new paths of experimentation, conception and composition and proving a driving force to stimulate his ideas on the making of art.

To celebrate the end of this most concentrated and artistically successful period in Hockney's career, a special edition book, *Paper pools*, edited by Nikos Stangos was published by Thames and Hudson in 1980 with an accompanying colour lithograph made in an edition of 1000. This was one of many ventures by the artist who liked to bring his art to a wider audience. The drawings with a reed pen Hockney made during his stay while sitting on the sidelines were reproduced in the book as illustrations. They depicted the pool, Tyler and Green working away making paper, mixing pulp and pigments or taking a brief moment's rest, and Evans sitting on Tyler's dental chair, smoking. An experience so concentrated and experimental was liberating for the artist, 'All the time I was thinking, should I go to California, or shouldn't I; I wanted to paint. Finally I realised, because I had these buckets full of blue and full of green if this was paint and I was doing a painting I wouldn't have the nerve to just throw it around like this and pour it on. With these pictures I was prepared to do this and, at the end of the day, to tear them all up if we didn't like them.'[96]

The explorations in paper pulp were bound to affect Hockney's art in other ways. The artist's experience had an impact on his printmaking and he was able to continue his free flowing studies of water and light, beginning in 1980 when he made two key-line lithographic plates which were then used in two series of *Lithograph of water* in various combinations of colours, wash and crayon tusche, stones and plates.[97] These studies were made on his visits to Bedford in March, April and August 1980 and published that year (illustrations 70, 71 and 72). No longer did Hockney resort to spaghetti forms to indicate water, movement and light – the lines and washes of colour suggest the movement of water and light on the surface and at depth. Changing intensity

[95] David Hockney quoted in Jan Butterfield, 'David Hockney: blue hedonistic pools, *The print collector's newsletter*, volume X, number 3 July - August 1979, p. 74.
[96] David Hockney, *Paper pools*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, p. 62.
[97] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers, series one, 81.1323.1-6; series two, 81.1266.1-4 and proofs 2002.1.1-24.

and changing colours indicate time and season, while the palette recalled the vividness of his 'Paper pool' oeuvre.

Even greater fluidity and boldness of colour was achieved in the lithographs that Hockney made in July 1979 in further studies of water, with *Afternoon swimming, Bora Bora* (illustration 73) and *Afternoon swimming* (illustration 74). After experimenting with the imagery and the colours, Hockney produced free-flowing lithographs capturing the very essence of the subject.[98] This freedom continued in his portraits of friends drawn from life in July 1979 at Bedford. Brilliant in colour and loose in execution, Hockney experimented with unusual viewpoints in the form of the composition, for instance in his portrait of Joe McDonald. In the case of the double portraits, *Johnny and Lindsay* and *Joe and David Harte*, the artist experimented with scale and the placement of figures within the picture plane. He also embarked on some very tender portraits of Anne Upton and Byron, her son of 16 years, beginning with the two portraits of Byron in crayon drawn on the stone and two colour figure-studies of Anne seated, made in wash on aluminium plates. Hockney made many further studies including *Seated Anne & Byron, Byron, door and ladder* and *Seated Anne with Byron*. Sadly, Byron was to die in an accident on the London Underground and so these gentle portraits of the boyish charming teenager remain as unsigned proofs and were never editioned (illustration 75). These are now part of the National Gallery of Australia collection.[99]

Aside from Frank Stella and Robert Rauschenberg, Hockney was one of the most ingenious and inventive printmakers working collaboratively with Tyler. Reflecting on his work with Hockney, Tyler wrote:

> The artist plays an important role in this evolution [of techniques], since it's his or her imagery that the printers are experimenting with. In David's case, as one of the most process minded artists to collaborate in a workshop, he would get turned on by a particular step in the printmaking and then try to adapt or alter his drawing so both artist and printer has success. Keeping all avenues open for constant experimentation is what I call the 'building block' approach. Each step as represented as a 'building block' adds up eventually to some breakthrough. Most of the time when this happens, the artist is pleased and does more work

[98] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers 81.1297; proofs 2002.1.559.1-16; 81.1297; proofs 2002.559.1-15.
[99] Collection National Gallery of Australia, the uneditioned proofs and a lithographic stone are as follows: accession numbers 2001.1040-1045; 2002.1481; 2002.563.1-9; 2002.564.1-9; 2002.565.1-9; 2002.566.1-17; 2002.685.1-10.

pushing the dimensions of the particular process or technique along with the printers. Ideally all of this takes place in a relaxed atmosphere with neither artist nor printer becoming too excited and rushing the process or technique to the detriment of the artist's image.[100]

Hockney continued the loosely worked lithographic style when he returned to live in Los Angeles with the intention of painting. The experience of making paper pulp compositions had freed Hockney to work on a far greater scale than before and adopt a more brilliant palette. This is evident in the paintings of landscapes and cityscapes that followed. Despite his renewed desire to paint, Hockney also made some prints at Gemini in 1979, having remained close to the directors, particularly Sid Felson, since Tyler's departure from the workshop. Working with the gifted lithographic printers Serge Lozingot, Charley Ritt and Anthony Zepeda, Hockney made a series of quite private portraits of Anne looking at her reflection in a mirror, beautifully linear in outline combined with the rich, decorative, almost flat patterned quality of her dress. The intimate boudoir scene also evokes the earlier Japanese and French traditions. This style recalls that of Japanese *ukiyo-e* prints, which inspired French artists of the late nineteenth century such as Pierre Bonnard and Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec. At Gemini Hockney also completed a series of accomplished and tender portraits of Celia – weary, amused, inquiring, elegant and reclining (illustrations 76 and 77). These are all beautifully drawn directly with a brush in lithographic wash on aluminium plates. The process was a freewheeling one and Hockney was able to draw very loosely. His facility in lithography was now clearly apparent. The poses are relaxed with a great feeling of warmth between artist and sitter and the compositions with their cropped figures evoke a sense of casualness and spontaneity. The lithographs of Celia made at Gemini GEL have a vibrancy and tenderness as portraits and are executed in relative simplicity and reveal Hockney's sustained talent as a great draughtsman.

The following year Hockney continued the portraits of Celia in a loose-brushed style, this time with more emphasis on the decorative nature of Celia's clothes or the pot plants beside her. Further studies of Celia reclining on a striped bedcover reveal Hockney's mature lithographic style and remain works remarkable for the wonderfully relaxed poses of the model matched with the assured lines of the artist (illustration 78).

---

[100] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 16 October 2003.

Chapter 4: The modern day Cubist

From the 1980s for about a decade there was a noticeable shift in Hockney's art away from an emphasis on the figure, which had been so central to his art during the 1960s and 1970s. Increasingly it was the viewer who would become the human element for the picture in responding to the play of space in Hockney's landscapes and interiors. This development should be viewed as Hockney's very individual approach to the broader genre of installation art; an art form which began its early days as land art and happenings in the 1960s and had become a major – particularly institutional – art form during the 1980s. Underlying Hockney's own development, however, was the powerful force and influence of Pablo Picasso.

In 1979 the English-born director at the Metropolitan Opera in New York approached Hockney to work on the set designs for *Parade* by Eric Satie and Jean Cocteau, one of a triple bill of French operatic performances along with *Les Mamelles de Tirésias* and *L'enfant et les sortilèges*.[101] The ballet *Parade* had originally been performed in Paris in 1917 with sets and costumes by Picasso and to accept the commission was a considerable challenge for Hockney; he had big shoes to fill. At the same time the experience provided him with the opportunity of revisiting Picasso's designs and learning lessons from the master. Hockney's involvement in set and costume design was a further factor in his growing obsession with space.

At about this time, in June 1980, Hockney had seen *Pablo Picasso: a retrospective* at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and been captivated by the experience. The curator of the exhibition, William Rubin, had set out to select and display Picasso's work in a manner that recalled his viewing of the artist's work in his studios. '[I]n an addition to a comprehensive representation of sculpture,' he wrote in his introduction to the catalogue, 'I wanted to exhibit sufficient numbers of the works I saw in the many studios distributed through out Picasso's villa to communicate their cumulative effect of restless proliferating inventiveness, their revelations of the eddies and the backwaters of his mind, as well as its major currents.'[102]

---

[101] Martin Friedman, *Hockney paints the stage*, Minneapolis: Walker Art Center and New York: Abbeville Press, 1983, with contributions by John Dexter, David Hockney and Stephen Spender. For an account by the artist and Martin Friedman of the evolution and performance of the triple bill see pp. 123-177.
[102] William Rubin, *Pablo Picasso: a retrospective,* New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1980, p. 11.

This extraordinary exhibition with its breadth, associations and variations, reinforced Hockney's consuming admiration for the artist.

One major current he grew to appreciate in particular was what Hockney called 'Picasso's great invention' of Cubism. For much of the twentieth century a particular interpretation of Cubism had prevailed. This more conventional view of Cubism interpreted the groundbreaking style retrospectively as a key – if not the first real stepping stone – toward Abstraction in the twentieth century, liberating the picture plane from one point perspective, and influenced by African sculpture. As his understanding of Cubism evolved along with his own artistic development, Hockney came to reject such a view, enunciated by Douglas Cooper, who wrote of *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* of 1907, 'Here, for the first time, Picasso abandoned a perceptual for a conceptual way of representing things and de-personalised his figures by giving them mask-like faces and treating them in generalised terms'.[103] Hockney now disagreed with this assessment. Rather he argued that Picasso's Cubism in fact heightened perception not lessened it. This notion was something that the artist freely admitted he didn't fully understand for a while:

> It took me a long time, for instance, to realise fully that, contrary to what some people may think, there is no actual distortion in Picasso. What he does may appear distorted only if you think of one particular way of seeing, which is always from a distance and always in a kind of stopped, frozen time. The moment you realise what Picasso is doing, how he is using time as well – and that is why you could see round the back of the body as well as the front – once you begin to realise this, it becomes a very profound experience, because you begin to see that what he is doing is not a distortion, and slowly it begins to look more and more real in fact it is naturalism that begins to look less and less real. And that, of course, leads you into thinking about the nature of realism and what it is and what it isn't. You become aware, perhaps more than ever before, that there are different forms of realism and that some are more real than others.[104]

The process of understanding Cubism began, in part, with Hockney's experimental photography in the early 1980s. Hockney had made what he called 'joiners' in the early seventies. Having acquired a wide-angle lens, he had discarded it as he disliked the resulting photographs: 'They seemed extremely untrue. They depicted something you never actually saw ... [I]t wasn't just the lines bending in ways they never do when you look at the world. Rather

[103] Douglas Cooper, *The Cubist epoch*, Oxford, New York: Phaidon in association with the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1970, p. 22.
[104] David Hockney, *That's the way I see it*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p 102.

it was the falsification – your eye doesn't ever see that much on one glance.'[105] For the 'joiners', Hockney would take several shots and then join the lines and form of his subject. This proved a success:

> At first I was just going through all this because the result, the depiction of the particular subject, came out looking clearer and more true to life than a single wide-angle version of the subject ... However, fairly early on I noticed that these joiners had more presence that an ordinary photograph. With five photos, for instance, you were forced to look five times. You couldn't help but look more carefully.[106]

From February 1982 to June 1983 the artist began experimenting with multiple viewpoints of multiple subjects over time and from different standpoints. He took many hundreds of photographs, which he then joined in the form of composite Polaroids, and later photo-collages. A selection of 127 of these was published in the monograph, *David Hockney: Cameraworks* of 1984.[107] For Hockney, the problem with photography in the past had always been that the composition was a single view – 'such a tunnel to me'[108] – and could only inadequately deal with the subject at hand. His decision to make photo-collages followed 'a Cubist idea ... when you put one piece of paper on top of another ... you put two pieces of time together, [and] therefore make a space. I thought I was making time, then you realise you're making space ...Then you realise time and space are the same thing.'[109]

These and later experiments in photography were shown in an exhibition at the International Center for Photography in New York, *David Hockney photocollages: wider perspective* in 1986. One key work in the exhibition was the photo-collage, *Paint trolley* of 1985, which is a visual tribute to Picasso whom Hockney considered the most significant artist of the twentieth century. For its composition, Hockney had placed a collage of photographs including his treasured volumes of Zervos, along with his paints to make his admiration apparent. Hockney also made reference to his devoted household companions

[105] David Hockney quoted by Lawrence Wechsler, in the introduction 'True to life', *David Hockney: Cameraworks*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1984, p. 8.
[106] David Hockney quoted by Lawrence Wechsler, in the introduction 'True to life', *David Hockney: Cameraworks*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1984, p. 8.
[107] *David Hockney: Cameraworks*, with an introduction 'True to life', by Lawrence Weschler, London: Thames and Hudson, 1984, p. 8.
[108] David Hockney quoted in Marco Livingstone, 'Getting closer to the Grand Canyon: David Hockney interviewed by Marco Livingstone', in *David Hockney space & line: Grand Canyon pastels on paper 1998 & works on paper 1966-1994*, exhibition catalogue, New York: Richard Gray Gallery, 29 April - 28 May 1999; London, Annely Juda Fine Art, 30 June - 18 September 1999, p. 19.
[109] David Hockney interviewed, *David Hockney: en perspective*, documentary film by Monique Lajournade & Pierre Saint-Jean, Paris: Canal+/ Mirage Illimité/ Grand Canal, Centre Georges Pompidou, 1999. For recent examinations of the role of Cubism and photo-collages see Reinhold Misselbeck (ed.), *David Hockney: Retrospektive Photoworks*, Cologne: Editions Braus, Museum Ludwig Köln, 1997; *David Hockney: Dialogue avec Picasso*, Paris; Éditions de la réunion des musées nationaux, 1999.

– his dachshunds – by including photographs of their dog biscuits. On the shelf below he included a further collage of photographs, including his copy of Matisse's *Oeuvre gravé* in two volumes and a copy of his own *Cameraworks* publication. At the bottom of the trolley we see Hockney's camera and paint brushes, together with a copy of Paris *Vogue* designed by Hockney for the December 1985 – January 1986 issue. On the cover was his small canvas portrait of Celia shown like a fashion model with lashings of mascara and ruby red lips. This image also appeared in one of Hockney's *Moving focus* series of lithographic portraits of Celia, as well as in his *Home made prints* series. Apart from valorising the great twentieth-century master, *Paint trolley* should be considered as part of a continuum of compositions in the tradition of the artists depicting their studios, from Gustave Courbet to Jasper Johns.

Paint trolley remains a key example of the artist's photo-collages. Picasso's appeal for Hockney was that he considered his work, particularly in Cubism, not a distortion but more real than naturalism. With Picasso 'you no longer look at the picture, you're inside the picture'.[110] For *Paint trolley* Hockney photographed his motif from multiple viewpoints, which he then combined as a collage. This, according to the artist, would provide a more accurate sense of what it was like to see the paint trolley because of its multi-perspective viewpoint, which in turn necessarily formed the motif in reverse perspective.

There were other lessons to be learned in Hockney's exploration of space. According to the artist, one of the most exciting days of his life occurred when he saw a great Chinese scroll at the Metropolitan Museum's Department of Far Eastern Art on a visit in 1984. Within a landscape, multiple viewpoints of buildings and streetscapes coalesce to form a greater sense of the subject than would have been the case had it been viewed from a one-point perspective. The viewer could move around the landscape, not see it from the outside. It excited Hockney, 'How marvelously it dealt with space, time and narrative', and he delighted in the close examination of the scroll, 'I had just been through a Chinese city; I'd spent hours wandering up one street, down another, up another and I was not fixed in one point'.[111] David Hockney was filmed with this scroll for a documentary, *A day on the Grand Canal with the Emperor of China or surface is Illusion but so is depth*, which was produced and directed by Philip

[110] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993 p. 102
[111] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 128.

Haas and where curator Mike Hearn acted as a consultant for the film issued in 1988.[112]

Different viewpoints, multiple perspectives, changes in form and colour were all explored in Hockney's theatrical designs. This in turn informed the artist's work in two-dimensions in painting and in print. His various explorations and projects contributed to the artist's escape from what he termed 'obsessive naturalism'. It became Hockney's view that for 300 years European painting had been dominated by one-point perspective, viewing the subject through a window, which delineated the separation between viewer and the viewed. Chinese and Japanese art, in comparison, he argued, looked 'out of doors' and Cubism breaks the window. Hockney began experimenting with photographic collages to break down the single-point perspective and to avoid the single moment of a snapshot. Hockney's photographic collages also broke down the wall. There is no void between the viewer and the subject. In the case of a still life on a table, for instance, the table and its contents are taken up to your waist and you are in the picture. Hockney could now see the power of multiple viewpoints in Cubism; a development which, to paraphrase Yves Alain Bois' words, had become 'His cubism'.[113] It heightened the reality for Hockney in terms of space – providing a sense of the substance and form of a table, chair or object – as the contents spill out into the picture plane.

Hockney's new view of space was evident in his prints from the mid 1980s. In 1984 he produced some minor etchings at Gemini exploring ideas about Cubism and the depiction of space. The first of these was *House doodle*, which relates directly to the painting *A visit with Christopher and Don, Santa Monica 1984*.[114] In both compositions Hockney depicts different points of view of a house and its inhabitants. The etching, as noted in the title, was more like a doodle, with little figures, cars and plants poking in and out of three-dimensional forms. The artist also made an etching of a Mexican hotel that would become a feature in his later work of that year. Figure studies followed, with *The marriage in Hawaii of David and Ann* and *Ann in the studio*, similarly made at Gemini in 1984.

Thereafter began a new chapter in Hockney's history of collaboration with Ken Tyler. From 1984 to 1987 Hockney made 29 prints consisting of interior views

[112] Mike Hearn, the Douglas Dillon Curator for Chinese Painting and Calligraphy, Department of Asian Art, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 2 September 2009.
[113] See the earlier discussion on Cubism, especially Yves-Alain Bois' reference to 'My Cubism' in **Section 3: Chapter 4: The Human Clay and the ghost of Picasso**, footnote 48.
[114] Collection David Hockney.

and chairs in reverse perspective, views of a Mexican hotel and portraits of his mother, Celia, Gregory Evans and Ken Tyler in colour lithography which was published as the *Moving focus* series. It was a summation of Hockney's obsession with space at that time – the depiction of space, the experience of being within a space or travelling through space over time. These were begun between 1984 and 1985 when the artist worked at Tyler's workshop while his house in Los Angeles was being renovated. *Moving focus* was a series notable for its innovation both technically and in terms of composition. It stretched the boundaries of colour lithography and explored multi-point perspective. In the field of graphics, it was the most concentrated of projects since Hockney's *Paper pool* series, although this time the experience spanned several years.

The title 'Moving focus' was derived from an essay title that Hockey found in a book by George Rowley, *The principles of Chinese painting* published in 1947.[115] The analysis enthralled Hockney and became a guiding influence on the next stage of his art. Rowley drew a distinction between the European tradition of space since the quattrocento and the Chinese approach:

> Chinese painting is an art of time as well as space. This was implied in the arrangement of the group by movement motif through intervals; in the extended relationship of groups, movement in time became the most memorable characteristic of Chinese design … These early principles were later transformed and enriched until they reached their fulfilment in the supreme creation of Chinese genius – the landscape scroll. A scroll painting must be experienced in time like music or literature. Our attention is carried along laterally from right to left, being restricted at any one moment to a short passage which can be conveniently perused. This situation entirely alters the choice of design principles … In the European tradition, the interest in measurable space destroyed the 'continuous method' of temporal sequence used in the Middle Ages and led to the fifteenth-century invention of the fixed space of scientific perspective. When the Chinese were faced with the same problem of spatial depth in the Tang period, they reworked the early principles of time and suggested a space through which one might wander and a space which implied more space beyond the picture frame. We restricted space to a single vista as though seen through an open door; they suggested unlimited space of nature as though they had stepped through that open door and had known the sudden breath-taking experience of space extending in every direction and infinitely into the sky. Again, east and west look at nature through different glasses; one tries to explain and conquer nature through science, and the other wants to keep alive the eternal mystery which can only be suggested. Each seeks truth in its own way, and each has it strengths and weaknesses. The science of perspective achieved the illusion of depth and gave continuity and measurability to the spatial unit; however, perspective put

[115] George Rowley, *The principles of Chinese painting*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1947.

the experience of space into a strait jacket in which it was seen from a single fixed point of view and was limited to a bounded quantity of space. The control of space might give measure to an interior figure scene but it was certainly harmful to landscape painting.[116]

Rowley's essay had a profound effect on the artist and he became determined to rid himself of the single-point perspective in his art, which was a practice that had been so detrimental to his painting in the 1970s.

The idea for the subject of what was his major printmaking undertaking, the *Moving focus* series, came from Hockney's experience in Mexico when he attended the opening of *Hockney paints the stage* in February 1984 at the Museo Tamayo in Mexico City. The original exhibition had been organised by Martin Friedman, the Director of the Walker Arts Center in Minneapolis, in 1983. Hockney then travelled to a second venue in Mexico for *Hockney paints the stage*; an exhibition which summarised the artist's considerable contribution to operatic stage production to that date.

On his way from Mexico City to Oaxaca Hockney's car broke down and he, Gregory Evans and friend David Graves, who had assisted with technical details for the set designs, were stranded in the little town of Acatlán. There they stayed at the Hotel Romano Angeles while repairs were underway. The artist was captivated by the hotel and its garden and, in preparation for a painting, he made various sketches of the building and its courtyard, as well as photographing interior and exterior views. The subject for the project, according to the artist was 'not about a hotel, but about an attitude to space. At the same time as you acknowledge the spaces outside you are still moving round it. The longer you look, the more spatial it gets.'[117]

Indeed, in the resulting lithographs Hockney explored reverse perspective, where the forms grow smaller to the front of the picture plane and where the viewer, in a sense, becomes the focal point. He had begun to explore the method of creating reverse perspective with his painting *Kerby (after Hogarth) useful knowledge* of 1975, so that the further away the objects were, the bigger they became. At the time, however, Hockney had not fully realised the implications of such perspective. Now, working on the *Moving focus* series it

[116] Republished in Lawrence Weschler, *True to life: twenty-five years of conversations with David Hockney*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008, p. 232.
[117] David Hockney, *That's the way I see it*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 157.

was apparent. Later Hockney was to explore further ideas of reverse perspective in his own painting in the *Grand Canyon* series.

On his return to Los Angeles, Hockney spoke to Tyler about his unusual experience. In the past they had discussed how to work outside the confines of a studio, since travelling together in the Zion Canyon in Utah in 1983. Tyler saw this as a chance to work with Hockney again and had been keen to develop a print project 'outside the shop', using a Mylar lithographic technique he had been perfecting and he flew to California to demonstrate it to Hockney. The use of Mylar allowed the artist to work *en plein air* in the manner of the Impressionists almost a century before, when artists took their easels outside to work. Compared to plates or stones, Mylar sheets bound together as if like a sketchbook were portable and would allow the artist to draw directly out of doors. In essence the process consisted of hand drawing on Mylar sheets. These sketchbooks enabled the artist to draw with tusche in layers of colour which, when combined, would form the completed composition. The Mylar sheets were then remade into metal plates, which could be printed in colour from a flat bed offset press. Aside from its portability, using Mylar had many advantages compared to traditional colour lithography as it reduced the number of steps in printing and allowed the artist the freedom to draw directly and for mistakes to be wiped away – one couldn't easily patch a gestural sweep on metal or stone. [118]

Tyler had developed a printing method that had been ideal for artists such as Robert Motherwell and Joan Mitchell who were both working in the Abstract Expressionist tradition and had to make marks with a great degree of spontaneity. These artists kept an open mind regarding printmaking that Jackson Pollock never possessed. Tyler had introduced his ideas to both Abstract Expressionist artists with successful outcomes and was now keen to work with Hockney. Tyler wrote of these technical developments in Mylar, which had evolved over the years:

> The early use of drawn acetate to make negative and positive photo plates kept advancing through the late 70s and early 80s. With the introduction of textured Mylar, better tusches and improved Howson Algraphy continuous tone photo plates and chemicals [first made in England and in use since the early 70s] the Mylar technique was firmly established in the workshop.[119]

[118] A collection of these sheets and 'sketchbooks' are held at the National Gallery of Australia in the Tyler Archive.
[119] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 29 October 2003.

Advances in colour drawing materials were also important:

> As the specially made light sensitive aluminum printing plates were improving, permitting a greater range of tonality, we were developing more sensitive and stable tusches and better textured surfaces on Mylar and acetate sheets. So it was the confluence of better plates, tusches and toner crayons and textured Mylar sheets that made it possible in 1984 for me to devil up the color tusche for David to use on Mylar ... The early 1981 Mylar drawings made with toner tusches and crayons and oil paint sticks transferred to continuous tone plates by Joan Mitchell and Robert Motherwell were the precursors to the colored Mylar technique starting with David in 1984. It's interesting to note that the solvent we began to use in making toner tusches was alcohol. Alcohol dissolved the oil paint sticks, which gave me the idea to use alcohol to dissolve the colored crayons and make a tusche paste that could be diluted with more alcohol to make various dilutions of liquid tusche.[120]

Such innovations enabled Hockney to explore colour lithography in new ways and provided him with a greater freedom to draw and a notionally limitless palette of colour. While some works reveal struggle, others are carried off with a gestural flourish. Hockney enthusiastically embraced the new technique and his first work *Conversation in the studio* shows his chairs in conversation with each other. It was made in seven colours, with each colour drawn over the previous one. Hockney continued with his experimentation and Tyler prepared Mylar sketchbooks to take on his travels because the artist was planning to travel to New York and then to England. These 'books' consisted of 15 sections of four sheets of Mylar, followed by a sheet of white wove paper. The sheets could be dismantled to make printing plates as they were held together by removable pins. Hockney went on to make Mylar prints in London in his studio, *Pembroke studio with blue chair and lamp*, *Two Pembroke studio chairs* (illustration 79) and *Pembroke Studio Interior*. In New York State he drew *Tyler's Dining room*, replete with the Stella mural print *Pergusa three* of 1983 (illustration 80). These interior views were notable according to Hockney: 'Because of the many viewpoints in the pictures the eye is forced to move all the time. When the perspective moves, the eye moves, and as the eye moves through time you begin to convert line into space. As you move the shapes of the chairs change and the straight lines of the floor also seem to move in different ways.'[121] Literally, his work had a moving focus.

---

[120] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 23 October 2003.
[121] David Hockney, *That's the way I see it*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 130.

Hockney embraced the new process developed by Tyler. 'With each successive mylar sheet', Tyler recalled, '[H]e seemed to introduce new layers of experimentation, wetting colour crayons to create washes on the mylar, drawing on the mylar over textures, or scraping into drawn areas with a razor blade. David has always had a keen sense of process and a knack for by passing established methodologies to arrive at previously undiscovered uses for new materials and techniques.'[122] The technique was perfect for Hockney, as he, like Picasso, was adept at thinking in layers, while at the same time delighting in the technical experimentation and rejection of traditional methods. In turn, it greatly assisted in his new print series and informed the kind of imagery he created. The works continue his fascination with Cubism and reverse perspective and, if the compositions with their multiple perspectives were influenced by Picasso, the brilliance of palette owes something to Henri Matisse and the fluid drawing style something to Raoul Dufy.

In a further development, Hockney sought to emphasise the lack of discreet edges in his *Moving focus* prints. This was to counteract any residual notions of easel painting with single perspective, where the viewer looks through a window. Hockney continued the idea of multiple viewpoints within the composition by having especially shaped multi-faceted frames made by Jerry Solomon. These were hand painted for many of the *Moving focus* prints in order that Hockney could accentuate the sense of space developed in his compositions. Almost two decades earlier in the lithographic series *A Hollywood collection*, Hockney had incorporated frames within the composition, inspired by working at the back of Solomon's framing workshop in the first incarnation of Gemini. Artists such as the Post-Impressionist Georges Seurat took great care of the way their work was framed so that their explorations in colour theory were not ruined by inappropriate traditional framing.

From another practical point of view, the Mylar technique of colour printing, compared to conventional lithography, simplified and minimised the various stages of printing, as Tyler explained:

> Once the first colour proof was prepared, it had to be traced onto additional plates in order to register subsequent colour prints. The Mylar technique circumvents these two time-consuming steps. The drawn Mylar was made into plates and went directly to press for colour proofing. We soon learned how to process colour drawings on plastic sheets, exploiting a variety of oil-paint sticks and water–soluble crayons

[122] Ken Tyler, 'Layers of space and time: David Hockney's *Moving focus'* in *Contemporary master prints from the Lilja collection* 1995, p. 122.

which could be diluted to create watercolour effects. For the first time, acetate and Mylar sheets could be drawn with colour crayons to make individual printing plates ... Since they were already in registration, tracings onto additional plates were not necessary. The colour separations were stacked on top of each other, granting the artist the freedom of going back and forth to correct any passages of the drawing by addition or subtraction. Even after proofing the original drawn Mylars could be corrected and new plates made.' [123]

After some initial experimentation, the artist and printer returned to Acatlán and to the hotel, where Hockney worked on the Mylar sheets producing a series of compositions of the hotel and its courtyard. Having seen the drawings and photos that Hockney took on his previous visit, Tyler was surprised to learn that the bricked courtyard and fountain of the hotel were in fact made of painted plaster of Paris and not, as he had imagined, of bricks and mortar. Added to this the drainage system ran into the courtyard and watered the garden. It was a fantasy world as much as anything and what appeared real was truly artifice – an enticing subject for the artist. Intrigued, Hockney went on to create a series of colour lithographs of the hotel courtyard. He made a series *Hotel well I to III* where he drew three views of the 'brick' well set in a leafy green courtyard, viewed from a veranda of red tiles beneath a portico, and which investigated various perspectival views. Fourteen trial proofs for the series of three editioned prints on handmade paper reveal how the intensity and contrasts in colour were augmented during the printing process.[124]

Hockney also made three more complicated diptychs on two sheets of handmade paper, *Hotel Acatlán: first day*, *Hotel Acatlán: second day* and *Hotel Acatlán: two weeks later* (illustration 81). All explored the same subject. Most dramatic of the three was the last of these prints where Hockney had introduced brilliant yellow columns with their red shadows, supported on blue bases, along with their purple shadows in reverse perspective on the red tiles of the floor. The heavy beams of the interior of the roof, supported by the columns, crowd into the picture plane while the artist sits in the corner viewing the scene. The spatial arrangement plays on the eye of the viewer who, in looking around the composition seems to move around within the space. This work was made using a phenomenal 41 different colours and relates to a painting of the same subject, *A walk around the Hotel Courtyard, Acatlán* of 1985.[125] Despite the vivid colours, many of the landscapes, interiors and chairs

---

[123] Ken Tyler, 'Layers of space and time: David Hockney's M*oving focus'* in *Contemporary master prints from the Lilja collection,* 1995, p. 121.
[124] Collection National Gallery of Australia. editioned works and related proofs, accession numbers 2002.1.92; 20902.1.93; 2002.1.228.1-4; 2002.1.719.1-5; 2002.1.711.1-3.
[125] Collection Bennesse art site, Naoshima, Kagawa, Japan.

have a certain emptiness found in much of his later work. Noting this, Hockney later commented: 'my sister pointed out that a lot of my paintings have a lot of loneliness in them. Empty chairs … She pointed that out. I thought, "That's a good interpretation, actually."'[126]

The last of the *Moving focus* series was the screen, *Caribbean tea time* 1987, which was printed in 67 colours in remarkably perfect registration and on handmade papers and, in this instance, a hand-coloured screen (illustration 82). In this he followed in the footsteps of the Nabis and their desire in Pierre Bonnard's words, 'to link art with life'.[127] By including the screen in the later works of the series, Hockney was able to draw in a richly coloured tusche made up of a paste of Caran d'Ache crayons and methanol which Tyler had devised, using textured magnesium plates for added complexity. In *Caribbean tea time*, as with other views in reverse perspective, the human figure is absent from the composition. Rather, the viewer of the work is intended to be the human element within the image. The screen comprised eight panels of handmade paper printed in colour lithography with screenprinting. As brilliant in colour as one might find in Matisse's Fauve period or his *livre d'artiste*, *Jazz,* and with delicate overlays of inks found in Dufy's brushwork, *Caribbean tea time* was a celebratory scene composed by Hockney recalling a recent holiday taken in Mustique. For this *magnum opus* of the series, Hockney explored five variations of details, patterning and colour combinations. These reveal the careful process of refinement that Hockney undertook for this major print produced in the form of a screen.

For the final editioned work, Hockney chose for the top border simple curvilinear forms which emphasise movement in the composition and the shape of the screen. This shape with its rounded forms reinforce the notion of movement and consist of a four-panel folding screen of lacquered wood, which was a hand-painted version with four screenprinted plastic panels recto. Not only did the Mylar printing process allow for the complexity of the colour the artist wanted, it also saved the workshop many hours of proofing. 'With the first year of the *Moving focus* project, the workshops had used the technique to proof and print some 293 colour plates. For such extensive work, the traditional colour lithography process would have taken the workshop nearly three times

[126] David Hockney quoted in Nigel Farndale, 'The talented Mr Hockney' in www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/33606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html 15 November 2001, viewed 20 November 2009.
[127] Pierre Bonnard correspondence 7 January 1923, quoted in Claude Roger-Marx, *Bonnard: lithographe*, Monte-Carlo : Editions du livre, 1952, p. 11, and mentioned in Section 1, p. 31, footnote 22.

as long.' [128] The phenomenal undertaking and all the steps that were carried out in preparing, printing and proofing of *Caribbean tea time* are found in Tyler's worksheets for the project and have been included as an appendix.

In his review of the history of Cubist developments which was published in 1970, Douglas Cooper had written:

> The currently accepted division of Cubism into phases labelled 'analytic,' ' hermetic,' 'synthetic,' and 'rococo' is largely meaningless, since these words apply exclusively to stylistic methods – often found together in single work – used by only certain artists and having no general application, and also because they cannot be properly defined. With today's hindsight, I see an extensive movement growing up and around 'true' Cubism, developing and changing fast, and then falling apart. Therefore, to my mind, the divisions which count are historical rather than stylistic and may be said even to cut across the stylistic phases. For that reason I prefer to borrow the terminology which is generally used in discussing the evolution of Renaissance art, that is to sat 'early,' 'high,' and 'late.' The 'early' phase of Cubism, as I see it, runs from the end of 1906 till the summer of 1910; it was a period of necessary experiment by Picasso and Braque alone and led to their first major achievements before any Cubist movement had started. The period of 'high' Cubism which followed was shorter, lasting only two years, from the summer of 1910 till the winter of 1912. [129]

Initially Hockney's interpretation of Picasso's Cubism was in keeping with that of Douglas Cooper, who believed that in the case of the groundbreaking sculpture *Woman's head* of 1909-1910:

> Picasso came to represent both objects and space with an elaborate arrangement of planes and faces. Figures...as well as objects were submitted to the process of abstraction and lost their individuality. Picasso made planes and forms open up into each other so that he could penetrate to the inner structure of things. [130]

The style was principally about space and planes and the human component was abstracted in the process. For Cooper 'Early Cubism' and 'High Cubism' represented a growing refinement and abstraction. No wonder Cooper was to reject Picasso's late work. Hockney then revisited his view of Picasso in the 1980s; accepting the spatial and structural element of Cubism but adding a

---

[128] Ken Tyler 'Layers of space and time: David Hockney's *Moving focus'* in *Contemporary master prints from the Lilja collection* 1995 p. 122.
[129] Douglas Cooper, *The Cubist epoch*, Oxford, New York: Phaidon in association with the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1970, p. 13.
[130] Douglas Cooper, *The Cubist epoch*, Oxford, New York: Phaidon in association with the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1970, pp. 47-48.

further element; this was to consider Picasso's Cubism, especially that of the 1930s, as a heightening of reality and becomes evident especially in the portraiture of the *Moving focus* series. In Hockney's view, the lessons of Cubism allowed the artist to heighten the physical characteristics and the psychological nature of the sitter. In his book devoted to Picasso, published in 1990, Hockney wrote about the portraits made in *Moving focus*, which contributed to the gestation of his understanding of Cubism, that:

People often complained that Picasso distorted things. I don't think there are any distortions in Picasso at all. For instance, those marvellous portraits of his lover, Marie-Thérèse Walter, which he made during the 30s: he must have spent hours with her in bed, very close, looking at her face. A face looked at like that *does* look very different from one seen at five or six feet … So one of the important things that Picasso was getting at – in Cubism as in his later work – was an intimate form of seeing.[131]

Hockney was always fascinated by how one sees other people; not only did faces change and move when seen close up. So Picasso's Cubism of the 1930s, as in the case of portrayals of Marie-Thérèse Walter, whether in sculpture, painting, printmaking or drawing, was a new development from the *Woman's head* of 1909-1910.[132]There was a heightened reality and a heightened emotional response in a Cubist form.

In the process of making an image of someone else both the sitter and the artist are not stationary. 'A single viewpoint,' Hockney argued, 'implies we are standing still, and that even the artist? Yet we all know that our eyes move constantly, and the only time they stop moving is when we're dead – or when staring. And if we're staring we're not really looking. That is the problem with a single frame photograph: all you can actually do *is* stare at it. Your eyes cannot wander around in it because of its inherent lack of time. This is compounded by the fact that the camera is only one lens one eye. Often when we look at something close-up with one eye, that is to say, we make ourselves into a camera. Otherwise, things start to swim and it becomes difficult to hold them in visual space. Cubists did not shut their eyes.'[133]

[131] David Hockney, *Picasso*, Madras and New York: Hanuman Books, 1990, p. 38.
[132] Collection Fort Worth Art Center Museum, Texas.
[133] David Hockney, *Picasso*, Madras and New York: Hanuman Books, 1990, pp. 36-37.

The portraits Hockney made in the mid 1980s represent this new interest in revealing multiple viewpoints, which highlighted the features of the sitters and their personalities: the big eyes, warmth and openness of Celia, the constantly active Tyler talking enthusiastically on the phone, and the gentleness and composure of the artist's much loved elderly mother. Hockney explored the theme of movement over time in several major prints from the *Moving focus* series. In *An image of Gregory* we see Gregory Evans moving his head and touching his face, while at the same time he is seated patiently with legs folded and hands on the back of the seat (illustration 83). The movement is emphasised by the use of two sheets of different sizes with shaped, hand-coloured frames. For this work, Hockney captured the ageing prettiness of Evans as well as his rather distant look. It is a rather formal but very personal view of Evans by the artist at a time when their relationship was no longer so intimate: 'A friend of mine said that the big lithograph of Gregory sitting on a chair felt as if it were my farewell to Gregory. It might have been. We are still friendly but he is not always there.'[134]

An image of Celia shows a collage of images of Celia recycled from other compositions (illustration 84). Her changing gaze and moving arms and legs seated in a plush cushioned-seat are emphasised by the use of multiple viewpoints and multiple motifs in a richly coloured and textured collage. The movement and viewpoints are in turn given emphasis by the composition's apparent lack of a discrete edge with the changing form and shape of the hand-coloured frame, counteracting the sense of viewing the subject through a picture window. Here and in the following two works it is as if, like Matisse, the artist was circling his model, searching for the essence of his sitter.[135] *An Image of Celia state I* was a variant collage of multiple images of Celia, while a third variant *Image of Celia state II* is composed in a curvilinear frame with barely a straight line.

In summary, the *Moving focus* series stands as an important investigation of colour, with a glorious palette which celebrates the artist's belief that the visual arts, unlike literary ones, can be, to use his term 'pretty'. It is also an investigation of ideas of about space and time. 'In these prints there is no way to see what is depicted all at once,' Hockney commented, 'Your eyes have to move over the surface of the paper. In doing that you're aware that you keep moving from one thing to another and in your mind you convert that time into

[134] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 158.
[135] Jane Kinsman, *Intimate Matisse*, Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 1999, pp. 8-9.

space … [S]pace can be made into time. That's the way space is created in these pictures, because there's many perspectives. If there's only one-point perspective there's only one moment in time. That's why it restricts space, because one moment in time has put a boundary on space.'[136]

As well as an important exploration of Cubism for Hockney in the mid 1980s, the *Moving focus* series points to future artistic developments, notably more than a decade later in *A bigger Grand Canyon*, which is a 60-canvas, brilliantly coloured painting with as many viewpoints and as many points in time. *The Moving focus* series, therefore, with its new space, sense of emptiness and brilliant colouring should be considered as a major precursor to Hockney's achievements in painting from the 1990s onwards.

[136] David Hockney in an interview with Pat Gilmour, taped at Tyler Graphics Ltd, Bedford, New York, 22 June 1985, quoted in Ken Tyler, 'Layers of space and time: David Hockney's M*oving focus*' in *Contemporary master prints from the Lilja collection* 1995, p. 124.

Chapter 5: A different point of view

The complex nature of Hockney's art was to become apparent by the 1980s. It becomes evident from this time onwards in his openness to many forms of inspiration, his adoption of exciting new techniques and his return to old ones, but with a twist.

Since 1965 Tyler had established four incarnations of his workshops. These were Gemini Ltd and Gemini GEL in Los Angeles, California (established 1965 and 1966 respectively), and Tyler Workshop Ltd (1974) and Tyler Graphics Ltd (1975) at Bedford and Mount Kisco (1987), both in New York state. Recalling this experience, Tyler spoke of the changes that had taken place over the years as a printer–publisher working with a stable of artists:

> We kept repeating our visits with artists as much as we could and … We had developed the art of the mixed media print to quite a new height and there wasn't quite anything we couldn't do by bringing all the mediums together. And indeed it became like a candy store for the artist and no matter what their fancy might have been, technique wise we were able to pull it off pretty quickly. Having now all the machinery to do it and within a very short period of time I had moved from just silk screen and lithography into intaglio into woodblock printing, embossing and then eventually early on into paper making … – [which now allows for making] very large prints.[137]

While many artists including Frank Stella, Helen Frankenthaler and Roy Lichtenstein embraced such workshop experiences, Hockney was to turn his back on the concept of the big print workshop. Jim Dine, too, found that the emphasis on collaboration with a highly skilled workshop making lithographs, in particular, was off-putting:

> [T]o work with great lithographers in America is to work with prima donnas and pains-in-the-ass, and I don't like it. I don't like working with those Tamarind people – those overly trained, highly technical people. It's not necessary. They are all too well-trained.[138]

While some artists found the idea of working in a large print workshop totally positive, others were overwhelmed. The Abstract Expressionist artist Robert Motherwell, who loved collage, used the printing process to add to or subtract

---

[137] Ken Tyler Qantas Lecture Series, National Gallery of Australia, 14 October 1999.
[138] Jim Dine quoted in Susie Hennessy, 'A conversation with Jim Dine', *Art Journal*, volume 39, number 3, Printmaking, the collaborative art, Spring 1980, p. 169.

from his compositions and many of his prints, therefore, should be viewed as stepping stones in his eternal search for refinement. The workshop for Motherwell, however, had its downside. The artist enjoyed the camaraderie of the workshop in contrast to the solitude of the studio where he had to confront an empty canvas on a daily basis and was solely reliant on his own resources. But Motherwell also found working in a big workshop system daunting, likening the experience to moving from playing the piano in the privacy of your home and enjoying the experience, to playing before an audience of 3000 who wait to watch you being inspired. He found that such an arrangement placed great strains on his creativity.

> What actually happens when you're going to work with a noted printer/publisher such as Tamarind or Gemini or Tyler or Universal Limited Art Editions is that you arrive, say, at ten o'clock and are introduced to everybody. There are five or six printers standing around, there are a couple of secretaries, there's usually a photographer – maybe a member of the staff – and, in effect, you realise with a sinking heart that an enormous amount of time and money and organisation has been set aside in a definite time slot for you to be a creative genius. Now there's no situation that freezes your blood more.[139]

By the late 1980s, Hockney found that the huge apparatus that had celebrated creativity of the artist now could overwhelm it. There was a certain lack of independence that was abhorrent to someone who was staunchly independent. The stop-and-start nature of a workshop also stifled spontaneity, allowing for the various stages of preparation and proofing. Hockney found that having to switch creativity on and off was a frustration. In the next stage of his printmaking career, he turned to making 'home made' prints; the venue was literally his house. By the mid-1980s Hockney had become a very talented technician in printmaking. Cecil Beaton once observed that Hockney's technical facility compared to his own was considerable, as he 'has great technical flair ... he can open unfathomable locks, he knows how to put things together ... He is an engineer, but he is also that strange thing, a phenomenal genius.'[140]

The cumulative effect of learning new processes such as colour etching from Aldo Crommelynck and colour Mylar lithography from Ken Tyler enabled Hockney to work both spontaneously and in layers, something he was particularly adept at doing. This set him in good stead for *Home made prints* – a

[139] Interview with Stephanie Terenzio, 28 December 1979, quoted in Stephanie Terenzio, *The Prints of Robert Motherwell*, catalogue raisonné by Dorothy C. Belknapp, New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1991, p. 128.
[140] Cecil Beaton, *Self portrait with friends: the selected diaries of Cecil Beaton 1926-1974*, edited by Richard Buckle, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979, 'Reddish: Whitsun', 1969 entry, p. 399.

series made by using a Xerox machine; for now he wanted to set out on his own. The experience of working at home, solo and with a colour photocopier was almost the direct antithesis of working in a big print workshop, with its technical facilities and trappings and pressure to perform. He liked the immediacy of the photocopying process compared to a major print workshop and he liked the fact he could work just by himself. 'Over the years', Hockney said in an interview with Lawrence Weschler:

> I've made prints working in several master printshops. It's an exciting process, but I've always been bothered by the lack of spontaneity: how it takes hours and hours, working alongside several master craftsmen, to generate an image. How you're continually having to interrupt the process of creation from one moment to the next for technical reasons. But with these copying machines, I can work by myself – indeed you virtually have to work by yourself, there's nothing for anyone else to do – and I can work with great speed and responsiveness. In fact this is the closest I've come in printing to what it's like to paint: I can put something down, evaluate it alter it, revise it re-examine it, all in a matter of seconds.[141]

Hockney's experimentation in photography also aided him, as according to the artist it, 'made me look into cameras and what they were really doing, making me realise that an office copying machine was a camera that confined itself to flat surfaces. It never attempts to depict space.'[142] His photo collages with their multiple viewpoints taken over time helped in his understanding of space.

In February 1986 the artist began exploring the possibilities of printing using a photocopier, becoming fascinated with the 'new space' it made, where 'the lens had in effect moved right up to the surface'. Instead of ink there was dry powder – meaning that the layers of colour did not need drying time – which was transferred electronically from paper to paper. Hockney contrasted this process with colour lithography:

> For the artist there are great advantages here. First, printing from paper to paper means that the original marks can be made on the same kind of paper one prints on. This seems to remove a layer. For instance a wash in a lithograph is made by dipping a brush in tusche and laying it on a zinc plate, stone, or Mylar. Now the way a brush behaves on these surfaces is different from the soft absorbent surface of paper, the way wash dries is different – on paper it is through absorption and evaporation only, so the marks printed on paper from paper seemed

[141] Lawrence Weschler, 'A visit with David and Stanley: Hollywood Hills 1987' in Maurice Tuchman & Stephanie Barron, *David Hockney: a retrospective*, Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1988, pp. 77-78.
[142] Hockney, David, *Home made prints*, Los Angeles: David Hockney, 1986, p. [1].

more direct. A lithographic wash on paper is an illusion of a paper wash – it was made on metal.[143]

The artist made 33 prints using a photocopier from March to July of 1986. Although he hoped for an edition of 60 for each of the works, some were less. The smallest was 25, owing to the exigencies of printing in layers of colour with each colour drawn separately on a different piece of paper. Consistent with his style of the mid 1980s, Hockney prints are notable for the Cubist look and reverse perspective, and include subjects of interiors and the exterior veranda of his house, still lifes, animals, a self-portrait and the face of Celia on a small canvas which had originally been designed for the cover of French *Vogue* of December 1985–January 1986 and reappeared in the *Moving focus* series. Other figure studies include *Black plant on table, April 1986* and *Man reading Stendhal, July 1986* (illustrations 86 and 87). The palette for the prints is brightly coloured, with the exception of those in a beautiful velvety black that Hockney was able to achieve using a photocopier, the Kodak Ektaprint 225F. He used two other photocopiers – the Canon P. C. 25 followed by the Canon N. P. 3525.I. Later in 1986, Hockney made a further four homemade prints: two of his dog Stanley, one of an office chair and one composite wall piece in an edition of 15 consisting of eight framed sheets arranged in the form of a tree with out-reaching branches and leaves, *The tree, November 1986.*

As with the more elaborate, deluxe *Moving focus* series, Hockney's ability to think in separate colours and consecutively enabled him to achieve in Xerox accomplished and beautiful works. Hockney's interest in new technologies, methods of printing and mass media grew in the 1980s; he experimented with computer graphics, newspaper prints using a tri-chromatic printing process, television imagery using paintbox and faxes. For the *Home made prints* series, there was no proofing as required in traditional printing methods and no need to collaborate with anyone, which would have been required in a traditional print workshop. And he was free to act more spontaneously, more intuitively.

Home made prints led to another avenue of printing – the newspaper prints for Andy Warhol's trendsetting magazine *Interview*, and the *Bradford Telegraph and Argus*. To accompany his conversation with Robert Becker for the December 1986 issue of *Interview*, the artist proposed that he make an original

---

[143] David Hockney, *Home made prints*, Los Angeles: David Hockney, 1986, p. [2].

print for the publication using colour separations in tri-chromatic printing. The publishers agreed to this and printers combined the separations for magenta, cyan and yellow plus black to produce his work *Peace on Earth*. Hockney followed this with a further venture for the Bradford newspaper, which had asked the city's now famous artist to support the 'Bradford's bouncing back campaign' that it was sponsoring. Hockney's response was *A bounce for Bradford*, which he again composed in colour separations and the newspaper's printers combined to make this original print in a huge print run of 100,000, published on 3 March 1987.

From March to May 1986 Hockney had exhibited all 29 prints from the *Moving focus* series at the Tate Gallery, London. Some were the editioned prints, while others were at trial proof stage. There was also a hand-coloured working proof of *Caribbean tea time*, which would not be editioned until 1987 and three drawings related to the series. Three of the Acatlán subjects from the series were also shown at the Royal Academy annual summer exhibition of that year, having been criticised for their expense as these technically complicated and elaborate essays in printmaking were not cheap.[144] This irritated the artist and so for the following year's Royal Academy exhibition, he had a further print run of 10,000 copies of A *bounce for Bradford*, which his brother Paul arranged with the Bradford newspaper, allowing individuals to purchase a Hockney print for 18 pence. This action was welcomed by the critic for the *Guardian*, who noted that the gesture questioned the fundamental role of the Royal Academy summer exhibition as 'both picture and price-tag challenge the view that the artist's job is to make exclusive knick knacks for the living rooms of the well-to-do.'[145]

On 22 February 1987 Andy Warhol died suddenly after complications following an operation to remove his gallbladder and Hockney was asked to write on his importance for the *Sunday Times Magazine*, published on 29 March of that year. He wrote that Warhol, like himself, saw the importance of new technologies and argued that, 'The art of painting has to be connected with printing today; if not, not many people can see it. Most people know painting through printing; Warhol understood that and began to make something of it. He began to turn the media into the medium.'[146] Hockney's own experiments with technologies and his move into magazines and newspapers were some

---

[144] Peter Webb, *Portrait of David Hockney*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1988, p. 236.
[145] Waldemar Januszczak, 'Summer of the umpteenth doll, *The Guardian*, 6 June 1987, quoted in Peter Webb, *Portrait of David Hockney*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1988, p. 237.
[146] David Hockney, *Sunday Times Magazine*, 29 March 1987, quoted in Peter Webb, *Portrait of David Hockney*, p. 235, note 16.

resourceful attempts to achieve this for his own art, that is, to reach a wider audience and make his work accessible.

Continuing with his concern to produce low cost prints, further colour separations were made for the catalogue for *David Hockney: a retrospective* for the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, which opened on 4 February 1988 and then travelled to New York and London. Consisting of 23 pages of organic forms, dogs, figures and landscapes, sometimes heavily textured, the compositions for the catalogue were made up from colour separations by Hockney after he had proofed his work on his colour photocopying machine. The artist wrote that these pages:

> Were conceived using the medium of printing ink on paper. I constructed them by drawing the four colours separately. Each colour was drawn in black-and-white on separate sheets of paper with the thought of the coloured ink in my head. The picture only exists when all four separations are put together. This happens here on this surface. They are therefore not reproductions in the ordinary sense of the word but the original work. (i.e. this is the only form they exist in.)

Because of this it was Hockney's view that the process had 'opened up commercial printing as a direct artist's medium'.[147]

In 1988 Hockney purchased a beach house at Malibu, located right on the ocean shore. The overwhelming physical nature of the ocean had an immediate impact on Hockney, 'To be able to walk along that wooden deck with the water at your feet gives you a real connection to the sea. Here I'm on the edge of the largest swimming pool in the world – the Pacific Ocean.'[148] After the opening of his retrospective at the Los Angeles County Museum, Hockney more or less moved permanently to the beach. The subject for his art once again became how to depict water. Unlike his earlier depictions of water that was glistening, contained, and still – except for the movement of a figure or the splash of water – now it was water in motion in all its astonishing power that Hockney wrestled to depict, just as the Japanese *ukiyo-e* artist Katsushika Hokusai had done so before him.[149] Hockney's imagery also was one of emptiness and loneliness,

---

[147] David Hockney in Maurice Tuchman & Stephanie Barron, *David Hockney: a retrospective*, Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1988, p. [312].
[148] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 178.
[149] Katsushika Hokusai, *The great wave of Kanagawa*, from the series *36 views of Mt Fuji*, 1831.

evident in painting, such as the tea-set for one in *Breakfast at Malibu, Sunday* of 1989, reflecting his personal circumstances at this time in his life.[150]

Home made prints had led the artist to other investigations of new technologies in printing, including the fax machine, or, as Hockney called it, 'the telephone for the deaf' and who, at this stage in his life, was suffering from a growing deafness. Hockney began experimenting in October 1988. At first the faxes were of paintings of the sea at Malibu, which he manipulated to alter size and scale as well as collaging them:

> I started the faxes in about October 1988, in Malibu. Many of them were made from paintings of the sea stretched on one machine, reduced in another way, crammed in, pasted up, made into a collage and then into a fax. I began sending them out to various people who immediately responded by asking how I got such a clear fax machine. I said I'd been exploring various methods. There's no such thing as a bad printing machine – so the fax, which is a printing machine, can be used in a beautiful way. To make half-tones, for instance, you don't use washes for something to look like a wash, you use opaque grey; the machine read the opaque greys and made the dots itself. I mixed different greys and so developed quite complicated-looking tones.[151]

The faxes were then 'published' by Hockney's tongue-in-cheek company the 'Hollywood Sea Picture Supply Co, Est 1988'. The fax machine allowed Hockney all kinds of experimentation where he could bend his images by tilting the work, as well as playing with the notion of making images within images. It was another means of making art in print relatively cheaply (illustrations 87 and 88).

As well as faxes to family and friends, Hockney sent an exhibition of his work through the fax machine. The first was for an exhibition curated by Henry Geldzahler for the São Paolo Biennale in October 1989. Building on the idea of multiple-sheet works, which he had created for his *Paper pool* series, Hockney designed four large composite faxes specifically for the walls of the gallery space and in theory delivered down the phone lines – though in practice they were faxed to another machine in Hockney's house and then delivered by Richard Schmidt to the Biennale venue. In keeping with the exhibition of faxes, faxed to the venue, Hockney thought it appropriate that as the artist he should not attend the exhibition in person but held interviews by fax for the occasion.

---

[150] *David Hockney: Some new pictures,* Los Angeles: L.A Louver, 1989, introduction by Peter Goulds, catalogue number 1.
[151] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It,* edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, pp. 191-192.

On seeing the faxes at Hockney's home in Los Angeles, his longtime friend from Bradford, Jonathan Silver, asked Hockney if he could send him a fax at the 1853 Gallery at the Salt Mills in Saltaire, Yorkshire, which Silver had established in 1987. Hockney duly complied and prepared a multi-sheet work to send down the wires. To mark the occasion Silver borrowed two Ricoh fax laser-printers with high-quality paper and threw a party for 400 guests while the 144 sheets of *Tennis* were faxed through, assembled at the other end and framed on the gallery wall – all to the music of Richard Wagner's *Die Walküre*, with the proceedings filmed by Yorkshire Television. 'After all', Hockney remarked in conversation about the faxes with Paul Joyce:

> The fax machine is just a printing machine. It occurred to me that it could be used in a beautiful way, to make beautiful things. It also struck me that you can send as many sheets as you want, literally hundreds, which could be assembled at the other end to make a work just as large as you want. So I started with sixteen sheets, making a complete picture. Over the six months or so that I worked with the fax, this expanded to twenty four, then upwards to one hundred and forty-four and finally, the largest of all, two hundred and eighty-eight pages.[152]

Other faxes were both playful correspondence combined with careful compositions of images within images, such as an illustration of a painting placed on a drawing of an easel set within the drawing of an imaginary artist's studio and with notes from Hockney included such as, 'Yet another picture from' and 'David Hockney did this'.[153] Others were little visual mementoes to friends such as to R. B Kitaj, with the comments 'Personal', 'Rush', 'for R.B.K from D. H.' and humorously, 'Original'.[154] Faxes to Tyler included a 26-sheet alphabet and an image with the rather pointed words 'There is no such thing as a bad printing machine only a bad printer'; a playful quip at the expense of Tyler.[155]

During these months of experimentation with faxes, Hockney made small canvases of new landscape forms, painted quickly and spontaneously and inspired by the experience of living next to the ocean, and car trips along mountain roads where he wanted to capture movement within a landscape: 'When I moved down to the beach at Malibu, I also developed a drive through the mountains, once I had choreographed *Tristan* spatially as a mode. I began

---

[152] David Hockney & Paul Joyce, *Hockney on 'Art': conversations with Paul Joyce*, Boston, New York: London: Little, Brown and Company, 1999, p. 183.
[153] Collection of the artist, Studio reference number 89 J07 and 89 J08.
[154] Collection of the artist, Studio reference number 89 D07.
[155] Collection National Gallery of Australia, 313 individual sheets of faxes, accession numbers 2002.1.1870 to 2002.1.1965.

exploring the Santa Monica Mountains playing Wagner, realising how dramatic it could be. I actually choreographed two drives after that where brilliant colour, simple forms and textures all played an important role.'[156]

In early April 1990 Hockney was visited by Tyler in Los Angeles where he showed the printer his photocopier and materials he used for textures and the techniques he employed for this prints. Hockney at this time was, Tyler recalled, 'Just coming out of the great Fax period of 1989-1990'.[157] The printer–publisher was very keen that Hockney should come and work with him again. The artist planned to visit New York later that year for the opening of Wagner's cycle of operas *Der Ring des Nibelungen* at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York, beginning with *Das Rheingold* on 18 June. This was then followed by *Die Walküre* on 19 June, *Siegfried* on 20 June and finally *Die Götterdämmerung* on 21 June. At Tyler's bidding the artist agreed that he should visit the Tyler Graphics workshop, which was part of the new purpose-built complex at Mount Kisco.

Undaunted by the artist's reluctance to work in a print workshop, and as indefatigable as ever, Tyler purchased a copier similar to the one Hockney had shown him in preparation for the artist's visit. At the print workshop Hockney stayed for a week and then returned later in May 1990. In preparing to make some new lithographs at the Tyler workshop, some of Hockney's imagery from his *Home made prints* were enlarged and then transferred photographically onto lithographic plates, to begin the basis of new compositions. The experiments with faxes also informed other forms of his printmaking, replicating qualities of graininess and various textures. Hockney began a series of 26 proofs where he had drawn three-dimensional forms with shadows, swirls and patterning as he sought to translate his very new fax style into lithography.

By the time Tyler Graphics Limited was established, his workshop was a very well organised and honed business. John Hutcheson, a senior figure, remembered the details of how the workshop was run:

> At TGL my role was to support Ken's creative printmaking by ensuring that we always had the necessary materials, manpower, and machinery no matter what new direction he took. Every day there were new pits to steer the shop around in order to keep it running smoothly for his high

[156] David Hockney quoted in Nigel Farndale, 'The talented Mr Hockney' in www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/33606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html, 15 November 2001, viewed 20 November 2009.
[157] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 November 2003.

expectations. One of the hallmarks of Ken's collaborations with famous artists was his technological developments and his attitude of 'thinking large'. He was continually re-inventing the traditional methods and offering his new, improved version to his artists. This meant that we were constantly re-working our machines and searching for exotic materials to support Ken's vision. Although everybody got involved in the innovations, I was Ken's main 'go to' guy in the Workshop for that research. And, once we had a new technique running smoothly enough, I would rejoin the team to use the new method to make the editions of prints.

Ken himself is a master inventor and is perfectly capable in this kind of design and research. But at that time, he really wanted to be 'making art' with the artists. Also, at that time, he really wanted his line printers to keep to their printing tasks and not get side-tracked. So he would often hand the backup tasks for a new invention to me and to outside consultants.

My typical day at TGL would start early with a check of the printer's Time Record Sheets to see if everybody was on schedule and if they might be needing new supplies ordered to prevent any slow-down. Ken was always there early and we would have a chance to get the marching orders set for that day. Once those overall shop concerns were settled I would start my own printing or papermaking task for that day. By then the rest of the production team would be arriving. I was always teamed with one or more of them in a leading or supporting role. [158]

In his practice as a master printer, Tyler would go to great lengths to acquire the perfect tool, in this case, the most perfect roller for inking his lithographs. In documentary footage made in 1990 when was working on the lithographs *Four flowers in still life*, *White Lines dancing on printing ink*, *The wave, a lithograph* and *Rampant*, published in 1991 at the Mount Kisco premises, Tyler explained:

I broke the wooden handles, I wore them off, and so I now have a stainless steel handle and a pin that goes all the way through this roller. This is made from a belly of a horse that's never seen a barbed wire fence, because the belly, of the horse, has no marks in it, no scars. And it is sewn perfectly so there's practically no seam, and that's necessary so that when you lay down a layer of film on the stone or the plate there's no marks coming from the roller. This is like a pure piece of velvet. That's why you hear that wonderful hiss; it's all the little horsehairs. [159]

In more footage of Tyler and Hockney at the Mount Kisco workshop at this time, artist and printer can be seen working at their symbiotic best. Several proofs

---

[158] John Hutcheson, 'Answers to a staff questionnaire for the Kenneth Tyler printmaking collection', received on 26 October 2011, to be published online in the Kenneth E. Tyler website, National Gallery of Australia.
[159] CAN120_IRN134868 + CAN120_IRN134871, 1990.

were made of *The wave*, refining both the colour and forms, with Tyler providing the technical expertise for Hockney's demands for colour and tone. Following this Tyler was able to produce the required modifications with great attention to detail and with great speed, allowing Hockney to proceed rapidly with his variations until a final composition could be approved (illustration 89).[160] The banter was warm and friendly, with jokes still about the expensive nature of the *Moving focus* prints and similar exercises, with Hockney asking the printer: 'Did you know the cheap print is coming back'?[161] In further film of this date, the cameraman continues the joke asking Tyler, 'Is this the return of the cheap print?', and Tyler responding, 'The return of cheap labour is what it is ...'[162]

Later in 1990 Hockney was visited in Los Angeles by Tyler, who was keen to demonstrate a new method of lithography – the toner chalk printing. As Tyler remembered, 'The technique was developed by Nik Semenoff, who had been experimenting with the process since 1984, while he was an artist-in-residence at the University of Saskatchewan, Canada in 1991 ... We kept exchanging experiments and information on the use of Xerox powder toners from 1984 and into the early 90s'.[163] Subsequently Tyler made further improvements to the process:

> In February 1991 I made a die for a chalk mould to make compressed 1 1/2" diameter toner chalks in various degrees of hardness. One can use the chalk to draw directly onto Mylar, aluminium plates or stone. The toner chalk is fixed with 'white gas', a gasoline containing no tetraethyl lead, which evaporates very quickly, leaving no oil residue. To apply the white gas, I designed a fume box that consisted of a tray for the printing element and above that a tray containing a rag blotter soaked in white gas. After the drawn element was exposed to the fumes of the white gas, the toner chalk would be hardened and then could be processed like any other crayon drawing.[164]

Because it used a dry medium of photocopier toner, instead of greasy tusche used in traditional lithography, beautiful washes and chalk drawings were possible. Hockney returned to Mount Kisco in January the following year of 1991 and made three prints using the toner chalk technique of the dry powder method. These were whimsical images full of texture, bold colouring, a range of lines and creating three imaginary 'landscapes', *The new and the old and the new*, *Twelve fifteen* and *Table flowable*. Although Hockney only made three of

[160] CAN 120_IRN135517 + CAN403_135518.
[161] CAN120_IRN134840 + CAN120_IRN134845.
[162] CAN397_IRN135510 + CAN137_IRN135512.
[163] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 2 December 2003.
[164] Ken Tyler in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 2 December 2003.

these toner chalk prints, they provided a foretaste of his 'very new' style, which evolved in the 1990s, of 'abstract narratives' in his printmaking and painting.

Hockney made further prints during this period, *Eine*, *Deux* and *Trés,* which were closest stylistically to the constructed spaces and textured forms of the faxes yet were highly complex in their making, with up to 15 plates and 15 colours used. These three prints, along with some of the faxes, all possess an air of lingering sadness and loneliness about them – they lack the *joie de vivre* which one often associates with Hockney's art (illustration 90). One reason for this bleak imagery was that by 1989 so many of his friends had died from Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), which had first been identified in the United States in 1981 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Hockney remembered that:

> At one point I was flying weekly to New York where I had four different friends dying from Aids in four different hospitals. I lost a lot of friends. That is why New York is so different now. Two generations were wiped out, really. Very talented people.[165]

The deaths were bound to reverberate in his art of the time. Another response to his grieving was to make images of the living in a series of painted portraits of his friends and family, and in the digital print set *112 LA visitors*, 1990–1991. This print series consisted of composite images of anyone who visited Hockney's house – from intimate friend to repairman – and was made from video stills using a digital camera. Each standing individual was videoed from head to toe, with five parts of each video still stored in a camera and printed using a laser printer, resulting in five printed sheets of each person to be joined together as one whole.

Hockney's concerted effort in opera set and costume design over several years from the latter part of the 1980s and early 1990s came to influence his two-dimensional art in painting and print. In 1986 Hockney had been commissioned by Peter Hemmings, Director of the Los Angeles Music Center Opera to design Wagner's opera *Tristan and Isolde*. Preparation continued through 1987 and the first performance took place that year. In September 1990 Hockney began working on his first Italian opera, *Turandot*, by Puccini, a composer whom he loved, which opened at the Lyric Opera, Chicago, in January 1992. This was

[165] David Hockney quoted in Nigel Farndale, 'The talented Mr Hockney' in www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/33606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html, 15 November 2001, viewed 20 November 2009.

followed by Richard Strauss's *Die Frau ohne Schatten* for the Royal Opera Covent Garden in London, opening later that year. Hockney's stage sets were notable for their brilliant colour, dramatic light and organic forms and textures. The play of space in the three dimensions had the effect of drawing the audience into the stage, rather than observing the performance from afar.

His theatre design was to have a pronounced influence on Hockney's other work, his painting and later his prints, which took on the appearance of three dimensions. The third dimension intrigued Hockney:

> The third dimension is of course time, the time you give a picture when you look at it and it pulls you in and moves you around and you therefore become aware of taking time. Time becomes another dimension and again, that has to do with the awareness of the surface: and only when you *see* the surface can you then play around with it, but you have to see *everything* on the surface, the marks clearly made on it ... I have also used linear perspective and played textural games because perspective can be achieved by texture. I tried to do the same with the river in *Die Frau*, using texture to make a space to make it look as if it's going a long way back.[166]

The new style culminated with his series of 23 small canvases and one larger one with spontaneous brushwork, *Some very new paintings* of 1992, followed by *Some new prints* of 1993 and *Some more new prints* in 1993–1994, which he made at Gemini GEL in Los Angeles. The compositions in paint and in print further revealed the artist's interest in space and time. They show the effect of the Californian landscape, the mountains of Santa Monica where he felt the 'violence of nature'; and Malibu, where he was constantly aware of the 'invisible forces' and 'endlessly moving' Pacific Ocean. Underlying this art is the constant, sometimes subliminal reference to Picasso. The experience of working in paper pulp informed this new series of prints. There is an emphasis on texture and patterns, a brighter palette of inks and the use of multiple sheets to create larger lithographs, such as *Four part splinge* from the series *Some very new prints*, and *Going round* from the series *Some more new prints* (illustration 91).[167]

The print compositions at this stage were neither representational nor abstract. By this time Hockney had come to view them as 'not mutually exclusive, each must contain elements of the other'. Noting the power of the landscape he was

---

[166] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 236.
[167] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 94.1414 A-D.

enveloped in, Hockney said, 'Here at the beach I am between two great forces, the mountains and the sea. The mountains were made by a great force of nature, a thrusting force, which calmed in time, leaving them here, grand and peaceful. While below the other thrust continues, the endless movement of the sea ... they are also quite sexual – or so I'm told. But I know that! These things were on my mind when I was painting them.'[168] By this time the figurative and abstract elements in Hockney's art had further fused, as these landscape forms were neither representational nor simply formal, but rather had become evocations of the physical world. 'I soon realised that what I was doing was making internal landscapes using different marks and textures to create space so that the viewer wanders around'.[169]

A further exploration of spatial relationships followed in 1995, which was the most dramatic in its play of multi-dimensionality on a two-dimensional plane. Hockney made two abutted canvases, which he combined on the floor with a curved canvas-covered Masonite. He painted these in oil in the 'very new style' of curvilinear forms, textures, bright colours and placed several geometric forms within the installation. The result was like a new set design, only not for an opera performance, but rather another means of exploring space. The result was *First detail* to *Fifth detail* from the series *Snail's space*, which was part of a larger series of 20. These were photographed and printed using a digital inkjet printer in editions of 45. They were remarkable for the play of two and three dimensions – as the three-dimensional object was photographed and printed it became a two-dimensional work, but because of its 'very new' style of forms, colours and textures, it obviated its true dimensions to suggest movement and time, and therefore again becomes three-dimensional. This painted environment was Hockney's version of installation art, *Snails space with Vari-lites: painting as performance* 1995–96, with an accompanying programmed light-show of ten minutes which altered the look of the surfaces, forms and colours. It was shown at the André Emmerich Gallery in New York, leading one commentator to describe it as, 'An opera with out sound ... Or else: Music for the deaf.'[170]

Hockney also explored other three-dimensional forms, namely multiples. In 1989 Dutch-born George Mulder had joined Robert Lococo to establish Lococo

[168] David Hockney & Paul Joyce, *Hockney on 'Art': conversations with Paul Joyce*, Boston, New York, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1999, p.189.
[169] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 230.
[170] Lawrence Weschler, 'Liebstod: a final Tristan (1996)', republished *True to life: twenty-five years of conversations with David Hockney*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008, p. 91.

Mulder Fine Art Publishers. Mulder's print publishing house evolved after he had been introduced to the New York art publishing scene by Andy Warhol in 1982. Seven years later Mulder established a new limited-edition publishing house with Robert Lococo, the Lococo Mulder Fine Art Publishers based in St Louis. Hockney made two multiples. He had begun the project in 1989, and completed the two pieces in 1994: *Big chair*, made of purpleheart wood with royal-blue velvet upholstery and *Little chair* made of the same materials.[171] These chairs were constructed in reverse perspective seen in the *Moving focus* series; as with *Two Pembroke studio chairs* and *The perspective lesson*, both 1984, and the more elaborate *Number one chair* 1985-86,[172] which would again become a subject for his prints in 1998.[173]

During the mid 1990s, Hockney continued to have print editions published by Mulder Lococo with the artist, taking the occasional break from the explorations of space and new techniques, returning to more conventional subjects, still lifes and animals. Hockney also reverted to more conventional printing methods of etching and aquatint for *Sunflower* of 1995, while working without colour in black and white. He used conventional methods of etching and aquatinting, though adopting a bold colouring, for a series of dog compositions, *Small dogs*, *Vertical dogs* and *Horizontal dogs*, working with printer Maurice Payne.[174]

For several of his *Home made prints* Hockney depicted one of his two small dogs, Stanley in 1986, when the daschund was just eight weeks old. He was named after the comedian Stan Laurel, who was a favourite of both Hockney and his father. These were strange and slightly humorous, disjointed depictions. Later in a new series of studies of the two daschunds, Stanley and Boodgie, Hockney shows his remarkable draughtsmanship, capturing both the character of his pets and their rotund forms. Hockney also produced paintings and drawings of some of his favourite canine sitters. He wrote of his experience of creating these non-human portraits later:

> From September 1993, I painted and drew my dogs. This took a certain amount of planning, since dogs are generally not interested in art (I say generally only because I have now come across a singing dog). Food and love dominate their lives.

---

[171] Respectively 119.0 x 102.0 x 69.0 cm., edition 6; 91.0 x 76.0 x 46.0 cm., edition 6.
[172] National Gallery of Australia, accession numbers, 2002.1. 87, 2002.1.707; 2002.1.88; 2002.1.96, 2002.1.67, 2002.1.665-.667.
[173] *David Hockney: Recent etchings*, Los Angeles LA Louver, 1999, catalogue number 1, *Van Gogh chair (black)*, 1998; catalogue number 2, Van Gogh chair (white), 1998; catalogue number 7, *Chair with book on red carpet*, 1998.
[174] Maurice Payne interviewed by Jane Kinsman, 12 November 1999.

In order to draw them I had to leave large sheets of paper all over the house and studio to catch them sitting or sleeping without disturbance. For the same reason, I kept canvases and a fresh palette ready for times when I thought I could work.

Everything was made from observations, so speed of execution was important. (They don't stay long in one position and one knock on the door is enough to make them leap up; not very good models.)

Sometimes I put their cushion on a platform so I could observe them at eye level.

I make no apologies for the apparent subject matter. These two dear little creatures are my friends. They are intelligent, loving, comical and often bored. They watch me work; I notice the warm shapes they make together, their sadness and their delights. And, being Hollywood dogs, they somehow seem to know that a picture is being made[175].

Such subjects were brief interludes and provided some respite from Hockney's obsession with space and its depiction – such a major focus for the artist at the time. In the mid-1990s Hockney decided to tackle the big subject of big space: the Grand Canyon. He had had the ambition to paint this monumental subject since travelling the first time by car across the United States as a young man in 1964. On reflection Hockney considered his obsession with space was related to his growing deafness, 'In my case I felt I could appreciate space much better when I lost my hearing, I think it's because sound locates you in space. You have to compensate somehow. I am interested in space. That's why I like painting the Grand Canyon. And the Yorkshire moors.'[176]

Hockney had photographed the Grand Canyon in 1982 – a monumental task he had set himself. He commented later that he wanted 'to photograph the unphotographable. Which is to say space … [T]here is no question … that the thrill of standing on that rim of the Grand Canyon is spatial. It is the biggest space you can look out over that has an edge…'[177] The artist's solution for his two-dimensional image of the Grand Canyon was to take a series of photographs which, with their multiple vanishing points, he placed together as the collage, *Grand Canyon with ledge, Arizona*, 1982.[178] This was one of

[175] David Hockney, *David Hockney's dog days*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1998, pp. 5-6.
[176] David Hockney quoted in Nigel Farndale, 'The talented Mr Hockney' in www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/33606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html, 15 November 2001, viewed 20 November 2009 .
[177] David Hockney quoted in 'Interview' by Lawrence Weschler', in *David Hockney: looking at landscape/being in landscape*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles, LA Louver, 15 September – 24 October 1998, p. 28.
[178] Collection of the artist, photo-collage.

several such photo-collages that he made at the time and can now be identified as a crucial step in the making of *A bigger Grand Canyon* in 1988. In 1986 in preparation for his forthcoming photographic exhibition, the artist revisited his preferred collaged view of the Grand Canyon. He produced this as a large-scale photo-collage of 60 photographs, reprinting them using the full negatives, which were abutted to make *Grand Canyon with Ledge, Arizona. 1982, Collage # 2, Made May 1986.*[179] It was this work which formed the basis of his painting of the subject over a decade later.

Years later, in June and July 1997, Hockney made two long trips by car from Los Angeles to Santa Fe and back: 'I'd been contemplating some sort of big landscape of the West. Big spaces: that's what was getting into my head. I was experiencing a growing claustrophobia … [and] stronger, the longing for big spaces.'[180] The full expression of this would be to paint the Grand Canyon. Almost immediately after this journey, Hockney returned to the landscape of his youth, Yorkshire, to be with a dying friend, Jonathan Silver, 'who always thought that life was a celebration'.[181] Hockney made frequent trips through the countryside to be at his friend's bedside. The experience inspired a series of paintings of the Yorkshire landscape, a subject suggested by Silver, in order 'to put some joy there'.[182] The last two paintings in the series, *Double East Yorkshire* and *Garrowby Hill* of early 1998 were painted on Hockney's return to Los Angeles, after Silver's death. As the work progressed, the imagery had become more and more dramatic. The latter painting, a view from Garrowby Hill, was a location that for Hockney that imparted 'this marvelous feeling how you're about to take off and fly. A momentary sense of soaring.'[183]This painting, about a journey through winding roads towards distant vistas, was rich in metaphor at this time of bereavement.

Hockney's obsession with depicting 'big spaces' had been fuelled by a visit in December 1997 to the exhibition *Thomas Moran* at the National Gallery in Washington DC. Moran, who was a fellow countryman (exactly 100 years older than Hockney) and, like Hockney, was from the North of England, had taken on the challenge of the Grand Canyon. Hockney remarked that the exhibition

[179] Collection of the artist, photo-collage.
[180] David Hockney quoted in *David Hockney: looking at landscape/being in landscape*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles, LA Louver, 15 September – 24 October 1998, pp. 8-10.
[181] David Hockney interviewed in *David Hockney: en perspective*, documentary film by Monique Lajournade & Pierre Saint-Jean, Paris: Canal+/ Mirage Illimité/ Grand Canal, Centre Georges Pompidou, 1999.
[182] David Hockney interviewed in *David Hockney: en perspective*, documentary film by Monique Lajournade & Pierre Saint-Jean, Paris: Canal+/ Mirage Illimité/ Grand Canal, Centre Georges Pompidou, 1999.
[183] David Hockney quoted in *David Hockney: looking at landscape/being in landscape*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles, LA Louver, 15 September – 24 October 1998, p. 26.

catalogue 'featured an early ad for the Santa Fe Railroad which characterised the Grand Canyon as 'the despair of the painter', meaning it was too difficult to paint.'[184] Returning home to Los Angeles, Hockney prepared to paint it.

He made two painted studies, one of nine canvases, the other of 15 canvases. These formed the basis for *A composition for A bigger Grand Canyon*.[185] Clearing his studio of everything except these and two related photo-collages, Hockney began, in February 1998, to work on a 60-canvas *A bigger Grand Canyon*. In an effort to resolve the painting further, he made three more drawings of the left, the centre and the right of the foreground. The subject, according to the artist, is '"Looking at the Grand Canyon", not just "the Grand Canyon"'.[186] *A bigger Grand Canyon* was to become a major statement by the artist about the depiction of space and the experience of being within a space, or travelling through a space, over time (illustration 93). *A bigger Grand Canyon* revealed how clearly Hockney had finally come to understand the lessons of Picasso and might be considered as a late twentieth-century Cubist work.

In an interview with the artist, Lawrence Weschler talked to Hockney about his paintings from the latter part of the 1990s; he reminded Hockney of a favourite quotation of the artist from the writings of the astronomer Carl Sagan, which reads, in part: 'How is it that hardly any major religion looked at science and concluded, "This is better than we thought! The universe is much bigger than our prophets said – grander, more subtle, more elegant. God must be even greater than we dreamed"?'[187] It is Hockney's view that Sagan's comment was 'actually about big space … how God must be even greater than we dreamed of. Much bigger. The universe, bigger. Grander. Vaster. More spacious. I thought that was marvellous.'[188] Such enormous space was the central subject of the painting *A bigger Grand Canyon*. Space, but on a smaller scale, was central to the prints he made concurrently.

[184] David Hockney quoted in *David Hockney: looking at landscape/being in landscape*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles, LA Louver, 15 September – 24 October 1998, p. 28; see also Gérard Wajcman, 'Le Désespoir des peintres,' in *David Hockney: Espace/Paysage*, Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou, 1999.
[185] Collection of Dale Chihuly, Charcoal, pencil, ink drawing with tape on three sheets.
[186] David Hockney interviewed in *David Hockney: en perspective*, documentary film by Monique Lajournade & Pierre Saint-Jean, Paris: Canal+/ Mirage Illimité/ Grand Canal, Centre Georges Pompidou, 1999.
[187] David Hockney quoted in *David Hockney: looking at landscape/being in landscape*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles, LA Louver, 15 September – 24 October 1998, p. 5.
[188] David Hockney quoted in *David Hockney: looking at landscape/being in landscape*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles, LA Louver, 15 September – 24 October 1998, p. 35.

Hockney's painting technique of building up layers of colour slowly and glazing thin applications of oil paint in the manner of Vermeer was necessarily a time-consuming process and, while working on a vast scale in 1998, Hockney turned again to making prints. These were to show an ability to make compositions of great depth, but in a complete *volte face* from his last printmaking undertaking with its focus on new technologies, the artist turned to the long-established technique of etching. Wanting to avoid the serious commitment and the intrusion of working in 'a state of the art' print workshop, Hockney opted for a traditional method of printing, just as he had turned to the methods of Vermeer when painting at this time. However, if Hockney's technique was traditional, his approach to making prints at this time was not. He wanted to celebrate the handmade and avoid any slick or mechanical appearance. He also chose to work in the limited palette of black, white and red; in contrast to the vivid colouring of his Grand Canyon paintings.

For this series Hockney worked on the project with Maurice Payne who was now living in the United States, principally in New York. Payne had moved his etching press to Los Angeles and set himself up in the smaller studio attached to Hockney's house in the Hollywood Hills in order to work with him. Hockney went on to make a series of etchings where the approach was one of experimentation. 'Especially on the project,' Payne observed, 'there was a lot of things David purposely left to see what happened.' This experience he found rewarding as 'it stops me being too careful, from becoming too stale'.[189] The focus was on the 'handmade' and on 'low tech' and almost crudely wrought – avoiding the sometimes mechanical, glossy productions found in some contemporary printmaking. Hockney chose to experiment with tools, with ink and inking, with hand and cloth wiping and with all kinds of combinations of hardground, softground, aquatint and engraving. He used many different wire brushes, some bought at the local hardware store; according to Payne, some, including a claw-like implement tied to a painting brush handle, were made up on the spot.[190]

The subjects were varied, including a favourite but melancholy theme of the empty chair. Hockney made two versions of the *Van Gogh chair (Black,* and *White),* which the artist had originally painted in 1988 as homage to Van Gogh, which in turn was inspired by van Gogh's painting now in the collection of the National Gallery in London,[191] as discussed previously. Hockney had revisited

[189] Maurice Payne interviewed by Jane Kinsman, 12 November 1999.
[190] Maurice Payne interviewed by Jane Kinsman, 12 November 1999.
[191] *Van Gogh's chair,* 1888, National Gallery, London, inventory number N63862.

the theme as multiples editioned in 1994 and, in the following year, created his *Black* version of the chair, printed with a consummate balance of black, red and grey tones with the white of the paper and in a range of textures, achieved by a blend of intaglio techniques (illustration 94). In the *White* version the textured background was achieved by using a domestic fly-wire screen, which was applied to the softground. These two prints and a further study of a chair were all drawn in reverse perspective and so despite being relatively small in scale compared to the painting Hockney was working on at the time, they have a great sense of space, as well as an air of pervading sadness and emptiness.

Portraits of Payne, his partner the artist Brenda Zlamany, and Celia were also made during this period at the artist's home studios in Los Angeles, with a radical use of the hardware tools. *Soft Celia* is created almost entirely by scraping the plate with a wire brush. In contrast to the portraits there are studies of flowers in *Black wire plant* (illustration 95) and *Red wire plant*, where the delicate lines were made on the plate by scrubbing the matrix with wire brushes in circular strokes. Further textures were achieved by using muslin in the background; and other fabrics like hessian were also used in some of the etchings to produce textural effects. The series was completed with 15 studies of the artist's dogs either on their own or asleep together and show a remarkable tenderness and dexterity.

An attempt to make a Grand Canyon etching was abandoned. Hockney had been able to work on a small scale to create intimate subjects. However, he couldn't work on a small copper plate with such a large-scale subject. During this time, Hockney maintained a regular schedule of working on his Grand Canyon painting, with the printer working around him. Hockney would walk back and forth from one studio to the other, which allowed him to see developments or opportunities with fresh eyes and enjoy the complete contrast of scale and working methods. The prints of the 1990s followed the path begun in the 1980s. Hockney explored his ideas about space and time, multi-dimensionality and his own sense of a constantly 'moving focus' in all its meanings.

Hockney's interest in reverse perspective had led the artist to reconsider Renaissance painting and ultimately his research was to lead to the publication of *David Hockney, secret knowledge: rediscovering the lost techniques of the old masters.* As well as the book, a video on the subject was produced and the artist took part in lectures and symposia explaining his thesis that there was visual evidence, along with scientific evidence, which tells us that many major

artists of the Renaissance period and beyond used mirrors and lenses to assist them in the making of their compositions.[192] In the meantime, it was through his photographic collages that Hockney realised he could dispute the widely held notion that 'the rules of perspective are built into the very nature of photography'.[193] The very process of reverse perspective became important in his compositions. He wanted to avoid one point perspective, 'I don't just want to look at key holes ...,' he explained, 'and you begin to do realise that it is the edges that define the keyhole.'[194] Using reverse perspective was a means of avoiding the hole and developing a more complex idea about space and time.

Hockney had started researching the idea of using mirrors and lenses in 1999 after he had seen the exhibition *Portraits by Ingres: image of an epoch* at the National Gallery in London, while visiting his sick mother before her death. It was there he noticed that Ingres had apparently used a device, such as the *camera lucida*, to trace some of his pencil lines for the portraits he made of the English in Rome. This then led the artist to an intense investigation, both visual and written, of when European artists may have first adopted optical aids. In turn, this led him to the view that Jan van Eyck and his followers may have done so in Bruges around AD 1430. Hockney's focus on optics and his belief in the widespread adoption of camera obscura in the history of art was summarised in his 2001 publication *David Hockney, secret knowledge: rediscovering the lost techniques of the old masters.*[195]That completed, the artist pursued new territory. As Hockney later recalled:

> I spent nearly two years researching and writing *Secret Knowledge.* After the book had gone to press, further experiments were made with optics and a film made for Omnibus (BBC). My conclusion was that the hand is now returning to the camera, through the computer. It all led me back to painting.[196]

During his research on the *Secret knowledge* project Hockney also produced a series of portrait drawings using a *camera lucida,* which were then exhibited at the Armand Hammer Museum of Art, at the University of California in Los

[192] David Hockney Qantas Lecture Series, National Gallery of Australia, 12 October 1999; David Hockney, *David Hockney, secret knowledge: rediscovering the lost techniques of the old masters*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2001.
[193] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 100.
[194] David Hockney, *That's the way I see It*, edited Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1993, p. 103.
[195] David Hockney, *David Hockney, secret knowledge: rediscovering the lost techniques of the old masters*, London: Thames and Hudson, 2001.
[196] David Hockney, Introduction in *David Hockney: painting on paper*, dated November 2002, London: Annely Juda Fine Art, 2003, n. p.

Angeles in mid 2000.[197] Hockney, however, did not want to pursue this further. Over the years Rembrandt's drawings had played an important role in Hockney's artistic life. At the turn of the century this now inspired him to abandon more technologically complex methods of depicting space in his art and returned to 'the hand'. The Dutch master was an artist Hockney had been 'moved by' as a young man.[198] Hockney's admiration of Rembrandt was renewed following a discussion about Picasso's *First steps* of 1943 and its 'very rare and very ordinary' subject.[199] In his lecture, 'Drawing in the Age of the Camera', at the Royal Academy of Arts, 10 June 2004, Hockney recounted a conversation he had had with Henry Geldzahler when looking at this painting of Picasso's housekeeper Ines and her small child. The composition is one of great tenderness and perception. Hockney wondered who else would choose such a 'marvellous ordinary' subject? Geldzahler had replied, 'I'm sure Rembrandt would have'. This prompted Hockney to look at Rembrandt again; buying the six volumes of Benesch's *The drawings of Rembrandt.*[200] Hockney had, by 2004, been 'looking at Rembrandt for a long time', finding inspiration in his simplicity, as well as because of the 'boldness of line' and 'remarkable sense of space'.[201]The artist's careful study of Rembrandt encouraged him to return to the hand.

Hockney had travelled a long way in printmaking since his first lithographs as a 17-year-old. Making prints provided the artist with a challenge, an inspiration and a method of sustaining his artistic momentum for almost 50 years. It has helped to drive his creativity and provided him with new artistic challenges and an alternative direction when he reached an impasse in a particular art form. Printmaking has allowed the artist to be a risk taker and an experimenter and has given him a way of developing his style and his subject matter. At his best in printmaking, Hockney achieves that harmonious balance to which he aspires of 'the hand, the eye and the heart'.[202]

---

[197] *Camera lucida drawings and color laser copies of drawings*, 25 April to 4 June 2000.

[198] David Hockney in conversation with R. B. Kitaj,' *The New Review*, volume 3, numbers 34-35, January/February 1977 p. 76. Hockney was responding to Kitaj's lament that he wished he had been more moved by Rembrandt than Pound at the age of 18.

[199] David Hockney, 'Drawing in the Age of the Camera', lecture at the Royal Academy of Arts, 10 June 2004; Otto Benesch, *The drawings of Rembrandt*, enlarged and edited by Eva Benesch, 6 volumes, London; Phaidon, 1973.

[200] David Hockney, 'Drawing in the Age of the Camera', lecture at the Royal Academy of Arts, 10 June 2004.

[201] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman, 13 June 2004.

[202] This is a favourite Chinese saying of Hockney's, which he quoted in his lecture, 'Drawing in the Age of the Camera', at the Royal Academy of Arts, 10 June 2004.

Chapter 6: From the heart, the eye, the hand

In 1999 Hockney began spending more time away from Los Angeles. From this time onwards there was a sharp decline in his interest in making prints; something that up until then had been an outlet for his creativity as well as providing a singular contrast to his painting. The reasons for this are complex. There were issues of the death of his mother and initially he was almost overwhelmed by grief. There were also issues relating to the visa problem that his British-born partner John Fitz-Herbert had with the United States authorities. Probably most significantly there was a new maturity and confidence that Hockney had in his painting style, particularly his large-scale landscapes of Yorkshire. It was as if the lifetime of lessons learned from his art practice and analysis of artists' work had finally provided a coherent approach to painting. As a result his need to pursue conventional printmaking as an emotional release and contrast to painting no longer existed. Added to this the iPad and iPhone applications he discovered and pursued provided another way for Hockney to maintain his artistic momentum.

At the beginning of 1999 the artist had three exhibitions of his work in Europe. In January of that year *espace/Paysage* opened at the Centre Pompidou and in February *David Hockney: dialogue avec Picasso*, from 10 February to 3 May 1999 opened at the Musée Picasso, both in Paris. Then, the exhibition emanating originally from Cologne, *Retrospektive-Photoworks: David Hockney*, went on display in Lausanne at the Musée de l'Elysée photography museum from 25 March to 13 June 1999.

At the same time as he was preparing for these exhibitions, Hockney returned regularly to England to visit his ailing mother who resided in Bridlington on the east coast of Yorkshire. She was to die there in May of 1999 and Hockney had her ashes scattered in the Yorkshire countryside. The experience of traversing the countryside, as he had done earlier with his visits to see his dying friend from Bradford, Jonathon Silver, encouraged Hockney to consider spending more time in the country of his birth. Events in California further compounded the growing pull of his homeland. His pet daschund, Stanley, who had been a fixture at his Los Angeles home, died, and later that year on 10 November 2001 a close friend in Los Angeles, the screenwriter Jeff Burkhart, also died at this time. Then, his British-born partner John Fitzherbert, who shared his house in Los Angeles, was refused a new visa for the United States on the grounds that he had stayed two days more than his visa would allow. Despite Hockney's

pleas to both British and American authorities for a more lenient approach, the visa for Fitzherbert for the United States was not renewed.[203] American bureaucracy had run rife following the suicide attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. These factors, combined with the increasing restrictions on smoking in California, which the artist railed against, contributed to Hockney's feeling of being out of sorts with a country and a city that he had embraced and celebrated for so long.

By 2002 Hockney had set himself on a new course and this would ultimately lead to new forms of printmaking in 2008. At the start of this journey, Hockney viewed several exhibitions that proved inspirational to his ideas on landscape and methods of making art. In March 2002 he saw an exhibition of Chinese painting titled *When the Manchus ruled China: painting under the Qing Dynasty (1644–1911)* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art[204] In London, Hockney also visited a major American landscape exhibition at the Tate, *American Sublime*.[205] He subsequently saw *Thomas Girtin and the art of the watercolour*, also at the Tate in that year.[206] Three visits to *American Sublime* raised serious issues for the Hockney. In 1860 when the artists were travelling westward, he realised that photography was about 20 years old and would have been considered the 'truth' and the 'pencil of nature' amongst the painters. To imitate the appearance of 'truthful' photography, many artists ought to remove brushwork in an imitation of the new medium, adding an overly glossy unnatural element to their appearance.[207]

In an attempt to introduce the element of the hand into his painting and to avoid any hint of a style that was glib, Hockney adopted the old-fashioned medium of watercolour, perhaps encouraged by the Girtin exhibition he had seen in New York and which proved a telling contrast, in a favourable way, with the *American Sublime* exhibition. Watercolour was the most difficult of painting methods, as, unlike oil paint, it dried immediately. It was therefore the most challenging of mediums. In modern times watercolour has been ignored by major artists and appeared to be the preserve of amateur painters, who avoided some of the difficulties inherent in the method by adopting slick shortcuts. Hockney had begun experimenting with the watercolour technique

[203] Transcript of David Hockney interview by Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005.
[204] The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2 February 2002 – 18 August 2002.
[205] 21 February – 19 May 2002.
[206] Britain, 4 July – 29 September 2002.
[207] David Hockney, Introduction in *David Hockney: painting on paper*, dated November 2002, London: Annely Juda Fine Art, 2003, n. p.

when in New York, attending the revived season of *Parade* at the Metropolitan Opera house. Hockney allowed himself six months to acquire this new skill.

To further his skill, the artist set out in search of subject matter that was both dramatic and on a grand scale and which prompted him to resume travelling. In particular he wanted to go to northern Europe, first to Norway in May and then to Iceland:

> To have longer periods of twilight (when colour is not bleached but extremely rich) one has to go north. I made a trip to Norway in May 2002, [and] was very taken with the dramatic landscape and returned to go much further north, when in June the sun never sets at all. You can see the landscape at all hours, 24 hours a day. There is no night. I found myself deeply attracted to it and then went to Iceland twice to tour the island.[208]

What then followed was three years of exploration of painting in watercolour. The principal subject was to become the East Yorkshire countryside, where in his youth Hockney had spent his summer holidays working in the cornfields nearby the coastal town of Bridlington. In the 1950s, he later recalled, he had been 'stooking corn for the harvest … picking up the chaff. The work was quite boring, though even then I noticed that the scenery was quite beautiful. The rolling hills, the little valleys. Very beautiful.'[209]Though the artist had found this manual labour tedious, the imprint of the countryside remained in his memory. It became a favourite location for his new landscapes. As Hockney progressed with his watercolours, he began painting more eloquently with a skilled application of washes and lines in soft colours capturing the atmospheric qualities he saw in the fields, roads and skies of Yorkshire; it was style less linear and less patterned than in his early Nordic watercolours.

Hockney was spending more time in Yorkshire by 2004, staying at the house he had bought for his mother and sister in Bridlington, which was an ageing seaside resort on the east coast. The artist had installed an attic studio there so that when he visited his family he could continue working during his visits. Later he moved to Bridlington on a more permanent basis and subsequently established a vast workshop of over 3000 square metres on an industrial estate on the outskirts of the town. This vast studio would allow him to work on a huge scale in the years to come.

---

[208] David Hockney, *Hockney's pictures; the definitive retrospective, compiled and with commentary by David Hockney*, New York, Boston: Bullfinch, 2004, p. 325.
[209] David Hockney quoted in Lawrence Weschler, 'Sometime take the time' in *David Hockney: hand eye heart*, 26 February – 2 April 2005, Los Angeles: LA Louver, 2004, p. 45.

In the English summer of 2004, the artist exhibited a group of 36 watercolours at the Salt Mills near Bradford.[210] While Hockney considered the work on 36 sheets to be one complete image, it was made up of composite images rather contributing to a single composition as had been the case earlier with his *Paper pool* and *Grand Canyon* iconography. The overall effect, however, was to capture the very essence of the landscape of East Yorkshire in an amalgam of subjects painted during the summer months.[211] There were roads curling off into the distance, glistening wheat fields, some containing hay rolls, others in close-up, with the details of the gold and crimson wheat grasses swaying in the breeze. There were farmhouses nestled amongst trees, vivid red-roofed houses, hedgerows, even exotic 'jungle gardens', canopies of verdant trees and scurrying clouds. Sometimes the occasional element from modern life intruded, such as a tractor, electricity lines or a van on the road. With the compound fusion of these compositions, Hockney captured the 'soul' of the Yorkshire landscape – one with which he now became increasingly obsessed.

It was the skill of the hand that was becoming so important for the artist. Hockney's criticism of photography, a frozen eye, was like viewing a subject from 'the point of view of a paralysed cyclops'.[212] He cited the Chinese saying that 'painting draws on three things, the eye, the heart, and the hand. And I longed to return to the hand.'[213] However, Hockney, as always, was keen as ever to experiment and had remained open to how to depict a landscape; once more he returned to the lens, working with a *camera obscura* out in the countryside. The results were disappointing:

> I set it up as Cotman or Varley would have done and made fascinating and very beautiful images, but I became very aware that the camera did not see space. It saw surfaces. The camera sees geometrically – we must see psychologically.

> In the early nineteenth century the optical projection of nature was seen as verisimilitude itself – not nature but it is two-dimensional image. ... By the beginning of the twenty first century I knew it was not 'verisimilitude' – it had too much missing – but I realised this knowledge which I confidently held opened everything again. You could plant a canvas in

[210] 5 June to 30 September 2004; 36 sheets.
[211] Illustrated at http://www.hockneypictures.com.salts_mill.php.
[212] David Hockney quoted in Lawrence Weschler, 'Sometime take the time' in *David Hockney: hand eye heart*, 26 February – 2 April 2005, Los Angeles: LA Louver, 2004, p. 48.
[213] David Hockney quoted in Lawrence Weschler, 'Sometime take the time' in *David Hockney: hand eye heart*, 26 February - 2 April 2005, Los Angeles: LA Louver, 2004, p. 48.

the Yorkshire countryside and now paint the spatial experience of landscape, something of which I know the camera was incapable.[214]

These experiments proved unsatisfactory and Hockney abandoned any idea of using lenses. The way forward lay in another direction. When interviewed by Laurence Weschler in 2005, Hockney commented, 'For a short time, but only a very short time, I wondered if there was some way I could adapt optics to my new purposes. But I quickly realised that no, the trouble with optics is the trouble with photography: it's not real enough, it's not true enough to lived experience.'[215]

In preparation for the landscapes he intended to paint of East Yorkshire Hockney relinquished his cameras and adopted sketchbooks. Later he would have pockets sewn into his coats, even his tuxedo, in order to hold small sketchbooks. Always a keen draughtsman he developed the idea that the more one drew a subject the greater the ability to see it. For so much of his working life his camera, what ever its faults in his view, were still accompaniments in his working methods. Now this changed, at least for the time being. In another foray into the East Yorkshire countryside in 2004, Hockney produced a further group of watercolours in his new style. These were shown in Los Angeles in the exhibition *David Hockney: hand eye heart* at LA Louver,[216] taking as its title the Chinese saying. Also shown was the composite watercolour of 36 sheets shown earlier at Salt Mills. The new watercolour series of 2004 were on a grander scale on a sheet size of 74.9 x 104.5 cm and sometimes on two sheets spanning a length of 210.8 cm, greater? than the composite work. This group further examined the rolling countryside of East Yorkshire, the winding roads, the puddles, the grey days and stark tree trunks of deciduous trees denuded of their leaves in the colder seasons. At the same time the countryside was also shown in the brighter palette of springtime and with the vivid hues and richer flora of the warmer seasons. The rendering was sometimes translucent in its application, sometimes measured in application with a very full brush. The method of painting with watercolours by its very nature meant that the paint dried quickly; these landscapes were remarkable exercises revealing Hockney's great facility in the medium. This experience would later inform Hockney's printmaking, where the charm of his watercolour drawing style with an application of washes would also dominate his compositions.

---

[214] David Hockney, July 2006 in *David Hockney: A year in Yorkshire*, London: Annely Juda Fine Art, 2006, n.p.
[215] David Hockney quoted in Lawrence Weschler, 'Sometime take the time' in *David Hockney: hand eye heart*, 26 February - 2 April 2005, Los Angeles: LA Louver, 2004, p. 48.
[216] 26 February – 2 April 2005.

By 2005 Hockney felt nostalgia for his birthplace and the landscapes of East Yorkshire. These feelings were further compounded by the issues he confronted by living in the United States and meant that he was spending much more time in England. His focus turned to painting in oil, an interest in landscape and working *sur la motif* leading Hockney to spend a summer painting landscapes near Bridlington, with excellent results.

The following year, in 2006, the Senior Curator of Modern and Contemporary Art at Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Stephanie Barron, visited Hockney in his studio and reminded him that the exhibition *Constable: the great landscapes* would be shown at the Huntington Library venue for Art Collections and Botanic Gardens in San Marino, and she wanted to involve him in the exhibition while it was shown in California. Hockney had already seen the exhibition at Tate Britain and it had left a profound impression on him, reminding him of his earlier admiration for Constable:

> Constable had already made a great impact on me back during my student days, freshly arrived in London for Bradford, as how could he not have? He was after all the first English painter ever to really engage the English landscape in an authentic manner. With Gainsborough, for example, by contrast, you merely get a generic backdrop. But Constable is clearly out there traipsing through the Suffolk countryside; you can almost sense the mud on his boots. Granted, he is not yet fully painting in the open air, though he is one of the first to go outside, painting with his little box. He was still having to make do, though, with paint bladders – remember, the collapsible tube doesn't come online till several years later. Let's see, Constable dies in 1837, just before the invention of chemical photography – for that matter, he and Turner constituted the last generation of English painters not to have to contend with the full onslaught of chemical photo reproduction – and collapsible tubes don't really start appearing until the 1850s. Without those tubes, impressionism, for example, would have been a lot more difficult, if not impossible – Van Gogh could carry the tubes with him out there into the fields around Arles, and with them all that pure color. Constable, by contrast, would mainly sketch, working up a series of studies while on-site before then returning to his studio to paint the actual canvases, especially of course those Great Landscapes. [217]

The desire to get 'mud on his boots', working *in situ* and on large scale, became paramount for Hockney. The results of this were seen in an exhibition of his oils from 2005 to 2006; *David Hockney: a year in Yorkshire* was shown in London in 2006 and in Los Angeles the next year.[218] In this body of work we can observe

---

[217] Lawrence Weschler, 'A return to painting (2007)', *True life*, University of California Press, 2008, p. 208.
[218] *David Hockney: a year in Yorkshire,* Annely Juda, London, 15 September - 28 October 2006, LA Louver, Los Angeles, 9 February - 28 October 2007.

Hockney's transition from relatively small pictures to those on a vast scale. This change in scale meant the artist had to confront certain practical problems, such transporting large canvases out into the countryside, setting these supports up and returning them back into the house. With multiple canvases he felt that he had a solution.[219] The effect of working in watercolour influenced Hockney's oil painting style in the future. There was a lightness of touch in the brushwork, a great variety of brush strokes, as he aimed to capture the details of the rolling hills, the crops and trees and the different sky lines and cloud compositions as the seasons changed from summer to winter.

In 2007 a further focus on watercolours took place when David Hockney was invited to be guest curator for the largest exhibition ever held of J. M. W. Turner's watercolours. These were drawn principally from the Turner Bequest of 1856. Selecting 165 watercolours for the exhibition which opened 11 June of that year, Hockney was to comment on his selection process, 'The pictures that I have chosen for this exhibition are ones that, it seems to me, come direct from the heart, down the arm...',[220] once again referring to the Chinese saying that had become his favourite mantra.

As early as 1985 Hockney had began experimenting to create art using a computer. Michael Deakin had introduced him to the Quantel paintbox, which was television graphics software. Subsequently *Painting with light* was screened the following year on the BBC. In the documentary Hockney explored the Quantel program and developed his own compositions with the aid of the computer. Although since the mid to late 1990s, Hockney had not been engaged seriously in printmaking, in 2008 he returned to what had become a rare excursion in this field. He created a series of 'drawings in a printing machine', which became 'inkjet computer drawings', produced in editions from seven to 30. In his introduction to a series of digital prints of landscapes and portraits of November 2008, Hockney explained his renewed interest and experimentation in using a computer to generate prints:

> The computer is a useful tool. Photoshop is a computer tool for picture
> making. It in effect allows you to draw directly in a printing machine, one
> of its many uses. One draws with the colours the printing machine has,
> and the printing machines is one anyone can have. They are now
> superior to any other kind of printing, but because it's very slow, of
> limited commercial appeal. I used to think the computer was too slow for

---

[219] David Hockney 'Introduction' in *David Hockney: a year in Yorkshire*, dated July 2006, p.?
[220] http://www.tate.org.uk/shop/do /Books/Hockney-Turner-Watercolours/product/34773;jsessionid=0D41C6FEB9F56E3CDE9656BFF43E972E.B viewed 19 September 2010.

a draughtsman. You had finished a line, and the computer was 15 seconds later, an absurd position for someone drawing, but things have improved, and it now enables one to draw very freely and fast with colour. There are advantages to anything new [as] mediums for artists, but the speed allowed here with colour is something new, swapping brushes in the hand with oil or watercolour takes time. These prints are made by drawing and collage, they exist either in the computer or on a piece of paper, they were made for printing, and so will be printed. They are not photographic reproductions. My idea is to make them in small editions between 7 and 30.[221]

Hockney worked in the two genres of subject matter most active in at this stage of his career – landscapes and portraiture. The landscapes are of East Yorkshire shown at various times and in different seasons, from summer to winter. They are notable for the influence that the technique of watercolour plays on this new exploration of printmaking. It is particularly evident in the semi-transparent lines, forms and washes found in some of the compositions. Sometimes the clouds are depicted as tiny lines scudding across the rapidly changing skies of Yorkshire, and at other times as washes of white cumulous clouds tinged with the colour of the season or suggesting the hour of the day. Hockney portrayed the sweeping roads of the Yorkshire in a manner which recalls the Eastern landscape tradition, where the further the distance the higher the motif is placed on the picture plane.

Sometimes Hockney has incorporated photographic elements within the composition, such as the trees in *Summer road near Kilham* of 2008 and *Green valley* (illustration 96). Often trees or their branches in silhouettes frame the scenes, notably in *Winter road near Kilham* of the same year, reminiscent of a Claude Lorrain pictorial device (illustration 97). On occasions these were produced on a large –scale, such as *Autumn trees near Thixendale,* which spanned the considerable length of 88.9 x 213.0 cm. As the seasons changed, so did Hockney's palette, the soft greys of winter giving way to the boldest of orange and greens in *Autumn leaves* (illustration 98). The result was a brilliant composition evoking the rich seasonal complexity of nature.

Most evocative of all was *Rainy night on Bridlington Promenade* – it is like an almost digital version of Van Gogh's *La nuit étoilée* of 1888 (illustration 99). For his composition, Van Gogh chose to paint the Rhône riverside, which he found was spellbinding at night with the richness and complexity of the evening sky. The expanse of evening skies, the gaslights along the river and their reflection

---

[221] David Hockney, *Drawing in a printing machine*, London: Annely Juda Fine Art, 1 May - 11 July 2009, n.p.

in the water were a tantalising subject for the Post-Impressionist artist. For Hockney, as for Van Gogh before him, the night sky is not black, but rich in colour, in this case made up of deep dark reds and deep blues, with just a hint of grey clouds in the dark light. It is a night sky filled with colour. Like Van Gogh, Hockney sought to capture the effect of the lights of the harbour as they followed the curve of the bay. These lights are also reflected in the water-soaked walkway. And again, Hockney brilliantly created the effect of raindrops on water on this very wet evening; returning to a pictorial problem he had addressed in the past, as we see in his *Weather series*.

Some landscapes were less successful, such as in *Tall black trees*, which are rather illustrative in style and recall the more feeble landscapes of John Piper. The cityscapes *Kilham with church* and *Cardigan Road, Brid.* are slight compositions, with elements such as the trees appearing more like doodles than masterful depictions of the countryside. Hockney's foray into portraiture in digital printmaking was also less successful. The process did not lend itself easily to this genre. The faces of his sitters are overly detailed, without any finesse or lightness of touch and rarely capture the essence of character. The bodies in the various poses seem to have little connection with the heads and the backdrops have even less relationship with the sitter.

More recently Hockney has continued to paint landscapes, grappling with scale and space, seeking to capture the effects of the light and the seasons, as if to follow Monet in the French artist's last years. It was a challenge according to Hockney, 'In order to convey space and spaciousness, rather than mere surface. You have to be out there, in person, *en plein air,* facing out into all that space.'[222] Wanting to work on an even greater scale than before, yet wanting to paint *in situ*, Hockney would take a series of six panel canvases for each composition to set up on easels at the particular vantage point he wished to paint. Once painting had concluded for the day, Hockney's workshop assistant Jean-Pierre Gonçalves de Lima (described by the artist as 'the only person to have left Paris for Bridlington')[223] would take digital photographs of the panels, which could be printed out in different scales. This would allow the artist to acquire a true sense of how the landscape composition was progressing. Hockney would then sometimes trace the photographs in order to explore variations of how to proceed when returning to the countryside to paint. The experience of working in Mylar to make prints out of doors, devised by Ken

---

[222] Lawrence Weschler, 'A return to painting (2007)', *True life*, University of California Press, 2008, p. 210.
[223] David Hockney, *News Statesman*, 18 June 2009 http://www.newstatesman.com/art/2009/06/hockney-yorkshire-california viewed 12 October 2011.

Tyler years before, where the artist could add or subtract, or vary elements of a composition, was a precursor to his new method of painting.

Working on multiple canvases allowed Hockney to develop multiple views, following hedgerows, flowering hawthorn blossoms and travelling down ditches all in the one picture. In this way he avoided the tunnel effect of one-point perspective, as he had done previously with his *Grand Canyon* series. However, those earlier paintings lacked the subtlety of the new spatial explorations. They had been informed by collages of photographs with single viewpoints of the camera and therefore there was a certain mechanical effect in the depiction of complex space. This time, however, Hockney could capture the experience of what he saw out in the Yorkshire countryside 'eyeballing' his subject, to use a Hockney expression. Similarly, the ability to work on multi-panelled works had in the past allowed Hockney to work on a huge scale, something he first explored with his *Paper pool* imagery. The lessons learnt from these experiences now enable the artist to work to a phenomenal size on a 50-canvas oil painting created *en plein air* – *Bigger trees near Warter* or *Ou Peinture sur le motif pour le nouvelle age post-photographique* (illustration 100). The painting spans over 4.5 metres by over 12 metres, which is almost twice the size of *A bigger Grand Canyon*[224] painted almost a decade before. The composite canvas painting was shown at the Royal Academy in 2007 and was given to the Tate by Hockney in the following year.

The artist has continued to work on a massive scale. He has returned to looking at historic landscapes and in particular those of Claude Lorrain. Hockney visited New York for his first major exhibition there in nine years at the Pace Galleries, which opened on 23 October 2009. While in New York, he visited the Frick Collection and became enamoured with Claude's *Sermon on the Mount* 1656, which had been damaged by fire many years ago before at Fonthill, England during the eighteenth century. It had subsequently been treated in 1959–1960. Initially the Frick provided Hockney with a high-resolution image of the painting, which he then set out to 'clean', not literally but by applying his computer skills to the image. Hockney removed the darkened smoke-damaged Claude and replaced this with a palette of lighter, more brilliant colours. This particular painting by Claude is unusual as the rocky outcrop and silhouetted trees are in an asymmetrical composition, framing the picture, yet prominently located in the centre. Since 2010 Hockney worked on developing his own version of *Sermon on the Mount*, which is displayed at the Royal Academy exhibition in January of

---

[224] Collection National Gallery of Australia, accession number 99.121.A-D

2012. It is now as if Hockney has turned full circle, exploring the art of the past as he did with the adopted imagery for his personal and highly original *Brother Grimm* etching series.

Having seen the iPhone of the writer Lawrence Weschler in 2008, Hockney immediately bought one of his own. Thereafter he began exploring the use of the 'Brushes' application on the iPhone using his fingers and then, almost completely, just his thumbs to wipe or draw or paint compositions in the brilliant full-spectrum colour that the phone provided. According to Weschler writing in the *New York Review of Books* for the 22 October 2009 issue:

> Over the past six months, Hockney has fashioned literally hundreds, probably over a thousand, such images, often sending out four or five a day to a group of about a dozen friends, and not really caring what happens to them after that. (He assumes the friends pass them along through the digital ether.) These are, mind you, not second-generation digital copies of images that exist in some other medium: their digital expression constitutes the sole (albeit multiple) original of the image.[225]

Initially Hockney created intimate scenes of flora, sunrises, still lifes and self-portraits, exploring the possibilities of the application in textures, brilliant digital colour, light, and time of day. These he would make usually first thing in the morning, keeping the iPhone on a small easel by his bedside. These he would email to his friends. Since living on the east coast, by the North Sea, he has set out to create compositions that capture the sunrise on water, after long periods of living on the west coast of the Pacific, where he experienced sunsets. In conversation with Weschler, Hockney commented that 'I've always wanted to be able to paint the dawn', noting that:

> After all, what clearer, more luminous light are we ever afforded? Especially here where the light comes rising over the sea, just the opposite of my old California haunts. But in the old days one never could, because, of course, ordinarily it would be too dark to see the paints; or else, if you turned on a light so as to be able to see them, you'd lose the subtle gathering tones of the coming sun. But with an iPhone, I don't even have to get out of bed, I just reach for the device, turn it on, start mixing and matching the colors, laying in the evolving scene.[226]

---

[225] Lawrence Weschler, 'David Hockney's iPhone passion', *The New York Review of Books*, 22 October 2009.
[226] Lawrence Weschler, 'David Hockney's iPhone passion', *The New York Review of Books*, 22 October 2009.

The results of these exercises have recently been exhibited. As if to replicate his exhibition in São Paulo where he faxed the exhibits to the museum, Hockney sent over 200 digital artworks loaded in iPads for the exhibition *David Hockney: Fleurs Fraîches* held at the Fondation Pierre Bergé-Yves Saint Laurent in Paris from 20 October 2010 to 30 January 2011. This exhibition was then shown at the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto.[227]

At present these digital images have not been printed, as the artist wishes them to be viewed electronically rather than printed on paper, revelling in the broad spectrum of colour that is available. During the Christmas season of 2010 Ken Tyler visited Hockney in Yorkshire and noted that his studio in the industrial section of Bridlington was like:

> A vast airplane hanger-like space. A lot of new work, blown up iPad drawings, which I'm sure he will be publishing as 'prints' soon, very large paintings with their smaller study versions in various stages of completion ... These drawings he has printed out on a large scale and perhaps some of these will become 'prints' at a later ? [Jane, stage?].[228]

Tyler's predictions proved to be accurate and in the exhibition held at the Royal Academy in January 2012 Hockney had some of the iPad drawings digitally printed for display, which is a process increasingly adopted by contemporary artists as a method of printmaking. However, it is unlikely that Hockney would undertake working in a state-of-the-art print workshop again, or use traditional print methods that require a need to collaborate with a master printer.

Now, after years of experience and concentration, Hockney has achieved a new maturity and confidence in his painting, evident in the grand canvases of his Yorkshire landscapes; the home of his birth and the place where he now lives. His paintings also present new ideas about depicting space; taking this a stage further than his Cubist-inspired landscapes of the late 1990s and born out of new experiences. For instance, his latest exploration of three-dimensional landscape in film is undertaken while driving through the Yorkshire countryside in a four-wheel drive vehicle fitted with nine cameras filming the terrain. At the same time as developing his skills as a landscape artist, with 'mud on his boots', and with the aspiration of John Constable and his landscapes of Surrey, Hockney has most recently returned to the art of the past with his unwavering need to analyse and solve pictorial problems. This was something he had

explored in some of the 1960s prints, which stood him apart from other Pop-inspired artists of the day. In painting he has now returned to earlier imagery. This time it is the landscape painting of Claude Lorrain as he develops images in homage to the celebrated Baroque artist.

Hockney is currently focusing on painting huge landscapes. He has travelled a long way in printmaking since his first lithographs as a young student of the 1950s. Making prints provided Hockney with a challenge, an inspiration and a method of sustaining his artistic momentum for more than fifty years. It has helped to drive his creativity and afforded him new artistic challenges and an alternative direction when he reached an impasse in a particular art form. Printmaking has allowed the artist to be a risk taker and an experimenter and has given him a way of developing his style and his subject matter. At his best in printmaking, Hockney achieves that harmonious balance 'the hand, the eye and the heart' to which he aspires.[229]

---

[229] This is a favourite Chinese saying of Hockney's, which he quoted in his lecture, 'Drawing in the Age of the Camera,' at the Royal Academy of Arts, 10 June 2004.

CONCLUSION

For David Hockney printmaking was not a minor artistic activity, a small stream running next to the mighty river of his activities as a painter, nor was it a means for breeding less expensive originals for the art market of works initially conceived in a different medium. Printmaking instead from Hockney's earliest student days through to the present was a creative experimental laboratory in which significant developments in his art received some of their initial resolution and some of his painting evolved from this source. Printmaking provided the basis of some of his most radical developments in the use of colour and scale, as for example in the paper pulp works, as well as the source for other formal innovations, such as his multi-faceted imagery in the *Moving focus* series.

Hockney is probably one of the best known artists of the day, who has appeared regularly and publicly in all forms of the mass media, since he first made a name for himself as an emerging artist in the 1960s. In this thesis, I have explored in depth the complex nature of his art practice as revealed through the prism of his many years of making prints. This experience of printmaking has provided Hockney with a driving momentum to develop in many other creative fields.

Printmaking, however, also played a different role in his art – that of a confessional and diaristic medium, where Hockney could express intimate and private passions concerning his sexuality, his literary obsessions and his responses to what was happening in the world. Frequently it enabled him to develop a narrative, one which could be read on many levels. Hockney's large body of prints may be read as a diary and reveals much that is autobiographical. In this thesis a narrative has been developed drawn from Hockney's imagery set within a sociological and art historical account. Hockney's graphic art provides a more vivid account of his creativity than that in any other medium that he has worked in.

Despite the importance of Hockney's printmaking in his artistic development over what is now more than half a century, there have been few publications that have dealt comprehensively with such a pivotal field of his artistic endeavour. In this thesis I have endeavoured to rectify this *lacuna* in art

254

historical research. Up until now only a few exhibition catalogues and journal articles published from the mid seventies to the mid 1990s, have dealt solely with Hockney's printed *oeuvre.* These I have outlined in the Introduction to this thesis. While such publications have their merits, because of the limited scale or the early date of publication, such texts have lacked a current and in-depth analysis. So too, the extensive scope of Hockney's printmaking career has not been adequately scrutinized. It has been my intention to provide such detailed research and analysis in this thesis and to examine the extensive nature and character of the printed *oeuvre* of David Hockney. This has been placed within a curatorial, art historical and sociological framework.

For this thesis I have made use of a vast array of primary sources, notably Hockney's editioned prints, his preparatory proofs, some unpublished proofs as well as sketches and preliminary drawings to achieve a greater understanding of Hockney's art practice. Proofs often tell so much about the creative process of an artist. Frank Stella, for example, searches for infinite variations to achieve his ideal composition, while one can plot Robert Motherwell steps forwards and backwards as he develops his abstract and collaged imagery for his compositions in order to achieve the highly finessed results in his editioned works. Hockneys proofs reveal the stages of his creative process, as he searches for the perfect line, or the exact choice colour or combinations of colour, along with solving pictorial problems of depiction, such as how to portray someone, how to depict a landscape or a season, a time of day or under certain weather conditions and how to indicate space and time in two-dimensional art form. For Hockney, printmaking has been an integral part of this search and discovery.

This printed *oeuvre* has been augmented by interviews, correspondence by key figures who played a role in the artist's life with regards to his printmaking. As well as the artist himself, this included his friends and associates, fellow artists, teachers, printers, publishers and gallery owners. Sadly some of those who have provided material have died over the gestation period of this thesis and it is therefore timely to include this information and provide further art historical detail for future researchers. These visual, written or recorded sources have been supplemented with further visual documentation provided by film, sound and candid photography.

Unlike so many other artists who took up printmaking during its revival from the late 1950s to the end of last century, Hockney never ceased to explore new ideas about subject-matter, choice of style and different media and this has been set in the context of broader developments in printmaking in Britain, France and the United States in the post-war period, as well as the social context in which these prints were realised. I have argued in this thesis that printmaking played an important role in his artistic evolution, as well as his personal needs. It has provided him with a platform to innovate and experiment, unlike in other forms of his creativity.

There have been several stages in Hockney's career as a printmaker. The first phase was when Hockney began his journey as a young student in Bradford and then in London. This was a time when Hockney showed great promise in graphic art, as well a growing awareness of the significant developments in European art in both the late nineteenth century (with the Nabis), modern art movements in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century, along with those in the United States period after World War II. Hockney's appreciation of such events was in contrast with the widespread parochialism in the British art world of the 1950s. It has been argued in this thesis that the prints of David Hockney should be viewed as a confidential diaristic and intimate medium, where the artist confided in the burin his deeply personal concerns and obsessions dealing with his sexuality, homoerotic urges, literary and visual loves and presented a personal philosophy on life and being.

Hockney's printmaking career coincided with the widespread revival of printmaking in Britain, Europe and most importantly the United States, where the modern print workshop, provided rich experience both technically and personally in the second stage of his progress as a printmaker. It was then that Hockney developed a growing confidence and ability to take advantage in an era of entrepreneurial printers and publishers and great technical advances in printmaking and papermaking.

Hockney had established a reputation as a rebellious, inventive and irreverent figure associated with Pop Art in the 1960s. In the next and third phase of his printmaking career, because of Hockney's focus on an art of figuration in the

following decade, the artist was criticised for a perceived conservatism with his failure to embrace non-figurative art which held currency with those who advocated the need for a permanent avant-garde in art. Once the *enfant terrible* of the London art scene, Hockney, who had taken this world by storm, now appeared to some to belong to the old guard in art and in the view of many, out of step with their time, and linked to an older generation of artists working in Britain. Hockney revelled in his role as the *bête noire* of devotees of post-war trends, and the later styles of Minimalism and Conceptualism. Hockney, like his friend, the artist R.B. Kitaj, was at odds with this orthodoxy. Hockney considered it 'absurd' that such a notion was still held in the 1970s and rejected the theory that valid contemporary art was a sequence of continuous radical breakthroughs. This seemed to him a ludicrous proposition.[1] However, Hockney's art came to be blighted by an obsessive Naturalism, which led him to an artistic dead end. What then provided him with a new impetus was his growing admiration for Picasso and his early excursions into Cubism in the 1970s. This was to become a total obsession and passion later in Hockney's career. I have noted in this thesis the powerful influence of Picasso's Cubism on the artist. Conceptually Hockney has interpreted Cubism in a rudimentary way as witnessed in *The Blue Guitar* series of intaglio prints from 1976-77, but this was to change in the years to come.

Hockney's printed *oeuvre* provided an almost continuous visual diary of his art practice and witness to this is evident in the far more complex understanding in the 1980s and 1990s of Picasso's Cubism. This was the fourth stage in Hockney's development in printmaking. It followed Hockney's interlude in working in paper pulp in 1979 – the product of new developments in papermaking – stimulated the artist's growing interest in adopting a more brilliant palette of colours than previously, as well as working on a grand scale. What also becomes apparent at this point is a change of interpretation by Hockney – he becomes a modern-day Cubist – most evident in his printmaking at this time and this had a further impact on other aspects of his creativity. Also there is evidence of Hockney's growing interest and comprehension of Cubism and his changing understanding of how to depict space. It is seen in the ground

[1] David Hockney, *David Hockney on David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, London: Thames and Hudson, 1976, p. 129.

breaking *Moving focus* series, as well as his retreat to creating the more personal 'Home made prints', within a home environment, which was far away from the world of the modern print workshop, which he now shunned. Recent art theory has recognised the need to move from an ahistorical and descriptive understanding of the most important art style of the twentieth century to the more complex reading of this movement, as has been outlined in this thesis. For example, Mark Antliff and Patricia Leighten have recently argued that there is a need for a continuous re-interpretation.[2] The artist himself noted his own change in his analysis of Cubism after years of study in one of many interviews with Lawrence Weschler:

> When you say, 'cubism,' they think you're talking about a particular historical style, a kind of painting, say, that was popular for a few years over half a century ago. I think one could mount a certain case against the Museum of Modern Art for helping to perpetuate that fallacy, for diluting the effects of visual resolution by encapsulating it, confining it inside the walls of a museum (and even then, only certain walls in certain rooms, devoted to a particular historical moment), as if it need have no effect outside...[3]

Today Hockney is entering a new and fifth stage as a graphic artist in the twenty first century. Hockney finally achieved his ambition to become a landscape painter of consequence, born of his obsession with depicting space in the 1980s and 1990s. The crucial role that prints have played in his artistic career has now changed and in the digital age the artist experiments and explores in his graphic art through the technologies of the iPhone and the iPad. Having 'conquered' the art of the watercolour earlier this century, Hockney became sufficiently liberated to return to oil painting on a grand scale and needs no longer to adopt certain devices, such as his photographic collages, as a means to get there. His most recent paintings have not evolved in this earlier indirect manner, but instead like Claude Monet, he explores the Yorkshire landscapes *in situ* observing the differing seasons and conditions of light. The experience has led him most recently to a further exploration of digital interpretations of both

---

[2] *A cubism reader: documents and criticism; 1906 to 1914*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
[3] Lawrence Weschler, 'A visit with David and Stanley: Hollywood Hills (1987)' in *True to life: twenty-five years of conversation with David Hockney*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004, p. 66.

landscape and portrait genres, which he has now released as 'editioned prints'.[4] This signals likely developments in printmaking by the artist for the near future.

In this thesis David Hockney's printed *oeuvre* is examined within a curatorial and art historical methodological framework revealing a narrative which spans for over fifty years. This body of work displays over time his principal concerns as an artist as well as his growing skill as a draughtsman. In this thesis I have demonstrated how printmaking for David Hockney was not a minor activity in Hockney's artistic *oeuvre*, but the critically creative mechanism, which fed and nurtured much of his art production

Making prints provided Hockney with a challenge, an inspiration and a method of sustaining his artistic momentum. It has helped to drive his creativity and provided him with new artistic challenges and an alternative direction when he reached an impasse in painting. Printmaking has allowed the artist to be a risk taker and an experimenter and has given Hockney a new way of developing his art practice.

[4] Marco Livingstone and Edith Devaney, *David Hockney: a bigger picture*, London: Thames and Hudson, 2012

APPENDIX

DH86
David Hockney

Caribbean Tea Time, from the Moving Focus Series -- 1987
Lithograph, screenprint, collage, stencil, folding screen (67)
Four panels: 84 5/8 x 134 1/2 (215.0 x 341.6); each panel: 84 5/8 x 33 1/2 (215.0 x 85.1); hinges: 1/2 (1.25)
Paper: white TGL, handmade; surface-pigmented Rives BFK, mould-made; Polystyrene plastic panels
Edition: 36
Proofs: 10AP, 4CTP, WP, RTP, PPI, PPII, A

Papermaking by Steve Reeves and Tom Strianese; prep work for continuous-tone lithography by Kenneth Tyler; plate preparation and processing by Lee Funderburg; proofing and edition printing by Roger Campbell and Funderburg; screen preparation, processing and proofing by Strianese; edition printing by Strianese, Michael Herstand, and Campbell; preparation and adhering of collage elements by Campbell, Funderburg, Strianese, and Marcella Morgese; screen assembly by Ron Davey, Henry McGee, and Rolf Kaul; stencil preparation by Strianese; stenciling by McGee

Signed *David Hockney* and numbered in pencil lower right panel; chop mark lower right panel; workshop number DH85-829 lower left right panel verso (paper sheet)

Front: 135 runs: 57 colors on 8 sheets and frame, including 5 paper colors and 6 frame colors; 134 runs from 128 aluminum plates and 6 stencils:

1 light yellow (on top left white paper sheet); method Sa; IIa
2 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 1); method 5a; IIa
3 magenta (on same sheet as run 1); method Sa; IIa
4 light cyan blue (on same sheet as run I); method 5a; IIa
5 light pink (on bottom left white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
6 dark pink (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
7 red (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
8 light yellow (on same sheet as run 5); method *5a;* IIa
9 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
10 orange (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
11 brown (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
12 blue-purple (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
13 magenta (on same sheet as run *5);* method *5a;* IIa
14 light green (on same sheet as run 5); method Sa; IIa
15 medium green (on same sheet as run *5);* method 5a; IIa
16 blue-green (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
17 black (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
18 medium blue (on same sheet as run 5); method 5a; IIa
19 light pink (on top left center white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
20 dark pink (on same sheet as run 19); method Sa; IIa
21 light yellow (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
22 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 19); method *5a;* IIa
23 dark green (on same sheet as run 19); method *5a;* IIa
24 orange (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
25 brown (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
26 dark blue-purple (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
27 yellow (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa

28 magenta (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
29 light green (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
30 pale green (on same sheet as run 19); method Sa; IIa
31 transparent yellow-green (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
32 transparent cyan blue (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
33 transparent dark blue (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
34 transparent red-orange (on same sheet as run 19); method 5a; IIa
35 light pink (on bottom left center white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
36 dark pink (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
37 red (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
38 light yellow (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
39 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
40 orange (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
41 brown (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
42 blue-purple (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
43 dark purple (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
44 gray (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
45 dark gray (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
46 dark blue-purple (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
47 turquoise-blue (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
48 magenta (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
49 medium blue (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
50 blue-green (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
51 black (on same sheet as run 35); method 5a; IIa
52 light pink (on top right center white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
53 dark pink (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
54 light yellow (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
55 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
56 yellow-green (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
57 orange (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
58 brown (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
59 blue-purple (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
60 light thalo blue and dark thalo blue (on same sheet as run 52); methods 5a, 16c; IIa
61 light green (on same sheet as run 52); method Sa; IIa
62 pale green (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
63 transparent light blue (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
64 transparent violet (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
65 red (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
66 transparent pink (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
67 black (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
68 light yellow (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
69 blue (on same sheet as run 52); method 5a; IIa
70 light pink (on bottom right center white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
71 dark pink (on same sheet as run 70); method Sa; IIa
72 red (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
73 light yellow (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
74 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
75 orange (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
76 brown (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
77 blue-purple (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
78 purple (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
79 dark purple (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
80 gray (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
81 dark gray (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
82 transparent violet (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa

83 turquoise-blue (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
84 dark turquoise-blue (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
85 magenta (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
86 light green (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
87 medium green (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
88 blue-green (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
89 transparent violet (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
90 transparent pink (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
91 black (on same sheet as run 70); method 5a; IIa
92 light pink (on top right white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
93 dark pink (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
94 light yellow (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
95 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 92); method Sa; IIa
96 green (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
97 orange (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
98 magenta (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
99 light green (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
100 transparent ultramarine blue (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
101 transparent cyan blue (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
102 transparent pink (on same sheet as run 92); method 5a; IIa
103 light pink (on bottom right white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
104 dark pink (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
105 light yellow (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
106 dark yellow (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
107 orange (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
108 red-orange (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
109 brown (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
110 purple (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
111 dark purple (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
112 violet (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
113 magenta (on same sheet as run 103); method Sa; IIa
114 light green (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
115 blue-green (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
116 transparent pink (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
117 black (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
118 blue-violet (on same sheet as run 103); method 5a; IIa
119 light ultramarine blue (on small collage elements white paper sheet); method 5a; IIa
120 blue (on same sheet as run 119); method 5a; IIa
121 dark blue (on same sheet as run 119); method 5a; IIa
122 transparent blue (on same sheet as run 119); method Sa; IIa
123 transparent light green (on same sheet as run 119); method 5a; IIa
124 transparent yellow-green (on same sheet as run 119); method 5a; IIa
125 cerulean blue (on same sheet as run 119); method 5a; IIa
126 black (on same sheet as run 119); method 5a; IIa
127 transparent yellow-green (on same sheet as run 119); method Sa; IIa
128 green (on same sheet as run 119); method 5a; IIa
129 printed papers from runs 1*118; printed paper from runs 119*128 cut; red, light blue, dark blue, green, and black surface pigmented papers cut; method 36a (RC, LF, TS, MM); III
130 light yellow and dark yellow (on frame); method 32a (HM)
131 light yellow and dark yellow (on frame); method 32a (HM)
132 light yellow, dark yellow, and light green (on frame); method 32a (HM)
133 light yellow, dark yellow, and light green (on frame); method 32a (HM)
134 pink, magenta, and dark green; method 32a (HM)

APPENDIX Continued:

135 pink, magenta, and dark green; method 32a (HM)

Back: 17 runs: 10 colors on 4 polystyrene panels and frame (6 colors on panels, 4 on frame); 17 runs from 8 screens:

1 blue (on top left panel); methods 29a, 27 (TS); VI
2 yellow and black (on same panel as run 1); methods 29a (same screen as run 1), 27 (TS), 16e; VI
3 yellow and orange (on bottom left panel); methods 29a, 27(TS), 1 6e; VI
4 black (on same panel as run 3); methods 29a (same screen as run 3), 27 (TS); VI
5 yellow and blue (on top left center panel); methods 29a, 27 (TS), 16e; VI
6 yellow and green (on same panel as run 5); methods 29a (same screen as run 5), 27 (TS), 16e; VI
7 black (on same panel as run 5); methods 29a (same screen as run 5); 27 (TS); VI
8 magenta and blue (on bottom left center panel); methods 29a, 27 (TS), 16e; VI
9 orange and black (on same panel as run 8); methods 29a (same screen as run 8), 27 (TS), 16e; VI
10 blue and green (on top right center panel); methods 29a, 27 (TS), 16e; VI
11 yellow and magenta (on bottom right center panel); methods 29a, 27 (TS), 16e; VI
12 orange and blue (on same panel as run 11); methods 29a, 27 (TS), 16e; VI
13 black (on same panel as run 11); methods 29a (same screen as run 11), 27 (TS); VI
14 yellow and green (on top right panel); methods 29a, 27 (TS), 16e; VI
15 yellow (on bottom right panel); methods 29a, 27 (TS); VI
16 orange (on same panel as run 15); methods 29a (same screen as run 15), 27 (TS); VI
17 black (on same panel as run 15); methods 29a (same screen as run 15), 27 (TS); VI

Two of the eight sheets of paper used for the front image of the screen were shaped in a special mould during paper formation to conform to the contour of the special frame. The collage was adhered to neutral pH rag board using reversible archival adhesive, backed with 100% rag paper and neutral pH corrugated archival board, and mounted behind UF3 Plexiglas.

The artist, in collaboration with Jerry Solomon Enterprises, designed the sculptural frame which was made from multi-ply maple, coated with white acrylic and painted with yellow-ocher, yellow-brown, and red-brown stippled colors. (The front of the frame has six additional colors, documented previously).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

TRANSCRIPTS OF INTERVIEWS AND UNPUBLISHED LECTURES

Crommelynck, Aldo, transcript of interview with Jane Kinsman, 16 December 2003

Hockney, David, transcript from a lecture at the San Francisco Institute 1979

Hockney, David, transcript of the Qantas Birthday Lecture, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 12 October 1999

Hockney, John, transcript of the lecture, 'David Hockney is only interested in art', National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 27 November 2002

Hockney, John, transcript of interview with Jane Kinsman, 27 November 2002

Hockney, David, transcript of the Qantas Birthday Lecture, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 12 October 1999

Hockney, David, transcript of interview with Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 13 June 2004

Hockney, David, transcript of interview with Jane Kinsman in Los Angeles, 8 April 2005

House, Gordon, transcript of interview with Jane Kinsman, October 1991

Hutcheson, John, 'Answers to a staff questionnaire for the Kenneth Tyler printmaking collection', received on 26 October 2011, to be published online at the Kenneth E Tyler website, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra

Payne, Maurice, transcript of interview by Jane Kinsman, 12 November 1999

Tyler, Ken, transcript of the Qantas Birthday Lecture, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 14 October 1999

CORRESPONDENCE

Comenas, Gary, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 13 May 2011

Fuller, Ron, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 2 October 2003

Goulds, Peter, notes on the artist for Jane Kinsman, undated, received 6 April 2004

Hamilton, Richard, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 4 August 1991

Hearn, Mike, The Douglas Dillon Curator, Department of Asian Art, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 2 September 2009

Hockney, John, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 February 2004

Kasmin, John, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 4 December 2003

Stangos, Nikos, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 20 November 2003

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 23 May 2002

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 29 May 2002

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 11 June 2002

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 June 2002

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 21 June 2002

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 26 June 2002

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 16 October 2003

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 23 October 2003

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 29 October 2003

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 November 2003

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 2 December 2003

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 16 November 2009

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 17 November 2009

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 27 November 2009

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 19 April 2010

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 20 August 2010

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 18 December 2010

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 5 February 2011

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 14 May 2011

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 5 July 2011

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 26 August 2011

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 26 September 2011

Tyler, Ken, in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 8 November 2011

Weight, Carel in correspondence with Jane Kinsman, 31 September 1991

FILM AND SOUND

Unpublished

Author's note: In this body of work there is some overlapping and duplication in the content of the film and sound listed.

Hockney, David, filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN449 _IRN134680+CAN449_IRN134681

Hockney, David, filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN429_IRN134682+CAN429_IRN134683

Hockney, David, filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN403_IRN136497+CAN403_IRN136498

Hockney, David, filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive,

Hockney, David, filmed interview at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN 418_IRN1367042

Hockney, David, filmed interview featuring works, *Celia smoking*, *The master printer of Los Angeles*, *Rain* at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN401_IRN13894

Hockney, David, film footage at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN404_IRN136881

Hockney, David, film interview featuring works, *Celia smoking*, *Portrait of Celia*, *The master printer of Los Angeles*, *Weather series,* at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN 417_IRN136892

Hockney, David, film footage featuring works, *Weather series*, *Wind*, at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN 419_IRN136891

Hockney, David, film footage featuring work, *Rain*, at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN 420_IRN136889

Hockney, David, film footage featuring work, *Wind*, at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN 449_IRN136480,

Hockney, David, film footage at Gemini GEL in 1973, held in the National Gallery of Australia Tyler Film and Sound Archive, CAN 449_IRN136481 +CAN 419_IRN136891

Hockney, David, film footage at TGL artist's studio, CAN120_IRN134840 + CAN120_IRN134845

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist's studio featuring works, *The wave*, *Deux* (second part), *Rampant*, CAN397_IRN135510 + CAN137_IRN135512

Hockney, David, film footage in the TGL artist's studio featuring works, *The wave*, *Eine/Deux* (second part)/*Tres*, *Untitled proofs*, CAN405_IRN135517 + CAN403_IRN135518

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist's studio featuring works, *Four flowers in still life*, Untitled proof, CAN406_IRN135560 + CAN406_IRN135561

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist's studio featuring works, *The wave/ Four flowers in still life*, Untitled proof, *Eine/Deux/Tres*, CAN407_IRN135515 + CAN407_IRN135516

Hockney, David, film footage in the workshop and press room featuring works, *Deux*, *The new and the old and the new*, Not titled (accession number 2002.1.1222..1), *Rampant*, CAN408_IRN134682 + CAN408_IRN134683

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio, workshop and press room featuring works, *Four flowers in still life*, *The wave*, CAN411_IRN135557 + CAN410_IRN135559

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio and press room featuring works, *The new and the old and the new*, Untitled proofs, fax works, CAN416_IRN134680 + CAN416_IRN134681

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio, CAN411_IRN135555 + CAN410_IRN135556

Hockney, David, audio recording in the artist studio, CAN398_IRN13517

Hockney, David, short sound bite in the artist studio, CAN414_IRN135565

Hockney, David, audio recording in the artist studio and press room, CAN398_IRN135722

Hockney, David, audio recording in the artist studio, CAN 409_IRN135721

Hockney, David, audio recording in the artist studio and press room, CAN 412_IRN135730

Hockney, David, audio recording in the artist studio and press room, CAN 412_IRN135731

Hockney, David, audio recording in the artist studio, CAN 414_IRN135563

Hockney, David, audio recording in the artist studio and press room, CAN 414_IRN135723

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio featuring works, *Eine/Deux/Tres*, *The new and the old and the new*, *Rampant* (in various stages), assembled fax print, CAN401_IRN136744

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio featuring works, *Eine/Deux/Tres*, *The new and the old and the new*, *Rampant* (in various stages), assembled fax print, CAN402_IRN136745

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio featuring works, *Four flowers in still life*, CAN402_IRN137101

Hockney, David, film footage in the press room, [CAN406_IRN135560 + CAN406_IRN135561

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio and press room featuring works, *The wave*, *The master printer of LA*, *An image of Ken*, *Tres*, CAN410_IRN136750

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio and press room featuring works, *Eine/Deux/Tres*, *The wave*, CAN410_IRN136751

Hockney, David, film footage, CAN414_IRN135566

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio and press room featuring works, *Four flowers in still life*, *The wave*, CAN 415_IRN135562

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio featuring work, *The new and the old and the new*, CAN 415_IRN136736

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio, CAN 510_IRN136733

Hockney, David, film footage in the artist studio, CAN 418_IRN136743

Hockney, David, film footage of driving shots, Connecticut landscape and artist studio, CAN 418_IRN136747

Hockney, David, filmed footage in the artist studio featuring proofs for works, *Rampant* and *The new and the old and the new*, CAN 419_IRN136746

DAVID HOCKNEY AS AUTHOR

Hockney, David, quoted by Robert Wraight in *Tattler*, 18 December 1963

Hockney, David, 'The point is in actual fact ...', *Ark*, number 41, 1967, pp. 44–46

Hockney, David, 'Supplement: lithographs and prints', *Studio International*, volume 176, number 906, December 1968, p. 278

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: Oeuvrekatalog, Graphik*, Berlin, Petersburg Press, London, 1968

Hockney, David, 'First drafts of Grimm: David Hockney', *Ambit*, number 41, 1969, pp. 15–17

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: Grimm's Fairy Tales, suite of etchings,* Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1970

Hockney, David, 'Kestnet–Gesellschaft, Hanover', *Magazine Kunst*, number 39, 1970, pp. 1920–1921

Hockney, David, *David Hockney,* Kestner-Gesellschaft, Hannover, 1970

Hockney, David, 'David Hockney in Paris: a conversation with Melvyn Bragg', *Listener*, volume 93, 22 May 1975, pp. 672–673, cover

Hockney, David, *David Hockney by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, Thames and Hudson, London, 1976

Hockney, David, *Pictures by David Hockney*, edited by Nikos Stangos, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, 1976

Hockney, David, *David Hockney paintings, drawings and prints*, Laing Art Gallery, Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K., 1976

Hockney, David, *David Hockney prints: a touring exhibition from the collection of the Australian National Gallery, Canberra*, Australian National Gallery, Canberra, 1976

Hockney, David, *18 portraits*, Gemini G.E.L., Los Angeles, c. 1977

Hockney, David, *The blue guitar*, Petersburg Press, London, 1977

Hockney, David, 'In conversation with R. B. Kitaj,' *The New Review*, volume 3, numbers 34–35, January/February 1977, pp. 75–77

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: Paper pools,* edited by Nikos Stangos, Thames and Hudson, London, 1980

Hockney, David, *David Hockney, 23 lithographs, 1978-1980*, Tyler Graphics, c. 1980

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: looking at pictures in a book*, National Gallery, London, 1981

Hockney, David, *David Hockney*, Frankfurt Kunstverein, Frankfurt, 1983

Hockney, David, 'On photography. A lecture at the Victoria & Albert Museum, November 1983', André Emmerich Gallery, New York and Zurich, n.d. [1984]

Hockney, David, *Martha's Vineyard and other places: my third sketchbook from the summer of 1982*, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1985

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: moving focus with prints*, Tyler Graphics Ltd., Tate Gallery, London, 1986

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: photocollages*, Tynte Gallery, Adelaide Festival, 1986

Hockney, David, *Home made prints*, David Hockney, Los Angeles, 1986

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: faces 1966–1984*, Laband Art Gallery, Loyola Marymount University in cooperation with Thames and Hudson, London, 1987

Hockney, David, *David Hockney by David Hockney: my early years*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1988

Hockney, David, *Some new pictures*, Introduction by Peter Goulds, L.A. Louver, Los Angeles, 1989

Hockney, David, *Picasso*, Hanuman Books, Madras and New York, 1990

Hockney, David, 'Things recent and a catalogue with new kinds of reproduction', 5 December 1990 to 5 January 1991, Andre Emmerich Gallery, New York, 1990

Hockney, David, *Hockney's opera*, Mainichi Newspapers, Tokyo, 1992

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: paintings and prints from 1960*, Tate Gallery, London, 1993

Hockney, David, *That's the way I see it*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1993

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: New drawings, some drawings of family, friends, and best friends*, 1993–1994, 1853 Gallery, Salts Mill, Saltaire, Yorkshire, 1994

Hockney David, *David Hockney: flowers, faces and spaces*, exhibition catalogue, Annely Juda Gallery, London, 1997

Hockney, David, *David Hockney's dog days*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1998

Hockney, David, *David Hockney*, L.A. Louver, Venice, c. 1998

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: dialogue avec Picasso: Paris, Musée Picasso*, Réunion des musées nationaux, Paris, c. 1999

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: recent etchings*, L.A. Louver, California, 1999

Hockney, David, *Exciting times are ahead*, E.A. Seemann, Leipzig, 2001

Hockney, David, *Secret knowledge: rediscovering the lost techniques of the old masters*, Thames and Hudson, London, 2001

Hockney, David, *A rake's progress and other etchings*, quoted in Tessa Sidey, *Editions Alecto: original graphics, multiple originals 1960–1981,* Lund Humphries, Hampshire, 2003

Hockney, David, *Drawing in the Age of the Camera*, lecture at the Royal Academy of Arts, 10 June 2004

Hockney, David, *Hockney's pictures*, Thames and Hudson, London, 2004

Hockney, David, *Hockney's pictures: the definitive retrospective*, Bulfinch Press, New York, 2004

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: hand eye heart*, L.A. Louver, Venice, 2005

David Hockney interviewed by Laurence Weschler in 'Sometime take the time', in *David Hockney: hand eye heart,* 26 February – 2 April 2005, L.A. Louver, Los Angeles, p. 48

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: portraits*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2006

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: new ways of seeing*, Gustav Lubcke Museum, Germany, 2006

David Hockney 'Introduction' in *David Hockney: A year in Yorkshire* dated July 2006, http://www.tate.org.uk/shop/do /Books/Hockney-Turner-Watercolours/product/34773;jsessionid=0D41C6FEB9F56E3CDE9656BFF43E972E.B, viewed 19 September 2010

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: the East Yorkshire landscape*, L.A. Louver, 2007

Hockney, David, *David Hockney, 1960-1968: a marriage of styles*, Nottingham Contemporary, 2009

Hockney, David, *David Hockney: drawing in a printing machine*, Annely Juda Fine Art/David Hockney, London, 2009

Lawrence Weschler, 'Sometime take the time' in *David Hockney: hand eye heart,* 26 February – 2 April 2005, Los Angeles: LA Louver, 2004, p. 45

BIBLIOGRAPHY (ALPHBETICAL ORDER)

Ackerman, D. and M., 'Dear Kitaj and David: The quality of the creation is more important than the content', *Arts Review*, volume 29, 29 April 1977, pp. 285–287

Adam, Peter, *David Hockney and his friends*, Absolute Press, New York, c. 1997

Adams, Clinton, *American lithographers 1900–1960: the artists and their printers*, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, 1983

Albers, Josef, *Josef Albers: White Line Squares,* Los Angeles County Museum and Gemini GEL, 1966

Albers, Josef, *Interaction of color,* Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1975

Alloway, Lawrence, 'Britain's new iron age', *Art News*, New York, Summer 1953, pp. 18–20, 68–9

Alloway, Lawrence, *Nine abstract artists, their work and theory: Robert Adams, Terry Frost, Adrian Heath, Anthony Hill, Roger Hilton, Kenneth Martin, Mary Martin, Victor Pasmore and William Scott*, Alec Tiranti Ltd, London, 1954

Alloway, Lawrence, 'Art news from London', *Arts News*, New York, May 1955, p. 11

Alloway, Lawrence, 'The arts and the mass media', *Architectural Design and Construction*, volume 28, number 2, February 1958, pp. 84–85

Alloway, Lawrence, 'Notes on abstract art and the mass media', *Art News and Review*, 27 February – 12 March 1960, pp. 3, 12

Alloway, Lawrence, '"Pop art" since 1949', *The Listener*, 27 December 1962, pp. 1085–1087

Alloway, Lawrence, *The metallisation of a dream*, Lion and Unicorn Press, London, 1963

Alloway, Lawrence, 'The development of British Pop,' in Lucy Lippard, *Pop Art*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1966, pp. 27–67

Amaya, Mario, *Pop as Art: a survey of the new super-realism*, Studio Vista, London, 1965

Amaya, Mario, *Paintings and prints*, Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester, 1969

Andre, Michael, 'David Hockney (David and Long)', *Art News*, volume 75, October 1976, pp. 115–116

Antliff, Mark and Leighten, Patricia, *Cubism and culture,* Thames and Hudson, London, 2001

Antliff, Mark and Leighten, Patricia (editors), *A cubism reader: documents and criticism: 1906 to 1914*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 2008

Armory, Mark, 'Hockney magic', *Sunday Times Magazine*, London, 28 May 1978, pp.62–66, 69

Armstrong, Carol E., *A Degas sketchbook*, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, 2000

Arts Council of Great Britain, *French paintings: a second selection from Mr Peto's collection*, Arts council of Great Britain, Peto Collection, 1951

Ashton, Dore, 'A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, p. 39

Auden. W. H., *The complete poems of Cavafy,* Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1961

Bailey, Anthony, 'Profiles: special effects: David Hockney', *The New Yorker*, 30 July 1979, pp. 35–36, 41–42, 44, 49–58, 60–69

Bailey, Martin, 'Cultural Olympiad: 'the largest celebration in modern Olympic history'', *Art Newspaper*, number 220, January 2011, p. 7

Bailly-Herzberg, Janine, *Dictionaire de l'estampe en France 1830–1950*, Flammarion, 1985

Baker, Christopher and Henry, Tom (editors), *The National Gallery: complete illustrated catalogue,* National Gallery Company, London, 2001, p. 220

Baldesarrie, John interviewed by Christopher Knight, 'Oral history interview with John Baldessari, 1992 Apr. 4–5', Smithsonian: Archives of American Art, http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/oralhistories/transcripts/baldes92.htm

Baldessari, Anne, *Picasso Cubiste*, Réunion musées nationaux, Paris, 2007

Bann, Stephen, 'Where the English draw the line', *Artforum*, September 1979, pp. 70–72

Baro, Gene, 'The British scene: Hockney and Kitaj', *Arts Magazine*, volume 38, May–June 1964, pp. 94–101

Baro, Gene, 'David Hockney's drawings', *Studio International*, volume 171, May 1966, pp. 184–186

Baro, Gene, 'Hockney's *Ubu*', *Art and Artists*, volume 1, May 1966, pp. 8–13

Baro, Gene, 'David Hockney at Knoedler and Michael Walls', *Art in America*, volume 63, March 1975, pp. 93–94

Barr, Alfred, *Picasso: fifty years of his art*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1946

Barr, Alfred, *Cubism and abstract art*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1966

Battye, Christopher John, 'John Christopher Battye interviews David Hockney', *Art and Artists*, volume 5, April 1970, pp. 50–53

Beaton, Cecil, *Cecil Beaton's New York,* J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia & New York, 1938

Beaton, Cecil, *Self portrait with friends: the selected diaries of Cecil Beaton 1926–1974*, edited by Richard Buckle, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1979

Bech, Henning, *When men meet: homosexuality and modernity,* translated by Teresa Mesquit and Tim Davies, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1997

Bech, Henning, *Who's a pretty boy then: one hundred and fifty years of gay life in pictures*, Serpent's Tail, London, 1997

Becker, Robert, 'New York: David Hockney, André Emmerich Gallery', *Flash Art*, number 109, November 1982, pp. 67–68

Becker, Robert, 'David Hockney', *Interview* 16, December 1986, pp. 160–163

Bedell, Geraldine, 'Coming out of the dark ages', *The Observer*, 24 June 2007, http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/jun/24/communities.gayrights

Behbehani, Mandy, 'A picture of David Hockney', *W*, 19–26 April 1985, p. 16

Bell, Clive, *New Statesman and Nation,* 5 November 1938

Bell, Jane, 'David Hockney print retrospective at Knoedler', *Arts Magazine*, volume 48, December 1973, p. 75

Bell, Julian, 'David Hockney: a drawing retrospective', *Modern Painters*, volume 8, winter 1995, pp. 94–96

Bell, Quentin, 'Picasso and Picassini', *The Listener*, 8 November 1951, p. 802

Bell, Quentin, *4 French realists*, catalogue of a touring exhibition with an introduction by Quentin Bell, Arts Council of Great Britain, 1954

Benesch, Otto, *The drawings of Rembrandt*, enlarged edition, edited by Eva Benesch, Phaidon, London, 1973

Benson, Alan, *David Hockney at the Tate,* documentary film, Phaedon, London, 1988

Berger, Philip, 'Art Review: David Hockney', *Time Out Chicago,* number 173, 19–25 June 2008, http://timeoutchicago.com/arts-culture/art-design/57145/david-hockney

Berggren, Olivier, 'Picasso & Bacon: painting the other self', *Francis Bacon and the tradition of art*, in Wilfried Seipel (editor), Barbara Steffen and Chrisoph Vitali, Kunsthistorische Museum, Vienna, and Basel, Fondation Beyler, 2004

Bernstein, Richard, 'David Hockney, "Call me a slop artist if you like"', *Interview*, number 23, July 1972, pp. 34–35, 44–45

Berthoud, Roger, *Graham Sutherland: a biography*, Faber and Faber, London, 1982

Billaud, Jean-Pascal, 'Hockney en Californie', *Decoration International,* number 57, December 1982 – January 1983, pp. 67–69

Blackeston, Oswell, 'The blue guitar', *Arts Review*, volume 32, 29 August 1980, p. 378

Blake, Peter quoted in 'Still swinging after all these years', *Tate Etc*, Issue 1, Summer 2004, http://www.tate.org.uk/tateetc/issue1/article4.htm

Bloom, Peter, 'Art of the possible', *British Journal of Photography*, number 141, July 1994, pp. 18–19

Blunt, Anthony, 'Looking back on Picasso', *The New York Review of Books*, 14 June 1973, p. 31

Bois, Yves-Alain Bois, 'The semiology of Cubism', in *Picasso and Braque: A symposium*; edited by Lynn Zelevansky and William Rubin, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1989, pp. 129-208

Bongartz, Roy, 'David Hockney: reaching the top with apparently no great effort', *Art News* 77, March 1978, pp. 44–47

Bonnard, Pierre, Vuillard, Edouard and the Arts Council of Great Britain, *Pierre Bonnard and Édouard Vuillard*, Arts Council of Great Britain, 1948

Bosetti, Petra, 'Die Kakteen des Lehrers waren wichtiger als Rechnen', *Art: das Kunstmagazin,* number 9, September 1995, pp. 88–91

Botquin, Jean-Michel, 'Le grand théâtre de David Hockney', *Art et Culture,* 6 June 1992, pp. 19–20

Bowling, Frank, 'A shift in perspective', *Arts Magazine,* volume 43, Summer 1969, pp. 24–27

Bowling, Frank quoted in 'Still swinging after all these years', *Tate Etc*, Issue 1, Summer 2004, http://www.tate.org.uk/tateetc/issue1/article4.htm

Boxer, Sarah, 'Paintings too perfect? The great optics debate', *The New York Times*, 4 December 2001, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/04/arts/paintings–too–perfect–the–great–optics
debate.html?scp=1&sq=Paintings%20Too%20perfect?%20The%20great%20optics%20debate&st=cse

Boxer, Sarah, 'Computer people reopen art history dispute', *The New York Times*, 26 August 2004, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/08/26/arts/computer–people–reopen–art–history
dispute.html?scp=1&sq=Computer%20people%20reopen%20art%20history%20dispute&st=cse

Bragg, Melvyn, 'David Hockney in Paris: a conversation with Melvyn Bragg', *Listener,* volume 93, 22 May 1975, p. 672

Bragg, Melvyn, *Hockney at the Tate*, documentary film edited and presented by Melvyn Bragg, A London Weekend Television 'South Bank Show/RM Arts Co–Production, London, 1988

Braudy, Leo, 'Forerunner of the new', *Life*, February 1988, pp. 53–57

Brighton, Andrew, 'Hockney's courage', *David Hockney 1960–1968: A marriage of styles*, edited by Alex Farquharson et al, Contemporary Nottingham, Nottingham, 2009, pp. 73-80; http://www.nottinghamcontemporary.org/art/david-hockney

Brown, Betty A, 'David Hockney: the artist as seer', *Visions: The Los Angeles Art Quarterly,* 1 November 1986, pp. 4–7, 28–29

Brown, David Blayney, *Turner watercolours*, Tate Publishing, London, 2007

Brown, Kathan, *The Chuck Close Mezzotint "Keith" 1972 - A documentation with ten photographic etchings of the work in progress*, Crown Point Press, Oaklands, 1972

Brown, Kathan, *Ink, paper, metal wood; painters and sculptors at Crown Point Press*, Chronicle Books, San Francisco, 1996

Brown, Mark, 'David Hockney's *Bigger trees near water* given a big space at Tate Britain', *The Guardian*, 23 November 2009, http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2009/nov/23/hockney–tate–britain–trees/print

Buchanan, Terry, 'Medium matters: Hockney's photocollages at the Tate Gallery', *British Journal of Photography 135,* November 1988, p. 22

Buckle, Richard (editor), *Self-portrait with friends: the selected diaries of Cecil Beaton 1926–1974*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1979

Bumpus, Judith, 'David Hockney: the magpie instinct', *Art and Artists*, volume 15, September 1980, p. 8–11

Bumpus, Judith, 'It's the camera, stupid!', *Art Newspaper*, number 119, November 2001, pp. 35–36

Bumpus, Judith, 'Broadcasting: painting as an extreme sport', *Art Newspaper*, number 205, September 2009, p. 42

Burn, Gordon, 'Wall flowers: Hockney at sixty', *The Independent Magazine*, 12 April 1997, pp. 12–17

Burn, Guy, 'Prints: David Hockney', *Arts Review*, volume *38,* 11 April 1986, p. 186

Burr, James, 'Looking in Liverpool and London shows', *Apollo*, volume 87, January 1968, pp. 63–64

Burr, James, 'An erotic journey', *Apollo*, April 1970, p. 311

Burr, James, 'Bradford's golden boy', *Apollo*, 128, November 1988, pp. 371–380

Burr, James, 'The gap between art and life: pop prints', *Printmaking Today 2,* Summer 1993, p. 9

Butera, Virginia Fabbri, 'Arts reviews: David Hockney ... André Emmerich', *Arts Magazine 57*, December 1982, p. 43

Butler, Judith, *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*, New York: Routledge, c.1999

Butterfield, Jan, 'David Hockney: blue hedonistic pools', *Print Collector's Newsletter* 10, July–August 1979, pp. 74–76

Campbell, Ormond, 'David Hockney: The rake's progress', *Arts Review*, volume 27, 25 July 1975, p. 422

Canady, John, 'David Hockney', *The New York Times*, 27 May 1972, p. 25

Castleman, Riva, *Jasper Johns: a print retrospective,* Boston, Little Brown and Co, 1986

Castleman, Riva, *Seven master printmakers: innovations in the eighties, the Museum of Modern Art*, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, 1991

Cavafy, C. P., *Collected poems,* Princeton University Press, N.J., 1992

Cayzer, Elizabeth, *Changing perceptions – milestones in twentieth-century British portraiture*, Alpha Press, Brighton and Portland, Oregon, 1999 (with essay by David Hockney on 'Henry in Italy')

Clair, Jean, 'Peinture sur Nature', *Art Press International*, November 1977, pp. 11–12

Clark, Kenneth, *Leonardo da Vinci Drawings at Windsor Castle,* Phaidon, London, revised edition, 1968

Clark, Ossie, *The Ossie Clark diaries*, Bloomsbury, London, 1998

Cohen, Ronny, 'The medium isn't the message', *ARTnews*, volume 84, number 8, October 1985, pp. 74–81

Coleman, John, 'Chic to chic', *New Statesman*, volume 89, 14 March 1975, p. 351

James, Phillip, *Portraits*, catalogue of an exhibition held at the Galleries of Messrs Wildenstein, London, with a foreword by John Commander, Arts Council of Great Britain, London, 1954

Conrad, Barnaby, III, 'Mr. Geldzahler looks at Mr. Hockney', *Art/World*, volume 2, 12 November – 9 December 1977, pp. 1, 14

Conrad, Peter, 'Grand designs', *New Statesman*, 16 June 1978, p. 823

Conquest, Robert, *The great terror: a reassessment: 40th anniversary edition,* Oxford University Press, 1990

Cooper, Douglas, *The Cubist epoch*, Phaidon in association with the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1970

Cooper, Douglas, 'Letter to the editor', *Connaissance des arts*, number 257, July 1973, pp. 96–97

Cooper, Douglas and Tinterow, Gary, *The essential Cubism: Braque, Picasso and their friends*, Tate Gallery, London, 1983

Corbett, David Peters, and Perry, Lara (editors), *English art 1860–1914: modern artists and identity*, Manchester University Press, U.K., 2000

Coutts–Smith, Kenneth, 'Hockney', *Arts Review*, volume 15, 14–28 December 1963, p. 10

Cowling, Elizabeth and Mundy, Jennifer, *On classic ground: Picasso, Léger, de Chirico and the New Classicism 1910–1930*, Tate Gallery, London, 1990

Craft, Robert, 'Astrology, Hockney, Schubert: a musical diary', *The New York Review of Books*, November 1977, p. 26

Curtis, Penelope, *David Hockney: paintings and prints from 1960*, Tate Gallery Liverpool, 1993

D.C., 'David Hockney: portraits, Museum of Fine Arts', *Modern Painters,* May 2006, p. 114

D'Arcy, David, 'Little art films', *Artnet.com,* 26 May 2010, http://www.artnet.com/magazineus/reviews/darcy/art–films5–25–10.asp

Danilowitz, Brenda, *The prints of Josef Albers: a catalogue raisonné 1915– 1976,* Hudson Hills Press, in association with the Josef and Anni Albers Foundation, 2001

Danchev, Alex, *Georges Braque: a life*, Arcade Publishing, New York, 2005

David, Hugh, *On Queer Street: a social history of British homosexuality, 1895– 1995,* Harper Collins, London, 1997

De Vecchis, M., 'L'enfant prodige della pittura inglese ha dipinti il grande oviente massonico di Mozart', *Bolaffiarte* 10, February–March 1979, pp. 54–56

Denvir, Bernard, 'London', *Art International*, volume 14, February 1970, pp. 71– 72

Denvir, Bernard, 'London', *Art International*, volume 15, May 1970, pp. 59, 72

Denvir, Bernard, 'David Hockney: an episode in social aesthetics', *Art Spectrum*, volume 1, January 1975, pp. 26–29, 41–43

Denvir, Bernard, 'London letter', *Art International*, volume 15, February 1971, p. 42

Deitcher, David, 'David Hockney: the recent work', *Arts Magazine*, volume 52, December 1977, pp. 129–133

Dorment, Richard, 'Hockney at Nottingham Contemporary, review', *The Telegraph*, 23 November 2009, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/art/art– reviews/6637681/Hockney–at–Nottingham–Contemporary–review.html

Dougray, Ginny, 'David Hockney on why iPhones are the future for art', *Timesonline*, 9 May 2009, http://www.ginnydougary.co.uk/2009/05/25/david- hockney-on-why-iphones-are-the-future-for-art/

Dubuffet, Jean, *Jean Dubuffet: works, writings and interviews*, Ediciones Poligrafa, Barcelona, 2006

Dunlop, Ian, 'London contemporary', *Studio International*, volume 179, May 1970, pp. 229–230

Ebony, David, 'David Hockney at Robert Miller and André Emmerich', *Art in America*, volume 84, November 1996, pp. 116–117

Edgar, Natalie, *Art News*, volume 61, number 1, March 1962, p. 14

Eliot, George, *The leather boys,* Anthony Blond, London, 1961

Ellenzweig, Allen, 'David Hockney...Knoedler Contemporary Prints', *Arts Magazine*, volume 49, February 1975, p. 13

Engbert, Siri, 'Imaginary places and the art of the everyday', *Frank Stella at Tyler Graphics*, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, 1997, p. 9

Esterow, Milton, 'The second time around', *Art News*, volume 92, Summer 1993, pp. 148–153

Evans, Bob, 'David Hockney, Midland Group Gallery, Nottingham', *Arts Review* 31, 19 January 1979, p. 23

Fagus, Félicien, 'Petite gazette d'art: les murs en fleur affiches', *La revue blanche,* volume xxiv, January–April 1901, pp. 114-145, 308, 463-464

Falconer, Ian, 'Smart sets,' *Interview*, January 1988, pp. 51–55

Fantoni, Barry, 'Gold fingers, (Scared cows)', *Sunday Times Magazine*, London, 1 May 1977, p. 79

Farquharson, Alex, 'To youth: Hockney's sixties', *David Hockney 1960–1968: A marriage of styles*, edited by Alex Farquharson et al, Contemporary Nottingham, Nottingham, 2009, pp.7-23; http://www.nottinghamcontemporary.org/art/david-hockney

Farndale, Nigel, 'The talented Mr Hockney', *The Telegraph*, London, 15 November 2001, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/3606727/The-talented-Mr-Hockney.html

Farr, Dennis, 'The John Moores Liverpool Exhibition 3', *Burlington Magazine*, volume 104, January 1962, pp. 30–31

Faulkner, Simon, 'Dealing with Hockney', in *David Hockney*, edited by Paul Melia, Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York, 1995, pp. 11-29

Feaver, William, 'Safe with objects', *London Magazine*, volume 10, March 1971, pp. 85–86+

Feaver, William, 'London letter…' *Art International*, volume 17, March 1973, pp. 58–59

Feaver, William, 'International Reviews: David Hockney, Annely Juda, London', *Art News,* April 2003, p. 133

Feeney, Mark, 'David Hockney keeps seeking new avenues of exploration', *Boston Globe*, 26 February 2006, http://www.boston.com/news/globe/living/articles/2006/02/26/david_hockney_keeps_seeking_new_avenues_of_exploration/

Field, Richard S., *Richard Hamilton: Image and Process, 1952–1982*, Hansjörg Mayer, Stuttgart, London, 1983

Filler, Martin, 'The stage magic of David Hockney', *House and Garden*, December 1983, p. 218

Filler, Martin, 'Tristan by Vari–Lite', *Art in America*, April 1988, pp. 35–41

Finch, Charlie, *Pop art: object as image*, Studio Vista, London, 1968

Finch, Charlie, 'A walk in the woods', *Artnet.com*, 6 November 2009, http://www.artnet.com/magazineus/features/finch/david–hockney11–6–09.asp

Finch, Charlie, 'Hockney and Matisse', *Artnet.com*, 5 August 2010, http://www.artnet.com/magazineus/features/finch/matisse–and–hockney8–5–10.asp

Fine, Ruth E., *Gemini GEL: Art and collaboration,* National Gallery of Art, Washington & Abbeville Press, New York, 1984

Fingleton, David, 'Hockney paints the stage', *Arts Review*, volume 37, 16–30 August 1985, p. 415

Fingleton, David, 'Opera buffoon', *Arts Review*, volume 45, January 1993, pp. 37–39

Flayling, Christopher, *The Royal College of Art: one hundred & fifty years of art & design*, Barrie & Jenkins, London, 1987

Ford, Cohn, 'Photocall: Hockney's latest laser pictures', *Sunday Times Magazine,* 19 May 1991, p. 33

Forster, Edward, A., *Robert Rauschenberg: prints 1948/1970,* The Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Minneapolis, 1970

Foster, Alicia, 'Gwen John's self-portrait: art, identity and women students at the Slade School', *English art 1860-1914: modern artists and identity*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2000, p. 171

Foucault, Michel, *The history of sexuality,* volumes 1–3, translated by Robert Hurley, Pantheon Books, New York, c.1978–1986

Fox–Pitt, Sarah, 'David Hockney und "The Rake's progress"', *Du*, number 413, July 1975, pp. 71–81

Fox–Pit, Sarah, 'David Hockney und die 'Zauberflöte'', *Du*, number 451, September 1978, pp. 4, 6–7

Fox–Pitt, Sarah, 'David Hockney: Hockney paints the stage, Walker Art Center', *Artforum*, volume 22, April 1984, pp. 86–87

Frackman, Noel, 'David Hockney, Davis and Long', *Arts Magazine*, volume 51, September 1976, p. 15

Frackman, Noel, 'Arts Reviews: David Hockney... André Emmerich' *Arts Magazine*, volume 52, January 1978, p. 20

Frayling, Christopher, *The Royal College of Art: one hundred & fifty years of art & design,* Barrie & Jenkins, London, 1987, p. 132

Frémon, Jean, *David Hockney: close and far,* Galerie Lelong, Paris, 2001

French, Phillip, 'A bigger splash', *Sight and Sound*, volume 44, Spring 1975, pp. 120–121

French–Frazier, Nina, 'New York Reviews: David Hockney (Emmerich, Uptown)', *Art News*, volume 77, January 1978, p. 150

Friedman, Jon R., 'Everyday and historic: the photographs of David Hockney', *Arts Magazine*, volume 58, October 1983, pp. 76–77

Friedman, Martin, *Hockney paints the stage*, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, and Abbeville Press, New York, 1983 (with contributions by John Dexter, David Hockney and Stephen Spender)

Froiland, Paul, 'A new stage', *Horizon* 26, November–December 1983, pp. 40–45

Fry, Edward F, *Cubism*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1966

Fuller, Peter, 'Hockney', *Arts Review*, volume 22, 5 December 1970, p. 172

Fuller, Peter, 'David Hockney, December 1972, Kasmin Gallery', *Connoisseur*, volume 182, February 1973, p. 151

Fuller, Peter, 'David Hockney at garage...', *Arts Review*, volume 26, 26 July 1974, p. 467

Fuller, Peter, 'A bigger splash', *Connoisseur*, volume 189, July 1975, p. 252

Fuller, Peter, 'An interview with David Hockney: Part I', *Art Monthly*, November 1977, number 12

Fuller, Peter, 'An interview with David Hockney: Part 2', *Art Monthly*, number 13, December 1977 – January 1978, pp. 5–8, 10

Fuller, Peter, 'An Interview with David Hockney', *Art Monthly*, December 1978 – January 1979, pp. 5–10

Fuller, Peter, 'All the world's a stage', *New Society,* 26 July 1985, pp. 127–129

Furman, Laura, 'David Hockney (Knoedler)', *Art News*, volume 73, January 1974, pp. 50, 52

Gablik, Suzi, 'Protagonists of Pop', *Studio International*, volume 178, number 913, 1969, pp. 9–16

Garlake, Margaret, *New art new world: British art in post-war society*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1998

Gavanon, Anne-Françoise, 'Picasso's linocuts: interview of Hidalgo Arnéra', Valluaris, 11 June 2004, transcript pp. 47–56, translated by the author

Gayford, Martin, *A bigger message: conversations with David Hockney* Thames and Hudson, London, 2011

Geldzahler, Henry, 'A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, pp. 37–38

Gercken, Günter, *David Hockney, Zeichnungen, Grafik, Gemälde*, Erhältlich bei diesen Anbietern, 1971

Glazebrook, Mark, *David Hockney: paintings, prints and drawings 1960-1970*, Lund Humphries, London, 1970

Gibson, Robin, *The portrait now*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 1993

Gibson, Robin, *Painting the century: 101 portrait masterpieces 1900-2000*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2000 (with introductory essay by Norbert Lynton)

Gilmour, Pat, *Kelpra Studio: the Rose and Chris Prater Gift: Artists' prints 1961–1980*, Tate Gallery, London, 1980

Gilmour, Pat, *Ken Tyler master printer and the American print renaissance,* Australian National Gallery, Canberra, 1986

Gilmour, Pat (editor), *Lasting impressions: lithography as art*, Australian National Gallery, Canberra, 1988

Gilmour, Pat, *Innovation in collaborative printmaking: Kenneth Tyler 1963–1992*, The Yomiuri Shimbun and the Japan Association of Art Museums, Tokyo, 1992

Gilmour, Pat, *Hanga geijutsu no kyoen: Kenesu Taira to kyoshotachi, 1963–1992*, Yomiuri Shinbunsha: Bijutsukan Renraku Kyogikai, 1992

Glazebrook, Mark, *David Hockney: paintings, prints and drawings 1960–1970* Whitechapel exhibition catalogue, Lund Humphries, London and Bradford, 1970

Smith, Glen, Bartlett, Annie and King, Michael, 'Treatments of homosexuality in Britain since the 1950s–an oral history: the experience of patients,' *British Medical Journal*, volume 328, number 7437, 29 January 2004, http://www.bmj.com/content/328/7437/427.full

Goddard, Donald, 'David Hockney. Knoedler', *Art News*, volume 74, February 1975, pp. 97–98

Goldberger, Paul, 'Henry Geldzahler, 59, critic, public official and contemporary art's champion, is dead', *New York Times*, 17 August 1994, http://www.nytimes.com/1994/08/17/obituaries/henry–geldzahler–59–critic–public–official–contemporary–art–s–champion–dead.html?scp=1&sq=Henry%20Geldzahler,%2059,%20critic,%20public%20official%20and%20contemporary%20art%E2%80%99s%20champion,%20is%20dead&st=cse

Golding, John, *Cubism: an history and an analysis*, 3rd revised edition, Faber, London, 1988

Goldman, Judith, 'Gemini prints at the Museum of Modern Art', *Print Collector's Newsletter*, 2, May–June 1971, p. 30

Goldman, Judith, 'The print establishment', *Art in America*, July–August 1973, p. 108

Goldsmith, Barbara, 'How Henry made 43 artists immortal', *New York*, volume 2, number 41, 13 October 1969, pp. 44–50

Gordon, Alastair, 'Art in the modern manner', *Connoisseur*, volume 167, February 1968, pp. 108–109

Gordon, Alastair, 'Art in the modern manner', *Connoisseur*, volume 171, May 1969, p. 34

Gordon's Print Price Annual, volume 3, Martin Gordon Inc., New York, 1989

Gordon's Print Price Annual, volumes 4 and 5, Martin Gordon Inc., Naples, Florida, 1990

Gosling, Nigel, 'David Hockney: no dumb blonde', *Observer Magazine*, 22 March 1970, pp. 36–39

Gosling, Nigel, 'Things exactly as they are', *Horizon*, volume 20, November 1977, pp. 46–51

Gough–Yates, Kevin, 'A bigger splash', *Studio International*, volume 189, March–April 1975, pp. 143–145

Goulds, Peter, *David Hockney: some new pictures,* L.A. Louver, Los Angeles, 1989

Greenberg, Clement, *Clement Greenberg: the collected essays and criticism*, edited by John O'Brian, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1986-

Guilbaut, Serge, *How New York stole the idea of modern art: abstract expressionism, freedom and the cold war*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1983

Güner, Fisun, 'Interview: David Hockney', *New Statesman*, 18 June 2009 http://www.newstatesman.com/art/2009/06/hockney-yorkshire-california viewed 12 October 2011

Hamilton, Richard, *Collected words*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1982

Hamilton, Richard, *Richard Hamilton: prints: a complete catalogue of graphic works 1939–1983*, Editions Hansjörg Mayer, Stuttgart and London, 1984

Hamilton, Richard and Schwarz, Dieter, *Exteriors, interiors, objects, people*, Edition Hansjörg Mayer, Stuttgart and London, 1990

Harris, Emma, 'Josef Albers: art education at Black mountain College', in *Josef Albers: a retrospective*, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, 1988, pp. 50–57

Harrison, Charles, 'London commentary: David Hockney at Kasmin...', *Studio International*, volume 175, January 1968, pp. 36–38

Harrison, Charles, *English art and modernism, 1900–1939*, Allen Lane, London, 1981

Harrison, Jane, 'London at mid-season', *Arts Magazine*, volume 37, February 1963, pp. 32–33

Hartley, Craig, 'David Hockney: 'Printmaking and Technique – I', *Print Quarterly*, volume V, part 3, 1988, pp. 242–256

Hartley, Craig, 'David Hockney: 'Printmaking and Technique – II', *Print Quarterly*, volume V, part 4, 1988, pp. 373–394

Hartley, Craig *David Hockney: 25 years of printmaking*, CCA Galleries, Berkeley Square Gallery, London [1988]

Haworth, Jann, quoted in 'Still swinging after all these years', *Tate Etc*, Issue 1, Summer 2004, http://www.tate.org.uk/tateetc/issue1/article4.htm

Hazan, Jack, *A bigger splash*, documentary film, produced by Jack Hazan, Mike Kaplan, Mike Whittaker, 1975

Heilpern, John, 'In the picture with Hockney', *Observer Magazine*, 2 February 1975, pp. 12–17

Hennessy, Susie, 'A conversation with Jim Dine', *Art Journal*, volume 39, number 3, Printmaking, the collaborative art, Spring 1980, pp. 168–175

Heron, Patrick, 'The School of London', *The New Statesman and Nation*, 9 April 1949, volume 37, number 944, p. 351

Heyner, K., *David Hockney: exciting times are ahead*, exhibition catalogue, Kunst und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 2011

Higgins, Patrick, *Heterosexual dictatorship: male homosexuality in post-war Britain*, Fourth Estate, London, 1966

Hill, John, *Sex, class and realism: British cinema, 1956–1963*, BFI Publishing, London, 1997

Hill, Robert, 'David Hockney, F..F. McWilliam, Waddington Galleries', *Arts Review*, volume 28, 12 November 1976, p. 608

Hockney, Margaret, interviewed by Natalie Hanman, 'He can see deeper than the skin', *The Guardian*, England, 8 September 2006, http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2006/sep/08/art

Hodin, J. P., 'David Hockney', *Quadrum*, number 18, 1965, pp. 144–145

Homfray, Mike, *Provincial queens,* Peter Lang Publishing Inc, London, 2007

Houlbrook, Matt, *Queer London: perils and pleasures in the sexual metropolis, 1918–1957*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 2005

Howgate, Sarah, Stern Shapiro, Barbara, Glazebrook, Mark, Livingstone, Marco, and White, Edmund, *Likeness: recent portrait drawings by David Hockney*, UCLA Hammer Museum, Los Angeles, 2000

Howgate, Sarah and Shapiro, Barbara Stern, *David Hockney: portraits*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2006

Hughes, Robert, *London Magazine*, volume 5, number 10, January 1966, pp. 68-73

Hughes, Robert, 'Bland and maniacal', *Time*, 29 May 1972, p. 63

Hughes, Robert. *Frank Stella: the Swan engravings*, Fort Worth Art Museum, Fort Worth, 1984

Hunt, Jeremy, *This is tomorrow 1956–2006: just what is it that makes today's artists so rich, so successful?* http://www.thisistomorrow2.com/

Hunt, Jeremy, in electronic version of catalogue sent to me by Gary Comenas 13 May 2011, awaiting catalogue arrival

Hunt, Lyn, 'The unstable boundaries of the French revolution', in Ariès, Philippe and Duby, Georges, editors, *A history of private life*, volume 4, from *The fires of revolution to the great war*, Perrot, Michelle, series director, The Belknap Press of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1990

Hyde, H. Montgomery, *The other love: an historical and contemporary survey of homosexuality in Britain*, William Heinemann, London, 1970

Hyman, James, *The battle for Realism: figurative art in Britain during the Cold War 1945–1960,* Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2001

Inaba, Jeffrey, 'Carl Andre's same old stuff, *Assemblage*, number 39, August, 1999, pp. 36-61

James, Phillip, *60 paintings for '51*, foreword by Phillip James, Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1951

Januszczak, Waldemar 'Summer of the umpteenth doll', *Guardian*, 6 June 1987, p. 12

Jeffery-Poulter, Stephen, *Peers, queers and commons: the struggle for gay law reform from 1950 to the present*, Routledge, London, 1991

Jenkins, Hugh, quoted in 'The Bricks controversy and *'Save the Stubbs'*', from *Daily Mail*, 18 February 1976,
http://www.tate.org.uk/archivejourneys/historyhtml/people_public.htm

Johnson, Una E., *Ambroise Vollard Editeur*, The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1977

Jourdain, Francis, *Pierre Bonnard, ou, Les vertus de la liberté*, Albert Skira, Geneva, 1946

Joyce, Paul, *Hockney on art: conversations with Paul Joyce*, Little Brown Book Group, Boston, New York, London, 1999

Judd, Donald, *Arts Magazine*, volume 57, number 1, April 1962, pp. 52–53

Kahnweiler, Daniel-Henry, *The way of Cubism*, translated by Henry Aronson, New York, 1949, originally published as *Der Weg Kubismus*, Delphin-Verlag, Munich, 1920

Kahnweiler, Daniel-Henry, *Paintings from France*, Leicester Galleries, London, 1953

Kahnweiler, Daniel-Henry, *My galleries and painters*, translated from the French by Helen Weaver, translation augmented by Karl Orend; Introduction by John Russell, Boston MFA publications, Boston, 2003

Kato, Hiroko, *Hockney, David, prints 1954–1995*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Tokyo, 1996

Kelder, Diane, 'Collaboration and provocation', *Arts Magazine*, April 1988, pp. 7–8

Kinsman, Jane, *Pop! Prints from the 1960s and 1970s*, exhibition brochure, Australian National Gallery, Canberra, 1991

Kinsman, Jane, 'Making a splash at the Australian National Gallery: David Hockney: *A diver* (17) from the *Paper pools* series 1978', *National Gallery News*, September–October 1992, p. 26

Kinsman, Jane, 'Dear Kitaj', *National Gallery News*, July–August 1994, pp. 28–29

Kinsman, Jane, *The prints of R. B. Kitaj*, Scolar Press in association with the National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, Aldershot, Hants, 1994

Kinsman, Jane, 'Life-class: an interview with Betty Churcher about her time at the RCA', *National Gallery News*, November–December 1994, pp. 23–27

Kinsman, Jane, *Paris in the late 19th century*, with Bascou, Marc et al, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra 1996, author of the following chapters:

>   Chapter 1: 'Paris intense', pp. 8–37
>   Chapter 2: 'The Pastorals', pp. 38–57
>   Chapter 6: 'Inventing intimacy: the Nabis', pp. 90–107

Kinsman, Jane, *Picasso: The Vollard suite*, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 1997

Kinsman, Jane, *Dance Hall days: French posters from Chéret to Toulouse-Lautrec*, *artonview* exhibition supplement, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 1998

Kinsman, Jane, 'Imagining the Grand Canyon,' *artonview*, number 19, Spring 1999, pp. 14–18

Kinsman, Jane, *Intimate Matisse*, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 1999

Kinsman, Jane, *The art of collaboration: The Big Americans*, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 2002

Kipphoff, Petra, 'Verse in Farben von David Hockney', *Zeitmagazin*, number 15/1, April 1977, pp. 58–65

Kitaj, R. B., *The human clay,* Arts Council of Great Britain, London, 1976

Kitaj, R. B., 'R. B. Kitaj and David Hockney [Conversation]', *The New Review*, volume 3, numbers 34–35, January/February 1977, pp. 75–77

Kotz, Mary Lynn, *Rauschenberg/art and life,* Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, 1990

Kramer, Hilton, 'A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, pp. 36–39

Kramer, Hilton, 'Comedies of manners', *The New York Times*, 11 May 1969, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=FB0611FD34541B7B93C3A817 8ED85F4D8685F9&scp=2&sq=Kramer,%20Hilton%20Comedies%20of%20man ners&st=cse

Kramer, Hilton, 'David Hockney has moved toward a spare realism', *The New York Times*, 14 December 1974, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50B12FA35551A7493C6A817 89D95F408785F9&scp=1&sq=David%20Hockney%20has%20moved%20towar d%20a%20spare%20realism&st=cse

Kramer, Hilton, 'Art: the fun of David Hockney', *The New York Times*, 4 November 1977, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F10713FB345E1A738DDDAD0 894D9415B878BF1D3&scp=1&sq=Art:%20The%20fun%20of%20David%20Ho ckney&st=cse

Kramer, Hilton, 'Hockney show at the Met: over celebrating a light talent', *The New York Observer*, 20 June, 1988, pp. 1, 11

Kunitz, Stanley, Henry, 'A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, pp. 31–42

Lahr, John, 'Private lives / public theatre: Noel Coward and the politics of homosexual representation, *Representations*, volume 36, 1991, pp. 43-63

Lajournade, Monique and Saint-Jean, Pierre*, David Hockney: en perspective*, by Monique Lajournade and Pierre Saint-Jean, documentary film, Canal+/ Mirage Illimité/ Grand Canal, Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris, 1999

Lambert, Margaret and Marx, Enid, *English popular culture*, B. T. Batsford Ltd., London, 1951

Lambirth, Andrew, *Kitaj*, PWP Contemporary Art, London, 2004

Larson, Kay, 'The fine line', *New York*, 20 June 1988, pp. 62–63

Laughton, Bruce, *The Euston Road School: a study in objective painting*, Scolar Press, Aldershot, Hants, 1987

Laughton, Bruce, *William Coldstream*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2004

Leech, Michael T., 'David Hockney and "A bigger splash"'", *After Dark*, July 1975, p. 33

Lefevre Gallery, *Balthus and a selection of French paintings,* Lefevre Gallery, London, 1952

Lefevre Gallery, *French Masters XIX and XX century*, Lefevre Gallery, London, 1952

Lefevre Gallery, *French painting XIX et XX Century*, Lefevre Gallery, London, 1954

Lefevre Gallery, *Paintings by Dame Ethel Walker, drawings by Augustus John, OM, Selected works by XX century masters*, Lefevre Gallery, London, November 1949

Lefevre Gallery, *Selected French paintings XIX and XX centuries*, Lefevre Gallery, London, 1953

Lefevre Gallery, *The School of Paris*, Lefevre Gallery, 1951

Leicester Galleries, *In Paris now*, Leicester Galleries, 1950

Lewis, Peter, *The 50s*, Heinemann, London, 1978

Limbour, Georges, *Jean Dubuffet: paintings 1943–1957*, Arthur Tooth and Sons Gallery, London, 29 April – 23 May 1958

Lippard, Lucy, *Pop Art*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1966

Livingstone, Marco, *David Hockney*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1987

Livingstone, Marco, *David Hockney: etchings and lithographs*, Thames and Hudson, Waddington Graphics, London, 1988

Livingstone, Marco, 'David Hockney: portrait of a humanist with artistic devices', *Art and Design*, volume 4, number 1/2, February 1988, pp. 18–27

Livingstone, Marco, *Pop Art: a continuing history*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1990

Livingstone, Marco, *Hockney in California*, Takashimaya Art Gallery, 1994

Livingstone, Marco, *David Hockney*, revised and expanded edition, Thames and Hudson, London, 1996

Livingstone, Marco, 'Review of David Hockney portraits at 1853 Gallery, Saltaire', *Burlington Magazine*, volume CXXXVIII, number 1120, July 1996, pp. 475–476

Livingstone, Marco, *Signature pieces: contemporary British prints and multiples*, Alan Cristea Gallery, London, 1998

Livingstone, Marco, *David Hockney space & line: Grand Canyon pastels on paper 1998 & works on paper 1966–1994*, Richard Gray Gallery, New York, 1999

Livingstone, Marco, 'Twelve portraits after Ingres in a uniform style', in Morphet, Richard, *Encounters: new art from old*, National Gallery, London, 2000 pp. 153–63

Livingstone, Marco, 'The private face of a public art', *David Hockney: Portraits*, National Gallery London, 2001, pp. 16–20

Livingstone, Marco, *David Hockney: Egyptian journeys,* American University of Cairo Press, 2002

Livingstone, Marco and Heymer, Kay, *Hockney's portraits and people*, Thames and Hudson, London, 2003

Livingstone, Marco, *David Hockney: painting on paper*, Annely Juda Fine Art, London, 2003

Livingstone, Marco, 'Three Hockney prints rediscovered', *Print Quarterly*, volume XXIII, number 4, December 2006, pp. 417–420

Livingstone, Marco and Dine, Jim, *Jim Dine: talking about Aldo*, Enitharmon editions, London, 2008

Livingstone, Marco and Devaney, Edith, *David Hockney: a bigger picture*, Thames and Hudson, London, forthcoming

Livingstone, Marco, 'Heim nach Bridlington: Wege in Private Paradies' in *David Hockney, Nur Natur: Just nature*, curated by Gregory Evans, edited by C. Sylvia Weber, Swiridoff Verlag, Schwabisch Hall, Kunsthalle Würth, Künzelsau, 2009

Loring, John, 'David Hockney drawings', *Arts Magazine*, volume 49, November 1974, pp. 66–67

Lubell, Ellen, 'David Hockney…Michael Walls', *Arts Magazine*, volume 49, February 1975, p. 11

Lucie–Smith, Edward, 'Blake and Hockney', *London Magazine*, volume 5, January 1966, pp. 71–73

Lucie–Smith, Edward, 'London Contemporary', *Studio International*, volume 171, January 1966, p. 35

Lucie–Smith, Edward, 'David Hockney', *Studio International*, volume 171, April 1966, p. 159

Lucie–Smith, Edward, 'At last the real David Hockney steps forward', *Nova*, April 1970, pp. 40, 45

Luckardt, Ulrich, *Doll boy*, Hamburg Kunsthalle, 1991

Ulrich, Luckardt, and Melia, Paul, *David Hockney: a drawing retrospective,* Chronicle Books in Association with Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1995

Lynton, Norbert, 'Hockney: How his style changes', *The New York Times*, 26 April 1970, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F20710FF385F147188DDAF0A94DC405B808BF1D3&scp=1&sq=Hockney:%20How%20his%20style%20changes%E2%80%99&st=cse

Lyon, Christopher, *Two master printmakers in the shadow of Picasso*, The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1991

McGuigan, Jim, *Cultural populism*, Routledge, London, 1992

Madoff, Steven Henry (editor), *Pop Art: a critical history,* University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1997

Malvern, Jack, 'It's just like old Times as Hockney makes headline news 50 years on' *The Times*, 12 October 2006, http://www.hockneypictures.com/articles_html/theTimes_oct12.htm

Marlborough Fine Art, *French masters of the XIX and XX centuries*, second series, Marlborough Fine Art, London, 1950

Marlborough Fine Art, *Paintings and drawings by European masters*, Marlborough Fine Art, London, 1953

Marlborough Fine Art, *Roussel, Bonnard, Vuillard*, Marlborough Fine Art, London, 1954

Marr, Andrew, 'The purge', *A history of modern Britain*, McMillan, London, 2007, pp. 134–139

Masheck, Joseph, 'Colin Self and David Hockney discuss their recent work with Joseph Masheck', *Studio International*, volume 176, December 1968, pp. 277–278, 282

Massey, Anne and Sparke, Penny, 'The myth of the Independent Group', *Block 10*, 1985, pp. 48–56

Massey, Anne, *The Independent Group: Modernism and mass culture in Britain, 1945–59*, Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York, 1995

Matthias, Rosemary, 'David Hockney's painting at André Emmerich Uptown', *Arts Magazine*, volume 47, September 1972, p. 58

Matthiesen Gallery, *French paintings of the XIX and XX centuries*, Matthiesen Gallery, London, 1952

Maya, Mario, *Pop as art: a survey of the new Super-Realism,* Studio Vista, London, 1965

Meecham, Pam and Sheldon, Julie, *Modern art: a critical introduction*, second edition, Routledge, London and New York, 2005

Melia, Pail and Luckhardt, Ulrich, *David Hockney: paintings*, Prestel-Verlag, Munich, 1994

Melia, Paul (editor), *David Hockney*, Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York, 1995

Melia, Paul, *David Hockney: you make the picture: paintings and prints 1982–1995*, Manchester City Art Galleries, 1996

Melia, Paul and Luckhardt, Ulrich, *David Hockney*, Prestel Publishing, Munich, Berlin, 2007

Mellor, David Alan, *The sixties art scene in London*, Phaidon, London, 1993

Mellor, David Alan, 'Foreword', in Sidey, Tessa, *Editions Alecto: original graphics, multiple originals 1960–1981,* Lund Humphries, 2003, p. 10

Mellow, James, 'Hockney: from Pop to parody', *The New York Times*, 28 May 1972, p. 17

Melville, Robert, 'Golden boy', *New Statesman*, volume 79, 10 April 1970, p. 527

Mercanton, Jacques, *Vuillard et le goût de bonheur*, Albert Skira, Paris, 1949

Meyer, James, *Howard Hodgkin*, Tate, London, 2006

Misselbeck, Reinhold, *David Hockney: Retrospektive photoworks*, Edition Braus, Heidelberg, 1997

Morgan, Tracy D., 'Pages of whiteness, Physique Magazines and the emergence of public gay culture', in Brett Beemyn and Mickey Eliason (editors), *Queer studies: a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender anthology,* New York University Press, 1996, pp. 280–298

Morphet, Richard, 'Carl Andre's bricks', *Burlington Magazine*, volume 118, number 884, November 1976, pp. 762–765, 767

Nagger, Carole, 'David Hockney', *Zoom*, volume 27, November–December 1974, pp. 58–65

Naipaul, V. S., 'Escape from the puritan ethic', *Daily Telegraph Magazine*, 10 December 1971, pp. 38–44

Nairne, Sandy and Howgate, Sarah, *The portrait now*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 2005

Nash, Graham, 'Into a world of color: an interview with David Hockney', *Aperture* 125, Fall 1991, pp. 32–35

Newhall, Edith, 'David Hockney, André Emmerich Gallery', *Art News,* March 1991, p. 137

Nicholas, Kate, 'Borrowing from the masters', *Artists and Illustrators*, number 103, April 1995, pp. 54–57

Nisselson, Jane E., 'David Hockney, André Emmerich Gallery...Through Jan. 27', *ArtWorld* 3, 18 January – 15 February 1979, p. 8

O'Doherty, Peter, 'Lichtenstein: doubtful but definite triumph of the banal', *The New York Times*, 27 October 1963, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F30615FD3B581A7B93C5AB1 78BD95F478685F9&scp=1&sq=Lichtenstein:%20%20Doubtful%20but%20defin ite%20triumph%20of%20the%20banal%E2%80%99&st=cse

Oliver, G., 'David Hockney', *Connaissance des Arts*, number 273, November 1974, p. 144

Oliver, W. T., 'Bradfordian in world's elite', *Yorkshire Post*, 23 February 1969, http://www.yorkshirepost.co.uk/news/around-yorkshire/local-stories/on_this_day_february_24_1969_1_2554842

Ottinger, Didier, *David Hockney: Dialogue avec Picasso*, Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, Paris, 1999

Overy, Paul, 'Alexandria in London', *Listener*, volume 76, 4 August 1966, p. 170

Overy, Paul, 'Components of the scene', *Listener*, volume 79, 15 February 1968, p. 222

Parliamentary Correspondent, Westminster, *Glasgow Herald*, 5 September 1957, http://homepage.ntlworld.com/hamamelis/RIP-ISPrivate/Press/GlasgowHerald/GlasgoHerald1940To70.htm

Pasmore, Victor, *Victor Pasmore: with a catalogue raisonné of the paintings, constructions and graphics 1926–1979,* Thames and Hudson, London, 1980

Pasmore, Victor, http://www.victorpasmore.com/html/biography.htm

Penrose, Roland, *Scrap book 1900–1981*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1981

Peppiatt, Michael, 'Heartfield, Hockney, Kokoschka and Friedler', *Art News*, volume 74, January 1975, p. 99

Perreault, John, 'Review', *The Village Voice*, 25 May 1972, p. 31

Pillsbury, Edmund (intro), *David Hockney: travels with pen, pencil and ink*, Petersburg Press, London, 1978

Piper, David, *The English face*, National Portrait Gallery, London, 1992

Ratcliff, Carter, 'David Hockney at Emmerich and the Grey Art Gallery', *Art in America*, volume 68, September 1980, p. 125

Ratcliff, Carter, 'Hockney sets the stage: crowd pleasing by design', *Vogue*, November 1983, p. 77

Ratcliff, Carter, 'Collapsing hierarchies: photography and contemporary art', *Aperture* 125, Fall 1991, pp. 36–41

Rauschenberg, Robert, 'Notes on Stoned Moon,' *Studio International*, volume 178, number 917, December 1969, pp. 247–250

Raynor, Vivien, 'Americana with a British accent', *The New York Times*, 19 February 1978, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F70B1FF73A5A11728DDDA00994DA405B888BF1D3&scp=1&sq=Americana%20with%20a%20British%20accent&st=cse

Raynor, Vivien, 'Art: David Hockney, relish for good life', *The New York Times*, 25 April 1980, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F10913FD3E5F12728DDDAC0A94DC405B8084F1D3&scp=1&sq=Art:%20David%20Hockney,%20Relish%20for%20good%20life&st=cse

Raynor, Vivien, 'David Hockney, portraits and fragmented photos', *The New York Times*, 19 October 1984, p. Cl, C30

Read, Herbert, *Forty years of modern art, 1907–1947: A selection from British collections*, ICA, London, 1918

Read, Herbert, *Contemporary British art*, Pelican Books, London, Great Britain, 1951

Read, Herbert, *The philosophy of modern art*, Faber and Faber, London, 1951

Read, Herbert, *The origins of form in art*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1965

Rechy, John, *City of night,* Grove Press, New York, 1963, reprinted 1984

Reinhardt, Jasia, 'Les Expositions à l'étranger', *Aujourd'hui: Art et Architecture*, volume 34, December, 1961, p. 60

Reichardt, Jasia, *Art International* (Zurich), volume VIII, number 2, 1963

Reichardt, Jasia, 'Pop art and after', *Art International*, volume 7, number 2, February 1963, pp. 42–47

Restany, Pierre, 'David Hockney: Une poésie qui va de soi', *XXe Siècle*, number 44, June 1975, pp. 118–122, 188–189

Reynolds, Christopher, 'Do these faces look familiar?', *Los Angeles Times*, 9 June 2006, http://articles.latimes.com/2006/jun/09/entertainment/et-hockney9

Rich, Alan, 'Pure titillation', *New York*, 14, 23 March 1981, p. 50

Richard, Paul, 'Hockney and his lightness of being', *The Washington Post,* 9 February 1988, http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-1238726.html

Richardson, John, 'Pop?' *New Statesman*, volume 66, 6 December 1963, p. 852

Richardson, John, 'Homemade Hockneys', *Vanity Fair*, June 1988, pp. 132–139

Richardson, John, 'Hockney's natural wonder', *Vanity Fair*, July 1998, pp. 40–43

Richardson, John, *The Sorcerer's apprentice: Picasso Provence, and Douglas Cooper*, Alfred A. Kopf, New York, 2001

Rickey, Carrie, 'Studs and polish: L.A. in the sixties', *Art in America*, volume 70, number 1, January 1982, pp. 81–89

Riddle, Mason, 'Hockney paints the stage', *Minnesota Monthly*, December 1983, pp. 14–17

Robbins, David (editor), *The Independent Group: post-war Britain and the aesthetics of plenty*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, 1990

Roberts, Keith, 'The artist speaks?' *Burlington Magazine*, volume 117, May 1975, p. 301

Robertson, Bryan, quoted in Robertson, Bryan, Russell, John and Lord Snowden, *Private View*, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, London, 1965

Robertson, Bryan, 'Arts and amusements: David Hockney', *Spectator*, number 7204, 22 July 1966, pp. 121–122

Robertson, Bryan, 'Hockney on stage', *Radio Times*, 25 April–1 May 1981, pp. 72–74

Robbins, David (editor), *The Independent Group: post-war Britain and the aesthetics of plenty,* The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, 1990

Rockwell, John, 'David Hockney is back in opera, with a few ifs, ands and butts', *The New York Times,* 10 January 1991, http://www.nytimes.com/1991/01/10/arts/david–hockney–is–back–in–opera–with–a–few–ifs–ands–and–buts.html?scp=1&sq=David%20Hockney%20is%20back%20in%20opera,%20with%20a%20few%20ifs,%20ands%20and%20butts&st=cse

Roger-Marx, Claude, *Bonnard: lithographe,* Monte-Carlo, Editions du livre, 1952

Roger-Marx, Claude, `Preface to L'estampe originale', 1893 quoted in M. Stein and Karshan, Donald H,, *L'estampe originale: a catalogue raisonné,* Museum of Graphic Art, New York, 1970, p. 15

Rose, Barbara, 'The art of David Hockney: where Mozart meets Las Vegas', *Vogue*, July 1978, pp. 147, 176–177

Rose, Barbara, 'De Kooning and Hockney: new approaches to drawing', *Vogue*, July 1982, pp. 194–195, 250

Rose, Barbara, 'G.E.L. Gemini', *Vogue*, February 1985, p. 116

Rosenblum, Robert, *Cubism and twentieth century art*, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, 1960

Rosenstein, Harris, 'David Hockney', *Art News*, volume 69, January 1971, p. 19

Ross, Miriam, 'No joy at the Tate by David Hockney', *Observer*, London, 4 March 1979, p. 33

Rothenstein, John, *Brave day: hideous night: autobiography two*, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1966

Rowley, George, *The principles of Chinese Painting*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1947

Royal Academy of Arts, *L'école de Paris* 1900-1950, Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1951

Rubin, William, *Pablo Picasso: a retrospective*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1980

Rubin, William, *Picasso and Braque: pioneering Cubism*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1989

Rubin, William (editor), *Picasso and portraiture: representation and transformation*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1996

Rubirifien, Leo, 'Reviews/New York: David Hockney, André Emmerich Gallery', *Artforum* 16, February 1978, pp. 71–72

Russell, John, 'Part 1', in Bryan Robertson, John Russell and Lord Snowden, *Private view: the lively world of British art*, Nelson, London, 1965, p. 5–32

Russell, John, 'Art News from London', *Art News*, volume 65, September 1966, p. 22

Russell, John, and Gablik, Suzie, *Pop Art redefined*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1969

Russell, John, 'Art: Hockney, the inimitable', *The New York Times*, 11 June 1976, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F70815FC3D59157493C3A817 8DD85F428785F9&scp=1&sq=Art:%20Hockney,%20the%20inimitable%E2%80 %99&st=cse

Russell, John, 'David Hockney: storyteller without words', *The New York Times*, 26 February 1978, http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F20E14F83E5413728DDDAF0 A94DA405B888BF1D3&scp=1&sq=David%20Hockney:%20storyteller%20witho ut%20words&st=cse

Russell, John, 'David Hockney's designs for Met Operas "Parade"', *The New York Times*, 20 February 1981, p. C1, C26

Russell, John, 'A great night at the opera: the spirit of 1917', *New York Review of Books*, 28, 30 April 1981, pp. 40–43

Russell, John, 'How English artists have come to view New York', *The New York Times*, 19 July 1981, http://www.nytimes.com/1981/07/19/arts/how–english–artists–have–come–to–view–new–york.html

Russell, John, 'Today's artists are in love with the stage', *The New York Times*, 30 October 1983, http://www.nytimes.com/1983/10/30/arts/today–s–artists–are–in–love–with–the–stage.html

Russell, John, 'Hockney casts a new light on "Tristan"', *The New York Times*, 6 December 1987, http://www.nytimes.com/1987/12/06/arts/art–view–hockney–casts–a–new–light–on–tristan.html?scp=2&sq=Hockney+casts+a+new+light+on+%91Tristan%92&st=n yt

Russell, John, 'Art: Hockney's designs for "Tristan und Isolde" in Los Angeles', *The New York Times*, 8 December 1987, http://www.nytimes.com/1987/12/08/arts/art–hockney–s–design–for–tristan–und–isolde–in–los–

angeles.html?scp=1&sq=Art:%20Hockney%E2%80%99s%20designs%20for%2
0%E2%80%98Tristan%20und%20Isolde%E2%80%99%20in%20Los%20Angel
es%E2%80%99&st=cse

Russell, John, 'David Hockney's serious playfulness at the Met', *The New York Times*, 17 June 1988, http://www.nytimes.com/1988/06/17/arts/reviews–art–david–hockney–s–serious–playfulness–at–the–met.html?scp=1&sq=David%20Hockney%E2%80%99s%20serious%20playfuln
ess%20at%20the%20Met%E2%80%99&st=cse

Salvesen, Christopher, 'David Hockney's California', *Listener*, volume 83, 23 April 1970, p. 565

Schiff, Gert, 'Moving focus: Hockney's dialogue with Picasso' in *David Hockney: a retrospective* organised by Maurice Tuchman and Stephanie Barron, Los Angeles County Museum, 1988, pp. 41–53

Schneider, Norbert, *The portrait*, Taschen, Cologne, 2002

Sellink, Manfred, *David Hockney: Grafiek/Prints*, Museum Boymans van Beuningen, Rotterdam, 1992

Seymour, Anna, 'The golden boy', *Sunday Times Magazine*, London, 29 March 1970, pp. 22–25, 27

Shapiro, David, 'Hockney paints a portrait', *Art News*, volume 68, May 1969, pp. 28–31, 64–66

Shepherd, Michael, 'David Hockney prints', *Arts Review*, volume 26, 25 January 1974, p. 28

Shone, Richard, *Head first: portraits from the Arts Council collection*, exhibition catalogue, Hayward Gallery, The South Bank Centre, London, 1998 (with two entries on David Hockney portraits)

Sidey, Tessa, *Editions Alecto: original graphics, multiple originals 1960–1981*, Lund Humphries, Aldershot, Hampshire, 2003

Simmons, Rosemary, 'David Hockney, Jordan Gallery', *Arts Review*, volume 28, 2 April 1976, p. 163

Slaton, Amy, 'Pratt Graphics Center 1956–1981', *Print Review*, volume 13, 1981, pp. 15–23

Smith, Bernard, *The formalesque: a guide to modern art and its history*, Macmillan, South Yarra, Melbourne, 2007

Smith, Richard, 'New readers start here... Three painters in their last year at R.C.A., Derek Boshier, David Hockney, Peter Phillips...' *Ark*, number 32, Summer 1962, pp. 38–39

Sparks, Esther, *Universal Limited Art Editions: a history and catalogue: the first twenty–five years*, The Art Institute of Chicago and Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1989

Spender, Stephen, *China diary*, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, 1982

Spies, Werner (editor), *Picasso: painting against time*, Cantz Verlag, Hatje, 2006

Stanley, Wayne E. *The complete reprint of Physique Pictorial*, 3 volumes, Taschen Verlag, Cologne, 1997, volume I 1951–1960, volume II 1960–1967; volume III 1968–1990

Steinberg, Leo, 'A symposium on Pop Art', *Arts magazine*, April 1963, pp. 39–41

Stella, Frank, 'Melrose Avenue', *Frank Stella at Tyler Graphics*, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, 1997, pp. 32–51

Sterckx, Pierre, 'David Hockney: Images avec les deux yeux', *Chroniques de l'Art Vivant*, number 52, October 1974, pp. 26–28

Stevens, Mark, 'A stylish realist', *Newsweek*, 14 November 1977, p. 74

Sykes, Christopher Simon, *Hockney: A rake's progress: the biography*, volume 1, 1937-1975, forthcoming

Sylvester, David, 'Portrait of the artist number 85: Patrick Heron', *Art News and Review*, volume IV, number 7, 3 May 1952, p. 1

Sylvester, David, 'The Kitchen Sink', *Encounter*, 3 December 1954, pp. 61–64

Sylvester, David, 'Art in a Coke climate', *Sunday Times Colour Supplement*, Great Britain, 26 January 1964, pp. 14–23

Sylvester, David (editor), *René Magritte, catalogue raisonée: oil paintings, objects and bronzes*, 1949-1967 volume III, The Merrill Foundation, Philip Wilson Publishers, Antwerp and London, 1993

Sylvester, David, *Kasmin's sixties*, Paul Kasmin Gallery, New York, 2001

Tate Gallery, *The Pleydell-Bourverie Collection of Impressionist and other paintings,* Tate Gallery, London, 1954

Terenzio, Stephanie, *The prints of Robert Motherwell: catalogue raisonée,* Hudson Hills Press, New York, 1991

Terenzio, Stephanie (editor), *The collected writings of Robert Motherwell*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992

The Brothers Grimm, *Fairy Tales*, translated by Edgar Lucan, illustrated by Arthur Rackham, Constable, London, 1909

The Brothers Grimm, *Six fairy tales*, with original etchings by David Hockney; translated from the German original by Heiner Bastian, Petersburg Press, London, 1970

Tomkins, Calvin, 'Profiles: The moods of a stone', *The New Yorker*, 7 June 1976, p. 42

Tooth, Arthur, *Recent acquisitions*, Arthur Tooth and Sons Gallery, London, 1951

Tooth, Arthur, *Eléments botaniques*, Arthur Tooth and Sons Gallery, London, 1960

Towle, Tony, 'A few selected memories of Tanya Grosman and ULAE' in *Proof positive: forty years of contemporary American printmaking at ULAE 1957–1997*, The Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, 1997, pp. 13–30

Tuchman, Maurice and Barron, Stephanie, *David Hockney: a retrospective*, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1988

Twyman, Michael, *Lithography 1800–1850*, Oxford University Press, London, 1970

Tyler, Ken, *Reaching out – Ken Tyler, master printer* (documentary), Avery Tirce productions, 1976

Tyler, Ken, *Tyler Graphics: catalogue raisonné*, 1974–1985, Walker Art Center and Abbeville Press, Minneapolis and New York, 1987

Tyler, Ken, 'Layers of space and time: David Hockney's Moving focus' *Contemporary master prints from the Lilja Collection*, The Lilja Art Fund Foundation, Vaduz, Liechtenstein, in association with Azimuth Editions, 1995

Varley, William, 'Medium cool: the drawings of David Hockney', *Stand Quarterly of the Arts*, volume 13, number 4, 1972, pp. 44–54, cover

Varnedoe, Kirk and Gopnik, Adam (editors), *Modern art and popular culture: readings in high and low*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1990

Vauxcelles, Louis, 'Exposition Braque, Chez Kahnweiler, 28, rue Vignon', *Gil Blas*, 14 November, 1908, n.p.

Vauxcelles, Louis, exhibition review at the Salon des Indépendants, *Gil Blas*, 25 March 1909, n.p.

Vollard, Ambroise and Mourlot, Fernand, *Gravés dans ma mémoire: cinquante ans de lithographie avec Picasso, Matisse, Chagall, Braque, Miró...*, Editions Robert Laffont, Paris, 1979, p. 298

Von Bonin, Wibke, 'Germany: Hockney's graphic art', *Arts Magazine*, volume 43, Summer 1969, pp. 52–53

Von Bonin, Wibke, 'Formale Probleme in David Hockney's Graphik', *Kunst und dad Schöne Heim*, volume 82, July 1970, pp. 425–432, 456

Von Graevenitz, Antje, 'Nijmegs Museum Commanderie van St. Jan...David Hockney, Bilder, Zeichnungen, Druckgraphik...1975', *Pantheon*, volume 34, January–March 1976, pp. 71–72

Vuillard, Edouard, and Mercanton, Jacques, *Jacques Mercanton Vuillard et le goût de bonheur,* Albert Skira, Paris, n.d.

Waldheim, Richard, 'Hockney's work in perspective', *Modern Painters*, volume 1, number 4, Winter 1988–1989, pp. 12–20

Walker, Richard, 'Hockney's progress', *Art News*, number 91, November 1992, p. 31

Wallach, Amie, 'Tatyana Grosman: a memoir' in Esther Sparks, *Universal Limited Art Editions: a history and catalogue: the first twenty-five years*, The Art Institute of Chicago and Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1989, pp. 9–47

Warhol Stars, http://www.warholstars.org/, entries for the following:

> Henry Geldzahler
> Richard Hamilton
> David Hockney
> Mark Lancaster
> John McHale

Watson, G. F., 'A consideration of David Hockney's early painting (1960–1965) and its relationship with developments in British and American Art at that time' unpublished M.A. thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, London University, 1972

Watson, Sasha, 'Art talk: working the phones', *Art News* 108, number 11, December 2009, p. 29

Watt, Judith, *Ossie Clark 1964–74,* V&A Publications, London, 2003

Webb, Peter, *The erotic arts*, Secker and Warburg, London, 1975, deluxe copy in a limited edition of 100 includes a screen print by Allen Jones and an etching by David Hockney

Webb, Peter, *Portrait of David Hockney*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1988

Webster, Duncan, *Looka yonder!: the imaginary America of populist culture*, Routledge, London, 1988

Weeks, Jeffrey, *Coming out: homosexual politics in Britain, from the nineteenth century to the present,* Quartet Books, London, Melbourne and New York, 1977

Weeks, Jeffrey, 'Inverts, perverts and Mary-Annes: male prostitution and the regulation of homosexuality in England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,' in *Hidden from history: Reclaiming the gay and lesbian past*, edited by Chauncey, George, Duberman, Martin and Vicinus, Martha, New American Library, 1989, Markham Ontario, pp. 195–211

Weiermair, Peter, *David Hockney Zeichnungen und Druckgraphik 1959–1977*, Allerheiligenpresse, Graphische Sammlung Albertina,1978

Weight, Carel, *Towards art?*, Arts Council, London, 1963

Weisner, Ulrich (editor), *Picasso's Klassizismus: Werke 1914–1934,* Edition Cantz, Stuttgart, 1988

Weiss, Jeffrey, *The popular culture of Modern Art: Picasso, Duchamp, and avant-gardism,* Yale University Press, New Haven and London,1994

Weitenkampf, Frank, *American graphic art*, Henry Holt and Co, New York, 1912

Welchman, John C., 'Review', *Art International*, volume 3, Summer 1988, pp. 56–57

Welliver, Neil, 'Albers on Albers', *ARTnews*, volume 64, number 9, January 1966, pp. 48–51

Welzenbach, Michaele, 'Out of England', *New Art Examiner*, volume 15, April 1988, pp. 37–39

Wennerstein, Robert, 'Hockney in L.A.', *London Magazine*, volume 13, August–September 1973, pp. 30–49

Werth, Léon, 'Exposition Picasso', *La Phalange*, 20 June 1910, pp. 726–30

Weschler, Lawrence, *David Hockney: Cameraworks*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1984

Weschler, Lawrence, 'The art world: true to life', *The New Yorker*, 9 July 1984, pp. 60–71

Weschler, Lawrence, 'Hockney on the beach', *Interview*, August 1989, pp. 94–95

Weschler, Lawrence, 'What, do I hear the light?', *Modem Painters* 10, Spring 1997, pp. 56–60

Weschler, Lawrence, *David Hockney: looking at landscape/being in landscape*, LA Louver, 1998

Weschler, Lawrence, 'Onward and upward with the arts: the looking glass', *The New Yorker*, 31 January 2000, pp. 65–75

Weschler, Lawrence, *True to life – twenty–five years of conversations with David Hockney*, University of California Press, Berkley and Los Angeles, 2008

Weschler, Lawrence, 'David Hockney: painting in East Yorkshire', *David Hockney*, Pace Wildenstein, New York, 2009

Weschler, Lawrence, 'David Hockney's iPhone passion', *The New York Review of Books,* 22 October 2009, p. 35

West, Shearer, *Portraiture*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004

Westfall, Stephen, 'Art reviews: David Hockney... Christie's Contemporary' *Arts Magazine* 57, October 1982, p. 18

Wildenstein Gallery, *Edouard Vuillard*, Wildenstein Gallery, London, June 1948

Wildenstein Gallery, *Pastels by Edouard Vuillard*, Wildenstein Gallery, London, 1950

Wildenstein Gallery, *Paris in the nineties*, Wildenstein Gallery, London, 1954

Wilton, Andrew and Barringer, Tim, *American Sublime: landscape painting in the United States 1820–1880*, Tate Trustees, 2002

Whelan, Richard, 'David Hockney (Emmerich, Downtown)', *Art News* 78, April 1979, p. 144

Whistler, Rex, *A Rake's progress: from Hogarth to Hockney*, Apollo Magazine Ltd., London, 1997

Wolfenden, John, *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, with an introduction to the American edition by Menninger, Karl, Stein and Day, New York, 1963

Wolfram, Eddie, 'London', *Art and Artists*, volume 7, January 1973, pp. 44–45

Wood, Gregory, *A history of gay literature: the male tradition*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1998

Woodall, Joanna (editor), *Portraiture: facing the subject. Critical Introductions to Art Series*, Manchester University Press, 1997

Woods, Alan, 'Hockney's photographs', *Critical Quarterly*, volume 27, Summer 1985, pp. 7–22; cover

Wright, Karen, 'Interview: painting is just better', *Modern Painters*, Spring 2004, pp. 24–26

Wright, Karen, 'Fuming: David Hockney on painting, bohemia and freedom of choice', *Modern Painters,* December 2005–January 2006, pp. 66–69

Wright, Karen, 'Hockney landscapes explore color of rural England', *Bloomberg.com,* 19 September 2006, http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601088&sid=a99PHE_oYtMQ&refer=home#

Wright, Martha McWilliams, 'Hockney', *Art International*, volume 23, number 5–6, September 1979, p. 80

Wullschlager, Jackie, 'Interview: 'I'm very thrilled by space, me'', *Financial Times,* 18–19 April 2009, p. 3

Wullschlager, Jackie, 'Exuberance of youth', *Financial Times*, London, 14–15 November 2009, p. 13

Wykes-Joyce, Max, 'Hockney paints the stage, Hayward Gallery', *Arts and Artists,* number 228, September 1985, pp. 33–34

Zelevansky, Lynn and Rubin, William (editors), *Picasso and Braque: a symposium*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1989

Zervos, Christian and Cassou, Jean, *Exhibition of paintings by Picasso and Matisse,* Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1945