

Characters and Caricaturas: Lichtenstein, Guston and the Painted Cartoon

Pete Smith

I

Introduction

“Art, with a great social or political purpose, is seldom pure fine art; artistic aims are usually lost sight of in the anxiety to hit the social or political mark, and though the caricaturist may have great natural facility for art, it has not a fair chance of cultivation.” Philip Gilbert Hamerton, *Etching and Etchers*, (1866)¹

Cartoons and caricatures get a bum rap in the West, and what’s more, they always have. Generally accepted to have been developed by the Italian painters Augustino, Ludovico and Annibale Carracci², caricature has commonly been regarded as an aggressive and subversive act and in many instances, it is. For century’s notions of “fine” or “high” art, as a beautifying and celebratory activity of refined tastes and distinguished sensibilities has been given privilege in the official resting homes and textual vestiges of Western Culture. These pressures were felt early on by the Carracci. In response to such pressures, Annibale put forth the following apologia:

“Is not the caricaturist’s task exactly the same as that of the classical artist? Both see the lasting truth beneath the surface of mere outward appearance. Both try to help nature accomplish its plan. The one may strive to visualize the perfect form and to realize it in his work, the other to grasp the perfect deformity, and thus reveal the very essence of a personality. A good caricature, like every work of art, is more true to life than reality itself.”³

¹ Graham Everitt, *English Caricaturists and Graphic Humorists of the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Swan Sonnenschein, Le Bas and Lowrey), 1886, 9.

² Mike Kelley, “Foul Perfection: Notes of Caricature”, *Crime and Ornament*, Bernie Miller and Melonie Ward, ed., (Toronto:YYZ), 2001. 87.

³ William Feaver, *Masters of Caricature: From Hogarth and Gillray to Scarfe and Levine*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), 1981, 21.

In April 1743, William Hogarth published an edition of diagrammatic etchings titled *Characters and Caricaturas*.⁴ Meant as a means of classifying various approaches towards portraiture, this work drew a gradual yet definitive scale between the idealized ‘character’ portrait and the grotesque ‘caricatura’ portrait that had gained immense popularity in England during the tail-end of the 18th Century⁵. Morally opposed to the practice of caricatura, Hogarth was quick to distinguish the physiognomic reductions and exaggerations of his own works from the perceived amateurism of the popular press cartoon⁶. In so doing, Hogarth reiterates an already pervasive cultural division: the portrait from the caricature, the professional from the amateur, the high from the low.

These distinctions, however, are more difficult upon deeper investigation as the history of “high” art and “low” cartoon are intermittently and symbiotically linked, both formally and historically. The black outline for instance, one of the defining characteristics of the cartoon (and the bane of all first-year drawing teachers everywhere), has its origins in the etching and engravings of historic book illustrations. Even though contemporary reproduction technology has long since removed the necessity of such distinctive contours, the thick black outline remains an essential convention of the genre. Canonical art historical figures such as David often produced caricatures concurrently with the idealized portraits that paid their rent. The caricature has always been the portraitist’s revenge upon their sitters, a vehicle of personal insurgence, revealing how the artist truly felt about their well-to-do johns.

⁴ M. Dorothy George, *Hogarth to Cruikshank: Social Change in Graphic Satire*, (London: Viking), 1967, 14.

⁵ E.H. Gombrich and Ernst Kris, *Caricature*, (Middlesex: King Penguin), 1940, 18.

⁶ *Ibid*, 17.

In 1788, Francis Grose drew a link between caricatures and the Classical proportions of Ancient Greece. Grose claimed:

“The sculptors of Ancient Greece, seem to have diligently observed the form and proportions constituting the European ideas of beauty, and upon them to have formed their statues. These measures are to be met with in many drawing books; a slight deviation from them by the predominancy of any feature constitutes what is called character, and serves to discriminate the owner thereof and to fix the idea of identity. This deviation or peculiarity aggravated, forms caricature.”⁷

In 1830 Charles Philipon started the first comic weekly: *La Caricature*⁸. Immensely popular in France, *La Caricature* regularly parodied French Society culture. Philipon’s most important student, Honore Daumier worked for him all of his life and produced more than 400 lithographs for *La Caricature*⁹. Daumier’s most famous painting “Third Class Carriage” was actually produced during an era of censorship as much of his work was far more biting. In 1832 Daumier and Philipon were imprisoned for five months after publishing a Daumier lithograph that depicted King Louis-Phillipe as Gargantua on a commode. Philipon’s defense strategy was to demonstrate in court the King’s physiognomic resemblance to a pear¹⁰.

There is an inherent political and social character to the genre of cartoon, yet the cartoon has persistently maintained a lower status in the sphere of art history. Despite the blurred boundaries between high and low in contemporary hybrid culture, these notions still remain. Yet the cartoon has emerged recently as a vital and formidable strain within art in

⁷ Everitt, 1.

⁸ Gombrich and Kris, 20.

⁹ Ibid, 22.

¹⁰ Ibid, 20.

general and painting in particular. This large-scale incursion can be more or less attributed to the work and reception of two pivotal figures: Roy Lichtenstein and Philip Guston. Despite the shared adoption of the cartoon form, a large chasm separates their work. This chasm is clear and visible and, in many ways, self-evident. This paper will seek to provide, however, new means of accessing the work of Lichtenstein and Guston, and in so doing, suggest a means of accessing other contemporaneous and subsequent painted cartoons. It argues that the narrative qualities of this work, as well as both artists investment and understanding of literary culture, validates an interpretation through specific works of literary criticism. By discussing the mature work of Roy Lichtenstein and the late work of Philip Guston in relation to Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* and examining various repercussions of such an analysis, this paper attempts to open up new avenues of interpretation, and thus also, new pathways to meaning.

II Storytelling

"I got sick and tired of all that purity. I wanted to tell stories."
Philip Guston

Literary scholarship is generally left out of the resource pool of art criticism. Although some would suggest that it's bad politics for two forms of secondary texts to mingle too closely in the harrowed paddling pools of academic discourse, it seems bizarre and parsimonious to entirely segregate the labors of such distinguished intellectualism. In a time where art criticism draws upon everything from psychoanalysis to information theory, it seems strange that such an affluent storehouse of erudition as literary criticism is mostly absent from reference within art criticism. Only in the most obvious instances of overlap, such as Dada and Surrealism, are the immense similarities between art and

literature usually considered. Yet both fields rely on primary sources in paintings and poems and, more pointedly, in artists and poets that hardly exist in separation. They share similar ideals and aspirations, motives and intents as both belong to a larger culture of ideas. Spreading like a fog across the landscape, ideas exist as ‘something in the air’: exhaled by someone, somewhere only to be breathed in by another.

Philip Guston and Roy Lichtenstein were two artists that both breathed deeply. Both artists were embedded in larger intellectual cultural communities with strong ties to other disciplines: Lichtenstein at Rutgers and New York and Guston at New York and Boston University. Of the two, however, Guston’s links to a specifically literary culture are decidedly more direct. Philip Guston was profoundly invested in and influenced by literature. Perhaps the most direct (and literal) form that this engagement took was through his wife Musa McKim, whom he had met while the two were studying art at Otis College¹¹. Although McKim would continue to make paintings, she was mostly known as a poet. Even before Guston’s fabled return to figuration, the two would collaborate on “poem-pictures” where Guston would illuminate a work of McKim’s. Guston’s literary involvement was further nurtured during his time in New York City. The New York School, as a cultural and intellectual force, was inherently cross disciplinarian and Guston was closely associated with musicians, filmmakers, dancers and writers. Morton Feldman, Robert Phelps and Frank O’Hara were three of Guston’s closest friends and many of his paintings of the late fifties and early sixties were overtly dedicated to artists of various

¹¹ Debra Bricker Balken, *Philip Guston’s Poem- Pictures*, (Andover, Massachusetts: Addison Gallery of America Art), 1994, 32.

disciplines such as Feldman, Fellini, T. S. Eliot and Isaac Babel¹². In the wake of his return to figuration, however, Guston's involvement in literary culture became even more pronounced. Having been famously excommunicated from the New York school for his "betrayal", Guston took a job as Associate Professor at Boston University. This tiny art department had few true peers with which Guston could meaningfully interact and his primary intellectual outlook became the company of poets.

Bill Berkson and Clark Coolidge were poets who taught with Guston in Boston. They quickly befriended him and were impressed by his understanding of literature. Coolidge says that:

"Philip was a very literate guy....He wasn't like most painters. He read because he loved to read. He was literate, in the sense that he read heavy literature."¹³

And also that:

"He was in love with the poet's mind. I'm sure it was such a fresh antidote to the art world."¹⁴

Berkson recounts that Guston was a deep admirer of Sartre, Beckett, Auden, Rilke, Colette, Genet, Camus, Dostoevsky, Gogol, Checkhov, Kafka and Babel because their work was "given to the moral dimension of existence", an area that Guston would often claim, to be his own territory as well¹⁵. As is clearly evident, these were not mild mannered conversations but rather heated dialogues that dealt with critical issues in literature and literary criticism. In a letter to Dore Ashton of 1974, Guston reveals that his earlier friendship with Robert Phelps was due in large part to Phelps' "wide reading of

¹² Ibid, 33.

¹³ Ibid 26.

¹⁴ Ibid 26.

¹⁵ Ibid, 32.

Modern literature and criticism”¹⁶ and Coolidge claims that he and Guston would often discuss topics like:

“Eliot’s ‘garlic and sapphires in the mud’

Joyce’s Labyrinths.

Beckett’s disgust and Fellini’s hunger.

Melville’s wicked book and Kafka’s lightless image.

Frankenstein’s bangs.”¹⁷

Furthermore Coolidge states that:

“We wanted to make the drawing space and the writing space simultaneous. We believed that it was, anyway. No matter what we particularly did.”¹⁸

III The Episodic and the Encyclopedic

In 1957 Nortop Frye published his seminal work, *The Anatomy of Criticism*. Having gained a reputation internationally for his 1947 book *Fearful Symmetry* that analyzed the symbolism of William Blake and constituted a major development in Blake scholarship, *The Anatomy of Criticism* crashed through academia like a 300 pound linebacker. It remained literary gospel until Deconstructionist/ Postmodern criticism and is widely considered one of the most important works of literary theory published in the Twentieth Century. Frye’s study extends upon ideas set forth by the Chicago school’s New

¹⁶ Ibid 32.

¹⁷ Clark Coolidge, “What did we want to see?”, *Philip Guston’s Poem Pictures*, (Andover, Massachusetts: Addison Gallery of America Art), 1994, 46.

¹⁸ Ibid, 46.

Criticism that claimed that external stimuli, such as biographical and social data, must be excluded from textual interpretation. Like New Criticism, Frye's classically derived theory also uses literature itself as its focus. Frye proposes a "series of suggestions" of modes, symbols, myths and genres that 'scientifically' analyze the various properties of literary fiction. Although the focus of Frye's theories is distinctly and implicitly literary, their tremendous thematic and historical breadth has strong reverberations for art and art criticism.

In the first essay, "Historical Criticism: Theory of Modes", Frye categorizes literature according to three modes: comic, tragic and thematic¹⁹. For Frye, these distinctions are formed based upon the relationship of the protagonist to their society. In the comic mode, the protagonist is acting as someone integrated into society. In the tragic mode, they are isolated from their society and in the thematic mode they are a spokesperson of society.²⁰ Frye also breaks down western literary history into five main post-classical epochs: Mythic, Romantic, High-Mimetic, Low-Mimetic and Ironic.²¹ These epochs correspond to history but also to the relationship between the hero and the audience and their power of relative action. If a hero is greatly superior to both other humans and to his or her environment, the hero is the divine being of myths. If the hero is superior "in degree" to both other humans and to his or her environment, they are romantic. The defining characteristics of the Ironic Mode are, once more, borne out by the relationship of the hero to the audience. Frye claims:

¹⁹ Northrop Frye, The Anatomy of Criticism,

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ Ibid

“If inferior in power or intelligence to ourselves, so that we have the sense of looking down on a scene of bondage, frustration or absurdity, the hero belongs to the ironic mode. This is still true when the reader feels that he is or might be in the same situation, as the situation is being judged by the norms of a greater freedom.”²²

According to Frye’s theory, as Western society has advanced over the last fifteen centuries, its stories become increasingly ironic. He claims that this was true of classical culture as well²³.

In attempting to compare these observations to art and art history, it is important to consider the notion of the protagonist. Who is the hero of art’s multitudinous stories? In earlier Western art, the hero is mostly the subject matter of the work such as Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary or St. Peter. The role of the maker was secondary to the subject. But as Western art moved forward through time, a shift began to slowly occur. The hero slowly shifts from the subject matter to the subject maker until finally the great hero of Modern art is always the artist. The audience of an Early Christian mural, for example, believed that the work of art was a centre upon which they could focus their religious devotion. The role and skill of the artisan was entirely secondary. This slowly shifted until, in Modern Art, the audience is far less concerned with what is depicted than who has depicted it. The audience of Modern Art is not looking at a picture of distorted prostitutes they are looking at a Picasso.

Guston and Lichtenstein are most definitely the hero’s of their work. This is most obvious in the case of Guston, who’s overtly autobiographic works cast himself as the

²² Ibid

²³ Ibid

central character of his dramas. Subject and maker, in Guston's late work, are one and the same. Cartoon and caricature, as socially integrated modes of full-fledge-mass-cultural-absorption, are an inherently comic form and Guston's late work is tragic-comedy with Guston himself being the tragic hero, the subject of isolation, of his own narratives.

Although he is not physically depicted in all of his works, his presence is always felt and has a direct relationship to the other works. Like scenes in a play that set forth the action and create the varied tensions with which the hero must persevere or folly, these works cannot be fully understood until viewed in relation to a cluster of Guston's production. United by a profound sense of pathos, the recurrence of his symbolism becomes more vivid and the varied nuances of his meandering plots gain clarity. When Guston's late work is taken in its entirety, the vastness of its historical reference and the weight and depth of its symbolism can be more fully understood. Frye describes this sort of grand scale tragedy, related to lyric and elegy, as the Episodic Form.²⁴

Roy Lichtenstein is less obviously the hero of his dramas. He is never a character within them, but rather claims his status as hero by acting as the narrating voice, as a social spokesman who addresses the diverse complexities of late-capitalist Western Culture.

Lichtenstein's work is thematic-comedy in that the specific plots and subject matter of his representations are always secondary to the conceptual themes that they enliven.

Lichtenstein's mature work is less concerned with the specificity of its narratives or subjects, such as an individual brushstroke or what you know or don't know about his 'image-duplicator', than with the more abstract notions, the *dianoia*, that underlies their poignancy. The vast range of thematic and stylistic references that Lichtenstein employs

²⁴ Ibid

bears strong similarities to Frye's notion of the Encyclopedic Form.²⁵ Related to epic, the main theme of the Encyclopedic Form is the "comparisons with such instants against the vast panorama unrolled by history". It creates "a sense of contrast between the course of a whole civilization and the tiny flashes of significant moments which reveal its meaning."²⁶

IV

The Ironic Mode

"Can I learn to suffer
Without saying something ironic or funny
On suffering?"
W. H. Auden, *The Sea and the Mirror*

Both Guston and Lichtenstein, like most worthwhile twentieth century and contemporary work, are functioning within the Ironic Mode. According to Frye, the Ironic Mode "takes life exactly as it finds it" and "fables without moralizing"²⁷. We look down in pathos at Guston's self-deprecating fables and we stand with Lichtenstein as we look down upon the various objects of his derision. Although both Lichtenstein and Guston are working within the ironic mode, the specific manifestations of that irony are entirely different. In art, we tend to talk about irony singularly, yet there are many different forms of irony and degrees. Irony, which simply means "to say one thing and mean another"²⁸, becomes, upon further investigation, a truly complex phenomenon. Although both Lichtenstein and Guston's ironies have potentially contributed to forming the general, all-encompassing Postmodern irony that we now encounter, neither's use of irony can rightly be called

²⁵ Ibid

²⁶ Ibid

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ D.C. Muecke, *Irony and the Ironic*, (New York: Methuen), 1982, 1.

Postmodern²⁹; rather they return to and inhabit older ironic forms: Lichtenstein to Socratic Irony and Guston to Romantic Irony.

In classic Socratic Irony, as manifest in the Republic, irony is used to point out the inconsistencies and fallacies of a rhetoric. Pretending to be ignorant, Socrates questions the logic of the Sophists and in so doing proves the errors of logic within their definitions. He does not, however, offer his own definition. He merely suggests that the “wise” aren’t as wise as they themselves believe. Socratic Irony thus suggests a “capacity not to accept everyday values and concepts and to live in a state of perpetual question...”³⁰In this form we are “given one term that is negated...we have no other term to replace.”³¹ This is Lichtenstein’s irony. His paintings critique the various subjects of his scrutiny, pointing to the various absurdities of their enactments, yet they propose no productive alternatives. In this way, Lichtenstein allows himself and his audience, to skirt above the follies of his subjects. We look down upon the naivety of the poor crying blonde as she yearns for Brad and more so we look down upon those who genuinely invest themselves in such melodramas. The brilliance of Lichtenstein’s irony, however,

²⁹ In Claire Colebrook’s book *Irony* she describes the Postmodern ironic sensibility saying that in Postmodern culture:

“One cannot avoid the predicament of irony. The attempt to think of a context *itself* can only take place if one has a *sense*, definition or position in relation to that context...Only irony can, at one and the same time, judge the tyranny and moralism of a certain context *and* display its own complicity in that tyranny.”²⁹

Furthermore:

“We cannot avoid the horizon of history in general, nor the assumption of a continuity of sense. To read is to assume that the text means something *for us*; the singularity or immediacy of the past is lost the moment it is seen *as past*. What we can do, via irony, is work with this inherent political tension: that any political judgment that condemns the violence and closure of a context must in turn elevate itself above context....Postmodern irony affirms the equal validity and ultimate groundless nature of all discourse.”

³⁰ Ibid, 7.

³¹ Ibid, 25.

lies in the fact that he also uses his lofty perch to critique high culture values and elitism. It allows himself to be both the cool high art insider and the everyman voice of populism. He played both sides simultaneously, often in the same interview, sometimes in the same sentence. In a conversation with Lawrence Alloway, Lichtenstein states:

The cartoon – a source once removed from hand drawing - became a readymade way of doing everything I wanted to do - everything you weren't supposed to do all in one; it depicted and it outlined, but it brought it all into a really modern painting...a completely new expression.”³²

Elsewhere he stated:

“It was hard to get a painting that was despicable enough so that no one would hang it – everybody was hanging everything...The one thing that everybody hated was commercial art; apparently they didn't hate that enough either.”³³

And further:

“Pop art looks out into the world; it appears to accept its environment, which is not good or bad, but different – another state of mind...There are certain things that are usable, forceful and vital about commercial art. We're using those things – but we're not really advocating stupidity, international teenagerism and terrorism...”³⁴

For the Romantics, especially the German Romantics like Novalis, Solger and the Schlegel brothers, irony was less a literary device than an attitude towards life which they elevated to a supreme principle.³⁵ The Romantics were opposed to reason and the enlightenment idea of reason as a universal human norm and believed that the human condition was inherently ironic. They romanticized the fallen state of humans as being our optimal and eternal state. We are not fallen from some perfect origin, but rather are

³² Lawrence Alloway, “On Style: An Examination of Roy Lichtenstein's Developments, Despite New Monographs on the Artist”, Artforum, march, 1972, 17.

³³ G. R. Swenson, “What is Pop Art? Answers from 8 Painters”, American Artists on Art, Ellen H. Johnson, Ed., (New York: Harper and Rowe), 1982, 84.

³⁴ Ibid, 84.

³⁵ Colebrook, 47.

falling towards or 'becoming' some more idyllic state. As victims of a cosmic joke, our fall is one of tragic 'buffoonery'. The Romantics placed supreme importance upon the act and processes of artistic creation because they mirrored our own becoming.³⁶ The completed work was thus seen as a corpse that merely contained the evidence of its becoming. Thus, for example, Coleridge claimed that Kubla Kahn was incomplete and could never be complete. Because of this emphasis upon the process of creation, the Romantics often exposed the mechanisms of that process within the work and were self-consciously, self-reflective.³⁷

The parallels of this sense of irony and the work and intentions of Philip Guston are obvious and striking. Guston, like all New York Schooler's, likewise placed a supreme importance upon the process of creation. He is highly quotable in this regard. In a famous talk at Boston University in 1966 he said:

"I think it's about, I know it's about and revolves around, the issue of whether it's possible to create in our society *at all*...it was as if you had to prove to yourself that truly the act of creation was still possible."³⁸

Furthermore:

"There comes a point when the paint doesn't feel like paint, I don't know why, some mysterious thing happens...What counts is that the paint should disappear, otherwise its craft or something like that...Then there comes a time, if you persevere long enough, when the paint seems alive, it is actually living, and there's some kind of release....where thinking doesn't proceed doing."³⁹

³⁶ Ibid 48-50.

³⁷ Ibid 61.

³⁸ Joseph Ablow, "A Conversation Between Philip Guston and Joseph Ablow", Philip Guston: 1975-1980, Private and Public Battles, (Seattle: University of Washington), 1994, 29.

³⁹ Ibid, 30.

Later on in the conversation he addresses both the notion of becoming and the self-conscious condition of the artist. Guston says:

“It’s possible that this is the evolution of our minds and imagination, that we become more complicated, more conscious of our processes, but try to avoid it. You could take various drugs, you could do all sorts of things to try and get out of it. But how are you going to avoid feeling certain contradictions and consciousness?”⁴⁰

And later:

“I found that book (Pierre Teilhard Chardin’s *The Phenomenon of Man*), that idea, very inspiring, not only to be so fully conscious of yourself, but even to be conscious that you’re conscious. To act, to do something- and watch yourself doing it – is a strange set of affairs...”⁴¹

V

Conclusion

“...the ironic painter, who paints his own studio with himself in it painting a self-portrait is not in principle different from the novelist whose novel is about himself writing an autobiographical novel.”⁴²

D.C. Muecke, *Irony and the Ironic*

To say that the late work of Philip Guston and the mature work of Roy Lichtenstein has had a massive impact on contemporary painting is not only to state the obvious, it is also to understate their influence. Although there is a shared adoption of the cartoon as a painted form, a large chasm separates their work. Many of these differences are obvious and direct: Lichtenstein is more social, Guston is more personal. Lichtenstein is crisp and slick, Guston is clumpy and awkward. This paper has attempted to suggest, through thematic literary theory, another way of discussing their work. By looking at their work

⁴⁰ Ibid, 37.

⁴¹ Ibid, 37.

⁴² D. C. Muecke, 3.

in relation to ideas put forth in Northrop Frye's *The Anatomy of Criticism* and various literary texts on the theme of irony, it suggests that Guston's paintings are tragic-comedy functioning with a Romantic- Ironic sensibility and that Lichtenstein's work are thematic-comedy with a Socratic- Ironic sensibility. Guston is Episodic. Lichtenstein is Encyclopedic. In so doing it has made gross exaggerations, large scale reductions, and broad-sweeping generalizations in many areas. The most glaring is the attempt to characterize and garner the overall sensibility of two large and varied bodies of work. In this sense, it is meant merely as a proposition that may engender new possible readings and interpretations. In a conversation with AA Arnason, Guston said:

“There is something ridiculous and miserly about the myth we inherit from abstract art - that painting is autonomous, pure and for itself, and therefore we habitually defined its ingredients and defined its limits. But painting is ‘impure’. It is the adjustment of impurities which forces painting’s continuity.”⁴³

This is a relatively famous and unquestionably poignant statement by Guston. It is also one that has proven, through time, to be quite accurate. In many ways, however, the same sentiments could be applied to most other fields of activity, including art criticism.

Perhaps it is the adjustment and adoption of ‘impurities’, of discourses that lay outside of traditional disciplinary specificity, that force its continued vitality as well.

The painted cartoon, as a genre, is one of multifaceted storytelling: the story of its narrative, the story of its creation and the story of its history. They tell us the tale of a poor blonde yearning for Brad and of the anxiety of a Jew that has changed his name from Goldstein to Guston, keeping this secret from even his closest friends for over forty

⁴³ A.A. Arnason, Philip Guston,

years⁴⁴. They tell us the story of two artists imprisoned for taking a joke too far and of an artist desperate to distinguish his work from the untrained hoards that were storming his gates. In a genre teeming with and consumed by storytelling, it seems only logical to consider the terms of storytelling when discussing their meaning.

The stage is set and all of the characters are in place. Light is painted across their faces from the window laying yonder. The tension is thick and the paint even thicker. We look on in anticipation of the palpable drama that surely lies in waiting.

Bibliography

Ablow, J., "A Conversation Between Philip Guston and Joseph Ablow", Philip Guston, 1975-1980: Private and Public Battles, (Seattle: University of Washington), 1994.

Alloway, L., "On Style: An Examination of Roy Lichtenstein's Developments, Despite New Monographs on the Artist", Artforum, March, 1972.

Bindman, D., Hogarth and his Times: Serious Comedy, (Los Angeles: UCLA), 1997.

Bricker Balken, D. "Philip Guston's Poem-Pictures", Philip Guston Poem-Pictures, (Andover, Massachusetts: Addison Gallery of American Art), 1994.

Colebrook, C., Irony, (London: Routledge), 2004.

⁴⁴ Mary Drach McInnes, "Guston's Private and Public Battles", Philip Guston, 1975-1980, Private and Public Battles, (Seattle: University of Washington), 1994, 15.

- Coolidge, C., “What did we want to see?”, Philip Guston Poem-Pictures, (Andover, Massachusetts: Addison Gallery of American Art), 1994.
- Everitt, G., English Caricaturists and Graphic Humorists of the Nineteenth Century, London: Swan Sonnenschein, Le Bas and Lowrey), 1886.
- Tojner, P.E., “I know how you must feel...”, Roy Lichtenstein: All About Art, Holm, M.J., Tojner, P.E., Craiger-Smith, M., (Louisiana: Louisiana Museum of Art), 2003.
- Sylvester, D. “New York City, April 1997: David Sylvester Interviews Roy Lichtenstein”, Roy Lichtenstein: All About Art, Holm, M.J., Tojner, P.E., Craiger-Smith, M., (Louisiana: Louisiana Museum of Art), 2003.
- Lobel, M. “Pop Art According to Lichtenstein”, Roy Lichtenstein: All About Art, Holm, M.J., Tojner, P.E., Craiger-Smith, M., (Louisiana: Louisiana Museum of Art), 2003.
- Lobel, M. Image Duplicator: Roy Lichtenstein and the Emergence of Pop Art, (New Haven: Yale University), 2002.
- Feaver, W., Masters of Caricature: From Hogarth and Gillray to Scarfe and Levine, Gould, A., Ed., (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), 1981.
- Frye, N., The Anatomy of Criticism, (Princeton: Princeton), 1957.
- George, M.D., Hogarth to Cruikshank: Social Change in Graphic Satire, (London: Viking), 1967.
- Gombrich, E.H., Kris, E., Caricature, Middlesex: King Penguin, 1940.
- Kelley, M., “Foul Perfection: Notes of Caricature”, Crime and Ornament, Bernie Miller and Melonie Ward, ed., (Toronto: YYY), 2001. 87.
- Kierkegaard, S., The Concept of Irony, Capel, L.M., trans., (Bloomington: Indiana University), 1968.
- Marcoci, R., Comic Abstraction: Image-Breaking, Image-Making, (New York: MOMA), 2007.
- McInnes, M.D., “Guston’s Private and Public Battles”, Philip Guston, 1975-1980: Private and Public Battles, (Seattle: University of Washington), 1994.
- Muecke, D. C., Irony, (London: Methuen), 1970.
- Muecke, D. C., Irony and the Ironic, (New York: Methuen), 1982.

Rosenbaum, S. B., Professing Sincerity: Modern Lyric Poetry, Commercial Culture, and the Crisis in Reading, (Charlottesville: University of Virginia), 2007.

Schimmel, P., “The Faked Gesture: Pop Art and the New York School”, Hand-Painted Pop: American Art in Transition: 1955-62, Ferguson, R., Ed., (New York: Rizzoli), 1992.

Sichel, K. “Philip Guston at Boston University”, Philip Guston, 1975-1980: Private and Public Battles, (Seattle: University of Washington), 1994.

Swenson, G. R., “‘What is Pop Art?’ Answers from 8 Painters”, American Artists on Art, Ellen H. Johnson, Ed., (New York: Harper and Rowe), 1982.

Trilling, L., Sincerity and Authenticity, (Cambridge: Harvard), 1972.

