

## Unpacking Duchamp: Art in Transit. - Review - book review

Sheldon Nodelman

Unpacking Duchamp: Art in Transit, by Dalia Judovitz, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1995; paperback, 1998, 318 pages, \$22.95.

D'ailleurs, c'est toujours les autres qui meurent [Besides, it's always the others who die]. While thinly masking a metaphysical abyss, Marcel Duchamp's piercingly ironic farewell, engraved on his tombstone in Rouen, also suggests that he would not have been entirely surprised at the status he has lately assumed as the 20th century's most influential artist. The current crush of publications on Duchamp, which shows no sign of abating (to the point that this writer is embarrassed to admit his intention of adding to it(1)), is but one reflection of this preeminence. The 10 books listed above are only some of those which have appeared--in English alone--over the past few years,(2) and a broader survey of no more than the last decade, inclusive of important works in the major European languages,(3) would multiply this number severalfold.

Such attention may not be excessive for one who is now acknowledged not only as an uncannily prescient pioneer in, if not in some cases the outright inventor of, many of the artistic movements and genres which marked the 20th century's latter half--Conceptual art, assemblage, Pop art, Op art, installation, process art, chance art, performance, body art, to name only some. Nor is it surprising when applied to an artist widely regarded as the original and long avant la lettre postmodernist, even while a central figure in the history of modernism itself. But it is nevertheless remarkable for one who, with a certain degree of exaggeration, could refer to himself, little more than a decade before his death in 1968, as a "forgotten artist."(4)

Although Duchamp had attained international fame as early as 1913 (with the succes de scandale of *Nude Descending a Staircase* at the New York Armory Show that year), little was known and even less understood in the 1950s, outside a small coterie of associates and art-world insiders, of the true scope of his art. Duchamp had to wait until 1959 for the appearance of the first monograph (by his friend Robert Lebel) that presented an overview of his work to the general public,(5) and until 1963 for his first important retrospective--not in New York or Paris, but at the Pasadena Museum of Art. (This survey was followed in 1966 by another at the Tate Gallery, London, and then by four posthumous

"blockbusters": Philadelphia/New York in 1973, Paris in 1977, Barcelona in 1984 and Venice in 1993. Each accompanied by a major catalogue, these exhibitions mark the trajectory of ascent to his current superstar standing.) During the postwar decades, Duchamp indeed remained a celebrity of sorts, but one remembered for his achievements in a now-remote past, in the years around World War I. If he was famous for anything in the 1940s and '50s, it was for being the artist who since the early '20s had notoriously renounced art--in favor of chess or even, as he himself once put it in an interview, of simply "breathing."(6)

Of course this entire image--which Duchamp did everything possible to promote--was an illusion, a deliberate artifice compounded partly of direct misrepresentation, partly of cunning indirection like that in Poe's "The Purloined Letter," where an object is hidden by being exposed in plain sight. As we now know, Duchamp had been planning since about 1938, and actively but secretly preparing between 1946 and 1966, a great new installation work, *Etant donnees*--the dialectical counterpole and completion of the Large Glass--which would be revealed only after his death, in 1969. Now installed adjacent to the Large Glass in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, this stupefying masterpiece has lost none of its mystery or power to shock in the three decades since its appearance. Retroactively, it throws a transformative light on a long series of productions, activities and gestures, which, though in no way concealed, had been rendered indistinct in their meaning through a deficit of context.

But in a larger sense, Duchamp's entire artistic activity since the "definitive incompleteness" of the Large Glass in 1923 was an exercise in strategic invisibility, giving rise to objects and events which--because they were apparently too impermanent or unimportant or insubstantial, or because they eluded established genre conventions, or because they confused or diluted authorial identity--evaded recognition as "works of art." That category, in the optic of the time, was largely limited to "paintings" and "sculptures" designated as such by traditional markers of boundedness, stability, scale, material and fabrication. According to such criteria, even the infamous readymades, which had contributed so substantially to Duchamp's reputation as the enfant terrible of the avant-garde, could be considered mere provocations and so dismissed as something less than "real" works of art. This was yet more definitely the case with Duchamp's many apparently trivial or simply instrumental productions: the occasional sketch or altered scrap of printed matter given to a friend, the single door designed to serve alternately a studio's kitchen and bathroom.

The same reservation applied, of course, to the innumerable "versions" and "reproductions" sustaining a continuous process of self-quotation through constantly, if often minutely, varying formats, mediums, techniques and scales. Some of the productions of those years--the film *Anemic Cinema*, for example, or the various optical contraptions, and later the disturbing erotic sculptures of the early '50s (or were these merely life casts, hence not "sculptures" at all?)--seem to us so remarkable as to demand recognition as "works of art." As such, they would contradict their author's proclaimed

abstinence. But blinkered expectations and prejudices, adroitly reinforced and manipulated by Duchamp's own well-publicized pronouncements and pretenses, ensured the continuing success of the myth.

This elaborate performance was not motivated by gratuitous perversity: it was part of a systematic campaign, unparalleled in the history of art and conducted with exquisite self-consciousness, to dissolve the boundaries delimiting Duchamp's works from the world around them and from one another. They could then constitute a free-floating, ceaselessly interactive semiotic field rather than a set of discrete, determinate units of meaning. The more central of these works, those that could readily be taken as embodying such units, had to be surrounded by others, intimately related to them, whose meaning would seem codeterminate but slighter, more ephemeral, more deeply implicated in extra-artistic "life." These secondary creations would, in turn, generate others, even more contingent. So major works like the Large Glass were enveloped in a penumbra of lesser, ancillary works, themselves associated with sketches and preparatory essays of continuously diminishing independence and self-sufficiency, ultimately spilling over the border between the visual medium and the realm of language.

Thus verbal constructions in the form of notes, speculations, project plans were--beginning as early as 1914 with the famous Box of that year--mobilized, "published" and made accessible, so that their own web of suggestions, possibilities and conundrums enmeshed the primary works in yet finer-spun and more intricately interwoven filaments. These elaborations were then followed by the so-called Green Box of 1934, the White Box of 1967 and other posthumous releases. (The contents, in each case, were presented as collections of loose and separate items, leaving sequencing or connections among them to the discretion of the reader.) Meanwhile, these "objectified" clues and intimations were further surrounded by a cloud of innumerable statements, interviews, bits of conversation reported by third parties, etc., through which Duchamp would simultaneously advertise, efface and multiply his secrets.

The boundaries of this field--which is the Duchampian "oeuvre" in the full sense of that term--had necessarily to be made imprecise and ever changing. This was achieved, in part, through the dissemination of great numbers of "works," often inconspicuous and seemingly casual, which would easily be lost from view only to be rediscovered when, in a better informed perspective, their significance would be recognized. That process continues apace. In the recent third edition of his catalogue raisonne, *The Complete Works of Marcel Duchamp*(7), Arturo Schwarz lists 663 works, compared with 421 in the previous edition of 1970, and more works have since come to light.(8) We may be confident that "lost" works of Duchamp will continue to emerge for years to come. A complicating factor here is the problem of deciding what are actually works: as sensitivity to the nuances of the Duchampian system develops, more and more items that had been considered ancillary or documentary material, even mere "souvenirs," are seen to be invested with unexpected significance.

Another Duchampian device was the planting of "time bombs" for posthumous detonation after delays of various lengths. To the already-mentioned case of *Etant donné* should be added the Manual of Instructions<sup>(9)</sup> associated with it, mandated for public release 15 years after the revelation of the installation itself, as well as the carefully preserved ensemble of notes--invaluable supplements to those previously made known in the three boxes of 1914, 1934 and 1967--which Duchamp left behind at his death, and which were published in 1980 by his stepson, Paul Matisse.<sup>(10)</sup>

The limits and consistency of the field had further to be subverted by methods calling authorial agency and identity into question. Much of Duchamp's activity between the wars and up to the 1950s was collaborative in nature: publication projects, exhibition installations, catalogue designs and the like. Duchamp usually contrived to remain discreetly in the background of these ventures, understating the degree of his involvement and often acting through surrogates, so that the full extent of his role in many of them remains uncertain. Yet his inspiration was often decisive; this was surely the case for the two great International Surrealist Exhibitions of 1938 and 1947 (though neither has yet received the full-dress study it deserves) and a series of shopwindow installations mounted during the war years in New York. Many other such collaborations remain to be examined before the nature and importance of Duchamp's interventions can be appraised. Once isolated, his gestures invariably assume functional significance within the overall context of the oeuvre. A virtuoso in the exercise of the authorial function-- in its generative and authenticating aspects alike--Duchamp could employ it with equal effect through apparent abstinence, as in the situations just cited, or through seemingly promiscuous bestowal, as in his reported willingness to sign "anything" presented to him or which took his fancy. By the latter means, he conscripted many additional objects as readymades--including, on one occasion, a preexistent painting done by someone else and, on another, a pair of blue jeans owned by Niki de St. Phalle. We may be confident that such "random" items were in fact chosen or accepted with meticulous discrimination.

The oeuvre created through devices such as these is a phenomenon unique in the history of art, a meaning-generating machine of baffling complexity, proliferating components and indeterminate boundaries. In the current crop of Duchamp studies, it is approached in a variety of ways. Newly discovered or previously unrecognized materials are introduced into the corpus. Backgrounds, contexts and sources of varying importance are plumbed. The vast network of Duchamp's relationships with his contemporaries is explored and the pattern of his continuing effect upon younger artists traced. The structure of his project, its internal dynamics and its motives are analyzed, often from standpoints afforded by recent critical theory.

Any current work on Duchamp almost inevitably involves some combination of these features but will, like the books noted here, privilege one or more of them. Among the most distinctive--and at the same time subtlest and most original--

Duchampian strategies was the systematic replication in various forms of his own work, a technique dating back as early as 1916, when the artist created a "reproduction" of *Nude Descending a Staircase*, hand-colored over a full-sized photograph of the original--the first of a long series of versions of what was already an icon of modernist radicalism. It would be followed over the years by innumerable acts of replication of various works--distinguished from one another and from their original by painstakingly executed, occasionally minute, but always telling differences, signed and sometimes notarized with the date of execution. Some of these would be individual one-off works, others editions employing a variety of reproductive technologies. Some would be hand-executed with infinite pains by Duchamp himself, others delegated to surrogates--like the series of replicas of the *Large Glass* made by Richard Hamilton, Ulf Linde and others, or the reincarnations of the *Bottle Rack* obtained from commercial outlets by a number of intermediaries following Duchamp's instructions.

The most ambitious of these ventures was the *Boite-en-valise*, which preoccupied Duchamp for over a decade in the 1930s and '40s--a kind of portable museum within an attache case, containing a suite of 69 miniaturized reproductions in two and three dimensions of what one is invited to assume he considered his most important works. Over 300 of these sets were produced, with the deluxe editions distinguished by the inclusion of an "original" in each. The efficacy of such replication in paradoxically both deriding and exalting authorial agency and the validating power of the signature, while multiplying minute equivocations to disorienting effect, is plain.

Until very recently this replicative dimension of Duchamp's production (except with the *Boite-en-valise* itself) has either been ignored as "mere" reproduction, unworthy of comment, or else attacked as commercial exploitation--as were the editions of replicated readymades issued in the '60s. It is to the great credit of Francis Naumann (following on the heels of Ecke Bonk, author of an exhaustive and revelatory history of the *Boite-en-valise*(11)) that he for the first time addresses this phenomenon both seriously and comprehensively. [A recent gallery show, curated by Naumann, examined the work of contemporary artists who have created their own replications of Duchampian works; see review, p. 112.] *Marcel Duchamp: The Art of Making Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, a testament to the author's vast knowledge and tireless detective work, is a complete survey of this aspect of the Duchampian canon, abounding in previously unrecorded and often valuable information, and presenting some heretofore unknown works for the first time. Although the title evokes Walter Benjamin's celebrated essay, Naumann's text itself does not fully address the theoretical issues which Benjamin raised, nor those others which the material itself--much of it antedating Benjamin's essay--self-consciously poses. One would have appreciated a sharper differentiation among the various categories of replicative activity, with more attention to the specific functionality of each within the meaning-system of the oeuvre. Nevertheless, this will be an indispensable work for all future interpreters of Duchamp's art. It is handsomely produced, an homage to Duchamp's own typographic experiments.

Materials new to the corpus, both in the categories of work and of documentation (a distinction often not easily drawn, as we have seen), figure prominently also in Joseph Cornell/Marcel Duchamp ... in resonance, the lavish catalogue for a recent Houston/Philadelphia exhibition. Some of these items have come from the Duchamp estate, others from the collection which inspired the exhibition and upon which it was centered, the "Duchamp dossier" compiled by Cornell. Following the model of Duchamp's boxes, this is an army of memorabilia of all sorts pertaining to the long association between the two artists. (Cornell, a great admirer of Duchamp, was in close contact with him for several years during the early and mid-'40s, assisting in the production of copies of the *Boite-en-valise*.) It is an oddly touching ensemble of fugitive traces, the sensibility Cornell's even if the materials themselves are "from or by" Duchamp (as he put it in his *Boite-en-valise* inscriptions). Attentive students of the oeuvre will find items here that further nuance known works, activities and preoccupations of Duchamp as well as some that may qualify as works themselves, however slight.

The dossier is framed by a selection of pieces by the two artists from the period of their association and by useful essays contextualizing their friendship. Unfamiliar works by both men are presented, including studies for *Etant donné* and some remarkable mixed-medium creations by Cornell which strikingly evoke that work--suggesting that he may have had some hint of the great project which Duchamp was secretly nurturing at just this time. Duchamp's interactions with other artists are a rich and insufficiently explored lode of potential knowledge. Yet to be undertaken, for example, is an in-depth investigation of his long association with Man Ray and the many ventures to which the latter contributed.

Duchamp specialists are drawn into an arcane private imagery whose decipherment--always provisional and subject to what he called "all kinds of delays"--depends upon the tracing of multiple chains of allusion among figurative works, verbal texts, and the myriad ancillaries and by-products of both, always with reference to broader contexts ranging from esoteric high culture to the most banal circumstances of contemporary life. The *Large Glass* has already accumulated iconographic commentary rivaling in volume and intricacy that devoted to what might be considered its literary counterpart, *Finnegans Wake*. A recent entry into the lists is Juan Antonio Ramirez's *Duchamp: Love and Death, Even*. Ramirez reexamines the iconographic elements of the *Large Glass* in light of various sets of notes and other verbal indications, including those surrounding the works preparatory to or contemporary with it (especially the readymades). Previous ventures of this sort have for the most part considered the scenario of the *Large Glass* in its current state as all of a piece, at most hypothesizing its completion with the projected but unexecuted components. Ramirez focuses upon the work's development, seeking to reconstruct the evolution of Duchamp's ideas and the changing meaning of the *Large Glass* through successive phases across the decade (1913-23) of its conception and execution and on to its reconstruction in 1936 (following its breakage 10 years earlier), when the cracks themselves were integrated as part of the work.

Aficionados will no doubt quarrel with some of Ramirez's interpretations, but a new path toward understanding the Large Glass has surely been opened. Ramirez makes profuse use, here and in his treatment of the readymades, of comparisons and putative source materials drawn from later 19th- and early 20th-century science, technology and popular culture. (He thus partially anticipates Linda Dalrymple Henderson's recent magisterial survey of the background of Duchamp's themes, images and ideas in contemporaneous philosophy, science and technology, both at high and at popular levels.)(12) The most original section of Ramirez's book is its treatment of *Etant donnees*, in which the materially "given" work is, as never before, systematically cross-read against the contents of the Manual of Instructions, understood (as it surely should be) not as a mere practical aid but as a necessary complement, comparable to the Notes for the Large Glass.(13) Regrettably, the book is marred by numerous infelicities and occasional outright errors of translation.

David Hopkins's *Marcel Duchamp and Max Ernst: The Bride Shared* examines the persona of the Bride as a construct within and between the opera of the two artists. Although Duchamp and Ernst were friendly colleagues within the Surrealist milieu of Paris and New York, Hopkins fails to develop a persuasive case for the Bride-mythologem as a truly mutual creation of the two artists: Duchamp's Bride-conception, by all evidence, developed prior to and independently of any analogous formulation of Ernst's, even if the converse is not the case. Conceptual and iconographic materials contributory to the developing Bride-complex are sought within the esoteric tradition (here Hopkins follows the lead of Arturo Schwarz, Maurizio Calvesi, Ulf Linde and others) which played so large a role in fin de siècle Symbolism, as it did later in the Surrealism of the 1920s and '30s. This focus on Symbolism is to be welcomed, as Symbolist ideas surely were an important factor shaping Duchamp's goals as an artist, even if the influence of Symbolist pictorial language (of which Hopkins adduces some striking instances) was transient. Hopkins's discussion is immensely erudite and full of fascinating suggestions, but his arguments are undermined by a distressing tendency to transmute often strained inferences, speculations and metaphoric connections into established facts which are then pyramided into far-reaching conclusions.

Of the entire Duchampian production, it is surely the readymades which have had the greatest impact on the general consciousness, being at least vaguely familiar to many who know little or nothing else about the artist. Thierry de Duve's *Kant after Duchamp*, investigating the ideological foundations of later 20th-century artistic practice, revisits Kant's *Critique of Judgment* in light of the altered definition of "art" imposed by Duchamp's invention. The core of the book (much of it previously published in French as an independent work(14)) is a close scrutiny of the most scandalous readymade of all, the Fountain of 1917--or, rather, of Fountain's reception and the polemical manipulations surrounding the piece. Much discussion of the ready-mades heretofore especially that emanating from philosophers and aestheticians, often marked by dire mutterings about the "end of Art"--has been conducted around an abstraction largely divorced from the unique characteristics of the individual works, the different circumstances out of which each arose and the particular

meanings assumed by each within the context of Duchamp's work as a whole. De Duve's treatment (which should be read together with William Camfield's indispensable account(15)) returns Fountain to the concrete situation in which it was created (in particular, the art politics of the Society of Independent Artists exhibition from which it was so notoriously banished), tracing the gestation of the legend surrounding the event and shrewdly assessing its consequences, intended or otherwise, for all involved. Duchamp is revealed as already at this early date preternaturally sensitive to the invisible dynamics of authorial and institutional legitimacies and adept at exploiting, subverting and transforming them for his own ends. De Duve adds an extended riff on Duchamp's derisive observation that any painting, since it is created from preexistent tubes of paint (read: preexistent conceptions), is itself, inevitably, a readymade.

In the long run, these various approaches depend on a comprehensive analysis of the oeuvre as a system of signification--a system which is itself the oeuvre's most distinctive characteristic. Dalia Judovitz's *Unpacking Duchamp: Art in Transit* and David Joselit's *Infinite Regress: Marcel Duchamp 1910-1941* differ from other works considered here in that they are specifically critical investigations, aiming to assess Duchamp's artistic accomplishment as a substantive whole (despite Joselit's rather arbitrary-seeming cutoff date of 1941) and seeking to define its fundamental rhetorical structures, as well as the beliefs and expectations against which--and upon which--those structures arose.

As its title implies, Judovitz identifies the transactional dimension of the oeuvre as its key identifying feature. Ranging the full length and breadth of Duchamp's oeuvre, she delineates an economy of symbolic exchange whose energy derives from blockage and release across such established categorial distinctions as visual/conceptual, representation/trace, original/replication and artist/work (all seen as masks for the underlying distinction of self/other). Ultimately, she finds the crux of the system in the slash mark itself rather than in the terms to one side of it or the other. Judovitz never loses sight of the underlying constancy of strategic purpose which defines the subject matter, in the largest sense, of Duchamp's art--an art made out of the paradoxes inherent in the making of art. (His chosen terrain is the contradictions, collusions and acts of bad faith by which the identities of artist, art work and art viewer are constituted.) At the same time, Judovitz deftly evokes the particular character of individual works and thematically related groups, even in pursuing these larger themes. Her book is perhaps the most comprehensive and balanced description so far, in contemporary critical terms, of the Duchampian project.

Joselit's volume, more narrowly focused and more concentrated in approach, identifies the "infinite regress" within the work as a propulsive series of inversions of the subject-object relation at progressively deeper levels, so that, in his own words, each "image, object, or self becomes simultaneously a thing to be measured and a standard of measurement." To describe the tensions between bodily incarnation and positionally determined sign-value in Duchamp's Cubist phase of 1911-12, and between visually and verbally mediated conceptualization in the new cycle beginning in 1913--that of the

readymades and the Large Glass--the author draws on sources such as Lacan, Deleuze and Guattari, and commodity theory. Rather than serving as window dressing, as is too often the case in current criticism, these interpretive tools are here fluently deployed and functionally appropriate (indeed they develop themes already articulated by Duchamp himself). Between them, then, Judovitz and Joselit provide the best currently available accounts of the internal signifying machinery of the Duchampian project, and their contributions mark real progress in this regard.

Duchamp conceived of art as process rather than object, and hence as existing continuously beyond itself in perpetual relation and change. Reception and reaction are thus integral to it. These are such major themes of Moira Roth's *Difference/Indifference: Musings on Postmodernism, Marcel Duchamp and John Cage*. The core of the book is provided by her two very influential and much-cited essays of the '70s, "Marcel Duchamp in America: A Self Ready-Made" and "The Aesthetic of Indifference," amplified by a series of interviews Roth conducted--she is a virtuoso of the interview form--with such figures as John Cage, Robert Rauschenberg, Vito Acconci and George Segal. These talks both nuance our picture of Duchamp himself and trace the ripple effect of his work and persona upon American art in the third quarter of the 20th century. They are followed by a more personal section in which Roth in effect interviews herself, reflecting--from the distance of the present--upon her own bittersweet tale of engagement/disengagement with the Duchamp phenomenon.

*Marcel Duchamp* by Dawn Ades, Neil Cox and David Hopkins, a volume in Thames and Hudson's popular *World of Art* series, does not identify the contributions of its various authors. Unfortunately, the publisher's blurb on the back cover makes rather excessive claims for the text as "one of the most original and important" books on the artist--a work which "challenges received ideas, misunderstanding and misinformation." In fact, the study provides a compact, up-to-date and well-balanced overview with many valuable observations of detail, including thought-provoking new material on the Symbolist background of the work (contributed by Hopkins?). It is at present the best and fullest short introduction to Duchamp's art.

Not the least paradoxical aspect of Duchamp's art is its strange, even appalling, combination of extraordinary intimacy--the sense of having been fabricated out of the very essence of its author's inward and outward being--with an icy distance and objectivity. Normal curiosity about extraordinary lives--the desire to peer behind the curtain to see the wizard who has been engineering the display--is compounded in this case by the sense that the work conceals/reveals a daunting mystery which the life can perhaps explain, and which has led more than one commentator to perilous hypotheses. With Calvin Tomkins's highly regarded *Duchamp: A Biography* we have the second full-length biographical study, following on that of Alice Goldfarb Marquis from 1981.<sup>(16)</sup> Tomkins's writings of the '60s helped feed the fast-growing revival of Duchamp's fame and influence, sparked by the artist's "rediscovery" some years before by a new generation of young

avant-garde artists.(17) He has written a lively and well-presented biography and has discovered considerable new detail (adding to that compiled in Jennifer Gough-Cooper and Jacques Caumont's daunting but sometimes invaluable "Ephemerides"(18)), most notably concerning his subject's very active love life. Little new is unearthed which bears directly on Duchamp's works or causes us to see them in a different light. (The main exception concerns *Etant donné* and the role played in it by Maria Martins, sculptor and wife of the Brazilian ambassador to the United States, with whom Duchamp had an extended liaison during the '40s and who served as the model for the female figure upon which the installation centers.) Nor do we learn any great secret or uncover any psychic mechanism to motivate or otherwise elucidate Duchamp's achievement. In the end (as Tomkins himself acknowledges), peering behind the curtain does little to solve the mystery of the dazzling illusion presented on the stage. Duchamp, who made the transgression of the boundaries between art and life into the very substance of his art, has nevertheless contrived to maintain an impenetrable and enigmatic separation between them.

If the art work as Duchamp envisioned it is a perpetually unfinished construct, made and remade in its continuing encounter with the spectator, that spectator's admission within the field of the work comes at a price--surrender of the safe and disinterested "objectivity" that his/her presumed situation outside the frame had seemed to confer. Inherent and universal as he believed this process to be, Duchamp nevertheless took care to build purposefully frame-transgressive mechanisms into his oeuvre. The *Boite-en-valise*, which seems to prescribe in advance an entire summation and critical perspective upon the work, was a device that exploded conventional boundaries and pre-empted the viewpoint of the spectator. The successive volumes of notes were another--indeed all the materials ("documentary" and other) normally regarded as external to, and helping to situate, the oeuvre disconcertingly unmask themselves as parts of it. This extends to the works written by seemingly independent third parties. During his lifetime, Duchamp profoundly influenced from behind the scene what was written about him, to the extent of being--through active collaboration, control of the sources of information and the shrewd planting of ideas--a virtual coauthor. He was himself responsible for the highly inflected selection and layout of visual documentation in the Lebel monograph, and he--or his female alter ego, *Rose Selavy*--signed the frontispiece of Schwarz's *Complete Works*. Through the ingeniously open, endlessly permuting structure of the oeuvre, this process of co-optation continues. Those who write about Duchamp, like those who put on the series of vests and jackets which he designed during the '60s, risk transformation into living readymades. In fact, this risk is a certainty, but the attraction of sitting down at the chessboard to participate in the master's game is irresistible.

(1.) *Once More to This Star: The Genesis of Duchamp's Conception of Art*, in preparation.

(2.) The much-enlarged third edition of Arturo Schwarz, *The Complete Works of Marcel Duchamp*, New York, Delano Greenidge Editions, 1997, was reviewed in *Art in America*, January 1998. Linda Dalrymple Henderson, *Duchamp* in

Context: *Science and Technology in the Large Glass and Related Works*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1998, is reviewed separately in this issue. Mention should also be made of such earlier works, outside the time frame of this review, as Jerrold Siegel, *The Private Worlds of Marcel Duchamp*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1995; Jeffrey Weiss, *The Popular Culture of Modern Art: Picasso, Duchamp and Avant-Gardism*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1994; and Amelia Jones, *Post-modernism and the En-gendering of Marcel Duchamp*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994. Several of the articles in Naomi Sawelson-Gorse, ed., *Women in Dada: Essays on Sex, Gender, and Identity*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1999, dealing with various of Duchamp's female associates also contain useful biographical information on the artist.

(3.) These include, among others, works by Jean Clair, Jean Suquet and Jean-Francois Lyotard in French, and by Herbert Molderings, Thomas Zaunschirm and Dieter Daniels in German. The exhibition catalogue *L'Empreinte*, Paris, Centre Georges Pompidou, 1997, by Georges Didi-Huberman, contains an important discussion of Duchamp and presents what may be a previously unrecognized work by him.

(4.) Duchamp is clearly referring to himself with these concluding words to one of his one most important statements, the address "The Creative Act," delivered at the convention of the American Federation of Arts, Houston, Tex, in April 1957, and published in Robert Lebel, *Marcel Duchamp*, New York, Grove Press, 1959.

(5.) See above, note 4. Original edition: Robert Lebel, *Sur Marcel Duchamp*, Paris, Trianon Press, 1959.

(6.) Quoted in Tomkins, pp. 402-03.

(7.) See above, note 2.

(8.) For example, the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art has recently acquired important Duchamp materials from the estate of Maria Martins.

(9.) *Ordre des 15 operations de montage general*, facsimile edition, Philadelphia, Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1987.

(10.) *Marcel Duchamp: Notes*, ed. and trans. by Paul Matisse, Paris, Musee National d'Art Moderne, Centre Georges Pompidou, 1980.

(11.) Ecke Bonk, *Marcel Duchamp: The Box in a Valise*, New York, Rizzoli, 1989. A similar treatment of the Green Box of 1934 is much to be desired.

(12.) See above, note 2. This line of investigation was initiated by Michel Sanouillet's "Marcel Duchamp and the French Intellectual Tradition" in the exhibition catalogue Marcel Duchamp, ed. by Anne d'Harnoncourt and Kynaston McShine, New York, Museum of Modern Art, and Philadelphia, Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1973.

(13.) See above, note 9.

(14.) Thierry de Duve, *Resonances du Readymade*, Nimes, Editions Jacqueline Chambon, 1989.

(15.) William Camfield, *Marcel Duchamp: Fountain*, Houston, Menil Collection, 1989.

(16.) Alice Goldfarb Marquis, *Marcel Duchamp: Eros, c'est la vie: A Biography*, Troy, N.Y., Whitson Publishing, 1981.

(17.) Calvin Tomkins, *The Bride and the Bachelors: The Heretical Courtship in Modern Art*, New York, Viking Press, 1965; rev. ed. 1968; *The World of Marcel Duchamp*, New York, Time-Life Books, 1966.

(18.) Jennifer Gough-Cooper and Jacques Caumont, "Ephemerides on and about Marcel Duchamp and Rose Selavy," in *Marcel Duchamp: Work and Life*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1993, the catalogue of the comprehensive exhibition at the Palazzo Grassi, Venice, 1993.

Sheldon Nodelman teaches at the University of California, San Diego, and writes on both Classical and modern art.

COPYRIGHT 2000 Brant Publications, Inc.

COPYRIGHT 2000 Gale Group