

Conservation as a Connoisseurship Tool: Jackson Pollock's 1943 Mural for Peggy Guggenheim, A Case Study

Ellen G. Landau, Andrew W. Mellon Professor Emerita of the Humanities, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland OH

Using as a pertinent case study the joint analysis recently undertaken in Los Angeles of *Mural*, a famous 1943 painting by the American Abstract Expressionist Jackson Pollock, this paper considers the potential of closer collaboration between art historians, conservators and conservation scientists in facilitating connoisseurship. There is no issue at all concerning this particular work's quality or authenticity; it was commissioned by Art of This Century Gallery owner and noted collector Peggy Guggenheim for her townhouse foyer, and later given directly by her to the University of Iowa.¹ New findings in regard to Pollock's handling of subject matter and pigment in *Mural* could, however, offer a model for the extent to which such state-of-the-art partnerships might become crucial to successful resolution of the kinds of questions and issues that invariably come up in the process of preparing a catalogue raisonné.

Because his revolutionary 1947-50 all-over paintings are essentially process-based, Jackson Pollock provides an especially pertinent example for procedural examination; the primary subject matter of his signature works is located in their innovative facture.² A number of written and oral statements made by the artist underscore this primacy. These include, for example, "New needs demand new

technics,” “*No sketches* acceptance of *what* I do,” and particularly, “Experience of our age in terms of painting—not an illustration—(but *the equivalent*).”³ Two films, as well as approximately 500 widely circulated images of Pollock at work in his East Hampton studio made by photographer Hans Namuth in 1950, clearly demonstrate his technical audacity, exposing the high performance levels inherent in Pollock’s painting practice. These at-work pictures have remained astonishingly influential over the close to six decades that have passed since the artist’s untimely death in a 1956 automobile crash, and have affected our understanding of modernism’s development in consequential ways.⁴

Peggy Guggenheim’s *Mural*, roughly 247 x 605 cm and (at the sage suggestion of Marcel Duchamp) painted on canvas not directly on a wall, presents an interesting case for study since a number of the highly original “new technics” critical to the success of Pollock’s so-called “classic” poured paintings are already present. In *Mural* these were mostly employed to enhance or punctuate more traditional brushwork. For example, liquid water-based house paint—an inexpensive medium Pollock adopted more generally by 1947 to achieve greater flow—was here combined at a somewhat late stage with oil pigments applied to the surface in a relatively standard way, as well as (but to a more limited degree than in the future) dripped, poured and spattered. The latter are innovative procedures for which the artist is best known, and although they do not dominate

so far, Pollock did try these out in various locations on *Mural*'s significantly oversized composition, as well as in a number of contemporaneous smaller works exhibited at his November 1943 gallery debut. *Mural*'s huge expanse is, of course, another portent of the future. Explaining in a 1947 grant proposal that, if awarded, he would use the requested funds to "paint large movable pictures" that "will function between easel and mural," Pollock explicitly noted that he had set a precedent in this genre "in a large painting for Miss Peggy Guggenheim."⁵

Very early in *Mural*'s history its material origins served to generate a high level of mythology, beginning in 1946 with anecdotes of its putative one-night genesis published in the first edition of Guggenheim's memoirs.⁶ Peggy's account was grounded in alleged first-person reportage by Lee Krasner, Pollock's wife, whose accuracy and motives in promoting this legend still remain a matter for speculation. Based on a later recollection by Harry Jackson, a younger painter friend of the artist, it has also been claimed that *Mural*'s imagery was rooted in Pollock's remembered childhood experience of observing a wild horse stampede. Subsequent assertion was made by Steven Naifeh and Gregory White Smith in their 1989 biography *Jackson Pollock: An American Saga* that, not only horses, but other animals of the southwestern United States are also buried depictions in the painting.⁷ The work's recent cleaning has rendered more obvious (and beautiful) the somewhat unexpected presence of bird, insect and animal imagery in the

work's final layers (perhaps including one horse's head). But Naifeh and Smith's more hyperbolic surmise, as well as art historian Henry Adams's recent claim that Pollock based the entire composition of *Mural* on his signature writ large across the surface,⁸ has not been confirmed by the separation of lower strata involved in hyperspectral imaging. This state-of-the-art technique, used last year in tandem with XRF scanning, does support the probable continued use of compositional advice given to Pollock in the early 1930s by his teacher American Regionalist painter Thomas Hart Benton.⁹ Benton recommended that large wall compositions be based on a frieze of vertical poles with action swirling around each of them. Also raised is the likelihood that *Mural*'s design was equally influenced by some of Pollock's more recent friendships, particularly with British printmaker Stanley William Hayter, many of whose recommended techniques—including rapid execution, transposing figure and ground, and counterposing texture to line—are demonstrably present. Another close relationship in 1943 with Swiss photographer and graphic designer Herbert Matter seems also significant. Matter's "action" pictures of persons in movement (for which Krasner was one of several models Pollock knew), could certainly have inspired or affected *Mural*'s composition. Pollock's line of striding figures in *Mural* grows increasingly blurred starting from right to left in much the same manner as Matter's stroboscopic photographs which were exhibited in Manhattan earlier that year.¹⁰

Despite the standard story's repetition and vivid re-enactment in American actor/director Ed Harris's 2000 Hollywood film on Pollock, exploratory work on *Mural* done a few years earlier by conservators James Coddington and Carol Mancusi-Ungaro, in preparation for the Museum of Modern Art's 1998 blockbuster Pollock retrospective, had already discredited the notion it could have been created in a single night of frenzied activity as Krasner always said.¹¹ *Mural*'s stratified imagery, except at the very start, was not applied wet in wet, plus top layers of the painting could not have dried quickly enough for Pollock to roll it up and install it at Peggy's the following day, a feature of his wife's narration. In conjunction with a Guggenheim Venice exhibition in 2003 that focused on the war-time accomplishments of Art of This Century, Peggy Guggenheim's New York gallery, one of the editors of Pollock's 1978 catalogue raisonné (published during Krasner's lifetime and inclusive of information obtained from her) admitted to the manifest untenability of her version of the *Mural* story. In his essay for the Venice catalogue, Francis O'Connor detailed a number of dating and other errors involved in the painting's well-known creation legend. His findings and those of the MoMA show conservators, made separately and at different times, reinforce each other; the more focused combination of scientific and art historical dialogue characteristic of the two-year project undertaken at the J. Paul Getty Museum has advanced these arguments

considerably, providing additional information pertinent to a broader understanding of Pollock's ground-breaking methods and techniques.¹²

As noted in "Still Learning from Pollock," my essay in the Getty's 2014 publication, *Jackson Pollock's Mural: The Transitional Moment*, Ed Harris, who directed the 2000 Pollock film and starred in it as well, had ample cues for re-performing the actions involved in originating the artist's signature canvases of 1947-50. To prepare for these scenes Harris obviously studied Namuth's visual documentation, but for the genesis of *Mural*, a clearly seminal work both for Pollock's career and Abstract Expressionism in general, Harris had only verbal testimony to consult, none of it (including Krasner's) from eye-witnesses to the work's actual creation. It's worth replaying the *Mural* segment in Harris's movie in some detail as key aspects help throw into perspective some of the crucial ways in which cooperative analysis of its facture and iconography sets a new standard for the potential use of conservation findings.

Beginning explication of the production of *Mural*, we first see the actor playing Peggy's assistant Howard Putzel gleefully inform Harris/Pollock that, in addition to issuing him a contract with a monthly stipend and scheduling a solo exhibition for November 1943, Guggenheim wishes to commission him "with total artistic license" to provide a wall painting for the Manhattan townhouse where she

lives, along with others, at 155 East 61st Street. The real Jackson Pollock wrote to his brother Charles in late July 1943:

I have a year's contract . . . and a large painting to do for Peggy Guggenheim's house, 8'11 1/2" x 19'9". With no strings as to what or how I paint it. I am going to paint it in oil, on canvas. They are giving me a show Nov. 16, and I want to have the painting finished for the show. I've had to tear out the partition between the front and middle room to get the damned thing up. I have it stretched now. It looks pretty big but exciting as all hell.¹³

Indeed, in the very next frame of the film we see Pollock hacking away at the walls of his and Krasner's downtown Manhattan rental apartment (an illegal modification forcing them to dispose of plaster chunks in huge buckets in the dark of night). Pollock then lays out the huge piece of canvas Guggenheim obtained for him, builds its stretcher and, once attached, props it up against the wall at an angle; the apartment's dimensions do not allow for positioning it any other way. He has not yet come up with the idea to paint directly on un-stretched canvas laid flat on the floor as the real artist would later do in his barn studio on Long Island. In a rather clever stroke regarding *Mural's* primary iconography of striding personages (and probably based on Bernard Schardt's photograph of Jackson Pollock with the unpainted canvas for *Mural* taken in early fall 1943), Harris paces back and forth in front of the blank canvas, dimly lit at night by a single lamp turned toward its face. This causes him to see his own shadow walking across its expanse from left

to right *and* right to left (the latter becoming the painting's primary compositional direction). We also glimpse the artist sitting in a corner of the room staring at the surface but paralyzed by inaction and, coming next, hear actress Marcia Gay Harden playing Lee Krasner scold him, establishing a timeline in the process. "What do you see there Pollock?" she demands. "You've been looking at it for weeks. Peggy's threatening to reconsider." Through the window we observe it snowing outside, and in one shot Harris sits wearing his hat and scarf indoors implying it's the dead of winter.

In the following scene, the camera focuses in on the artist's eyes partially obscured by smoke from his cigarette, which he drops as background music starts, and he begins to move rapidly across the canvas (here starting left to right which was not the actual case) in order to lay in a compositional skeleton with dark umber pigment. Next, interstitial areas are masked with gray, working top toward bottom; lemon yellow is added, red is slashed across the canvas allowing it to drip and the rest is quickly filled in with areas, lines and shapes of white, cerulean blue, salmon and a variety of other colors. Sutured to these preliminary stages we quickly view the work in an almost finished state with Pollock adding final touches of whitish pigment. Krasner, waking up the next morning, shuffles down the hall to the bathroom and opens the door to see Jackson on the toilet, his clothes covered in paint. Understanding immediately, she returns to the apartment studio and

stares in amazement at the monumental painting, apparently miraculously finished in a turbulent campaign lasting just one night.¹⁴

As noted, Lee Krasner was still alive and active in the promotion of her husband's work during the 1970s when the first four volumes of his catalogue raisonné were in process. O'Connor and Eugene Victor Thaw, its editors, likely felt constrained to include her version of the creation of *Mural* in their entry for this work which reads, in part:

Lee Krasner Pollock recalls he would sit in front of the blank canvas for hours. Some time in December 1943, or possibly during the first weeks of January 1944, he suddenly locked himself in his studio and finished the painting in one day. There is a photograph of him standing in front of the undated canvas. Later he inscribed it 1943. The painting was installed in the lobby of its patron's townhouse and was first shown to the public on the day of the opening of AOTC 1945 [referring to Pollock's second exhibition at Guggenheim's gallery].¹⁵

In an interview I conducted with Krasner also in the late 1970s she told me the same story (corroborated by painter John Little, the couple's close friend) explaining that *Mural* was first shown at a party at Peggy's on New Year's Eve 1944—the infamous event where a supposedly drunken Pollock publicly urinated in his hostess's fireplace.

Sixty years later, writing in the Guggenheim Venice catalogue, O'Connor detailed the erroneous nature of Krasner's version of the date (and season) of *Mural*'s production, as well as refuting numerous other points in the standard account (such as the work's having had to be cut down to fit the townhouse wall on the day of installation, for which there is no forensic indication). O'Connor cited documentary evidence, including a letter from Jackson written in January 1944 telling his brother, Frank, "I painted quite a large painting for Miss Guggenheim *during the summer*—8 feet x 20 feet. It was grand fun," and another Peggy wrote on 12 November 1943 to a friend, in which she describes:

We had a party for the new genius Jackson Pollock; who is having a show here now. He painted a 20 foot mural in my house in the entrance. Everyone likes it nearly except Kenneth [referring to another tenant]. Rather bad luck on him as he has to see it every time he goes in and out . . .¹⁶

Clearly *Mural* was finished by the time of Pollock's fall 1943 debut at Art of This Century, and likely many months in advance while it was still warm outside. Anonymously shot photos of the composition taken in three sections at a late, but incomplete stage were published in the artist's 1978 catalogue raisonné; these should have appeared inconsistent with Krasner's account in any case. Investigations applied during *Mural*'s recent stints in the Museum of Modern Art and Getty conservation labs (with help from John Delaney of the National Gallery

of Art in Washington DC) validate O'Connor's documentary research, further disproving the legend through technical means. The Getty conservators conclude definitively that "rapid work is not the case here, as there are many areas of dried oil paint evident under subsequent layers." Scientific analyses of minute samples of paint, they explain, confirm this as well.¹⁷

So what do we know at this point about how *Mural* was really made, and how does up-to-date scientific analysis either dovetail with or definitively negate repeated oral tradition complicated by both written and visual evidence? Can any broader lessons be extrapolated from exposing the problematic aspects of *Mural*'s genesis legend that not only aid Pollock experts in understanding his unique development, but also provide a potential set of guidelines for defining other artists' signature styles, especially those also at work in the 20th century? To begin with, this case demonstrates quite definitively that even what might appear impeccable first-hand testimony needs to be surgically examined: memories not only grow dim with age but are prone to hindsight reconstruction or embellishment. In fact, I can cite a related example of this in which I've been more closely involved.

Pollock's 1978 catalogue raisonné includes a section presenting works for further study in terms of gauging their authenticity. One of the paintings featured was found rolled up in an outbuilding on his and Krasner's East Hampton property

“folded into sixteen sections and in a ruinous condition, having been exposed to the elements for as long as twenty-five years” according to its entry. “What can be seen,” O’Connor and Thaw write, “is the remains of a painting done over another which is different in style and which is made visible only because of surface paint loss. Extensive conservation work was done during 1975 to stabilize the condition of what remained of the canvas which could not be successfully x-rayed to reveal the underpainting.” Lee Krasner Pollock, they explain, “believes that it probably dates circa 1950-53 and is an unfinished painting which her husband may have rejected as unresolved and removed from his studio, possibly intending to return to it at a later date—the jar of pigment having been reserved by him for this purpose.” “Further investigation,” they conclude, “is required to determine the exact circumstances of its creation and the precise place within the chronology of the oeuvre.”¹⁸

As we know now, the wrong oeuvre altogether was implicated by Krasner; in the process of preparing her catalogue raisonné during the early 1990s, I was able to confirm both the work underneath and the final layer of markings on this canvas as hers and not her husband’s. Infrared photographs were arranged in 1993 by Helen Harrison, the director of the Pollock-Krasner House and Study Center, as the couple’s Long Island home and studio are now called. These photos more easily exposed sections of the under layer including obvious spots of green, pale

blue, pink and magenta paint. Petal and leaf forms also became visible beneath more abstract brushwork, especially in the upper right. Armed with this information, I was able to match the bottom layer to Hans Namuth's photograph of a 1957 Krasner painting extant in her papers and marked "whereabouts unknown." This apparently "lost" work had virtually identical proportions to the painting found in the shed, as well as clear parallels in color and form to other known works Lee Krasner created the same year. It then became possible to identify additional colors, shapes and even drips from the original composition and to coordinate the final markings stylistically to another series of canvases painted by Krasner in 1962, indicating this work had been in the outbuilding on Fireplace Road for twelve, not twenty-five years.¹⁹ Given their continuous lack of funds, it would not have been impossible that Pollock might resort to painting over a composition abandoned by his wife; as I confirmed with Jim Coddington at MoMA, his 1944 canvas *Gothic*, for example, was definitely painted on top of an incomplete composition of hers. But, here, the under-composition of the larger work can firmly be dated to a year after Jackson Pollock's death.

Lee Krasner's motives for making her determination in the 1970s that this was a rejected work by Pollock will also remain a mystery. Although some twenty years earlier and with his documented permission, she had collaged pieces of Pollock's discarded markings into some of her own paintings,²⁰ in no other case I

am aware of did Krasner claim as his a painting she herself had done. The presumed evidentiary force of her assertions regarding *Mural* has, of course, occasioned larger repercussions for her husband's reputation.

Despite its destination as a foyer adornment and his likely initial dithering, in creating *Mural* (however long it really took), Jackson Pollock achieved a revolutionary result, some of the basic outlines of which prefigured his 1947 breakthrough to maturity. As MoMA's former director of painting and sculpture, William Rubin, once explained, Pollock's ultimate artistry "involves a mosaic of esthetic decisions in a context of free choice over a field whose exact shape and size plays a crucial part. The precarious poise of his all-over, single image is achieved through the equally precarious balancing of virtually endless asymmetries."²¹ Although *Mural* is not so far resolved to that point, quite a bit of what's to come is already present in nascent form. At the same time, seen even more clearly since varnish was removed in the process of its being recently cleaned, echoes in *Mural* of the conversion to new purposes of style and iconography seemingly rejected in the all-over style (see, for example, its more obvious use in Pollock's *Guardians of the Secret*, also painted in 1943) position *Mural*'s significance as acting like a hinge, linking past and present to a future not entirely fully imagined.

Assessing through material means to what degree this is true of a work heralded by fellow Abstract Expressionist Robert Motherwell as “probably *the* catalytic moment in [Pollock’s] art,”²² is understandably a boon to further study. Part of *Mural*’s importance lies in the fact that it provides an early, yet first-rate example of Pollock’s singular *modus operandi*, as Motherwell described it, of using painting as “his thought’s medium.” Mancusi-Ungaro provided the apt phrase “response as dialogue,” to define Pollock’s constant reworking of forms throughout *Mural*’s surface (and elsewhere) combining and, more importantly, reconciling such disparate techniques as masking and reinforcement. These are used to great effect in *Mural* in the unusual, somewhat late introduction across the canvas of more fluid, semi-opaque off-white retail trade paint, mostly used in the light reserves between linear colored forms.

In the course of stabilizing Pollock’s painting, one of the goals pursued by multiple participants in the Getty project (a partnership between the museum’s conservation department and the Modern and Contemporary Art Research Initiative of the Getty Conservation Institute) was to try and discover with the help of science whether there might be any truth at all to the mythology dominating biographical and art historical treatment of *Mural* for so many decades. Indeed, after scrutinizing stratigraphic evidence from paint cross-sections and analytic imaging, the Getty catalogue authors state unequivocally that the umber so-called

“Bentonian architecture” of the painting’s primary design did not (as demonstrated in the Ed Harris film) constitute Pollock’s very first markings. The umber skeleton lies over and, in places, did interact with a sequence of three other initial colors still wet: cadmium lemon yellow (used first and later as well), cerulean-rich dark teal, and cadmium red, all diluted with solvent and “applied vigorously in broad, sweeping, dynamic gestures.” Interactions of these colors, visible both on the painting’s surface and in cross sections “suggest they were applied close together in time, possibly in a short, vigorous burst of creative activity.” “It is tempting to speculate,” the Getty team members write, “that the dramatic genesis embodied in these four paints has some connection to the myths about the rapid execution of the work.”²³ Those three anonymous “snapshots” of the left, middle and right sections of *Mural* seemingly taken close to its completion, as well as Herbert Matter’s well known early 1947 photos of the artist at Vogue Studios standing in front of *Mural* (which had not yet been signed and dated), provide corroborating evidence of Pollock’s decision-making process in bringing the work to its final state. While O’Connor concluded that Pollock “carefully went over his exuberantly created ‘first draft’ of the painting, editing out a lot of slapdash elements and adjusting others to create a design that worked visually overall,” agreeing with Mancusi-Ungaro that there were likely two such sessions of retouching, according to the Getty’s investigations physical evidence implies that, after solidification, all final

edits (that is, what's not seen in the three studio photos) were done in a single campaign. For instance, a map of the late edits and re-touchings compared with the hyperspectral image obtained for cobalt blue “shows a striking correspondence between the two.” Surprisingly, the house paint (which appears quite drippy in certain areas) was not a feature of the carefully executed and very deliberate final changes, having been applied just a little earlier in the game.²⁴

As someone who has written extensively on Jackson Pollock, I can confirm that many new insights on his work were gained through my conversations with the Getty team, as well as with additional experts invited into the lab to view and discuss Iowa's painting in the process of conservation. While I am certain that this admittedly very privileged, first-hand circumstance will affect my own approach from here on out, is this experience more widely translatable on a secondary level? Art historians, collectors, dealers and curators will undoubtedly study the Getty's conservation results very carefully in the course of making quality and authenticity decisions about Pollock—and perhaps find ways extrapolate these findings to other members of his cohort in the mid-20th century. As Museum of Modern Art conservation specialist Jim Coddington so aptly explains, “The more information there is around secure works of art by any artist, the more we can apply that information to analysis of other works.”²⁵

While scholars and conservators looking at the same painting might speak quite disparate languages and choose to focus their attention somewhat differently, the weaving of facts and perceptions from separate disciplines that characterized the Getty project provides a powerful model for 21st century connoisseurship. New historical and scientific findings on *Mural*'s material and structural state jointly contributed to critical decisions made during its cleaning and treatment. The general outlines of this process were presented as an integral part of the work's spring 2014 showing in Los Angeles, to the fascination not just of experts, but also the public. Exhibition at the Getty Center of Jackson Pollock's *Mural* in its newly revived condition, accompanied by didactic explanation of the process used to conserve it, set a startling new attendance record for the museum.

In this instance, the bar for quality in both research and intervention has admittedly been raised rather high. On its own, the University of Iowa would not have been able to assemble the expertise and resources, financial or otherwise, to undertake this level of investigation. The conservation departments headquartered at the Getty and their extraordinary network of contacts and funding position it—perhaps uniquely world-wide—to achieve the results fully detailed in *Jackson Pollock's Mural, The Transitional Moment*. In the near term, widespread repetition of the cutting-edge examination techniques used on this painting is probably not a reasonable expectation. But, without a doubt, the Getty's study of

Pollock's *Mural* for Peggy Guggenheim has provided a paradigm that future projects can work to emulate.

ENDNOTES

¹ For this history, see Francis V. O'Connor, "Jackson Pollock's *Mural* for Peggy Guggenheim, Its Legend, Documentation, and Redefinition of Wall Painting," in Susan Davidson and Philip Rylands, eds., *Peggy Guggenheim and Frederick Kiesler: The Story of Art of This Century* (New York: Guggenheim Museum Publications, 2004), 150-71.

² See Ellen G. Landau, *Jackson Pollock* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1989) for further discussion.

³ Jackson Pollock, "Handwritten Statements," in Pepe Karmel, ed., *Jackson Pollock Interviews, Articles and Reviews* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1999), 24. Pollock's emphasis retained.

⁴ See Pepe Karmel, "Pollock at Work: The Films and Photographs of Hans Namuth," in *Jackson Pollock* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1998), 87-137.

⁵ Pollock, "Application for a Guggenheim Fellowship, 1947," reprinted in Karmel, *Interviews, Articles and Reviews*, 17.

⁶ Peggy Guggenheim, *Out of This Century: The Informal Memoirs of Peggy Guggenheim* (New York: The Dial Press, 1946).

⁷ Steven Naifeh and Gregory White Smith, *Jackson Pollock: An American Saga* (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, Inc. Publishers, 468).

⁸ Henry Adams, *Tom and Jack: The Intertwined Lives of Thomas Hart Benton and Jackson Pollock* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2009), 274-275. For additional analysis of Naifeh and Smith's and Adams's claims, see Ellen G. Landau, "Still

Learning from Pollock,” in *Jackson Pollock’s Mural: The Transitional Moment* (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2014), 28, n. 21.

⁹ Yvonne Szafran, Laura Rivers, Alan Phenix and Tom Learner, “Jackson Pollock’s Mural: Myth and Substance,” in *Jackson Pollock’s Mural: The Transitional Moment*, 31-90. Hyperspectral images: 50-51.

¹⁰ Landau, “Still Learning from Pollock,” 22-24 and “Action/Re-Action: The Artistic Friendship of Herbert Matter and Jackson Pollock,” in Ellen G. Landau and Claude Cernuschi, eds., *Pollock Matters* (Boston: McMullen Museum of Art, Boston College, 2007), 9-58.

¹¹ Carol C. Mancusi-Ungaro, “Jackson Pollock: Response as Dialogue,” in Pepe Karmel and Kirk Varnedoe, eds., *Jackson Pollock New Approaches* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1999), 118.

¹² See Szafran et al, “Jackson Pollock’s Mural: Myth and Substance,” and Alan Phenix, “Deconstructing Mural: A Guide to Pollock’s Paint,” in *Jackson Pollock’s Mural: The Transitional Moment*, 91-7.

¹³ Reprinted in *Jackson Pollock and Family: American Letters 1927-1947* (Cambridge UK: Polity Press, 2011), 186-87.

¹⁴ Scenes from *Pollock*, a film by Ed Harris, Brant-Allen Films/Columbia Tri-Star Home Entertainment, 2000.

¹⁵ Francis V. O’Connor and Eugene Victor Thaw, eds., *Jackson Pollock: A Catalogue Raisonné of Paintings, Drawings, and Other Works*, 4 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), vol. 1, 94-95, cat. no.102; hereafter *JPCR*.

¹⁶ O’Connor, “Jackson Pollock’s *Mural* for Peggy Guggenheim,” 153-55.

¹⁷ Szafran et al, “Jackson Pollock’s Mural: Myth and Substance,” 35.

¹⁸ *JPCR*, vol. 4, 166, cat. no. “S/n.”

¹⁹ Ellen G. Landau, *Lee Krasner: A Catalogue Raisonné* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995), 196, 198, cat. no. 370.

²⁰ See *Ibid.*, 134-38, cat. nos. 273-76 and 145, cat. no. 287, for example. For additional analysis: Ellen G. Landau, "Channeling Desire: Lee Krasner's Collages of the Early 1950s," in *Jackson Pollock, The Irascibles and the New York School* (Milan: Skira editore, 2002), 189-93.

²¹ William Rubin, "Jackson Pollock and the Modern Tradition: Part III: The All-Over Composition and the So-Called Drip Technique," *Artforum* (March 1967), reprinted in Karmel, *Jackson Pollock Interviews, Articles and Reviews*, 131.

²² Robert Motherwell, quoted in B. H. Friedman, *Jackson Pollock: Energy Made Visible* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1972), 63.

²³ Szafran et al, "Jackson Pollock's Mural: Myth and Substance," 49.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 65. O'Connor, "Jackson Pollock's *Mural* for Peggy Guggenheim," 156.

²⁵ Jim Coddington, quoted in publicity relating to the Getty's conservation of Jackson Pollock's *Mural*.