

A Special Case of Pathetic Fallacy: Papini's Picasso

Mircea-Ioan Lupu¹

¹ "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University Iasi, Faculty of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences, Blvd Carol I, No. 11, 700506, Iasi, Romania
e-mail: mirceaioanlupu@gmail.com
telephone: +40 745 587 404

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the European Social Fund in Romania, under the responsibility of the Managing Authority for the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007-2013 [grant POSDRU/107/1.5/S/78342]

ABSTRACT

The first aim of this study is to prove that the commonly held concept of pathetic fallacy, as defined by John Ruskin, applies not only to inanimate things but also to human persons. Using the concept of *distributed person* described by Gell in 1998 within his *Art and Agency* we shall analyze the example of a most controversial quote attributed to Pablo Picasso, which, in fact, is part of an imaginary interview with the artist authored by Giovanni Papini. The quote is held by some to be true in order to discredit any positive image of the Spanish artist by means of moral invalidation. The secondary aim is to prove that, even if the specified quote could be authenticated as Picasso's, the claim for the artist's immorality is not sustainable on this basis, the same being true for Papini if we follow the hypothesis concerning his authoring of the quote.

Keywords: pathetic fallacy, art's agency, distributed person, Alfred Gell, Pablo Picasso, Giovanni Papini, John Ruskin.

1. Introduction

When John Ruskin proposed the concept of *pathetic fallacy* in his third volume of *Modern Painters* (Ruskin, 1863, pp. 156-172) he did not explicitly enter the domain of logic because of his particular interest in the psychology of perception and in the philosophical dilemma of objectivity versus subjectivity, those being in fact only hypothesis for a major conclusion concerning the problem of aesthetic validation.

We shall not enter the domain of logic either. But the problem of pathetic fallacy is often considered to be only a problem of personification, of anthropomorphizing, that is attributing human characteristics to inanimate objects and we will attempt to contest that, while maintaining ourselves somehow inside the conceptual framework provided by Ruskin. This fact will be done not by a sort of forced interpretation, in other words, we are not interested in twisting Ruskin's definition of the above mentioned erroneous thinking against his aesthetic theory, nor in ascribing

him paternity for other peoples ideas, but by permeating his definitional frame and establishing new relations with the outside, understood temporally and spatially, so that the value of his theory to be reenacted in the contemporary stage of art theory, at a level that himself was probably not conscious of.

The anthropological theory provided by Gell (Gell, 1998) offers us the important elements needed for enlarging the signification horizon adumbrated by the concept of pathetic fallacy, his descriptive account of the *distributed person* being to some extent revelatory to our concern, but these elements achieve their righteous value understood only in the post-structuralist thought environment where the concept of *image as functional simulacrum* was extensively theorized (Baudrillard, 1994).

2. Pathetic Fallacy: Conceptual Framework

The definition given by Ruskin for pathetic fallacy to which we refer is not textually circumscribed but it can be derived from a series of examples which he provides in order to qualify it first as an “error, that which the mind admits when affected strongly by emotion” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 159), second as “a falseness in all our impressions of external things” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 159), third as an thinking error occurring in those having “a mind and body in some sort too weak to deal fully with what is before them or upon them; borne away, or over-clouded, or over-dazzled by emotion” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 162) but all the above mentioned examples deal with cases in which some particular poet uses personification as a mean to describe some object's qualities, in other words ascribing human characteristics to things. The particular use Ruskin gives to *pathetic fallacy* is nonetheless different from the usual personification as he points out the importance of the “violent feelings” which have a strong effect on us.

We have also to consider the fact that the pathos is not that of the inanimate things which have to deal with those human feelings being cast upon them, but of the human subject who has to deal with his own emotions in order not to be overwhelmed by them and to keep his balance between sensitivity and intellect when he chooses to report his perception of a phenomenon.

For Ruskin, this ability of keeping oneself steady in front of any possible distortion of his perception is the criteria for valuating poets, but also ordinary people. He does admit that, in the end, “however great a man may be, there are always some subjects which *ought* to throw him off his balance” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 163) but we must make the difference between the “weaker man, overborne by weaker things” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 163), and those men driven by “prophetic inspiration” defined by Ruskin as “the men who, strong as human creatures can be, are yet submitted to influences stronger than they, and see in a sort untruly, because what they see is inconceivably above them.” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 163) These are the two extremes of a scale which comprises also the first order of poets, those “who feel strongly, think strongly, and see truly” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 163) opposed to those of the second order, which we already mentioned when we referred to “weaker” men, their weakness being one of the intellect and also the reason for their falseness in seeing.

He concludes this dissertation over the specified form of erroneous thinking reinforcing his opinion that “the pathetic fallacy, — that so far as it is a fallacy, it is always the sign of a morbid

state of mind, and comparatively of a weak one.” (Ruskin, 1863, p. 170). He also states that

In ordinary poetry, if it is found in the thoughts of the poet himself, it is at once a sign of his belonging to the inferior school; if in the thoughts of the characters imagined by him, it is right or wrong according to the genuineness of the emotion from which it springs; always, however, implying necessarily *some* degree of weakness in the character. (Ruskin, 1863, p. 170)

Bearing in mind the fact that we only followed Ruskin in his theoretical and definitional assertions and not in the examples he provided in order to sustain his thinking, we shall pass to our own example of a so-called pathetic fallacy, hoping to be able to prove in which ways this could be regarded as pathetic and in which ways as fallacious. But we shall not do that before a necessary, even though ludicrous, intermezzo, where we shall try to figure out what are we really talking about whenever we use the word *person*.

3. Our Hypothesis: Persons as Images

First of all and maybe last of all, we must assert that, in our opinion, persons are not real!

After all, this might not be so surprising for those who are familiar with the usual *all persons fictitious disclaimer* which accompanies many of the movies today. It usually reads like this: “All characters appearing in this work are fictitious. Any resemblance to real persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental.”

The thing which is so interesting in it is the implication that persons could be discriminated in respect to their reality, the possibility of not real persons being considered. The other interesting aspect of the disclaimer, even though it does not concern us for the moment, is that being a person is a status which disregards one being alive or dead.

In spite of all this, most of the time, we treat other people as persons. This is fallacious because, after all, a person is a sort of mask, an image through which other people see us and we see them.

If you do not take my words for granted, feel free to ask Carl Gustav Jung about it. Of course he does not speak of person but of *persona* (Jung, 1953, p. 170) because he has indeed some kind of a structuralist thinking which provides the “real” individual with a social, relational mask. Jung has no personalist ambitions and thus he warns anyone who has the decency to listen to his advice that we should not mistake the persona with the true individuality which lies beneath the mask.

And if some of us are not so easily convinced by this kind of thinking, being ready to take the famous psychoanalyst for some kind of projector, who constructs reality just in order to take some profit out of it, let me remind those people that he follows the good tradition of other trustworthy men and we have amongst them the example of good old Shakespeare, an extraordinary man, capable of telling if not indisputable truths then very convincing lies and there is one I would like to bring under scrutiny in order to find if it bears any resemblance with Jung's thinking.

We have to admit Shakespeare was a clever old fox who, in order not to be punished for some kind of impiety towards some crowned heads of his time, put his own head on some character's shoulders when he allows his *As you like it* to begin with:

“All the world's a stage,/ And all the men and women merely players:”

There is at least some similarity between that and the Jungian concept of *persona*, hm? I do think so, indeed.

But, if finding similarities between people living in different centuries and cultural frameworks would bring a smile on some canonical scholars faces, allow me to tell them that the last thing some of us like to hear about is when the *Other* tells us how different from us she/he *really* is.

To tell the truth, we do not even listen to what other people have to say. Most of the time we indulge in listening to other “persons”, because every other human being is in fact a *person*, the same as I consider myself to be. Right? Wrong! Or again, maybe not! The truth about persons lay somewhere in the middle and that's where it should be, after all! Let us attempt to find out what am I trying to say here.

When we look to other people we do in fact try to find some similarities, and we do that in order to make sure that we are of the same species, that we abide to the same rules, that we are able to coexist without killing and eating one another in order to survive. Because, after all, that is surviving almost all about: a full belly and a place to sleep.

And all the basic assumptions about other people being similar to us, which in fact allows us even to speak of such things as “people” or “humanity” are made through some kind of projecting our own thoughts unto others, making them bear our resemblance, being some kind of mirrors for ourselves. That is how persons are created. We do not really care if they are different and we do not listen to any of their independence proclamations, not even hearing them unless they admit we are alike. That is part of the surviving strategy too. And this is the reason why we speak about humanity as being made of persons. It is a pity though, this way, we manage only to survive. Living, that is another business.

Let us now twist a little the perspective and take the other side for a moment. The side of those speaking of themselves as being different. What are they doing when saying “I am in a way you are not”? Is this the mirrored response of “I am the same as you”? I can not tell for sure, but it looks like it.

Why are they saying that? How do they know in which ways they are different? Are the differences so easily perceivable? Even those which are kept inside our heads and souls and which we name thoughts and feelings? Because even if we are somehow different in the way we look, in our physical appearance, that is not the main argument in the *perpetual otherness camp* and that because we have to have something similar in order to be able to communicate and the slogan they all seem to be taking for granted is this:

“We may look alike but I am different in all other respects!”

In other words she/he is telling you that she/he is different from you in all those important features. And she/he does that probably thinking that *different* means *better*. That is another aspect of the surviving strategy of men. Or beasts, for all that matters.

But how is discrimination really accomplished? How do they know they are so different after all? They do not, if you want my answer!

All the difference is made between how they want to be perceived and how they would not

like others to see them. And that is how we turn back to the person-as-mask problem! And what a problem that is!

Wearing a mask is not a bad thing in itself. The bad thing is not being able to take it off even when you are alone! And that is what Jung was speaking about! The problem with the *perpetual otherness camp* is that by telling you how you differ from them, they are in fact imagining things, and by doing this alone they are allowing you to think of them as being capable to really act in that way. After all “If you think it you might as well be it” is just another way of putting the same problem from the “We may look alike but...” slogan. That is why, in a way, both camps are made of projectors, of people connecting to one another through images, images which we project unto ourselves, images we make other people wear as if they were clothes, images we do not have the courage or the decency to take off even in the privacy of our homes, when facing a speechless mirror, not like that of Snow-White's step mother's.

That hideous character was, after all, more sincere than most of us even when she was ready to act in order to remain beautiful, the most beautiful, that is! What a paradox would that character's character appear for Edmund Burke's vision on beauty and sublime! But that is part of surviving too and many women in our urban jungle would disagree with Burke if they would only be able to acknowledge their darkest motivations.

And, before someone treats me for a misogynist..., allow me to say that, in fact, anyone who speaks of other people is speaking of himself. In the end, that is what I am striving to prove here! Let us turn serious again and understand that as playful as it may seem, this critique of solipsism is not unfounded, since one character of our story, Giovanni Papini, averts his readers against the perils of what he calls “the maddest form of inebriacy” (Papini, 1924, p. 90).

Living in a world of images, not being able to tell which one is true and which one is fake, missing the criteria for a discrimination and choosing to call the images of people – persons, brings us back to the beginning, when we were stating that persons are not real. And we have to correct that by saying:

Persons are not real people!

If we choose to stick to that version of the story, we must admit that most of the time they sure do act as if they were real! This happens because our criterion for discerning between real and fake people is not a tangible one, but stems only from our minds even if we think of the mind as embodied. Or we might say that the mind being embodied is really the reason why our criterion for measuring people can not be reached, can not be objectified!

But if we can not objectify our ideas, we can *act* as if they were things, touchable physical realities! (Remember Shakespeare's saying about actors!) This is called, by people smarter than me, reification (Petrović, 1983, pp. 411-413) and what I can tell you is that this particular trick of reification does surely pay the bills.

4. Our Case: Pablo Picasso Identity Stolen

The fact that images are producing real effects to real people is not so pleasing after all, if you think about someone stealing your identity on Facebook only to tell nasty things about people you like, or even worse, stealing your bank account password to pay for some clothes that you will

never wear, or for some expensive champagne that you will never drink!

Identity theft is as we know it, a real danger in a world of actors! If someone else acts better than myself as me, then he must be me! Then who am I, after all? This is a hard question to answer, if you ask me! And believe it or not, even in Pablo Picasso's life (and everyone knows who Picasso is, right?) there was a moment when he had to answer to this difficult question!

Why had he this unpleasant opportunity? Because, at that particular moment, Picasso was a victim, and the most important thing about this is that Picasso was the victim of Picasso. He became the victim of his own image, of his own fame, of the celebrity of the name Picasso to which himself was abiding because that name, the image he constructed under it made him rich, made him far more important than people usually are for other people, distanced him from the momentum when surviving meant only a problem of a belly to fill and a place to rest your back on.

Who did the acting part, being Picasso against Picasso in such a convincing way that the real Picasso had to fight back in order to regain his identity? Who took this role to such perfection that even today, after more than half a century from the time their play had been played, some people, or should I say persons, continues to mistake one Picasso for the other?

He had to be a good actor, indeed, and this actor's name was Giovanni Papini (Papini, 1952, pp. 265-268). An artist of letters, not of paint, that's all you need in order to create a convincing spoken/written image of a man who deals mainly with paint and brushes, but who has the guts to tell his story from time to time using words also. Let us see what Picasso is supposed to have said about himself:

In art the mass of people no longer seeks consolation and exaltation but those who are refined, rich, unoccupied, who are distillers of quintessences seek what is new, strange, original, extravagant, scandalous. I myself, since Cubism and before, have satisfied these masters and critics with all the changing oddities which passed through my head, and the less they understood me, the more they admired me. By amusing myself with all these games, with all these absurdities, puzzles, rebuses, arabesques, I became famous and that very quickly. And fame for a painter means sales, gains, fortune, riches. And today, as you know, I am celebrated, I am rich. But when I am alone with myself I have not the courage to think of myself as an artist in the great and ancient sense of the term. Giotto [and] Titian, Rembrandt [and Goya] were great painters: I am only a public entertainer who has understood his times and exploited as best he could the imbecility, the vanity, the cupidity of his contemporaries. Mine is a bitter confession, more painful than may appear, but it has the merit of being sincere. (Papini, 1952, as cited in Brink, 2007, p. 60)

Some scholars took the time to avert us on the falseness of the interview Papini said he have had with Picasso. Some others still rely on this story as if it were true and, after all, in this world of smoke and mirrors, who could really blame them? Is there a pronounced scent of immorality stemming out of this particular counterfeiting of reality? It could be the case, if we could only maintain the previous sentence, when we said that *the real* Picasso had to fight back in order to regain his identity. Who was the real Picasso?

Was he a man, an individual who used his natural given talents to build a pedestal for his

name, a name which he entrusted with his fame, his celebrity, his material safety in the end? Is material safety equivalent with fame and celebrity on any pertinent level of reality? If so, we could react as he reacted when Picasso tried to clear his name by the aid of his biographer Pierre Daix. But, since we do not possess any hard evidence that through what Papini did, the selling prices of Picasso's works decreased, we must content ourselves with the idea that the conflict was only between two different images to which the same name was ascribed. One was the image of the way a man wanted to be seen by others, the second being the image he would not like others to identify him with. But, as Alfred Gell would put it:

We suffer, as patients, from forms of agency mediated via images of ourselves, because, as social persons, we are present, not just in our singular bodies, but in everything in our surroundings which bears witness to our existence, our attributes, and our agency. (Gell, 1998, p. 103)

Sometimes this suffering has effects even on our physical health, as we can find out from Memory Jockisch Holloway's book *Making Time: Picasso's Suite 347*, who tells us about the "ulcer" "Picasso developed" as a consequence of the publication of *Life with Picasso* by Françoise Gillot (Holloway, 2006, p. 20) and this can be also sustained by making use of Gell's *distributed person* concept, as he, following Hirn, accepts the possibility that

the kind of leverage which one obtains over a person or thing by having access to their image is comparable, or really identical, to the leverage which can be obtained by having access to some physical part of them (Gell, 1998, p. 105).

That being said, we could judge Papini for immorality, or worse, for belonging to the second order of poets, as described by Ruskin. But let us not jump to conclusions, yet.

Of course, usually you need more than a name coincidence to mistake one person for another, but here comes the genius of Papini into action and his ability to emulate in his short story the main features of Picasso's character: his cynicism, his radicalism, his particular taste in rebellion, his way of jumping out of the last hat you would expect him to inhabit and, most important of all, the fact that the thing which punches you in the face when leaving the hat is not a mere rabbit, but a roaring lion, or, to use a comparison that even Picasso used for himself, the Minotaur.

Why could Papini do that at such level of mastery that even Picasso had to admit the dangerous resemblance of that image to the one himself was advertising on daily basis and therefore had to combat? Was he to such a degree capable to acknowledge the depths of Picasso's mind, of his soul, to the point that revealing his darkest motivations became unbearable for the artist?

If so, we must abandon our hypothesis regarding a certain incapacity of others to know about us anything else than a projection stemming out themselves. We must grant Papini with the abilities of a foreseer being capable of knowing Picasso better than and before he knew himself.

Even in this case, we have to understand that our problem falls near the pathetic fallacy tree, to say the least. We must admit that Papini was not a "weaker" man, nor was Picasso one. They both enter the particular situation described by Ruskin of those poets "who feel strongly, think strongly, and see truly", or even better, the situation at the top of the scale, when men are driven by "prophetic inspiration". After all, the Italian author often thought of himself as of an *intended*

“apostle, prophet, messiah” (Papini, 1924, p. 254) or “leader, guide, center”(Papini, 1924, p. 165) or again “prophet of a religion, [...], redeemer of souls” (Papini, 1924, p. 165). And the way Papini chooses to use Picasso's image is by no means a negative one, since the Italian author had not the same moral commitment to society as most people do.

But what if Papini was speaking of himself rather than of Picasso? What then? It would be a certain case of the fallacy Ruskin defined? This problem becomes even more intriguing when, following the lines from *The failure*, we find that Papini was afraid of being under somebody else's influence, “afraid that someone will speak through” his “mouth” (Papini, 1924, p. 261). He even admits a strange possibility

When I am speaking I do not know whether the words come from my own brain or from some hideous prompter crouching behind my back. (Papini, 1924, p. 261)

He goes even further when fearing that it is not him who thinks and dreams, “but the coffee, the tea, the wine, the oxygen,” or even “the music” (Papini, 1924, p. 264). Is this only rhetoric? We might consider that way, since he dismisses as “stupid fear” his debt towards the “red and white liquids” that he pours into his stomach (Papini, 1924, p. 264).

We have a man submitted to so many influences to the point he does not recognize himself anymore. He wants to find himself, searching for the “ultimate residuum” of his individuality, but he finds himself condemned to “always live as a stranger” “with this Self, bound, dressed, wrapped, cluttered up by others” (Papini, 1924, p. 265). Is he really Papini? Or is it just a beautiful literary exercise of proving what personalism as an existential option is for the individual? Whatever would be the answer, the situation reminds me of our previous discussion over the incapacity of taking off the mask we are wearing, even when nobody looks at us. Nobody? We are looking, and that is enough.

To make him one of the “weaker” men, “overborne by weaker things” is to shrink Papini to the dimensions of “easily-gulled simpletons and so-called experts” who took the “nonsensical mystification” as “gospel” as Pierre Daix warns us about the so-called interview (Daix, as cited in Gale, March 24, 1994).

Instead we should try to understand, for example, what was his opinion on buffoons, on mountebanks, since he considers as so not only Picasso, but also “Homer and Cervantes, Shakespeare and Dostoievski” of whom he admits that they “have brightened our childhood”(Papini, 1924, p. 268). Even though he thinks that

men must be amused and made to laugh – that a good story will keep them awake [...] till you can reach their minds with a good idea and fool them into swallowing a great truth (Papini, 1924, p. 267).

he “refuse(s) to play buffoon to any one” (Papini, 1924, p. 267). He allows Picasso to do that at will, and this should not be shocking for anybody's ears, even if we think Picasso really said the words, because one undisputed quote of Picasso says that

We all know that art is not truth. Art is a lie that makes us realize truth, at least the truth that is given us to understand. The artist must know the manner whereby to convince others of

the truthfulness of his lies. (Picasso, as cited in de Zayas, May 1923)

Papini approves that telling people the truth is a matter of necessity, rejecting at the same time the particular way used by artists, because he believes a more radical solution is needed:

Why have so much compassion for them, why spend so much genius to help them to bed and amuse them, when it would be much more beautiful and dangerous to wake them up with howling, put them with the face in the dark, hang them head down in the abyss and that way force them to lift themselves, know themselves, become sadder but nobler in the face of a universe which now barely concedes them life! (Papini, 1924, pp. 269-70).

5. Contemporary use of the quote: fraudulent or negligent misrepresentation?

To cite the highly contested quote in articles like Germaine Greer's "Picasso was just a big show-off. Most of his work is inherently trivial" from *The Guardian* (Greer, December 12, 2010), is to continue endorsing an image of the artist which does him no good, but also does nothing good for the image of the author of this article. Why? Because six days after its publication the journal published a clarification about the "long and self-critical quote attributed to Picasso" which is "widely thought by art experts to have been fabricated by an Italian journalist and critic, Giovanni Papini, in the early 1950s".

It seems that Germaine Greer could be seen as part of the second order of poets, or having a specific interest to use this quote as true. In both cases, we deal with pathetic fallacy. The first had already been explained before, but the assertion we make in the last part of the phrase, where we try to discover some specific interest, some disguised intentionality beneath the self indulgence of Germaine Greer, has yet to be analysed. Who's fallacy would that be? We should admit that Picasso was the one supposed, at least by the cited author, to have given this proof of erroneous thinking. In this case, we should go further with our investigation in order to see if Picasso, real or just reified, was under the effect of some "genuine emotion" when he went on and on bragging about how he "exploited as best he could the imbecility, the vanity, the cupidity of his contemporaries" (Papini, cited in Brink, 2007, p. 60). The quote gives us the needed answer: It is a "bitter confession", here we can see the pathos, and "has the merit of being sincere." (Papini, cited in Brink, 2007, p. 60), those last words giving a sense of authenticity to Picasso's feelings.

But again, this is not the real Picasso. The real Picasso was probably unknown even to Picasso himself and that is a good reason for taking as true whatever image of Picasso serves us well.

In his *Art and Agency* Gell uses this exotic example of the Malangan idols to explain how someone's influence can be inherited by those who witness his funeral. These ritual objects are brought to "life by being carved and painted – only to be 'killed' with gifts of shell-money."

The gift of money which 'kills' the Malangan entitles the donor to *remember* the image on display, and it is this internalized memory of the image, parceled out among the contributors at the ceremony, which constitutes the ceremonial asset – entitling the possessor to social privileges – which is transacted at the mortuary ceremony and transmitted from senior to junior generations. (Gell, 1998, p. 225)

Of course this example of the Malangan recalls the previous mentioned disclaimer and the

idea that persons continue to exist despite them being alive or dead.

More than this, it gives us a point of departure in understanding Greer's article which brings in discussion the case of Pierre le Guennec who said that he is the proud and honest owner of 271 works of Picasso, unknown to the public or even to the artist's heirs, his family, until the retired French electrician decided in 2010 to show them to Claude Picasso, the artist's son, in order to be authenticated (Greer, December 12, 2010). What is the liaison between the appearance of such an amount of new, or better said, not known until now, works of Picasso, "painted during his most creative period and worth a conservative estimate of €60m (£50.5m)" (Willsher, November 29, 2010) and the quote from Papini, attributed once again by Germaine Greer to Picasso? She does not mention it clearly in her article, but Alfred Gell, speaking of the Malangan idols, provides us with an answer:

The example of the Malangan art is useful in that it can start to undermine the distinction we commonly make between the material and the mental (or cognitive) with respect to material culture. The Malangan are indisputably material objects, but the *socially relevant* Malangan are internalized images which New Irelanders carry about inside their heads. (Gell, 1998, p. 225)

Taking this as a model we can equally state that is not an incoherent action to near, inside an article, two types of artifacts, one being a *socially relevant* image of an artist, appropriated and reconstructed by others, the other being material objects, works of art by the same artists, which surely exert some kind of agency over those who have them in their possession. If, in case of the Malangan, the social agency of the carved idols is exerted through remembrance, thus through an internalized image of that artifact, in the western society, the agency of the material artifact is efficient in its economical valuation, which depends, even if only partially, on the social agency exerted through internalized images that people have of the artist that shaped it.

As coherent as it may be, this approximation was not necessary consciously done by Germaine Greer, not in the way we propose it, that being the reason why our attempt of understanding is nothing else than an attempt of dressing her, through the mediation of Gell's theory, in an image which stems out our own mind.

6. Conclusions

The concept of pathetic fallacy was not of our use in any of the literary examples Ruskin provides for proving it, but in the reasons he gives for the occurrence of this falseness in seeing. Trying to understand how his aesthetic criterion is based on some perceptual ability of men, we discovered that this perceptual ability depends on a weakness of the soul, real or just represented. Therefore the presence of pathetic fallacy could be speculated for a certain intellectual if not even moral validation of the one in whose work it appears.

This case study was not about how great an artist Pablo Picasso was, but about people using other people images for or against those people interest. The quote from Papini's *Visita a Picasso* (Papini, 1952, pp. 265-268) was employed by some in order to discredit the Spanish artist as a moral person, which in fact has nothing to do with him as an artist, since art and morality do not

necessarily go together. Nonetheless we should not refuse the possibility that some people consider necessary an equation between the artistic value of some artifacts and the moral value of the man creating them.

We hope we made clearer that a person is only an image of an individual, and as an image, it can be acted upon in order to change it, somehow like on any material object we can put our finger on. That is why we can and occasionally will look at an artist's personal image the same way we look to his other works, especially when the artist himself does that, that being also the reason why we construct the meaning of his own image as it serves us best, disregarding a certain immanence of the meaning in the individual or in his own intentionality.

References

Baudrillard, Jean, (1994). *Simulacra and Simulations*. Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser, University of Michigan Press. Originally published in French by Éditions Galilée 1981.

Brink, Andrew, (2007). *Desire and Avoidance in Art: Pablo Picasso, Hans Bellmer, Balthus and Joseph Cornell. Psychobiographical Studies with Attachment Theory*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

de Zayas, Marius, (May, 1923). Picasso speaks. *The Arts*, vol. III, no 5, (pp. 315-326), New York.

Gale, Iain, (March 24, 1994). ART / Picasso and that famous interview: The identity of Jack the Ripper? Look no further than the poet Swinburne. Or the artist Sickert. Or wossisname. And Shakespeare: he was really Marlowe, right? Or was it Bacon? Conspiracy theories litter the world of artistic scholarship. Iain Gale closes the recently re-opened file on Picasso". *The Independent*. [Online], Available: <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art--picasso-and-that-famous-interview-the-identity-of-jack-the-ripper-look-no-further-than-the-poet-swinburne-or-the-artist-sickert-or-wossisname-and-shakespeare-he-was-really-marlowe-right-or-was-it-bacon-conspiracy-theories-litter-the-world-of-artistic-scholarship-iain-gale-closes-the-recently-reopened-file-on-picasso-1431247.html>

Gell, Alfred, (1998). *Art and Agency*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Greer, Germaine, (December 12, 2010), Picasso was just a big show-off. Most of his work is inherently trivial, *The Guardian*, electronic edition, [Online] Available: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2010/dec/12/germaine-greer-picasso-show-off>

Holloway, Memory Jockisch, (2006). *Making Time: Picasso's Suite 347*. New York: Peter

Lang Publishing, Inc.

Jung, Carl Gustav, (1953). *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. Londra: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Papini, Giovanni, (1924). *The Failure*. Translated into English by Virginia Pope. Harcourt, Brace and Company Inc. Reprinted by Greenwood Press, Westwood, Connecticut, (1972).

Papini, Giovanni, (1952). *Il libro nero. Nuovo diario di Gog*. Florence: Vallecchi Editore. [Visita a Picasso (o della fine dell'arte), pp. 265-268].

Petrović, Gajo, (1983). *Reification*. In Tom Bottomore, Laurence Harris, V.G. Kiernan, Ralph Miliband (Eds.), *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, (pp. 411-413). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Ruskin, John, (1863). *Modern painters, Vol. III*. New York: J. Wiley.

Willsher, Kim, (November 29, 2010), *Hundreds of unknown Picasso works discovered in Paris*, *The Guardian*, electronic edition, [Online] Available: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2010/nov/29/picasso-unknownworks-discovered>