IV

Variations on Variation

—or Picasso back to Bach

1. When Is a Variation?

I want to explore here the notion of a variation in music, and kindred notions in music and other arts. The music I shall focus on is classical music in standard western notation. Such music is a two-stage art: composition of a work results in a score, execution in performances of the score. This art is also multiple: the musical work consists of the several performances. And finally, such music is an allographic art: compliance with the score is the sole requirement for a genuine instance of a work, no matter who performs it; history of production does not affect genuineness of an inscription or performance of the score.

A score does not prescribe performance completely or precisely. Musical notation leaves some features unspecified, and specifies

I am grateful for the cooperation of Lyle Davidson, David Alpher, James Welu, Konrad Oberhuber, and Jesús Mosterín, among others.

others only within certain tolerances. Thus genuine performances of a work may differ drastically even between those of equal quality. This troubles some composers, moving them to seek means of exercising greater control. On the other hand, some performers chafe at the constraints imposed by a score and want greater freedom for improvisation.

What must be stressed, however, is that the several performances of a work are *not* variations upon, but rather constitute, the work. However much they may differ, all genuine performances of a work comply with the same score, and no performance complies with more than one score. In contrast, a variation on a theme has a different score, and may be a variation on other themes.

A variation upon a work or theme or passage obviously must be like it in some respects and different from it in others. But that, after all, holds true for any two passages. What special musical relationships of likeness and difference must obtain between two passages for one of them to be a variation on the other? The Grove dictionary[1] begins by describing some elementary types of variation where the principal changing factor is pitch or harmony or rhythm, and then goes on to discuss combinations of and deviations from these along with all sorts of other cases. Some ways of making variations fall under such general ways of worldmaking as deletion, supplementation, deformation, reordering, and reweighting (*WW*, 7–17). Formulating an approximately adequate definition of the requisite musical relationship between variation and theme, covering even the commonest cases, is manifestly a complicated task. I happily leave it to the musicologist, and for now assume it done. My present concern is with subsequent questions.

Whatever relationship in terms of likenesses and differences may be required between a variation and a theme, that by itself

1. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 1980) 19, pp. 536–537.

is not enough; for the relationship of theme to variation is not symmetric, and furthermore, neither of two passages in entirely diverse works will function as a variation on the other unless they are somehow brought together.

In short, the question immediately facing us is "When is a variation?"; that is, "Under what circumstances does a passage *v* having the requisite musical relationship to a passage *t* function as a variation upon *t*?" This question takes priority over the question "What is a variation?" much as the question "When is art?" takes priority over the question "What is art?" (*WW*, 57–70). In both cases, characterization of a function precedes and provides means for demarcation of a class.

2. Reference in Variation

Our first try at an answer might be to say that if *v* has the requisite basic musical relation to *t* and is a passage that occurs later in a work beginning with *t*, then *v* functions as a variation on *t*. But that is both somewhat too narrow and somewhat too broad, and misses a central point. In the first place, the theme does not always precede the variations in a work, but may occur at the end or somewhere in the middle. Furthermore, if a passage *b* is musically related to another passage *a* in such a way as to make *b* eligible as a variation on *a*, then *a* is also musically related to *b* in such a way as to make *a* eligible as a variation on *b*. In *Variations on "America"* by Charles Ives, the theme appears at the end, reached by progressive extraction from the first, most elaborate, variation. In this case, the title and the familiarity of the song *America* unmistakably indicate which passage is the theme. Just how or whether one can determine without some such clues which among several passages is the theme is a question I leave to musicians. What concerns us here is the *significance* of the distinction when made. Plainly, that the requisite musical relationship obtains between two passages does not determine which is the theme, but is only a necessary, not a sufficient condition

for functioning as a variation. What we have been missing so far is the recognition that a passage *v* functions as a variation on *t* only when *v refers to t* in a certain way. Functioning as a variation involves not only the requisite musical relationship but also a *referential* one. That calls for some explanation.

In what way, then, does a passage functioning as a variation on another refer to it? Not being a picture or a paragraph, a musical variation does not depict or describe the theme. And although variation and theme must possess certain common musical features, joint possession of such a feature by two passages does not constitute reference between them. An instance of a label does not solely on that account refer to another instance; two things may both be apples without either one referring to the other.

Reference by a variation to a theme is highly complex. In the first place, when functioning as a variation a passage does not merely possess but *exemplifies* the musical feature(s) it must have in common with the theme. To exemplify is to serve as a sample of a feature or label,[2] much in the way swatches of cloth in a tailor's or upholsterer's shop serve as samples of texture, color, pattern, and weight. Exemplification, as we have seen, *reverses* the direction of denotation, running back from instance to label, and is *selective:* a sample does not exemplify all its features—a swatch normally does not exemplify its size or shape—and an instance often does not serve as a sample at all. To exemplify is to bring out, call attention to, but not necessarily to stress a feature; a significant feature of the theme may be quite subtle,

2. No commitment to either nominalism or platonism is required by the present discussion. For those who, like the present writer, are nominalistically inclined, features are to be construed in terms of labels; and we may then speak indifferently of something possessing or being denoted by a feature. Those who are platonistically inclined will want to read "denoted by a feature" as short for "denoted by a label for a property". Either way, two points must be kept in mind: (1) by no means all labels are verbal, and (2) what is denoted by a label does not in all cases refer to that label, but in some cases (see below) does refer to it—by exemplification.

or somewhat hidden by changes made in a variation, so that exemplification emerges only after repeated listening.[3]

Referring to the musical features it must share with the theme is still not enough for a passage to function as a variation on a theme; the variation must refer to the theme *via that feature*. When the variation exemplifies the feature, which in turn denotes the theme, a route of reference from variation to theme is available. Still, that a passage refers to the feature and the feature to the theme, while providing two connected referential links constituting a path, does not imply that the passage refers along that path to the theme. When *a* refers to *b*, and *b* refers to *c*, *a* does not always refer to *c*. A name of a name of Helsinki refers to a word naming the city but seldom to the city. On the other hand, "The Cross", by naming a holy object that refers to Christianity, also refers to Christianity *via* that object. In short, referring is sometimes transitive, sometimes not.[4] When exemplification of the feature in question by a passage and denotation of the theme by the feature are taken as separate steps, the passage does not refer to the theme; but when the referring runs on through this two-link path, the passage refers to the theme via that feature.

Such reference, incidentally, is a special case of a type of reference that may well be called *allusion*: mediate or indirect reference along a path that reverses direction in a denotational hierarchy at least once (*MM*, 65–66). Reference from variation to theme goes in one direction (by exemplification) to certain common features and continues in the opposite direction (by denotation) from that feature to the theme.

Variation, though, plainly depends as much upon difference from as upon likeness to the theme. And just as functioning as

3. See *MM*, pp. 83–84 and the Monroe Beardsley article there cited.

4. See *WW*, pp. 41–56. But that discussion wants some elaboration to take care of further complications; for example, when a symbol *S* refers to *and contains* a symbol *Q* that refers to *x*, then whether or not *S* refers to *x* via *Q*, *S* may be said elliptically to refer to *x*—as short for saying that *S* contains something that refers to *x*. I leave such intricacies for another occasion.

a variation involves not merely having certain features in common with the theme but also referring to the theme via these features, so also such functioning involves not merely having certain features that contrast with the theme but also referring to the theme via such features. This raises a problem. *How can a variation refer to a theme via a feature not common to both?* How can a variation exemplify a feature it does not have? Or how can it refer to the theme by exemplifying features the theme does not have?

Consider for a moment how a giant can be called tiny. The term "tiny" is here applied metaphorically to something that not this term but a contrasting term applies to literally. "Tiny" denotes the giant not literally but figuratively and figurative denotation is no less genuine reference than is literal denotation. And figurative exemplification—that is, exemplification of a label that applies only figuratively—is no less genuine than is literal exemplification. Thus reference by a variation to a theme may be via a feature that literally belongs to one but only figuratively to the other. In this way metaphor is involved in *contrastive exemplification* and hence in variation.[5]

3. 'Formal' Requirements

In sum, we have found in our study two conditions on variation: a 'formal' condition and a functional one.[6] First, to be *eligible* as a variation, a passage must be like the theme in certain respects

5. Metaphor may be even more heavily involved where the contrasting features are already metaphorical, as when we have a sad variation on a happy theme. Here a further metaphorical step enters into contrastive exemplification. In effect, upon transfer from feelings to music, the scheme of labels is also reversed in its application to the variation so that the variation, by a double metaphor, contrastively exemplifies the happiness of the theme and refers to the theme via that feature. (Alternatively, the scheme is reversed in its application to the *theme*, and the variation refers to the theme via sadness.)

6. "Formal" or "musical" in the present context is not confined to what is in any narrow sense purely a matter of form, but is used for contrast with "functional" or "referential" as explained here.

and contrast with it in certain others. Second, to *function* as a variation, an eligible passage must literally exemplify the requisite shared, and metaphorically exemplify the requisite contrasting, features of the theme, and refer to it via these features. *Being* a variation derives from functioning as such: a variation is a passage that normally or primarily or usually so functions. A variation does not always so function any more than a work of art always functions as such, or a name always names, or a symbol always symbolizes.

I have examined the functional condition in some detail, but I gave the formal condition short shrift, promising to come back to the requisite musical relationship between variation and theme. Writers on music describe numerous types of variation and give the impression that new types are constantly being introduced. That makes formulating a general and projectible requirement a daunting task and raises the question whether, indeed, variation requires any musical relationship beyond likeness to the theme in any nontrivial musical respect and difference from it in any other. Does any passage referring to the theme via such features function as a variation? Can the formal conditions be dropped leaving only the referential one?

The answer, I think, is somewhat complicated. On the one hand, a formal requirement seems needed to distinguish variations from passages that do not count as variations at all but may refer to the theme in the same way. On the other hand, it seems clear that whatever formal condition is set forth, a musical relationship violating that condition may in practice come to serve as the basis for a new type of variation. Resolution of these contending considerations depends upon recognizing that while a formal condition is needed to exclude nonvariations that satisfy the referential condition, such a formal condition is only a codification of the musical relationship that in current practice distinguishes what are accepted as variations. Changes in that practice are not precluded. When particular judgments and general principles collide, an adjustment must be made by revising either or both (*FFF*, 63–64).

4. Improvisation and Parody

Among concepts closely related to variation, *improvisation* is presumably subject to somewhat looser formal restrictions than is variation. Otherwise, improvisation *upon*—that is, referring to—other music differs little from variation. A completely 'free' improvisation referring to no other music is simply a spontaneous invention having nothing to do with variation.

A *parody* of a work ordinarily meets the formal requirements for a variation. But while a variation is always upon a theme or work, a parody may be upon (or of) a style or a whole corpus of works; and the features exemplified and those contrastively exemplified are features common to works in the corpus. Of course the point of a parody is quite different from that of the usual variation. This may remind us that I have not so far discussed the *why* of variations—what they do, how they are used, what artistic roles they play. But I shall postpone that subject a little longer until after we have considered variation in arts other than music.

5. Variation in Various Arts

What I have said about music applies generally to dance. But important differences appear in arts such as printmaking that, though like music and dance in being two-stage and multiple, are unlike them in being not allographic but autographic. In etching, for example, the first stage consists in the making of a plate; the second stage, of printing impressions from that plate. Like the performance of a musical work, the several prints are the only instances of and constitute the work; and just as differences in players and playing among the performances may be great,

so may differences in printer and printing—in ink, wiping, paper, and so on—among the impressions. *But* whereas in music genuine instances of a work are those performances, good or bad, that comply with the score, in etching there is no score, no notation. Genuine instances of a work are those impressions, good or bad, that are printed from the plate. Thus in etching—and other kinds of printmaking such as engraving, lithography, woodcut, and ordinary photography,[7] as well as in cast sculpture—history of production, not compliance with a score, distinguishes between what are and what are not instances of a work. Still, impressions are like performances in being instances of, not variations upon, the work. A variation upon a musical work complies with a different score; a variation upon an etching is printed from a different plate.

Painting lies at the furthest remove from music in being neither two-stage nor multiple nor allographic but one-stage and singular and autographic. The object produced by the painter is the work itself; there is no score or plate with multiple performances or impressions that must be distinguished from variations. But variations are distinguished from nonvariations on a work in much the same way in painting as in music and etching. A variation upon a painting is another work referring to it by exemplification of certain shared features and contrastive exemplification of certain differing features. Specifying the relevant features and spelling out the requisite relationship in detail may well be even harder than for music,[8] but the general principle is clear.

Painting and other pictorial arts differ from music, though, in some ways that bear on variation. One such difference is that in music, theme and variation are usually contained in a single work, while in painting the theme and variations are almost always separate works. Thus in music, variations are normally arrayed

7. But daguerrotype and some kinds of instant photography are, in contrast, one-stage, singular, and autographic.

8. Since some of the relevant features in music, though by no means all, can be specified in terms of the notation.

by the work in a unique linear order, while in painting no unique order is determined, and sets of variations without either theme or determinate linear ordering are not abnormal.[9]

Another relevant difference, that representation is much more common and more often important in painting than in music, calls for consideration of the relationship between variation and representation. We might suppose that a variation on a painting must always be a picture of it and also have the same subject matter. *Not so;* for example, a variation on a representational painting may be purely abstract, representing neither the painting nor its subject nor anything else. Conversely, a picture of a painting—for example, a picture showing the painting as seen from the back or the edge—is not always a variation on it. Even a picture that represents both the painting and its subject—for example, a slavish copy—need not be a variation on it. In sum, representation is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for variation. A variation must refer to the painting by way of exemplification of certain shared, and contrastive exemplification of certain unshared, features; and this relationship neither implies nor is implied by representation.

Yet of course a variation on a painting may also represent the painting or its subject or both. And paintings that are not usually variations on each other may function as such under certain circumstances. For instance, taken simply as pictures of Paris, paintings by several different artists do not refer to each other, and none is a variation on another, but when assembled in an exhibition, they may come to refer to each other in the way required for functioning as variations; and exemplification of the shared feature of representing Paris may participate in effecting such

9. Where there is no determinate sequence, variation is symmetric, but still not transitive. Although we may speak of a set of variations as 'variations on each other', that does not imply that every one is a variation on every other. It implies only that every one is connected by a path of variation-links to every other. That will be the case at one extreme where all the variation-links make up a single linear path, and at the other extreme where every variation is a variation on every other.

reference.[10] Likewise, a close copy normally functions as a picture of or a substitute for the original painting; but when the copy is juxtaposed and carefully compared with the original, certain differences may come to be contrastively exemplified, and the copy may function as a variation.

On the other hand, a copy that could hardly serve as a substitute for the original may be clearly a variation upon it. In a copy by an artist in his own style after a work by another artist in a very different style, contrastive exemplification may play a more prominent role. Rembrandt studied Leonardo da Vinci's fresco of the Last Supper (Fig. 8) intensively, probably from an engraving, and did at least three drawings, progressively diverging from the painting. The final drawing (Fig. 9), far from being a substitute for or memento of the Leonardo, is an *interpretation* of it in Rembrandt's terms—an exemplary variation. Benesch writes:

> The drawing is the final result of Rembrandt's studies after Leonardo's *Last Supper*. Rembrandt has completely transformed the Italian composition into a work of his own creative spirit. The result . . . is a greater dramatic movement surging round the Saviour and rolling in waves through the composition. The pen strokes are split, confused, and vibrant with inner motion . . . by signing and dating it, he made it clear that it is to be considered an end in itself.[11]

6. The *Las Meninas* Variations

In painting, the most impressive variations are Picasso's studies of the Velázquez *Las Meninas*. Picasso first saw the picture (Prado Museum, Madrid) at the age of fourteen, and sketched it; at the age of seventy-six, some three hundred years after *Las Meninas* was finished (1656), he painted more than forty variations on it.

10. Since in this chapter the term "variation" is restricted to variations upon a work or part of a work, to speak of these paintings as variations upon Paris would be at best slightly elliptical.

11. Otto Benesch, *The Drawings of Rembrandt* (London: Phaidon, 1954) 2, p. 106.

The Velázquez shows the little royal princess in the center with a maid of honor on each side.[12] At our left is Velázquez, brush and palette in hand, before a canvas (shown from the back) that he has been working on. This work, a portrait of the king and queen, is partly reflected in the mirror at the back. At the right are two court dwarfs and the royal dog, behind them a duenna and a gentleman in waiting. At the rear is a palace steward holding open a door. The moment depicted is apparently just as the sitting has ended, with the royal couple about to pass through the studio and leave by the door held open for them; the dwarf at the right prods the dog to move out of the way.[13]

The painting was listed in early court inventories as "The Family Picture" but has come to be known by the name given to it in the catalogue of 1843: "Las Meninas", or "The Maids of Honor".[14] Why a painting with the princess as its central figure should come to be named for her attendants may be worth some reflection, and I shall return to this question later.

For those of us interested in reference, the painting offers an unusually complex network of six representational relationships: it represents the double portrait Velázquez is shown working on, and also a mirror in the background; the mirror represents (by reflection) the double portrait, and also the king and queen; and the double portrait and *Las Meninas* itself also represent the king and queen.[15] *Las Meninas* is unique and intriguing in many such special ways, discussed in countless papers. But Picasso is pri-

12. The Princess is Margarita Maria; the maid of honor at our left is Maria Agustina Sarmiento; the one at our right, Isabel de Velasco. The dwarfs are Maria Bárbola and Nicolasico Pertusato; the duenna, Marcela de Ulloa; the gentleman in waiting, probably Diego Ruiz de Azcona. The palace steward is José Nieto Velázquez. The name of the dog is not reported.

13. The interpretation in this last sentence, which I find entirely convincing, is due to Joel Snyder. See his "Las Meninas and the Mirror of the Prince", *Critical Inquiry* 11 (1985) 571, n. 27.

14. See José Gudiol, *Velázquez*, trans. Kenneth Lyons (New York: Viking, 1974), p. 388.

15. Note 6 above is relevant here.

marily concerned with something quite different. José Gudiol writes of Velázquez that figuratively "his ruling passion in life . . . perfectly realized in *The Maids of Honor* . . . is that of 'painting paint'".[16] Picasso shared this passion, and it accounts in large part for his intense and lifelong interest in this masterpiece of Spanish painting. That, together with his well-known fondness for children and pets, and the presence in his studio of a large reproduction of the Velázquez painting, must have prompted his choice of that picture as the theme for his variations. But along with his veneration was rebellion. Picasso's life was spent breaking away in all directions from the traditional ways of seeing and painting, and his set of variations is both a celebration of the Velázquez and also, as Lael Wertenbaker writes, "a summing up of the pictorial representations of form and space that Picasso himself had brought to modern art . . . a distillation of Picasso's life work".[17] What richer source of variations can there be than such a combination of concurrence and contention between visions?

Picasso's variations on *Las Meninas* are among the fifty-eight paintings he made and dated in the last four and one-half months of 1957. Forty-four of the fifty-eight are such variations, one (B.40) is a borderline case,[18] the rest are of other subjects (for example, in September he took a week off from *Las Meninas* to paint nine views through his studio window).

A prominent common feature running through this theme and variations is the depiction, in whole or part, of a constant subject

16. Gudiol, *Velázquez*, p. 291

17. Lael Wertenbaker et al., *The World of Picasso 1887–1973* (New York: Time-Life Books, 1967), p. 152.

18. The numbers preceded by "B" place the paintings among the fifty-eight in the order of production as given in the *Museo Picasso, Catalogo I* (Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, 1971). B.40 is not counted as a variation by the museum, apparently because, although it is based on the lower right corner of *Las Meninas*, it adds a piano not in that picture. I see no more reason for ruling this out than for ruling out musical variations that add to the theme.

matter. Another, more subtle, is the 'painting of paint' mentioned earlier. Among the variables are the selection of aspects and feelings of and toward the people depicted, along with features of drawing and design and style.

In the usual catalogue ordering, his set of variations is rather chaotic. The chronological order of production of the paintings cannot be taken as indicating a canonical order of the variations; a composer or other artist seldom works consecutively from the first to the final variation of a series but skips around as ideas occur to him. For the Picassos, where there is no need as in music to prescribe order of performance, there is not, except within certain short sequences, any indicated ordering at all. Nevertheless, the paintings have to be looked at in some order, and they relate to each other in interesting ways that suggest arranging them in various comprehensible and perhaps illuminating sequences.

As an example, nineteen of these variations are represented in the color plates[19] arranged according to subject: first, variations on the whole or a major part of the Velázquez composition; then successively, variations on each of the three major figures in it, taken from left to right. First, following the complete Velázquez *Las Meninas* are six Picasso variations (B.1, B.31, B.33, B.14, B.32, B.47) based on the whole or the central part of that picture. Next comes the left-hand maid of honor in the Velázquez followed by three Picasso variations (B.3, B.38, B.39) on this detail. Then the princess in the Velázquez followed by five variations (B.4, B.27, B.15, B.5, B.17). Finally the right-hand maid of honor in the Velázquez followed by five variations (B.46, B.51, B.53, B.52, B.58).

My selection and arrangement within each of the four groups is personal, but the guiding principles will be evident from the illustrations and accompanying comments. Like any other orga-

19. The original paintings vary in size from about ten by eight inches to about six and one-half by eight and one-half feet.

nization, this one involves interpretation, but with no claim that this is the only or the best interpretation or that it reflects any interests of Picasso's. Some notes on the illustrations follow.

1. *Velázquez,* Las Meninas.

2. This Picasso variation is also chronologically the earliest. Picasso was working, according to Sabartés, from a large black-and-white reproduction; and the present painting has little color. It is as if Picasso drained off Velázquez's color, preparatory to infusing his own. Two other aspects of this painting are especially notable. First, Picasso has let in the light, has opened the windows at the right so that daylight floods into the room; the light in Picasso's studio on the Mediterranean bursts in. Second, he has spread the composition out into a horizontal format. This suggests my reading from left to right. The figure of Velázquez here has become a kind of papier-maché hobgoblin, then appears very little in the other variations. The maid of honor at our right is viciously caricatured, but later (19–23) is shown in a very different guise. The royal mastiff has become Picasso's own pet dachshund, Lump.

3. The elements become more geometric, and bright twentieth-century color sharpens the complex composition.

4. The vertical format returns.

5. The design is simplified and almost circular, the space is deep and unified, the color more somber; the dog is black.

6. A flatter, angular, geometric pattern of hard-edged shapes in contrasting colors takes over. The dog is the livest element.

7. The three central figures are focused on here. The maids of honor dominate the diminished and devitalized princess. The mirror that reflects the king and queen in the Velázquez is here a blank square. Picasso was no royalist!

8. *Detail from* Las Meninas: *the left-hand maid of honor, Maria Agustina Sarmiento.*

9. The solicitous maid, painted with Van Gogh-like urgency, becomes an agitated, threatening figure.

10. The wildness gone, she performs a concentrated act of sorcery.

11. The sorceress reaches a paroxysm of witchery at the moment of taking possession.

12. *Detail from* Las Meninas: *Princess Margarita Maria.*

13. The princess, in near monochrome, receives the tray from the serving but grasping hands of the maid.

14. Clashing colors suggest internal turmoil.

15. The conflict and pain intensify in this compelling and penetrating portrait.

16. The color clashes have gone, leaving a stark record of torment.

17. Here the flesh is restored, the torment covered with courage, but the eyes and mouth poignantly reveal what lies underneath.

18. *Detail from* Las Meninas: *the right-hand maid of honor, Isabel de Velasco.*

19. The maid of honor begins a curtsey.

20-22. The curtsey develops into a dance.

23. In this final variation, which is also the final variation chronologically, the painting is richer, more detailed, and perhaps most Velázquez-like of all. The dancing figure contrasts sharply with the caricature of Isabel de Velasco in the first and some other variations.

7. Cross-Modal Variations

So far I have said nothing about cross-modal variations. Some features, such as feelings and aspects of design and style are common to painting and music; and a work in one medium may refer to a work in another via such features. What might musical variations paralleling Picasso's painted variations on *Las Meninas* be like? Composer David Alpher was enough intrigued with this question to spend some months composing a theme and twenty-two variations—for piano, oboe, guitar, and cello—correlated with

the Velázquez and a selection of the Picassos in an arrangement I suggested.[20]

Earlier in this paper I postponed the question of the *why* of variation—of what is accomplished cognitively and aesthetically by variation. The best answer, I think, can come from looking at such examples as the Picasso variations, listening to the music in conjunction with such looking, and observing the effect of such experiences. Variations upon a work, whether in the same or a different medium—and still more, sets of variations—are interpretations of the work; the Picasso variations function as much in this way as does an illuminating essay on *Las Meninas*. Like all other interpretations in paint or music or words, variations are works in their own right, though they may enhance and be enhanced by the theme. Variations and theme reflect each other; *Las Meninas* and the Picassos alike lose when either is deprived of the others. And incidentally, the Picassos, painted more than one hundred years after *The Family Portrait* became *The Maids of Honor*, vividly explain that change, showing the maids of honor as the psychologically dominant persons in the scene.

(*Goodman*)

20. Alpher composed the *Las Meninas Variation* in 1985 for a program called *Variations* based on a lecture along the lines of the present chapter, the slides, and the music. The program in various forms has been presented at the University of Helsinki, Wayne State University, the Rockport (Massachusetts) Chamber Music Festival, Harvard University, and Trinity University (Texas).

Figure 8 Leonardo da Vinci, *The Last Supper*, Sta. Maria del Grazie, Milan, 1495–1498

Figure 9 Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Last Supper* (after Leonardo da Vinci), Kupperstichkabinett, Berlin, 1635.