5. A Tale of Two Studios: Artist Jean Charlot in Walt Disney's Atelier

Apart from the artist, the two strong forces in the arts are the people and the academy.* The people send great creative impulses upward, as in the vernacular language drawn upon by Dante and the artisan techniques of church-decoration drawn upon by Giotto. The academy sends great creative researches outward and downward, as in the influence on all European literature of the Greco-Roman tradition and the diffusion to all levels of visual art of the perspectival, representational, and compositional discoveries of the Renaissance. We live at a time when, perhaps largely because of the effect of photographic and electronic inventions in the media of the arts, the force and reciprocal influence and variety of these flows and exchanges are at a high historical level of intensity.

The traffic between textbook and museum art on the one hand and popular and commercial art on the other has become a central fact of twentieth-century cultural life. Does Warhol's soup can elevate a consumer icon to the metaphysical glory of high art? Does Disney's *Fantasia* degrade repertory orchestral music and neo-classical draftsmanship to kitsch? Is the high art of Leger dependent on folk-sources and popular commercial conventions in figurative design? Would the popular-illustration animals of Beatrix Potter (*Peter Rabbit*) have been possible without the previous achievements in animal "portraiture" of Leonardo and Dürer?

First steps in trying to answer such questions depend on our possession of a descriptive and critical vocabulary having depth, range, and richness. Such a vocabulary must define the nature of the signs that compose the expressiveness of art. This in turn involves identifying the way in which the sign systems of fine and popular art arise in great part out of the media that they employ and the channels of distribution that are made accessible to the artist by these media. We now possess a body of commentary and criticism that accomplishes some of these tasks. Yet it is a salient fact that we possess few records showing the contribution to such critical methods made by the thinking of accomplished and articulate fine artists.

One valuable existing record consists of the remarks made by the distinguished French-born painter Jean Charlot when, on the invitation of Walt Disney, he addressed eight illustrated lectures to the animator-draftsmen at the Disney Studios in 1938.

The lectures are provocative because they provide a partial but unique record of five concurrent artistic encounters in the twentieth century: first, the intellectual collaboration in artistic research by Disney and Charlot; second, the encounter between the fine artist Charlot and a group of craftsmen in the popular arts; third, the connections

* unpublished manuscript, written c. 1994.

and disconnections between the visual arts of the pre-cinematic period and those of the cinematic age; four, the marriage between cinematic animation techniques of story-telling and our inherited folkloristic narratives of the oral and print traditions; and five, the migration into the modern media, from primordial sources and picturizations, of anthropomorphized animal figures. Such is the richness of the context for these lectures dating back to before World War II—lectures that inventively develop new insights into the nature of the animated film art.

The points at which the fine art of Charlot and the popular art of Disney are similar follow from the fact that they share a great deal of the Western tradition of visual representation: perspective, draftsmanship, chiaroscuro, and composition, for example. The points at which the contrast between the two is evident are of equal importance in this discussion; they arise out of a great historical process of technical change.

Charlot's skills and ideals are almost interchangeable with those of Giotto in the thirteenth century and Antonello in the fifteenth. They are the skills and ideals that were built up in the period before that rolling revolution in the mechanical reproduction of visual signs that included block-printing and printing with movable type (fourteenth century), engraving (fifteenth), lithography (nineteenth), photography (early-nineteenth), and cinema (late-nineteenth). The skills and ideals of Disney's employees included the art-school rudiments of the ancient manual great tradition mastered by Charlot, but were entirely harnessed to the animation techniques whose modern forms were entirely dependent on the cinema—and later, of course, collaterally dependent on audio-electronics.

In short, Charlot's art was the child of a system of visual signs that in their original context had largely been attached to walls as murals, had only later acquired a greater mobility in framed easel pictures and in the lithographic reproductions of the nineteenth century. The art of Disney's employees, on the other hand, was made possible as a technical and financial reality only by the grand revolution in the mobility of the visual sign: the twentieth-century ability to make the sign move on the cinema reel and, later, in TV, to make the cinema reel itself, bearing the sign, move all over the world with the speed of a radio-wave. This vast change in the manufacture and distribution of artistic signs has grown in mutual development with the growth of the great audio-visual consumer audiences, whose patronage of the modern mass media supplies the industry with constantly increasing inputs of capital.

Now if we ask whether the lectures affected the Disney product and its consumers, we find no documentation on which to base an answer. There is some evidence, however, pointing to the probability that his influence was indirect and diffuse. The painter's scholarly and articulate son John points in this direction when he refers to the noncondescending and informal seriousness which Charlot brought to his meetings with the Disney animators. John Charlot, moreoever, reported to me that in his own contact with some Disney employees, long after the event, he was told by them that Charlot had raised their morale.

It appears that many had begun their artistic lives with higher and more solemn aspirations than that of becoming partly "interchangeable parts" in an animation toy shop devoted to the getting up of cartoon figures out of the interchangeable parts of conventionalized animal and human anatomy. Jean Charlot, it seems, made them feel that there was a kind of craft-guild-like integrity in their efforts to amuse the millions and that they had not become mere mechanized pencil-pushers of industrialized popular art. And if this is so, it must have had effects on the cartoons—benign effects, at that.

The lectures show that Charlot suggested to his listeners at Disney Studios that they might consider themselves to be modern muralists, projecting great designs not on a wall but a movie screen. This could not have reduced the creative élan of his audience!

Turn now from the linkage between fine and popular art to a basic theme already mentioned: the question of the representation of the motion of visual signs and the correlation of this with factors of picture space, the passage of time, and the fundamental transformation of these factors by cinema. Charlot does not quote Lessing to his listeners when he implicitly reminds them of the Lessing perception that the pre-cinematic visual arts, unlike dance and music, could not portray motion through time and did not, like literature, represent events unrolling through time.

Yet in spite of this, he reminded them, many pre-cinematic artists invented roundabout ways of suggesting motion and elapsed time. A principal method is that of imaginatively rendering the human body as the painter's eye snap-shoots it in a certain pose revealing of motion, from a point of view that the viewer of the painting can immediately identify himself with. Charlot is clear about the limitations of that approach. On the way in which a painter can direct his viewer's eyes to see the same object from different points of view, at different times, Charlot notes in Lecture Five: "In Degas' painting of three dancing girls, the ground plan was a half circle on which the girls were placed at three different points in the same pose" so that the viewer gets "three different appearances of the same pose." Charlot asked animators to note that all this was the record of two implied motions, first of the painter's applied viewpoint, then of the viewer's responsive viewpoint.

However, as Charlot demonstrated to his listeners, the alteration that occurs when one moves from pre-animated, static representation to the animated variety has deeper transformations associated with it. Charlot boldly, and perhaps for the first time in art history, identifies five of them:

1. changes in the relative usefulness to the artist of basic shapes such as square and circle,
2. changes resulting from the animator's ability to use an elastic rather than unchanging and rigid outline,
3. changes resulting from the dynamic portrayal of gravity, speed and acceleration afforded to the artist and storyteller by animated motion,
4. changes in the sense of picture space resulting from cartoon design features, and

5. changes in the psychological tone of viewers with respect to their response to animals and humans—humans that are acceptable in static art can make people uneasy in kinetic art.

The point about shapes is simple: although both square and round shapes are equally useful in static art, square or angled shapes are the most useful in animated art because their outlines exhibit their motion more dramatically however they are moved, whereas the outlines of circular and spherical forms obviously do not. The question of elasticity is no more complex. The animator can make the outline of one of his animal figures, for example, expand and distort or collapse, for the sake of either realistic and fantastic effects. This is denied to the creator of the static picture.

Although Charlot does not say so, the listener could easily draw the conclusion that such flexibility is mentioned because it can be extraordinarily useful to the animator in the pursuit of comic, grotesque, and mystifying effects. Somewhat the same general principle is involved when we observe that the animator is able to display the forces of gravity directly (by dramatic falls, leaps, and leanings), while the nonkinetic artist is forced to signalize these forces indirectly, in entirely different—albeit often deeply creative—ways.

The last two points are more complex and subtle. Charlot points out to his listeners that the conventions of cartoon art resemble those of Byzantine art: the lines that divide the picture space are in most cases the same lines that provide the outline of the persons, animals, and objects portrayed. All other things being equal, this creates a tense, constricted pictorial space. As a result, living fictional characters have to be allowed to "create" space around themselves in animated cartoons; they do this by outwardly expansive motions. Charlot cites a Mickey Mouse episode as an illustration of this.

Finally, with respect to the choice between animal and human characters in animated cartoons, Charlot makes an observation that is iconological rather than technical. He claims correctly that some human characters in animation make us feel uneasy in a way that animals do not. Charlot does not explain this, but we can speculate that he is referring to our discomfort when human figures, moving in the animated cartoon, appear to be too mechanical and therefore alien. It is possible that Charlot was the first to add this very important hypothesis to the armory of the art historian.

Even while making reference so far only to a few themes, enough has been said to suggest the effortless brilliance with which Charlot illuminates the great transformation from static to kinetic art. In Lecture Two Charlot says: "Klee starts his history of painting by a single dot—and then he says that that point is going on a walk." And this is in effect what Charlot did for his listeners. Art history and the study of popular culture would be in firmer condition today if Charlot's lectures had been published in 1938 or 1950. But he did more. In one lecture or another, he discussed in depth the question of visual viewpoint—and the conventions that control it in art. For this he used stunning examples from his own

work as a muralist in Mexico. In effect, he was helping to make his listeners understand the artistic Relativity Law by which we can see that a mural can become a movie partly because viewers stream past it and so vitalize its narrative; while a movie can be seen as a mural because even though its imagery moves in time past the seated static viewer, it is a wall decoration that happens, by moving from viewpoint to viewpoint, subject to subject, to tell a story.

On the matter of the dynamics of viewpoint, Charlot calls the attention of his listeners to the fact that many mural paintings do not "look straight on" at their subject because the wall section on which they are painted stands above the level-eye gaze of the people who look at it. Thus, "a number of mural jobs begin over eye level" (Lecture Six).

On a related point, "El Greco, for example, came out of the Byzantine school, where they were painting walls at great heights . . . They had to evolve a style in which verticals were much increased . . . Nowadays, when his pictures are taken out of churches and put in museums, people look at those elongated figures and decide that he was a mystic."

The importance of this observation is that it throws light on the following distinction: the work can absorb the viewer or the viewer can absorb the art. Great church paintings such as those of Grunewald, for example, have the power to absorb the viewer. But, in modern secular painting, the absorptive power has been transferred from the work to the viewer—who is a consumer of the work rather than a communicant with it.

The third relationship explored in Charlot's lectures is that between cinematic handling of draftsmanship (that is, animation) and the use of this resource to convey a narrative involving fictional characters and situations. Charlot was speaking as an artist, not a script-writer, and therefore did not have anything directly to say about how to tell a story. He properly assumed that in the studio division of labor, this was left largely in the hands of writers, gag-men, idea-men and that they, in turn, in search of the bewitching plot, could resort to everything from borrowing and plagiarism to the theory of literary fiction in Aristotle's *Poetics*.

There, for example, one is reminded of the difference between tragedy, comedy, and epic and is told that a good complex story should not only have a beginning, a middle, and an end, but that it should have a climactic reversal of affairs involving a dramatic recognition scene. In Charlot's remarks, however, he spent a great deal of time in talking about how visual signs such as lines and contours help the visual narrator by giving an air of reality to the proceedings of his characters and the emotions they are intended to generate in the audience.

It is worth our while to sift over some of the concepts and conventions of graphic representation that Charlot discussed from optical, visual, and psychological points of view in his lectures. At the most basic levels, he kept reminding his hearers that the space of the picture plane, whether in mural, framed picture, or movie screen or TV monitor, is only a fictive version of the space that we live with and envision every day.

The space of our normal life activity is binocular—that marvelous system by which the two eyes, focusing on one object, see it in its actual distance and solidity because we see it from two slightly different points of view at the same time. But "in painting or the movies we cannot use binocular vision," says Charlot. The space of the picture plane is an immobilized one-eyed view of the universe in which binocularity cannot be represented itself in a meaningful sign—except perhaps, as this writer happens to think, in the treatment of edges by the painter. The edges of Vermeer seem to me to be binocularly varied and sculptural, soft and airy for rounded contours and knife-edged for sharp.

Within this picture-plane world, Charlot taught his listeners the development of kinetic picturization, animation, was to some extent anticipated by the progressive new geometrical perspective of the Renaissance. How could this be? Charlot explains the effect by showing that in the Byzantine conventions of painting that preceded the earliest reformulations of the Renaissance, the picture plane and the picture were on the same flat surface. There were no converging lines of walls or buildings or roads, moving to a vanishing point, to suggest the illusion of a space in which nearer things appear to be larger and far things smaller—and thus there was no virtual space within which motion in all three dimensions could easily occur. Byzantine figures and objects appear to be nailed to the flat space they inhabit. When Renaissance analysts introduced perspective, they, in the nature of the case, created a visual space in which motion could appear to have occurred: this led to sophisticated representations of motion frozen in time. And this in turn was the grandfather of the urge to animate.

Charlot also helped his listeners to understand their work by showing them, through his studies of composition, in how many different ways the cinematically based motions of the characters and objects on the Disney screen were similar to and different from the mobility associated with figures in painting. In animation the movement is supplied by the machines. In painting animation is provided by the painter and the viewer: the painter arranges lines, shapes, volumes, and enclosing spaces so that they "move" in meaningful harmony with each other—as in the upward sweep of a stairs "moving" toward an exalted figure of the Virgin at the top. The viewer is then invited to participate in this visual mock-up of a kinesthetic experience.

A reference to Klee's remark about an artist's "taking a walk with a line" is employed by Charlot to dramatize his remarkably effective discussion of composition dynamics. This treatment, distributed over various lectures, is full of examples from classic art and it explores the concept of composition from a succession of angles. In between sections he says, "The poor painter [as contrasted with the animator] is confronted by the problem that he can represent movement only when he paints things that are not in movement. That is, the composition of movement must be independent of the representation of the moving subject matter." Since Charlot's time—and under the influence of the fashionability of abstract painting—there have been many new studies of the dynamics of the picture space.

Composition deals, basically, with the way in which the eye is accustomed to respond to a given stimulus of line, shape, and color; how this can be identified with various canvas areas; how the picture plane is flattened in some painting and deepened in others; and how variations from the true vertical and horizontal and from photographic accuracy of outline are employed by various painters for various enjoyable effects. Again, "The painting optically is three times as vast as the panel on which it is painted," says Charlot, referring to the power exercised by perspective lines that meet outside the frame of a certain picture. Charlot was not trying to give to his listeners a scientific treatise on such matters, but the reader will see that he managed to take his audience's sense of compositon far beyond art-school platitudes and formulas.

It happens that in the course of such instruction, Charlot had some remarkably keen and sometimes debunking things to say about certain artists, including the moderns: "For the person who really wants to be abstract the biggest problem is completely to eliminate nature from his picture, which is impossible." Speaking of Mondrian's desire, in his later paintings, to be completely abstract and to envision all the contents of the picture as being in the same quasi-plane as the canvas, Charlot makes two amusing and penetrating judgments. He says that Mondrian cannot prevent Charlot's eyes from sometimes seeing a "thing" where Mondrian meant to supply only an abstraction; and he judges that Mondrian is unable to maintain the flat surface he claims to have validated. The rectangular grids that seem to assure this effect are contradicted by the presence of colors that operate as pushes and pulls on the picture plane and thus create an effect which contradicts the avowed artistic intention.

This comment can be added to the accumulating recognition that Mondrian is much over-rated, that his late period rectangularities are exercises in an ill-thought obsession—not the models of deperceptualized purity that they claim to be. Mondrian's picture space is an unsuccessful attempt to blend the Euclidean and the non-Euclidean and it does not work.

In concluding these observations on the rich range of Charlot's teaching about composition, it is useful to mention some incidental insights that he passes on to his listeners. For example, in discussing Cezanne's picture-plane, he points out that the illustrators of *Life* magazine took the trouble to *change* the colors in some of the printed reproductions of his work. Having "improved" on the work of the master, they also destroyed the consistency of his deliberated picture-surface.

Speaking in this way to young masters in the visual mass media, Charlot must have been aware that this analysis could serve to remind his listeners of the intellectual and artistic mendacity which is so much a part of modern publishing policy. He was also very graphic in alerting them to the rhetorical uses of lines that do not meet until they pass out of view beyond the bounds of the picture plane. And he reminded them of how much our perception of the outline of a recognizable object depends on its visual distinctness as a pattern seen contrasted with the field against which it is displayed. In reference to Gestalt principles of vision, Charlot

shrewdly says: "If you photograph at a distance and slightly out of focus an area covered irregularly with spots, you find there is a trail that relates these different spots so that the photograph looks like a geometric diagram." This is the principle which in the hands of other commentators has become almost a whole esthetic in itself. Oddly, perhaps, he does not mention the great Gestalt method of leaving an outline partly undrawn so that it will be, to greater effect, completed by the patterning eye of the viewer.

It is time now to turn to a fourth pairing that can help us to understand what Charlot was doing for his audience. This is the newly created relation between animal imagery and the mass media that has occurred in the twentieth century as a result of the employment of animation by Disney and innovators like him. Since Charlot himself concentrated on the technical *forms* of the animated cartoon and not on the *contents* of it, his reference to animal characters is of course only illustrative, incidental, and marginal. This is unfortunate, since he was undoubtedly capable of throwing a good deal of light on animal characters in the illustrations of fiction, including fables and fairy tales, in the days before animation. But this was obviously not contemplated by his contract with Disney. The linkage is discussed here not as if to criticize Charlot for a shortcoming and as if to make up for it, but because a greater understanding of the topic will provide an essential background for Disney's achievement and Charlot's critical appreciation of it.

As has already been pointed out, Charlot made significant reference to animal figures. He used them to illustrate a variety of points. He referred to the Egyptian convention of making its gods out of human bodies with animal heads. And he made the penetrating suggestion that animated animals were often easier to accept than animated humans, a possible basic explanation of the appeal of animal figures to the animators and a sidelight on the remark of the child who, when asked why Disney artists were called "animators," replied that this was because they "turned people into animals." Charlot would have been aware of the mythical and literary as well as the iconological heredity of the studio's animal figures.

To provide a background for this discussion, it is useful to remind ourselves that although art critics and art historians and commentators on popular culture study a communication art that employs signs as its basic elements, they do not state openly any fundamental theory of signs upon which their work is based. This is just as true of Greenberg and Panofsky as it is of Wollflin and Winckelmann and Kracauer and Agee.

The following remarks will be based on the theory of signs proposed by the philosopher C. S. Peirce, greatest of American thinkers, who said all signs could be considered as icons or symbols or indices and that all signs were a combination of each with one aspect dominant. An icon represents, a symbol calls up without representing, and an index reveals a force at work. Thus, the gilded cod weathervane on the statehouse in Boston is an icon (of a cod), a symbol (of the commonwealth's sea-based prosperity), and an index (of the source of the prevailing wind).

Painting before animation dealt with icons (portraits, for example, whether historical or fictional) and with symbols (every figure and object of European

painting from Byzantine Christ to the emblematically demagnetized American flag of Jasper Johns is capable of working as a symbol in painting) and often with indices (a painted station-of-the-cross suggests that the worshipper should kneel and say a fitting prayer; the painted lion-and-unicorn on a London pub point the thirsty citizen to a half pint of bitter). These sign-actions continued in cinematic visualizations of course, with the complication that printed and auditory word-signs were added to the stream of movie communication. And the introduction of realistic motion on the sixteen frame per second basis introduced changes as well.

The basic alteration was that the camera's lens could now force the viewer's eye to see only what it wished him to observe, from moment to moment, from the same angle applied to all viewers, while at the same time the realistic motion of the actors transformed the image from a static scene to a developing episode. The variable but universalized viewpoint embodied in the moves of the camera and the film cutting, and the vector of the action embodied in the moves of the directed players, could now become, in their turn, signs—signs capable of iconic, symbolic, and indexical significance. This occurred both as a variation on as well as supplement to all the iconic, symbolic, and indexical powers already possessed by the still picture and now retained by the moving picture.

These new powers were exhibited largely in the iconic and indexical modes. The iconic power of cinema lay in the portrayal of the movements of the camera's subjects: actors and natural forces and machines. Any of these icons, of course, could become a symbol—as when the repeated shots of a locomotive at full speed are offered as metaphor for haste, danger, approaching crisis, or alternatively, for departure and separation.

The indexical novelty was associated not with the subject but with the manipulation of the camera itself and the sequencing of the shots that it produced. These techniques constantly direct the viewers to a certain point of attention—the close-up is a good example. Thus, control of attention is effected by the use of fades, pans, rapid cutting, montage, lens effects, and so on. When they become obstructive, these indexical devices intended to evoke selective responses in the audience can become marks of the bad film. A requirement for good film criticism is that it must keep in mind, for any episode or collection of episodes, the synergy of the iconic and indexical. Only when the two come together does the movie work. When they are in conflict with each other, the effort fails.

This seems to be the case in late Chaplin films in which a new, more complex, seriousness of subject matter requires variety and flexibility in camera-planning, but in which Chaplin sticks to his old technique of unvaried straight-on shots toward an "on-stage" action. Failure to exploit the descriptive and analytical possibilities of a vocabulary and theory of signs involving iconic, symbolic, and indexical dimensions leaves most art history and most film criticism intellectually undeveloped.

The symbolic aspect of the animated film cartoon is based largely on the icons of its animal characters who, when appropriately represented and activated, come to stand for much more than their mere visual likeness accounts for. Or more than

their visual likeness *fails* to account for! The great case is Mickey Mouse, the most famous fictional animal in world history. He is a mouse mostly because he is called one—he was fashioned by Walt Disney and Ub Iwerks out of a discarded rabbit, in the form of a bean-bag body and rubber-hose legs and arms. He has no whiskers and his ears are excessively large and he looks like a mouse largely because we have been trained to think so. He does not even look like himself, since he started life as a fifteen-year-old, sharp-faced, street-wise critter and is now a round-faced, infantile-faced, senile millionaire. But he is MICKEY MOUSE and despite all Disney's attempts to dethrone and exile him, he now represents all over the world the energetic and trickster bounce of American imperial culture and the power of United States popular culture to penetrate, transform, and even subvert pre-existing cultures in Europe and the Third World.

Efforts to understand the ideological and esthetic potency of Mickey and his coevals such as Donald Duck and Bugs Bunny are important because it is too little recognized that without this animal cast of characters, drawing on immemorial folklore and legend, the interchange between Disney and Charlot in 1938 could never have occurred. Beginning before 1938 the Mickey Mouse image had already begun to accumulate copyright royalties which have added by now [in 1994] up to about $10 billion.

But the understanding of these polytheistic remnants in the modern world is blocked by the confusions of contemporary art historians and mythographers. In spite of Mickey's worldwide fame, for example, Joseph Campbell believes that the modern world is incapable of creating myths. This is largely because he has been influenced by the Euro-centered ideas of archetype and mono-myth put forward by Jung. These are both provincial and wrong. The nature of myth in the modern world is only beginning to be studied by scholars such as Hans Blumenberg. And in general, it is held back by modern art history and art criticism which, lacking an explicit theory of signs, are unable to see modern iconography in a fully contextual manner.

At this point, we have to ask what effects, if any, Charlot's lectures had on the development of the animated cartoon and our understanding of the form. The lectures were given in the year 1938 when Disney received the Oscar for Mickey Mouse but had already begun to shift from the earlier naive draftsmanship toward the more realistic drawing of *Fantasia* (1940) and *Bambi* (1942). There is no evidence that Charlot influenced the studio toward this alteration of style—and therefore no ground for those who, respecting the early style more than the later, might blame Charlot for a share in this development. On the other hand, since the lectures were not published until long after the event, they had no influence outside the studio on ideas about the animated cartoon art—except by word of mouth, perhaps.

It is also highly probable that Charlot was unaware of the fact that many of the features of the animated cartoon, so deeply influenced by one-reel comedy, had originated, at one step deeper into the past, in French cinema. Yet it is a fact that

rapid chases, evasions, disguises, unveilings, vanishings, collisions, and many other formulas of rapid fire slapstick comedy were first employed in film by French masters of short farces.

They took their devices wherever they could find them—in variety and vaudeville, circuses and clown traditions, travelling shows, medicine shows, and so on. These then became the staple of such studios as Chaplin's and Keystone in the United States and later, as we have said, of the animated cartoon—which was able as a consequence of its techniques to carry the wildest episodes of through-the-wall profiling of crashed heroes and the like far beyond the possibilities afforded to actors and cameras. Although Charlot, in the nature of the case, does not mention these conventions, it is fair to say that he must have been aware of them and gave them his tacit approval as strategies of comic art in his lectures.

Precisely because Charlot was so sensitive and articulate with respect to the viewpoints conventionally employed by painters, cameras, and viewers in various narrative and dramatic situations, we might well point out his failure to comment on the relation between the camera work and editing of cinema in general and that of the animated film. It has already been pointed out that cinema learned to use montage, cut, pan, fade, and other camera and cutting devices fairly early and made them a basic part of the film language. On the face of it, no such opportunities for the development of such a visual vocabulary is presented to the maker of animated films. In such films the camera-eye is fixed and slowly takes pictures frame by frame, of what has been supplied by the draftsman; when the images are assembled and sent through a projector at the proper speed, *they* give the effect of natural bodily motion. As a result, while animated cartoons often used pans, close-ups, vertical up and down shots, and other such cinema devices, these are *drawn* into the pictures by artists imitating cinema, not directly *generated* as they are in cinema camera work and film editing. Extended comments from Charlot on the consequences of this shift in the method of dramatizing viewpoints could possibly have been quite illuminating.

In conclusion, these lectures remain, richly enough, one of our few records of an encounter between the mind of a fine artist and the trade of a popular artist in the twentieth century. It is true that there may be similar records in the letters of Feininger, who was both a fine modernist and a comic strip artist; or in interviews with Warhol; or in the comments of Braque, who used immemorial folkish house-painter's techniques in producing a canvas—or earlier, of course, in the annals of Daumier, who achieves greatness both as a painter and as a satiric cartoonist in the lithograph medium. But the completeness and magnanimity of Charlot's approach to the animated cartoon remains interesting because it ticks off so many of the semiotic points that connect—and disjoin—fine art and popular art. For that reason, his remarks are worthy of close reading by anyone interested in the artistic development of the twentieth century. In a general cultural sense, moreover, their sympathetic look at the characters and enactments of animated cartoons is a gracious celebration of their comically constructed compassion for the heroism of everyday life.