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No Two Alike: Karl Blossfeldt, Francis Bruguière, Thomas Ruff is a curated exhibition for the 2018 FotoFocus Biennial: Open Archive. Now in its fourth iteration, the Biennial spans over 90 projects at museums, galleries, and universities across Greater Cincinnati; Northern Kentucky; Dayton and Columbus, Ohio; and features more than 400 artists, curators, and educators. The Open Archive theme emphasizes the centrality of photography and lens-based art to modernism, and examines our fundamental need to preserve photographs and to tell stories through their collection, organization, and interpretation.

Karl Blossfeldt (1865–1932)

Unless otherwise indicated, the photographs by Karl Blossfeldt are from the holdings of the Karl Blossfeldt Archive/Ann and Jürgen Wilde Foundation, Pinakothek der Moderne, Munich. All photographs are vintage gelatin silver prints; they were created over a period of three and a half decades, from 1898 to 1932. Dates provided are approximations based on publication dates. The prints were probably made in the 1920s in the context of exhibitions and the first editions of Blossfeldt’s books Urformen der Kunst (1928, translated as Art Forms in Nature, 1929) and Wundergarten der Natur (1932, translated as Art Forms in Nature. Second Series, 1932). Plate numbers refer to these two publications. With few exceptions all the motifs or variants thereof were on display in the 1929 Warren Gallery show.

Delphinium. Larkspur, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11 13/16 × 9 3/16 in. (29.7 × 23.7 cm)
Art Forms in Nature, pl. 45

Silphium laciniatum. Rosinweed, compass plant, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11 13/16 × 9 3/16 in. (29.7 × 23.7 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 41

Equisetum hyemale. Rough horsetail, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23 3/4 × 9 3/16 in. (59.6 × 23.6 cm)
Art Forms in Nature, pl. 2a

Equisetum arvense. Field horsetail, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23 3/4 × 7 3/16 in. (59.7 × 18.7 cm)

Vicia faba. Broad bean, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23 3/4 × 5 15/16 in. (59.5 × 14.8 cm)

Eryngium bourgatii. Eryngo, sea holly, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23 3/4 × 11 13/16 in. (59.7 × 30 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 32

Deiphinium. Larkspur, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23¾ x 9¾ in. (59.7 x 23.8 cm)

Cornus nuttallii. Dogwood, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23¼ x 7½ in. (59.3 x 18.7 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 15b

Dipsacus laciniatus. Teasel, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23¾ x 9¾ in. (59.8 x 25 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 44

Aristolochia clematitis. Birthwort, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.6 x 23.7 cm)

Equisetum hyemale. Rough horsetail, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23¾ x 9¾ in. (59.6 x 23.7 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 3a

Cucurbita. Pumpkin, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 4¾ in. (29.7 x 11.9 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 53a or c

Cucurbita. Pumpkin, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 4¾ in. (29.7 x 11.9 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 53a or c

Phacelia tanacetifolia. Lacy phacelia, blue tansy, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.8 cm)
Art Forms in Nature, pl. 98

Cucurbita. Pumpkin, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 4¾ in. (29.8 x 12 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 53a or c

Cucurbita. Pumpkin, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 4¾ in. (29.8 x 12 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 53a or c

Salvia argentea. Silver sage, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.9 x 23.7 cm)

Phacelia congesta. Blue curls, prior to 1932
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.8 x 23.8 cm)
Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Pinakothek der Moderne, Munich

Aquilegia chrysantha. Columbine, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.8 x 23.8 cm)

Cucurbita. Pumpkin, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.8 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 53a or c

Acanthus mollis. Bear’s breech, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.7 cm)

Cornus nuttallii. Dogwood, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
23⅝ x 7½ in. (59.3 x 18.7 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 15b

Aquilegia chrysantha. Columbine, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.8 x 23.8 cm)
Art Forms in Nature, pl. 95

Phacelia congesta. Blue curls, prior to 1932
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.8 x 23.8 cm)
Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Pinakothek der Moderne, Munich

Art Forms in Nature, Second Series, pl. 41

Salvia argentea. Silver sage, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.9 x 23.7 cm)

Acanthus mollis. Bear’s breech, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.7 cm)

Salvia argentea. Silver sage, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.9 x 23.7 cm)

Acanthus mollis. Bear’s breech, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.7 cm)

Art Forms in Nature, pl. 92

Salvia argentea. Silver sage, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.9 x 23.7 cm)

Acanthus mollis. Bear’s breech, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.7 cm)

Art Forms in Nature, pl. 99

Salvia argentea. Silver sage, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.9 x 23.7 cm)

Acanthus mollis. Bear’s breech, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.7 cm)

Art Forms in Nature, pl. 95

Salvia argentea. Silver sage, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.9 x 23.7 cm)

Acanthus mollis. Bear’s breech, prior to 1928
Gelatin silver print
11¼ x 9¾ in. (29.7 x 23.7 cm)

Art Forms in Nature, pl. 99
**Papaver orientale. Oriental poppy, prior to 1932**
Gelatin silver print
11\(\frac{3}{16}\) × 9\(\frac{3}{16}\) in. (29.7 × 23.8 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 104b

**Impatiens glandulifera. Indian balsam, prior to 1926**
Gelatin silver print
11\(\frac{3}{16}\) × 9\(\frac{3}{16}\) in. (29.7 × 23.8 cm)
Art Forms in Nature, pl. 19

**Impatiens glandulifera. Indian balsam, prior to 1926**
Gelatin silver print
11\(\frac{3}{16}\) × 9\(\frac{3}{16}\) in. (29.3 × 23.7 cm)
Art Forms in Nature, pl. 27

**Achillea umbellata. Yarrow, prior to 1928**
Gelatin silver print
11\(\frac{3}{16}\) × 9\(\frac{3}{16}\) in. (29.9 × 23.6 cm)
Variant of Art Forms in Nature, pl. 37
Francis Bruguière (1879–1945)

The photographs by Francis Bruguière are vintage gelatin silver prints from the collection of the George Eastman Museum, Rochester, and the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles. They were not dated by the artist, the given dates are thus approximations based on exhibition or publication dates. A large number selected for the exhibition was published in Francis Bruguière, Lance Sieveking, Beyond This Point (London: Zwemmer, 1929). The 1929 Warren Gallery exhibition list mentions fourteen unspecified photographs from this publication and fourteen unspecified papercuts listed as “Various Designs”, as well as seven staged stills from an unrealized film project, The Way, not included in this exhibition.

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1929
Gelatin silver print
9⅜ × 7⅜ in. (23.8 × 18.9 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller
Beyond This Point, p. 57

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9¾ × 7⅞ in. (24.7 × 19.3 cm)
The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles
Beyond This Point, p. 29

[Experiment], ca. 1926
Gelatin silver print
9⅜ × 7⅞ in. (23.8 × 18.9 cm)
George Eastman Museum, museum accession
Beyond This Point, p. 107
[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9 3/16 × 7 5/16 in. (23.3 × 18.5 cm)
The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9 3/16 × 7 5/16 in. (23.3 × 18.5 cm)
The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1926
Gelatin silver print
9 9/16 × 7 11/16 in. (24.3 × 19.5 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9 3/16 × 7 5/16 in. (23.3 × 18.5 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9 3/16 × 7 5/16 in. (23.3 × 18.5 cm)
The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9 3/16 × 7 5/16 in. (23.3 × 18.5 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1929
Gelatin silver print
13 3/16 × 10 13/16 in. (33.6 × 26.3 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1921/22
Toned gelatin silver print
13 3/16 × 10 13/16 in. (34.1 × 26.4 cm)
The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9 9/16 × 7 11/16 in. (23.6 × 18.7 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1927
Gelatin silver print
9 3/16 × 7 5/16 in. (23.6 × 18.7 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller

[Cut-paper abstraction], ca. 1929
Gelatin silver print
13 3/16 × 10 13/16 in. (33.6 × 26.3 cm)
George Eastman Museum, gift of Rosalinde Fuller

Variant of Beyond This Point, p. 159
Thomas Ruff (*1958)

All works by Thomas Ruff © Thomas Ruff. Courtesy David Zwirner, New York/London/Hong Kong
This exhibition is organized in collaboration with the Ann and Jürgen Wilde Foundation, Pinakothek der Moderne, Munich. Additional support provided by the Robert Mapplethorpe Foundation.

No Two Alike: Karl Blossfeldt, Francis Bruguière, Thomas Ruff (Verlag für moderne Kunst) is published on the occasion of the FotoFocus Biennial 2018 and the exhibition at the Contemporary Arts Center, Cincinnati.

Films

Francis Bruguière, Oswe Blakeson, Light Rhythms (1930)
35mm motion picture film transferred to digital file, black and white, silent, 5 minutes


Special thanks to Roger and Shirley Horrocks, Bruce Posner

Courtesy “Unseen Cinema: Early American Avant-Garde Film 1894–1941,” a collaborative film preservation project of Anthology Film Archives and Deutsches Filmmuseum generously supported by Linerci, Inc. www.unseen-cinema

Books and Journals


Francis Bruguière, Lance Sieveking, Beyond This Point. London: Duckworth, 1929, with dustjacket. The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, The Manfred Heiting Book Collection, museum purchase funded by the Caroline Wiess Law Accessions Endowment Fund

Francis Bruguière, Lance Sieveking, Beyond This Point. London: Duckworth, 1929. The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles

Lance Sieveking, Scrapbook. 1929. The Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN


No Two Alike: Karl Blossfeldt, Francis Bruguière, Thomas Ruff

Ulrike Meyer Stump

“No two alike” we say, awed by snowflakes, whose microscopic crystals display an infinite variety of forms. Yet “no two alike” also stands for nature’s absolute diversity, a wealth of forms that fill us with wonder each new spring. And it is the theme of this exhibition that brings together three artists whose work constantly revolved or still revolves around variations on themes: Karl Blossfeldt (1865–1932), Francis Bruguière (1879–1945), and Thomas Ruff (b. 1958).

Blossfeldt’s enlargements of plant details, which the German sculptor and photographer produced from the 1890s to 1930 as teaching materials for his class in plant modeling, are a vast inventory of vegetal forms. Again and again, Blossfeldt, a relentless perfectionist, photographed different specimens of a species until he found the ideal form. The American Bruguière lived in England from 1927 to 1945 and experimented for years with multiple exposures and light compositions, all of them similar and none the same. In his film Light Rhythms (1930), piano variations specially composed for the film accompany his photographic light designs as one image after another dissolves almost imperceptibly into the next. Finally, the German artist Thomas Ruff, who works in series, experiments in his large-format photograms with photographic abstraction as did Bruguière. Ruff’s photograms are unique and at the same time related to their Modernist precursors. In addition, in his Negatives series he tests out the negative as an artistically viable counterpart to the positive, reinterpreting both famous and unfamiliar material from the history of photography, from Blossfeldt to scientific photographs in the field of particle physics.

Astonishingly, Blossfeldt’s enlargements of plants and Bruguière’s light abstractions came together while both artists were still alive—in a show at Dorothy Warren’s small avant-garde London gallery in November 1929. This unique historical encounter of two photographers who were so different yet similar is being restaged as part of the exhibition No Two Alike in the extended Lower Gallery of the Contemporary Arts Center, Cincinnati. In the context of the 2018 FotoFocus Biennial, the Lower Gallery becomes an Open Archive so that historical material can be shown in this institution otherwise devoted to contemporary art. From the main hall, where Thomas Ruff’s large-format color Photograms series is on view, the visitor descends a short broad stairway to the Lower Gallery, entering a different epoch, when two photographers addressed themes that Ruff’s works reference directly or indirectly. The viewer gains insight into the image memory of a contemporary artist who engages with the history, techniques, aesthetics, and mediatization of photography in his work. Via a narrow ramp at the far end of the gallery, the visitor reascends to a space where she is met again by Blossfeldt motifs in Ruff’s small-format Negatives (2015). A separate catalog volume devoted to the restaging of the Blossfeldt/Bruguière encounter (Karl Blossfeldt and Francis Bruguière: The Dorothy Warren Show) is complemented by a volume on Thomas Ruff (Thomas Ruff: Photograms, Negatives, and Counterparts). Both volumes contain Blossfeldt’s images—accompanying Bruguière’s photographs in the one, as counterparts to Ruff’s Negatives in the other.

The 1929 Warren Gallery show in London celebrated the publication of Blossfeldt’s Art Forms in Nature (London: Zwemmer, 1929) and Bruguière’s Beyond This Point (London: Duckworth, 1929). The unusual association of image and text in the latter, a collaboration between Bruguière and the British radio writer Lance Sieveking (1896–1972), was perceived by critics as highly modern. Blossfeldt’s Art Forms in Nature was the English edition of his Urformen der Kunst, a large-format book of rotogravure prints published a year earlier in Berlin that was exceptionally successful in Germany. The galleryist Dorothy Warren (1896–1954) showed unknown young British artists as well as curiosities from the applied arts and was in touch with the London artistic and literary avant-gardes. Her eclectic program included artists who in later years became some of England’s most respected painters and sculptors: Paul Nash, for example, and Henry Moore, who held his first solo show in the Warren Gallery in 1928. In the summer preceding the Blossfeldt/Bruguière exhibition, the gallery came to public notice when a show of paintings by D. H. Lawrence...
was targeted by London’s vice squad. The matter attracted press attention and brought to the gallery thousands of visitors. Yet today the Warren Gallery, which ran for just a handful of years from 1927 to 1934, has been all but forgotten. When displayed genuine entrepreneurial courage and vision in bringing together Blossfeldt’s legendary plant photographs and Bruguière’s experimental multiple exposures and light abstractions. The full scope of their influence on British Modernism and its interest in biomorphism and abstraction only becomes clear with the present restaging of that encounter.

According to Walter Benjamin in his 1928 review of Urformen der Kunst, Blossfeldt’s artistic concept was the variant. For Benjamin, the 120 plates in the book engaged with basic forms that were manifested in Blossfeldt’s highly enlarged and formally abstract plant motifs: “From every calyx and every leaf inner pictorial laws leap out at us, retaining in all phases and stages of creation the final word as metamorphoses.” He took the idea yet deeper, raising it to the status of a general creative principle ruling nature:

This touches on one of the deepest, most unfathomable forms of the creative, on the variant that was always, above all others, the form of genius, of the creative collective, and of nature. This is the fruitful, dialectical opposite of invention: the natura non facit saltus of the ancients. One might, with a bold supposition, name it the feminine and vegetable principle of life. The variant is submission and agreement, that which is flexible and that which has no end, the clever and the omnipresent.3

Benjamin compared Blossfeldt’s unceasing differentiation of form and his uniform pictorial composition (plant details are mostly symmetrical and centered against a neutral ground) with the eternal waxing and waning of nature—not the leap of invention but the adaptation of plant motifs to basic ornamental forms underlying this plant modeler’s rich photographic oeuvre. But Blossfeldt’s plant motifs also seem endlessly varied because they assumed so many different forms in his lifetime without significant change: modeled in clay, as plant ornaments in Jugendstil designs, teaching illustrations, reproductions in the illustrated press, and finally as Modernist art works.4

Bruguière, especially in his abstract paper-cut images, also labored certain themes over and over again. As he put it:

In making subjects of my own, I have used paper-cut designs brought into low relief, and lit, generally, by one small spot lamp of 250 watts; the same lamp has been placed in different positions through a series of exposures. The field is not limited to paper; any plastic material will answer the purpose. Then you can have the pleasure of making your own ‘unnatural’ world, to which it is not unpleasant to return if you are a photographer, and have been working daily with fashions, portraits, or advertising.5

Bruguière put together a world of his own, cutting lines and curves in paper, sometimes giving them anthropomorphic forms, then twisting and folding them. Shapes changed when he reunited with his scissors or just varied the light. After altering the lighting—his experience as a Broadway theater photographer made him an expert—photographed the paper-cuts. Of his working methods he wrote: “Photography is not easily mastered. One’s attitude to it should be one of continual questioning and dissatisfaction.” His multiple exposures—the portraits and nudes—also approach themes by means of questioning and dissatisfaction: “[Through] multiple exposure [...] compositions can be made in endless variety to suit individual taste.” Finally, his film Light Rhythms incorporated variation in its musical dimension. Produced with his friend, the film critic Osweill Blakeston (1907–1985), this “absolute” film made history as England’s first abstract movie.6 Under Blakeston’s supervision, The Architectural Review published a sequence of stills with samples from the film’s musical score by the young Australian composer Jack Elitt (1902–2001). In Light Rhythms, which combined Bruguière’s paper-cut work and the technique of superimposition, dissolves and fade-ins effect the transitions from one still to the next. As the title indicates, light brings rhythm and movement into the film, and it is supported by the piano. A diagram in The Architectural Review documents the light movements the photographer performed in each of the film’s five approximately one-minute movements, thus supplementing the musical score with a “light movement score.”7

Thomas Ruff, a onetime pupil of Bernd Becher and a leading figure of the Düsseldorf School, has always been a great admirer of Blossfeldt’s work. In his photograph Night, Blossfeldt (1994), Ruff paid his respect to the plant photographer. It is a night photograph of a façade panel on the Ricola building in Mulhouse by Herzog & de Meuron, which is decorated with a Blossfeldt motif. The same yarrow leaf motif appears in Ruff’s Negatives series in 2015, this time as a shimmering bluish image against a dark ground. It is not identical with the original Blossfeldt version yet similar, thus inviting visual comparison. The invitation to compare Ruff’s photograms and Bruguière’s late 1920s–early 1930s light abstractions, in contrast, is a curatorial decision prompted by the Bruguière/Blossfeldt show. Ruff does not orient himself on Bruguière’s paper-cuts but on other historical, abstract patterns, though as photograms they are technically different from Bruguière’s works. Ruff draws on, among other things, Arthur Siegel’s photograms, specimens of which are in Ruff’s private collection. Bruguière himself spoke of photograms as a further technique alongside his paper-cuts for producing “unnatural” photographs, describing the process:

There is the photogram, from which photography originated. It is accomplished by placing objects on sensitive paper or film and exposing a light above them or from different angles. The shadow of the objects is cast and remains light; or, if transparent or semi-transparent objects are used, beautiful designs of multiple tones are built up.8

Ruff transfers the original photographic process to a virtual computer darkroom. He places virtual—sometimes transparent—objects on artificial paper, illuminates them with virtual light sources, and adds color to the light. To attain the perfection of refraction and reflection required, his huge format images are rendered on a supercomputer in Jülich, Germany. Ruff’s hi-tech photograms are sometimes formally very similar to Bruguière’s works, yet Bruguière had only simple analog materials at his disposal.

Ruff’s proton images, on view with the Blossfeldt motifs of Ruff’s Negatives series in the show, point in a different way both to Blossfeldt’s and Bruguière’s works. They guide the microscopic gaze Blossfeldt directed at plant details toward the dimensions of the primal form of matter. Here the disintegration of a photon, a light particle, has been photographically captured in a bubble chamber. The electrons and positrons produced by the collision of the photon and a proton generate diverging spiral traces in a magnetic field. As in Bruguière’s images, what we see are light patterns representing basic physical laws. The patterns are formally akin to biological processes. Blossfeldt several times photographed the curling shapes of pumpkin tendrils and Ruff’s photograms also include a spiral motif. Microcosm and macrocosm are seen to coincide, and through the observation of similar basic forms they become comparable. As a commentator on Blossfeldt’s plant images wrote in Das Magazin in 1931:

The variety of forms in nature is infinitely great. Of the approximately two billion human beings who inhabit the Earth, no two are completely identical. The same is true of the entire world of plants and animals: variants and varieties of the basic types abound everywhere. Of course, there are far more varieties than species, more variants than basic forms.9
Our delight in nature’s variety stems from our fascination with the variant. The English mathematician D’Arcy Wentworth Thompson also observed this from studies of snowflakes and formulated to all intents and purposes an aesthetic of comparison: “The beauty of a snow-crystal depends on its mathematical regularity and symmetry; but somehow the association of many variants of a single type, all related but no two the same, vastly increases our pleasure and admiration.”

A buildup of similar images as in No Two Alike, viewed comparatively, enables us to define basic forms and discover variants. Perceiving similarities, locating and comparing minute distinctions, as the Blossfeldt scholar Gert Mattenklott observed in his aesthetics of the similar, are in themselves an intellectual operation: “Producing similarity is not the activity of a romantically-ideally defined subject, but the modus operandi of intelligence itself, if it is to avoid extinction in identity or alterity.”

Engaging with non-identical items, in other words, becomes especially interesting if it does not lead to complete alterity but to similarities that make us look more closely and notice more distinctions. Hence the exhibition title No Two Alike also plays with the idea that these three artists’ works are perhaps not so different after all, as that they display formal similarities and are based on similar underlying working methods. And if each artist’s work is in its own way a variant of the other two, this also raises the question: Perhaps no two are alike—but what about three?

Translation: Christopher Jenkin-Jones, Munich

Endnotes

1 Although this popular belief is questioned by scientists today; see Nancy Knight, “No two alike?,” in: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 69, no. 5 (1988), p. 496.


3 Ibid., p. 273.


6 Ibid., p. 33.

7 Ibid., p. 36.


10 Bruguière (1966), see n. 5, p. 36.


400 + ARTISTS
31 + DAYS
ART + EVENTS