Gradiva and Rrose Sélavy – A Comparative Study of Imaginings of the Feminine in Salvador Dalí and Marcel Duchamp

By Deborah Bürgel

The graceful walking figure of Gradiva arises from the fantasy of a literary hero. In his novella Gradiva. Ein pompejanisches Phantasiestück from 1903, Wilhelm Jensen recounts how the young archaeologist Norbert Hanold discovers an ancient relief that completely enchants him. The relief depicts a graceful young woman whom he calls Gradiva: ‘the woman who walks’. After the ancient poets, who titled the god of war heading for battle ‘Mars Gradivus’, the archaeologist regards the term as most apt to the posture and movement of the young woman. Hanold falls passionately in love with the figure, hanging a plaster cast of it in his apartment where he can view it every day. Both awake and dreaming, he becomes increasingly immersed in his imagination, and one day he believes that he sees her walking past his house – but she disappears before he can pursue her. The archaeologist decides to leave immediately for Italy, wandering restlessly, until, in the ruins of Pompeii, he finally and to his total confusion encounters “Gradiva”. In the end he is beguiled by Gradiva – and she turns out to be a young woman of his acquaintance from his neighbourhood. So the figure of Gradiva arises in his imagination. Starting from a work of art, her admirer creates a fantastic being, and in his imagination the figure comes to life.
The sculpture that elicited this projection is a fragment of a Neo-Attic Roman semi-relief, believed to be a copy of a Greek original from the 4th century BCE. It is part of a composition in which a group of three women – the Aglauridae, dispensers of the nocturnal dew – walks from right to left. The Gradiva fragment can now be seen in the Museum Chiaramonti in Vatican City.²

It was Carl Gustav Jung who drew this novella to the attention of Sigmund Freud, who then, in his essay Der Wahn und die Träume in W. Jensens ‘Gradiva’ (1907),³ investigated this literary constellation as a psychiatric case, in an attempt to explain how external stimuli can bring to the surface the most deeply hidden psychological tension. A plaster cast of this relief fragment hung in Freud’s consulting room in his practice at Berggasse 19 in Vienna, directly beside his famous couch. Freud’s study made Gradiva into a modern mythological figure. In later years, it
attracted the interest of the Surrealists. His essay struck a chord with them, and before long Grádiva was haunting the dreams and works of the Surrealists.

As an example, in 1937 André Breton named the gallery he opened in Paris for a brief period Grádiva, with each letter of the name also standing for a surrealist muse (Gisèle, Rosine, Alice, Dora, Iñes, Violette, Alice), and accentuating the word ‘Diva’ in the lettering on the façade by capitalising the “D”.

Marcel Duchamp designed the entrance to the gallery – which took the form of the incised silhouette of a closely-entwined couple – as a rite of passage for the visitor and at the same time as a clear reference, not just because of its material, to his Large Glass. Paul B. Franklin has shown, using the correspondence of Salvador Dalí, that the influence of the Catalanian artist on the conception and design of Breton’s Grádiva gallery was far more
significant than previously assumed, and should perhaps also be seen in the context of Dalí’s
fascination with the projection of the female figure.⁵

In this essay I wish to compare and contrast Dalí’s projection of Gradiva with Duchamp’s
invention Rrose Sélavy and thus explore a common thread in the works of both artists, who were
also friends.⁶ I will endeavour to outline the parallels and the differences in the constellations of
painter and model, inventor and invention, interpreting Gala-Gradiva and Rrose Sélavy as
artistic strategies.

The literary figure of Graziva lived not only in the imaginary world of Breton, but also
even a few years earlier in the work of Salvador Dalí, as can be seen from some drawings and
paintings of the 1930s and early 1970s.⁷ These show a female figure with long hair, clad in just a
hint of a robe, stepping out gracefully. Sometimes she even appears in double. And she can easily
be spotted in works that do not bear her name in the title.
Dalí presumably read Jensen’s novella and subsequently Freud’s interpretative essay when it first appeared in French translation in Paris 1931. After reading them, he titled his drawing of a dual figure of a woman in pencil and ink “Gradiva”; this is now in the collection of The Dalí Museum, St Petersburg, Florida [Fig. 3]. It remains unclear whether the two bare-breasted figures with their heads turned far to the right between pleasure and suffering and their arms crossed behind their bodies are lying or standing on a base that is not depicted. They are framed by a shadow, with their long hair flying upwards like flames. It is also unclear from the drawing whether it is their close-fitting – almost bondage-like – clothing or their searing skin that permits the gaze on or even into their bodies. Dalí repeated the image as a way of depicting the duplication of the Gradiva figure and the real woman in Hanold’s neighbourhood described in the novella. In his

Fig. 3: Salvador Dalí, *Gradiva*, c. 1930/1931, collection of The Dalí Museum, St Petersburg, Florida
autobiography he named her “the double of the mythological image of Gradiva”\textsuperscript{10} and appeared especially interested in the transition between the two. This also appears to be the reason why Gradiva repeatedly appears as a double figure in his images. This motif of the dual figure of a woman called “Gradiva” can also be found on the right side of the picture just above the centre in Dalí’s enigmatic unfinished oil painting from 1929–1932 titled \textit{L’homme invisible}.\textsuperscript{11} Since this painting was reproduced in 1931 without the dual figure, it is assumed that it was added by Dalí in late 1931 or in 1932.\textsuperscript{12}

![Fig. 4: Salvador Dalí, Gradiva, celle qui avance, 1939, present whereabouts unknown](image)

Another example is the drawing \textit{Gradiva, celle qui avance}, from 1939, executed in pencil, pen and watercolour [Fig. 4].\textsuperscript{13} This shows two diverging female forms in close-fitting,
transparent robes, against the background of a distant landscape, with which however they have no deeper connection. The image appears to be doubled; a few lines bind the two figures to each other just above the ground. The motif of walking is evidently interpreted existentially by Dalí here, since at the bottom right can be read a question, which translated means: “Gradiva, she who walks, whence does she come and where did she go? Gala Salvador Dalí 1939”. In the following I will look at the phenomenon of the double signature which was central to the relationship of Gala and Dalí.

Fig. 5: Salvador Dalí, *Gradiva*, 1938, Fundació Gala-Salvador Dalí, Figueres

Another clearly abstracted yet very dynamic drawing, titled *Gradiva*, executed in pen and ink a good year earlier, shows a single female figure [Fig. 5]. As she – like a perspective study –
is standing in empty space, she also gives an existential impression. Lines that in the area of her legs appear to sketch her robe, higher up form her body, which in the upward maelstrom of these lines simultaneously gains dynamism and appears gripped in a whirling dissolution.

Fig. 6: Salvador Dalí, *Gradiva retrouve les ruines anthropomorphes (fantaisie rétrospective)*, c. 1931–1932, Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid

The treatment of his oil painting *Gradiva retrouve les ruines anthropomorphes (fantaisie rétrospective)* from c. 1931–1932 also takes place in an existential void: here, Gradiva appears to consist almost entirely of her tightly-bound robe, which appears almost like bandages [Fig. 6]. She is not alone, but is seen in a close embrace with a secretive, yet hollow figure. This figure, however, has long blonde hair, similar to some of the depictions of Gradiva.

The silhouette of the two embracing figures also triggers memories of Marcel Duchamp’s entrance for Breton’s *Gradiva* gallery. It is striking that the motif of a couple turned towards each
other occurs repeatedly in many variations in Dali’s work, as for instance in his painting *William Tell* and *Gradiva* from 1932.\(^{16}\)

Dali’s depictions of Gradiva are inseparable from his wife Gala: the Catalan painter fell passionately in love with Gala Eluard in 1929.\(^{17}\) At that time, Gala – real name Elena Ivanovna Diakonova, daughter of an official from Moscow, born in Kazan in 1894\(^{18}\) – was the wife of the Surrealist poet Paul Eluard. A unique love affair soon developed between Gala and Dalí. Up until her death in 1982, he associated his life and artistic work extraordinarily closely with Gala, as can be seen from his declarations of love, “I love Gala more than my mother, more than my father, more than Picasso and even more than money.”\(^{19}\) From this point on, Gala dominated his life and his work, she assumed many roles and was not least also responsible for his major commercial success. Their relationship was practically symbiotic, as another comment by Dalí in a letter shows, “Gala and Dalí form a ‘sentimental monster’.”\(^{20}\)

![Fig. 7: Salvador Dalí, frontispiece to *La Femme Visible*, 1931, collection of The Dalí Museum Archives,](image-url)
As already mentioned, Dalí had read Jensen’s novella shortly after meeting Gala, and he saw her as a kind of reincarnation of the ancient figure. Dalí even called his wife Gradiva, referring to her as ‘Gradiva Rediviva’\textsuperscript{21}, and dedicated his autobiography *The Secret Life of Salvador Dalí*, published in 1942, “To Gala–Gradiva, the one who advances”.\textsuperscript{22} In it, he wrote of Gala: “She was destined to be my Gradiva, ‘she who advances,’ my victory, my wife.”\textsuperscript{23}

Dalí used his wife Gala for many projections throughout his life.\textsuperscript{24} He turned her into an art object, the object of his obsessions: in the following decades, as well as Gradiva, Gala is turned by Dalí in his paintings for instance into Galarina,\textsuperscript{25} the *Madonna of Port Lligat*,\textsuperscript{26} Galatea\textsuperscript{27} and Leda.\textsuperscript{28} All this shows that Gala was far more than a muse, for Dalí projected numerous associations, mythical figures and female roles onto her, in some cases layered upon one another;\textsuperscript{29} similar to the metamorphic figure of Gradiva, “Gala represents the very possibility of metamorphosis, of becoming, rather than being.”\textsuperscript{30} Eventually she even became his queen or mistress: in later years Dalí gave Gala the Castle of Púbol; she accepted it, however on the condition that he could only visit on her invitation. This thrilled Dalí and he then compared Gala with her impenetrable fortress.\textsuperscript{31} He played with distancing his counterpart from himself.

Comparison with Marcel Duchamp and his creation Rrose Sélavy also shows that the complex relationships of each of the artists to their female fantasies and counterparts is always a refined way of playing with visibility and invisibility. The title of the first double portrait of Dalí and Gala, *L’homme invisible*, the oil painting which features the double form of Gradiva, plays on this, for here the man is described as invisible, complementary to the visible woman as the painter presented Gala in his art book *La Femme Visible*, published in Paris in 1930 [Fig. 7].
In a number of staged photographs Dalí and Gala present themselves together with his works, for instance in Cecil Beaton’s portrait of the loving couple with the paired canvases *Couple with Their Heads Full of Clouds* (1936)\textsuperscript{32} which in turn have the forms of lovers turned towards one another. The two portraits, astonishingly neither showing a human figure but simply a view of a table covered with a white tablecloth in the foreground of a wide, bright desert landscape under an open sky, give rise to associations with Duchamp’s *Gràdià*. It would perhaps be worth investigating whether he might have been inspired somehow by Dalí’s work. In the year that this unusual double portrait was created, Cecil Beaton took photographic portraits of Gala and Dalí standing behind the two painted portraits hanging on thin cords. These were
particularly dramatic images owing to the effects of the lighting, the intimate connection of the two lovers and their theatrical gestures [Fig. 8].

This provokes questions that can barely be answered: are these here two artists with both their works? A collaboration? Or is it the old constellation of the artist with his female muse and his work? Of course it is impossible to decide for sure here, but in other cases the attribution appears clearer, because some drawings and paintings suggest a collaboration, as Dalí repeatedly signs with “Gala Salvador Dalí” – for instance the Couple with Their Heads Full of Clouds. Therefore in these cases Gala appears simultaneously as muse, model and co-author of some works. As for example in Dalí’s oil painting from around 1944, One Second Before the Awakening from a Dream Provoked by the Flight of a Bee Around a Pomegranate, a painting as famous as it is complex and puzzling, and which also bears a double signature: “GALA / Salvador DALÍ”. In his Unspeakable Confessions, Dalí explains his habit of providing his works with a double signature, “In signing my paintings Dalí–Gala, all I did was to give a name to an existential truth, since without my twin Gala I would no longer exist.” In her book published in 2010, Drawing on Art. Duchamp and Company, Dalia Judovitz shows that Dalí’s duplication of himself is a radical gesture of redefining authorship in the modality of the multiple, and by it he appropriates and redeploy Rrose Sélavy – however viewing her merely as an “artistic persona and signature” and not as Duchamp’s artistic strategy.
This phenomenon of the double signature can also be found in some works of Marcel Duchamp: For instance, the miniature of a model window from 1921 bearing the title *La Bagarre d’Austerlitz* has the two signatures “Marcel Duchamp” and “Rrose Sélavy” on the two narrow sides [Fig. 9, 10]. This associates both their names at the same time as distancing them. *La Bagarre d’Austerlitz* unfolds an interplay of man and woman, which is similarly mysterious and vague as that between Dalí and Gala-Gradiva.

Who is Rrose Sélavy? Rose Sélavy – originally with just one ‘R’ in her cryptic forename, later adding a second ‘R’ to suggest a pun – first made a noise in the world in New York in 1920 as the copyright holder of another miniature window, *Fresh Widow*. She appeared to be an artist. For many years she signed various objects, such as the model windows or a bottle of
perfume with the title *Belle Haleine – Eau de Voilette*. She also worked as an illustrator, filmmaker, editor and designer, and published plays on words in her own publications and avant-garde journals. Her varied activities and “manifestations” spanned the entire range of the new artistic potential for expression. The diversity of the forms of her authorship remained characteristic.

In 1968, the year of his death, Duchamp – or Rrose Sélavy? – wrote three times like a magical formula “éros c’est la vie” and signed it with her name [Fig. 11]. Its decoding thus decorates the cover of a text on Duchamp’s famous cryptic major work *La mariée mise à nu par ses célibataires, même* (*The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors, Even*), also known as *The
Large Glass, with which Rrose Sélavy is extremely closely intertwined. Duchamp formulated his credo with the name of his invention Rrose Sélavy: éros c’ est la vie.45

However, in fact, Rrose Sélavy was not a real person but an invention of the artist Marcel Duchamp. It was he who turned himself into a woman, it was he who created a female artist, who – also working with him – signed works, and a publisher who edited works – including their joint works; he played on her in titillating or cryptic wordplays, and he repeatedly posed dressed as her for Man Ray’s camera.

Fig. 12: Man Ray, Marcel Duchamp as Rrose Sélavy, 1921, private collection

In 1921 she finally appeared publicly in several photographic portraits. Rrose Sélavy is seen for the first time in a portrait series taken by Man Ray in New York, just a few months after
her first signature. The starkly contrasting photographs present Duchamp as an elegant, secretive lady [Fig. 12]. Her pale painted face, thin lips, and string of pearls around the throat are framed by the deep contrast of a black plumed hat sitting deeply over her darkly-ringed eyes, almost hiding them, along with a thick wig and a soft, wide, padded collar, fastened with a brooch. She stares out defiantly. Her face is not distinctively feminine, although jewellery, hairstyle, hat and collar identify her as a woman and at the same time emphasise the sly artificiality of the clothing. The masquerade is used as a strategy to question both gender identity and artist’s identity at the same time.

Fig. 13: Marcel Duchamp, *Rrose Sélavy*, c. 1921, photograph by Man Ray retouched by the artist, private collection
A second series taken by Man Ray the same year in Paris shows Duchamp in slightly differing variations as Rrose Sélavy [Fig. 13]. In comparison to the images in the first portraits, which recall the Belle Époque and appear slightly theatrical because of the clothing, these photographs focus far more on contemporary fashion and the current stereotype of the seductive, emancipated woman of the modern New York of the early 1920s. She resembles a femme fatale, moving elegantly and attractively through urban life. This series of photographs again shows Duchamp, now with dark-painted lips and shadowed eyes, wearing a fashionable hat decorated with a striking hat band and a fur stole which Rrose Sélavy wraps around herself with an elegant protective gesture, hiding and presenting her face at the same time. Head tilted slightly, she gazes at the viewer confidently.

In contrast to the earlier rather more transvestite portraits, which still clearly show Duchamp, he can barely be recognised in these photographs. In this second series of portraits he endeavours skilfully to achieve the most female appearance possible. His friend Germaine Everling ‘lent’ him not only her hat but also her hands, and Duchamp retouched some of the photographs.

Through play-acting and masquerade, Duchamp cleverly associated photography – the medium that claims to represent the facts – with fiction. In this way he made innovative and imaginary self-portraits and created a new identity. All these variants of a “portrait of the artist as female counterpart” as different as they are, gave Rrose Sélavy a visual presence and affirmed her existence. So the invented identity was turned into a personality. At the same time, these portraits of Duchamp are a projection: he projects his image as Rrose Sélavy.
By posing as a woman before the camera of the photographer Man Ray, Duchamp cites the traditional role of the female model in art and the muse as a source of creative energy. Like the literary figure of Gradiva, this model is an invention, a projection of the artist on his female counterpart, which is often not much more than an object, a picture-subject, a surface for the projections of the male artist’s view. So, Duchamp takes up an old motif of painting here – without painting. A classic motif of the studio picture shows the scene of a man painting a woman – he shapes her according to the archetype, and at the same time creates her according to his ideas. Luke the Evangelist, who is said to have painted the Madonna, is the prototype of this relationship. In a self-portrait, the painter and the model merge into one unit. Duchamp invented himself as his model, in these photographs he is both subject and object of the picture. The artist himself becomes the picture.

The relationship of painter and model has also always had erotic connotations – as Dalí’s numerous depictions of Gala obviously show too. The dazzling associations of the name Rrose Sélavy refer to Venus, female beauty as a classical subject of painting, as well as the erotic aspects of nude painting and the relationship between painter and model. However, since the male artist always shows through in the portraits of Rrose Sélavy, she is an alternative to the classical ideal of the female nude in art and to the concept of a subjugation of woman to the view of the man – regardless of how aware she may be. In his sophisticated and complex, unfinished picture Dalí de dos peignant Gala vue de dos éternisée par six cornées virtuelles provisoirement réfléchies par six vrais miroirs, c. 1972–1973, Dalí dealt with this theme self-reflectively by showing himself and Gala, that is painter and model, firstly in their roles and secondly – extraordinarily – united as a couple in the mirror image.
The theme of painter and model always refers simultaneously to voyeurism as a prerequisite for the picture, a theme that Duchamp takes up time and again intensively.\(^6^8\) The combination of a portrait of Rrose Sélavy with a shot showing Duchamp looking through *La Bagarre d’Austerlitz* made by Man Ray in 1921 [Fig. 14] shows this clearly.\(^6^9\)

Marcel Duchamp and Rrose Sélavy – Salvador Dalí and Gala as Gradiva: the constellation of a male artist realising the female form and finally bringing it to life recalls the myth of Pygmalion as told by Ovid in the *Metamorphoses*. This is a poetic variation on the richly traditional idea of the vitality of the work of art: the sculptor Pygmalion creates the figure of a
woman in ivory and rouses this sculpture to life by the growing strength of his profound love and devotion as well as with the benevolent help of the goddess Aphrodite. So the story of Pygmalion combines crucial aspects of the essence of art, however not with regard to the deceptive realism of the mimetic imitation, but with regard to the ingenuity and free imagination of the artist, for the creation comes to life solely through his power of imagination. At the same time it is obvious that this allegory of the life-giving creative force of the artist Pygmalion equates to the long-standing picture of the genius artist creator.

In what could be called a model test arrangement, both Duchamp and Dalí transform profane figures into embodiments of their respective imaginings of the feminine: in the exhibition

Fig. 15: Marcel Duchamp, Mannequin (Rrose Sélavy) Rue aux Lèvres, ‘International Exhibition of Surrealism’, Galerie Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1938
held in 1938 in Paris at the Galerie Beaux-Arts run by Georges Wildenstein, which was organised by André Breton and Paul Eluard and designed by Duchamp in the role of an arbitrator, sixteen selected artists were invited, in addition to presenting their work – which in Duchamp’s case included *La Bagarre d’Austerlitz* – to dress a female mannequin provided to them. These mannequins stood in the exhibition room on fictional, surrealist streets with allusive names, which were promisingly announced as *Les plus belles rues de Paris* in the invitation to the exhibition opening.

Rrose Sélavy revealed herself half-naked on the fictitious street *rue des lèvres*. Duchamp dressed his shop dummy in men’s clothes [Fig. 15]. The blonde locks of a wig bubbled out beneath a gentleman’s hat, framing a painted woman’s face. Although on top she wore respectable gentleman’s clothing, stuck in the breast pocket of her jacket was a small red electrical bulb, as was commonly used in red light areas at that time, and her lower body was naked, decorated only with the lettering “RROSE SÉLAVY” – like a tattoo – just above her pubic mound. Duchamp therefore dressed a woman as a man. The existing female mannequin was masculinised by the artist, and precisely by this action, in what you might call a reversal of the reversal, turned into Rrose Sélavy. Rrose Sélavy is half him, half her. In his strategic play with his female personification, Duchamp left gender boundaries far behind. At the same time he leaves it unclear whether the writing is to be understood as a signature, so that Rrose Sélavy should be understood as the originator of the figure, or whether it describes her identity, and therefore the mannequin were her first real embodiment. So Duchamp playfully combines authorship and sexuality, themes favoured by the Surrealists, while at the same time maintaining
a critical distance to the other mannequins and the fetishisation in the exhibition of the female body, which was not uncommon in surrealist art.81

Fig. 16: Salvador Dalí, *Mannequin*, ‘International Exhibition of Surrealism’, Galerie Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1938

Dalí was also engaged in the design of the exhibition as a special advisor, and submitted some works including *L’homme invisible*.82 He created a great stir with his *Rainy Taxi* which was installed in the inner courtyard and therefore practically greeted every visitor to the exhibition. Dalí was also one of the artists who was invited to dress a mannequin for the grand display on *Les plus belles rues de Paris*.83 Dalí’s mannequin was naked except for gloves, a kind of belt and a pink balaclava which was designed by Dalí’s frequent collaborator, Elsa Schiaparelli, and which only left narrow slits for eyes, nose and mouth [Fig. 16]. Over this she
wore a kind of dark bird’s head with large eyes on her head like a hat. Her hybrid appearance recalls African totem figures known as Minkisi. Below the knitted balaclava, roughly between her breasts, there was a smashed hen’s egg, and the rest of her body was decorated with teaspoons – as if not only the egg but the female figure were also there as a dessert to enjoy. In her hand she held a lightbulb similar to the one that Rrose Sélavy used. This light formed a link to an arrangement like a still life on a small table next to her, which also included his later famous Lobster Telephone. Behind her on the wall – similar to other mannequins – were signs and posters, and the shop dummy was also set off against the background of a lengthy handwritten text which had previously been wrapped around her body. With all this the figure was “developed into a narrative tableau”. During the period of the exhibition, Dalí also showed a very similar mannequin, however without balaclava but with more spoons, dressed in two-tone gentleman’s shoes (recollecting Duchamp’s figure Rrose Sélavy) and ornamented with a large flower, in a shop window in the rue du Faubourg Saint-Honoré, the same street where the Galerie Beaux-Arts was situated.

Aside from being based on the same initial form, both hybrid women’s figures have one thing in common – that they exemplify and embody the artistic themes and methods of both Dalí and Duchamp. With its complexity and mystery and the references to consumption and consumerism, Dalí turns his figure into a seductive object. Duchamp’s female figure is radically different to all other mannequins on the surrealist streets, for she is a man – and refers to an artist who has turned himself into a woman. In this ironic playing with the genders, the real provocation is his strikingly simple and – although half-naked – still almost mundane transvestite.
Recalling Pygmalion, the theme of bringing to life is realised in the imagination of the observer, at the same time as signalling the high degree of abstraction of his invention.

Gala-Gradiva and Rrose Sélavy accompanied Dalí and Duchamp respectively for decades. In comparison, there are clear parallels in these figures, but also distinctive differences that are revealed above all in the forms of their fiction and vividness – and in comparison with the literary figure of Gradiva: in his novella, Wilhelm Jensen described how, sparked by contemplation of a work of art, a female figure comes to life in the imagination of the archaeologist – and how this fiction eventually becomes one with a living woman. The ancient figure of Gradiva became a fantasy figure that overlay reality. The force of imagination of its observer transformed a work of art into a fictional character that occupied the fantasies of the young archaeologist. In his imagination Gradiva comes to life. The idea of the moving, living sculpture has fascinated artists and writers since antiquity, as can be seen from the myths of the sculptures of Daedalus or Pygmalion that come to life.

Each in different ways, Dalí and Duchamp set the static image of a figure in motion like Gradiva, turning her from a static image into a walking one, into ‘the woman who walks’, into a woman who steps into our lives and our imaginations.

In the art of Salvador Dalí, the literary figure gains life in the projections of the artist, and in merging with the real person Gala. He turns her into something other, into a reflection of himself, into a surface for the projection of his ideas. Yet she never becomes a completely independent figure separate from him.
Although he creates the impression with shared signatures and staging that Gala contributed to his artistic creations, the authorship clearly remains his. Despite his efforts to multiply the authorship and develop a refined game with Gala as muse, model and co-author, Dalí’s technical mastery of his art means that his work is in the end always tied to his person.

Marcel Duchamp on the other hand creates his counterpart himself, in Rrose Sélavy, and gives her an autonomous existence. Because Rrose Sélavy is entirely fictitious and derives solely from the imagination of the artist. He even distances himself from her, withdraws behind her and finally almost disappears behind her. At the same time, he maintains the separation between himself and the invented artist at all times, and therefore achieves an ambivalent relationship to his fictional character. In Rrose Sélavy Duchamp achieves the impossible, that is, to be present and absent at the same time. In this sense, Rrose Sélavy is entirely part of his central dual strategy of creation and denial. With Rrose Sélavy Duchamp for the first time transforms the figure of the artist in the visual arts completely into a fiction, a complete invention. This invented artist comes alive in the imagination of the observers, and it is they who, by connecting up all the clues scattered by Duchamp – her signatures and portraits, her authorship of texts and plays on words – produce the idea that the construct Rrose Sélavy is an artist. It is this shaping in the imagination that Dali describes in his *Unspeakable Confessions* as the central characteristic of the art of Duchamp, “Had I listened only to Duchamp, I should have burnt my brushes. […] The only solutions that interested him were imaginary.”87
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