

Article

Symbolism of the Goat and Its Presence in Picasso's Work

Cristóbal Macías Villalobos * and Delia Macías Fuentes

Department of Greek Philology, Arabic Studies, Linguistics, Documentation and Latin Philology,
University of Malaga, Campus de Teatinos, 29071 Malaga, Spain; deliamacias@uma.es

* Correspondence: cmacias@uma.es; Tel.: +34-952137530

Academic Editor: Enrique Mallen

Received: 28 August 2016; Accepted: 9 March 2017; Published: 5 April 2017

Abstract: To ancient men, goats, and all that was related to them, were associated with a burning sexuality, even with lasciviousness and lust, and connected with the deities Venus and Bacchus. In this case, this connection occurs through mythological creatures, like fauns and satyrs, all of them representations of an unbridled sexuality. On the other hand, goats were also considered as whimsical and unstable animals, whose behavior was very changeable, and in some contexts, as a symbol of Christ. This paper will show how many of these symbols are repeated in the representations of this animal in Picasso's works.

Keywords: goat; buck; lasciviousness; lust; capricious behavior; Christ; symbolism; Picasso

1. Introduction

Approaching the goat from a symbolic point of view entails the discovering of an animal that presents maybe the most impressive number of interpretations. Those are, of course, reflections of both literary and art forms from antiquity. In addition, the values attributed to that species are often dependent on the sex of the animal—see, for example, the varied symbolism related to the he-goat in opposition to the she-goat—or on the age of the animal. It is not the same, from this point of view, considering a fully-grown creature in the same way as considering a mild kid.

The main aim of this research is to depict the presence of the goat in Picasso's production. The first task will be to examine the different interpretations assigned to that animal from Greek and Roman classical works, and how those meanings were kept or either transformed during Early and Medieval Christendom, as well as during the Renaissance. Then, it will be necessary to address and to understand in depth the use that the painter from Malaga made of the caprine family.

2. Goat and Goat-Like Creatures' Characterization in the Literature and Art from Antiquity to the Modern Age

Concerning the morphology, nature and habits of the goat, it must be noted that it is a ruminant,¹ which is not endowed with a steady behavior, but with a changing nature and vividness (cf. [1], p. 574a, ll. 11–12). The goat, according to Thomas of Cantimpré ([2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 1–3), possesses a beard of sorts, long, thin horns, and it grazes in both valleys and mountains. It is also able to reach branches of trees with its mouth. To this, the author makes further comments ([2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 36–38) on the he-goat as a lively animal, belligerent and robust. Its main strength resides in its forehead and horns. Maybe due to their temperament, when grazing, goats do not remain in

¹ According to Aristotle ([1], p. 632b, ll. 1–3), ruminants are those animals who do not have two rows of teeth, like oxes, sheep or goats.

a fixed place, but rather, they soon move to other locations ([1], p. 596a, ll. 15–17). Goats and sheep are gregarious creatures since they usually lay down huddled together ([1], p. 611a, ll. 1–5). In addition, they are not adapted to low temperatures. Therefore, according to Aristotle ([1], p. 610b, l. 33), they are less able to cope with cold weather than sheep, while Pliny the Elder argues that cold makes them suffer from miscarriages ([3], bk. 8, par. 201).

Touching their behavior, presumably the most emphasized trait in the different sources is their hyper-sexuality. This, inevitably, has turned the figure of the goat, and particularly of the he-goat, into a symbol of lust and lechery. Hence, Isidore of Seville discusses that the he-goat is a lascivious and ardent animal, always willing to have sexual intercourse. He also mentions that the he-goat typically uses its horns to confront its enemies, i.e., to defeat them and to be able to mount females. So conspicuous is its lasciviousness that, as mentioned by the Saint, the animal would be entitled with its nomenclature (Latin *hircus*) because of its tendency to “look cross-eyed”, given its sexual debauchery ([4], bk. 12, ch. 1, par. 14).²

According to Isidore of Seville ([4], bk. 12, ch. 1, par. 14) another instance of the ardent nature of the animal is its own blood. Supposedly, it is able to dissolve the hard diamond, something unattainable either for fire or iron. This remarkable piece of information is repeatedly noted in later sources as, for example, Thomas of Cantimpré’s *Liber de nat. rer.* ([2], bk. 4, ch. 18, l. 38) or Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie’s *Bestiaire divin* ([5], p. 185)³, who mentions that diamonds are to be broken only by hitting them with iron mallets impregnated with the blood of a he-goat. It was necessary, in order to break diamonds, that the blood was warm.

Pliny ([3], bk. 8, par. 202) explains, after Archelaus, that goats do always suffer from fevers, the reason why they would be more ardent than sheep when copulating. This information is echoed in Medieval times by Thomas of Cantimpré ([2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 16–18). This characteristic made Piero Valeriano ([7], bk. 10, p. 72E) realize that fever was represented in hieroglyphics by means of an image of a goat, who is distinct for having a very fiery breath.

On his part, Ripa in his depiction of the sanguine complexion, portrays a kid with a bunch of grapes in its mouth, together with a happy young male, cheerful, with a thick body, blond hair and a rubicund (somehow whitish) aspect. The kid with the bunch of grapes means that the sanguine man is prone to the pleasures typical from Venus and Bacchus. The inclination towards Venus is represented by the young goat, this animal being quite lustful; the bunch is a symbol for Bacchus. About this, Aristotle notes that the sanguine man is prone to venereal appetites due to his semen superabundance ([8], vol. 1, pp. 201–02).

The final reason to assign such a carnal desire to the he-goat and to goats in general is that those animals, soon after they are born, are prepared to mate although their seminal fluid, due to its immaturity, was utterly infertile. Thus, Aristotle ([1], p. 545a, ll. 24–25) expresses that, in general, sheep and goats (specially the last ones) mate and get pregnant from their very first year.

Because of that very reason, Pierio Valeriano said that Egyptian priests preferred he-goats over bulls as representations of the lecherous man’s shameful and lewd actions. That is also why ancient statues related the animal to Venus, to whom it served as a mount ([7], bk. 10, p. 73A-B).

In the age of Bosch, goats and he-goats were considered as symbols of lust and witchcraft, not only for their association with Aphrodite and Dionysus, but also for their proneness to mate, for its natural instinct, almost from the moment in which they are born ([9], p. 18).

The exacerbated lust attributed to he-goats was so extreme that they even copulated with women ([10], bk. 7, par. 19).⁴ Herodotus ([11], bk. 2, par. 46), for his part, makes clear that in

² Isidore of Seville, in order to support that etymology, concludes that, according to Suetonius ([4], p. 58), *hirqui* is the name for the corner of the eyes from which those animals would receive their name.

³ The depiction of the he-goat found in Isidore of Seville’s work and the destructive power of its blood is also found in *Bestiario de Oxford* ([6], pp. 23–24, 32–33). In this case it is not diamond what that blood is able to dissolve but rather lodestone.

⁴ According to this author, the oversexual nature of he-goats is only comparable to that of the mandrill.

Egypt, specifically in Mendes, where he-goats were especially worshiped, one of those animals even mated a woman publicly.

Aelianus ([10], bk. 6, par. 42) describes some *contra naturam* liaisons that a young shepherd, Crathis, maintained with a goat. He treated the animal with the same affection and care he would employ with a girlfriend. Those relationships provoked the jealousy of the he-goat, leader of the flock. The animal saw the shepherd as a threat; thus, the he-goat dashed his head against the man, killing him. Further, because of these illicit sexual encounters, a hybrid creature was conceived. It had a human face, and the lower extremities were typical of a goat. That animal became a deity of woods and valleys. Of course, Aelianus' account may be understood as an etiological myth designed to explain the origin of satyrs and fauns.

On the other hand, there is still preserved a Greek-Cypriot statuette that represents a woman carrying a goat under her left arm and three pomegranates in her right hand ([12], vol. I, p. 191); this fruit is related to Dionysus and the Underworld (see the myth of Proserpina), and therefore, it is also connected to fertility ([13], p. 228). Clearly, those three elements (the woman, the goat, and the pomegranates) collude with each other to express unanimously the idea of lasciviousness and lust.

Horapollon noticed that Egyptians, in order to represent the idea of the "the prolific man's male member", resorted to the image of the he-goat instead to that of a bull ([14], p. 143). Bulls need to be at least one year old to be able to mate, while he-goats only need a week after being born to copulate, although its semen is utterly infertile.

Connected to the lasciviousness attributed to goats, it needs to be observed the reason why in Spanish the term "cabrón" (synonym for he-goat with pejorative connotations) is usually employed for the husband cuckolded by his wife. According to Pierio Valeriano ([7], bk. 10, p. 73E–F), the reason behind the usage of the term is that in goat corrals, the kid can only be recognized by its mother, because of its unstable, lascivious and changing behavior, in the same way hieroglyphics used the image of the he-goat to refer to the man whose children were only able to be accepted by their mother.

Also, related to sexuality in the case of goats, it is distinctive the strong odor of he-goats, mostly when mating. That smell emanates from the sebaceous glands of the animal located in the poll but, especially from its habit of soaking itself in its urine ([15], p. 77). The he-goat's stench began to be used figuratively to refer to underarm odor. Hence, Catullus ([16], poem 69, vv. 5–6) addresses a man called Rufus in order to explain that the rejection that his armpits generate in delicate girls is due to his "fierce he-goat", which inhabits the hollows of his armpits. This explains the existence of a series of terms, in both Greek and Latin, to name body odor. Those proceed from some terms that both languages used to denominate he-goats: among other, in Greek are to be found utterances such as *grasos*, *tragomaschalos* or *hypertragizō*; in Latin, the reader may find *hircosus* and *tragus* ([15], p. 77).

On their part, during Medieval Christendom, he-goats became embodiments of the men enslaved by vice. The expression of this notion can be seen in a gargoyles dating from the 15th century at Notre-Dame de Marais, in Villefranche-sur-Saône, and in a curious he-goat with a human head, sometimes represented as a statuette. This symbolic value would come precisely from the association between the "smell of a he-goat" with the lubricious and lascivious behavior of the animal ([12], vol. I, p. 184).

The second trait defining the animal, and which will be an endless source of symbolic values (mainly among Christians), is its employment in animal sacrifices.

In this respect, there are plenty of references in pagan literature. Thus, Homer, in [17], describes the sacrifice of young goats (as well as of lambs) to Hermes ([17], bk. 19, vv. 396–98). Among the Greeks, there was a version on the origin of Delphi as a cultural and prophetic center in which those animals played a role. Indeed, it is said that there was a shepherd, Coretas, who observed that while his goats were grazing close to mount Parnassus, their behavior was altered when they approached a crevice from which vapors emanated; they even danced. In fact, the shepherd himself, when approaching the

crack, began to predict the future ([18], p. 42)⁵. Aulus Gellius ([19], bk. 5, caps. 11–12) states that a goat, *ritu humano*, was sacrificed to the Roman god Vejovis, Apollo's copy. That locution, *ritu humano*, has been widely interpreted, both in the sense of sacrificing the goat instead of a human being or, as Festus asserts ([20], p. 91 L), it was a sacrifice made to honor a deceased person. He asserts that Romans understood "human sacrifice" as that performed for the dead. The problem here lies in the fact that goats did not serve as victims in mortuary practices ([19], p. 245, n. 66). In Pliny, not employing goats when offering a sacrifice to Minerva is justified ([3], bk. 8, par. 204). It was thought that if goats liked olive trees, the goddess' sacred tree, these would become infertile.⁶ In the same fashion, the relationship between the he-goat (*Τράγος* in Greek) and Dionysus is well-known since, among other things, the god was transformed into a kid by Zeus and given to Hermes to be taken far away from Greece. The transmuted god was taken to a country named Nysa, as he was fleeing from Hera's wrath. There, he was raised by nymphs, who would finally become an example of catasterismus as stars in the Hyades cluster ([22], p. 140 and [23], p. 181). The goat is, in addition, the animal sacrificed to the deity ([24], vv. 138–139), which entails a sort of identification with him. The practical relationship between the drama in Greece (tragedy, particularly) and the worship of the god Bacchus is renowned. This is also related to the he-goat, as the very term tragedy is usually interpreted as the "singing of he-goats", maybe about the singing of a choir of satyrs disguised as he-goats. Then, they intoned dithyrambs, a kind of choral dance devoted to the god Dionysus and performed by satyrs.⁷

Moreover, it is not to be forgotten that myth and art often show images of Aphrodite riding he-goats (cf. ([35], bk. 6, ch. 25, par. 1), where can be found a description of an Aphrodite by Scopas riding a he-goat), or bulls, symbol for the exceeded sexuality of the goddess, whose major "worldly" manifestation was the practice of sacred prostitution in those temples devoted to her ([36], pp. 410–411).

The sacrificial area also needs particular attention in the case of young goats, kids. They were considered as images of candor among the Greek population. At a sacrificial level, it seems that they deserved the same consideration as lambs or mouflons', roe deers', fallow deers' and deers' offspring ([12], vol. I, p. 186).

Maybe Hebrews developed the most proper sacrificial usage of the goat, as noted in biblical texts ([37], p. 80), like Lv 4:23, where the offering of an immaculate he-goat in an expiatory sacrifice is mentioned, or in Num 7:35, where five he-goats served as peace-offers [38–40].

A detailed analysis on the several excerpts in which caprine animals were offered to Yahweh, in particular the case of he-goats, shows that the reason behind those sacrifices was to expiate some sort of evil or sin, either of an individual or of the population; that is, they were used as expiatory sacrifices. The utterance "scapegoat" (*chivo expiatorio* in Spanish) is derived from that practice ([12], vol. I, p. 181; [41]).⁸

This kind of sacrifice followed strictly a complex ritual described thoroughly in Lv 16:7–11, 16:15–23. It constituted the essence itself of one of the principal religious feasts for ancient Hebrews, the "Day of Atonement".

The ritual began with two he-goats in front of the temple's door; one for Yahweh, another for Azazel.⁹ The priest, after confessing his sins and those of his home, sacrificed a heifer or a bullock

⁵ As this author points out ([18], p. 42), the version of the cultural origin of Delphi is referred in Diodorus Siculus's (*Bibliotheca historica*, bk. 16, par. 26); Pausanias (*Description of Greece*, bk. 10, ch. 5, par. 7); Plutarch (*Moralia*, p. 435d).

⁶ Cf. also Varro's work ([21], bk. 1, ch. 2, par. 19). Their biting was also considered to be highly damaging for trees. From that piece of information derives Pierio Valeriano's statement ([7], bk. 10, p. 72F). He provides a curious symbolic connotation, as he compares this harm to that triggered by prostitutes in young men due to their experience. From a hieroglyphical point of view, goats would be the symbol of harlots.

⁷ On the origin of tragedy, still to be evaluated properly, and on classical Greek theater, cf., among others, [25–34].

⁸ Haag et al. argue that in the Old Testament "to expiate" means to offer a compensation in exchange for an affront against God in order to achieve absolution ([41], cols. 669–670).

⁹ Virtually nothing is known on the meaning of this noun that, without a doubt, is a representation of an evil spirit. Its negative influence is lessened by means of a he-goat used as scapegoat (*chivo expiatorio* in Spanish, *caper emissarius* in Latin) during the "Day of Atonement". About this, cf. ([41], col. 188).

as a scapegoat, entered in the *sancta sanctorum* and burnt some incense. By means of the blood of the heifer, he expiated his own sins; after that, a he-goat devoted to Yahweh served to expiate people's sins. However, in addition, he imposed his hands over the he-goat's head (the one devoted to Azazel), confessed the people's faults and he transferred them to the head of the animal. Doing that, it was expelled in the desert. That way, it was supposed that sins would come back to the Devil, from whom they were engendered, as the desert was thought to be the place in which devils inhabited ([41], cols. 462–63); [42], pp. 225–26).

From the sacrificial practice of the scapegoat (*caper emissarius* in Latin) derive different symbolic uses, in particular its assimilation to the figure of Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, who was sacrificed by God in order to save men from sin ([43]; [44], pp. 106–7). This direct relationship between Christ and the scapegoat was already established in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (Christian treatise written in Greek, made up by approximately 22 chapters; it dates from the end of the first century or the beginning of the second century A.D.) ([45], ch. 7, par. 7–9); in Justin Martyr ([46], ch. 40, par. 4), Tertullian ([47], bk. 3, ch. 7) or Origen ([48], bk. 1, par. 31).

Of course, this identification was usual for a great number of biblical presenters and exegetes. It also had its reflection in art; see for example the notable painting by William Holman Hunt, *The Scapegoat*, from 1854, an oil on canvas, which is housed at the Manchester City Art Gallery [49–51].

It is also to be considered an alternative sacrificial use of the animal, which lacks a proper religious meaning: its presence in still-lives with symbolic connotations. They were one of the main manifestations of *memento mori*, clearly rooted in the Medieval times.¹⁰ This motif, as will be explained below, occupies a significant place in Picasso's production.

As in paganism, for Christendom, the kid also had a religious role and, accordingly, symbolic as well. From the start, a curious forbidding appearing in some Old Testament passages should be noted: the kid must not be boiled in its mother's milk, as seen in Ex 23:19, Ex 34:26 or Dt 14:21, which is sometimes interpreted as the need to not kill or sacrifice the kid while breastfed, since it is a cruelty.

The image of innocence evoked by the kid explains its use to represent the incarnation of Christ in some cases. According to the episode in Gen 27:1–29, Jacob, in order to achieve the benediction from his father Isaac, who was blind, impersonated hairy Esau covering himself with the skin of some young goats. From it appears the idea of Jesus Christ as being responsible for expiating those sins committed by men. To accomplish the task, he passed himself off as a man, Jacob also impersonated his brother Esau, covering himself with the furry skin of some kids ([12], vol. I, pp. 187–88).

The association between Christ and kids has another curious support. When in Ex 12:5, Moses describes the characteristics that the lamb should have that would be sacrificed at Easter, he admits that, in absence of it, they had the possibility of replacing it with a young goat (*hedum*, according to the Vulgate): “Erit autem agnus absque macula masculus anniculus iuxta quem ritum tolletis et hedum” (The lamb must be without blemish, a yearling male; if the rite is kept alive, you can also use a kid).

Another meaning assigned to he-goats in biblical texts is as leader of the flock, and from it, at the symbolic level, the he-goat would become the copy of the leader, with all that this implies. Hence, in Jer 50:8 in the Vulgate version, it can be read: “Recedite de medio Babylonis, et de terra Chaldaeorum egredimini, et estote quasi haedi ante gregem”, which could be translated as “Move away of the midst of Babylon and go forth out of the land of the Chaldeans, and be as goats before the flock”. Those haedi are evidently he-goats, as their role in the herd is symbolically employed as the image of people's commander or leader.

The link between he-goats and commanders, leaders or princes shows yet another piece of evidence: some excerpts in the Old Testament recommend sacrificing a he-goat, so it could expiate sins

¹⁰ This artistic motif dates from, at least, the Hellenistic period. Nevertheless, it seems this motif was endowed with a preferential symbolic meaning during the Middle Ages. The contemporary concept of “still life” is relatively new: it was created in the 16th century, but it was developed and fixed during the 17th century mainly in Flanders and Holland. About this issue cf., among others, [52–55].

committed by those sovereign rulers. That is the very case in Lv. 4:22–23. It must be observed that it should be a sin of omission or ignorance.

A quite interesting excerpt is Chapter 8, Daniel, where one can find the description of Daniel's vision during the third year of King Balthazar's reign. In it, he saw a ram with very high horns, which gored in every direction, and no creature was able to escape from its power. On the other hand, he saw a he-goat that went all over the Earth and that did not touch the floor, whose meaning is provided by the prophet (cf. Dn 8:15 ff.). It is supposed that the he-goat, according to the prophet, is the king of the Greeks, so he would be Alexander the Great ([56], p. 437).

Without a doubt, one of the main Christian contributions (mainly medieval) to the symbolism of the caprine species is the association between he-goats and the Devil. This meaning or correspondence is generalized throughout the Medieval Ages.¹¹ From that moment, the image of a he-goat as the center of the coven and as the object of veneration for witches will become a cliché in Western art. One of the better-known representations of this cliché is, undoubtedly, Goya's *Aquelarre (El gran cabrón)*, an oil on canvas painted in 1798. In the same vein, the animal would serve as a mount for the witches in the coven ([42], p. 224).¹²

Regarding its origin, most authors agree to consider the caprine-like devil as a development of the classical deities related to fertility in the plant and animal worlds, part of the Dionysian entourage [59–63]. To wit, they are Pan, fauns, and satyrs, all of them imagined with caprine features since antiquity (Dionysus himself, from time to time, was presented wearing horns) and characterized by overwhelming lasciviousness, whose main sign was an enormous phallus, which led them to assault, in their sexual frenzy, both nymphs and young people. Evidently, this lubricious spirit is directly inherited from the hyper-sexuality attributed to the overall assembly of caprine animals, but, in particular, to the he-goat. It tells much about the lubricious nature attributed to the incarnation of evil. This does not look as a coincidence in the detailed iconography typical of the coven given by Herodotus ([11], bk. 2, par. 46) about the Egyptian worship of the Greek copy of Pan in Mendes. He included that sort of "hierogamy" in which a he-goat copulated with a woman, as it was supposed to happen in medieval and early modern covens. The Hebrew world, for its part, also had certain rituals in which evil and he-goats united. Concretely, one of them was the scapegoat ritual, already described. A young goat was offered to Azazel, a demon in charge of all sin and of the people's mistakes. Then, it was expelled in the desert, center and shelter of all diabolic deeds for the ancient Hebrews. It is not to be forgotten that witch practices can be concealed in ancient rites and cults for worshiping horned gods,¹³ demoted to fiends at the arrival of Christendom.

Another of the features that is very much highlighted by the different sources is its acute sight, especially at night. Hence, Aristotle ([1], p. 492a, ll. 14–15), when discussing the aspect of the eyes in diverse animals, specifies that goats have the "black part of the eyes" of a yellowish hue, which indicates visual acuity (cf. also ([65], par. 779a, ll. 33–b14). On his part, Pliny ([3], bk. 8, par. 203) indicates that these animals have good vision, both in daylight and at night, the reason why those who suffer from poor night vision (so-known as nyctalopes) think that by eating goat's liver, their night vision will improve. This very information will be later on echoed in Thomas of Cantimpré ([2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 21–23). Likewise, having an incredibly sharp vision is one of the

¹¹ Cf., for example, ([12], vol. I, p. 185; [42], p. 223; [57], p. 243; [58], p. 89).

¹² The he-goat is also a symbol for the devil for Valeriano ([7], bk. 10, p. 73C). According to Valeriano, Origen (also called Adamantius) equates the he-goat with the devil. The reason behind this association is the following one: by sacrificing a he-goat as if it were the one to blame after sinning (practice which is related to the Jewish Day of Atonement, as seen before), people began to link horns to the evil.

¹³ Generally speaking, every culture assumes a positive connotation for the horn. It conveys the idea of strength and power. Even Egyptian hieroglyphics relate the horn with the idea of "paving the way". In the case of animal representations, the fact of having horns was associated with fertility. No wonder they are phallic symbols, whose form is connected to the crescent moon—do not forget that the moon is also an essential part in the complex symbolic area of fertility. Horns acquire negative connotations when associated to all which is demonic, as the devil is usually depicted with horns. About this, cf. ([13], p. 160; [64], pp. 144–5).

features that sources remark on in the case of the wild goat (in addition to their tendency to live in the highest parts of mountains), as can be seen in Isidore ([4], bk. 12, ch. 1, par. 15). In fact, the Greek term for the wild animal, *δορκάς*, was related to the fact of having an excellent vision. Further, he added that these animals were able to discern far away if the men who was getting closer was a hunter or merely a walker, which also proved the creature's intelligence and sagacity ([2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 11–13; [66], ch. 20, par. 3–4;). Similarly, they could tell apart the good from the bad herbs with the naked eye ([6], p. 24; [67], p. 192).

This concrete trait, together with other meanings attributed to wild goats as, for example, their preference for high mountains or for grazing in valleys, were used by Christians. Symbolically, they were employed to characterize Christ's attitude. According to this, as those animals would do, Jesus Christ loves high mounts, that is prophets, apostles, and patriarchs, after what it is usually quoted in the Song of Songs 2, 9 ([66], ch. 20, par. 5–6). As these goats graze in valleys, Christ is also nourished in the Church. Christians' good deeds and the believers' alms are Christ's food ([66], ch. 20, par. 7–8). The acute vision of these goats, which allows them to see far away, makes also reference to our savior Jesus Christ, as can be read in the Scriptures: the Lord is the god of knowledge (1 Sm 2: 3) ([66] ch. 20, par. 12–13). As well as goats foretell the hunter's tricks from a great distance, our Lord Jesus Christ foresee and knows in advance the Devil's ruses and Judas' treason ([66], ch. 20, par. 18–20). The same symbolic meanings are repeated practically like that by the *Bestiario de Oxford* ([6], pp. 23–24) or Pierre of Beauvais' *Bestiaire* ([67], pp. 37–38; 137–38).

Like the wild goat that with its great visual sharpness showed its sagacity and intelligence, as it was able to tell apart the mere walker from the hunter in the distance, something similar happened with domestic goats.

In this respect, it was not only that the animal was able to remove its cataracts without human help, stabbing its eyes with a blackberry thorn according to Aelianus ([10] bk. 7, par. 14) or with the end of a reed, at least the females, says Pliny ([3], bk. 8, par. 201), which reminds us of the supposed capacity of goats, Cretan or not, to heal their wounds with a plant named white dittany, acknowledged by several ancient and later authors ([1], p. 612a 1 ff.; [2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 52–53; [3], bk. 8, par. 97; [4], bk. 12, ch. 1, par. 18; [68], bk. 2, par. 126; [69], bk. 12, vv. 411 ff.). According to what Pliny says ([3], bk. 8, par. 201), after some Mucianus, two goats who marched towards opposite directions found a long and narrow bridge. In order to cross it without any danger, one of them lied down and the other proceeded over its counterpart (cf. also [2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 13–16).¹⁴ In contrast, the fable provides us with some examples that, at the very least, question such an intelligence, at least in the case of the he-goat. Thus, in Aesop's fable Number 9, entitled "La zorra y el cabrón en el pozo" ("The Fox and the He-Goat in the Well") [70], he remarks on the impulsive behavior of the animal, who behaves thoughtlessly, without thinking about the consequences of its acts.¹⁵

Among the extraordinary faculties attributed to this animal, some authors even say that they do not only breath through the nose, but also through the ears ([10], bk. 1, par. 53), a belief criticized by Aristotle ([1], p. 492a, ll. 14–15), which he assigns to some Alcmaeon, but also found the information echoed by several other authors, such as Oppian ([71], bk. 2, l. 340) and Varro ([21], bk. 2, ch. 3, par. 5).¹⁶ On his part, Thomas of Cantimpré ([2], bk. 4, ch. 18, ll. 16–18) even affirms that they breathe through the ears, not through the nose.

¹⁴ Many other evidences on the intelligence of goats appear in Aelianus' works ([10], bk. 7, par. 26). For example, they know when they are going to have their throats slit; they also disdain following a flock of sheep. They acknowledge their own superiority and, thus, they prefer to walk ahead.

¹⁵ In that fable, it is narrated how a vixen fell into a well. The vixen was able to make a thirsty he-goat to jump into the well to get some water and made the he-goat to provide some help. The vixen, obviously, did not keep the promise of helping the he-goat to get out of the well afterward. At this respect, the words pronounced by the vixen against the complaints of the he-goat are eloquent: "¡Anda éste! Si tuvieses seso como pelos en la barba, no habrías bajado antes de pensar el modo de subir" ([70], p. 44) (You foolish old fellow! If you had as many brains in your head as you have hairs in your beard, you would never have gone down before you had inspected the way up).

¹⁶ On his part, Pliny ([3], bk. 8, par. 202) attributes this erroneous belief to some Archelaus.

By means of this wonderful faculty, goats achieved fame for listening quite well. Because of that, Horapollon affirmed that Egyptians used the image of the animal in order to represent someone who has acute hearing [14]. This idea was also supported by Pierio Valeriano ([7], bk. 10, p. 71C) and even in Brueghel's work *Orpheus and Animals*. Among the represented animals, there is a goat jumping happily, as if because of its acute hearing it would enjoy music even more ([14], p. 282).

Another curious aspect of goats is that they were widely used over the course of centuries for obtaining ingredients to be employed in witchcraft or popular medicine. From this animal, virtually everything was used, particularly their horns, fur, blood, milk, excrement and even urine. Such were its utilities, that Pliny the Elder gathered in Book 28 of his *Natural History* a great number of recipes and remedies proceeding from goats to such an extent that, according to the Roman author ([3], bk. 28, par. 153), Democritus declared that the goat was the animal from which more remedies were provided against the biting of a venomous snakes, as well as for other diseases. This, regarding blood, affirmed that which belonged to the he-goat had so much power that there was not anything better to sharpen iron tools ([3], bk. 28, par. 148). About their milk, he said that goat milk was the most nutritious right after human milk ([3], bk. 28, par. 123). With the smoke resulting from burning their horns and fur, snakes were shooed ([3], bk. 28, par. 152). It has been already noted the belief of eating goat's liver in order to improve the sight of those who suffered from an impaired night vision. In a similar manual dating from the Medieval period and of Arabic origin, *Libro de las utilidades de los animales*, ([72], pp. 7–9), it is said their urine could be employed to cure deafness. As seen, the variety and amounts of applications were vast. An area that should not be consigned to oblivion is the symbolism of the goat and its presence in mythology where, as will be noted, it plays a key role.

In this field of compulsory reference, in the first place, Amalthea should be mentioned. Sometimes, it is depicted as a goat and, some other times, as a nymph who secretly fed Zeus with goat milk in Crete to prevent him from being eaten by his father, Cronus ([22], p. 24; [23], pp. 52–53).

When the character is shown as a goat, it is sometimes simply named Aex (goat in Greek). Aex was a horrific creature, descendent of Helios. It frightened the Titans so much when seeing it that the Earth, at their request, had to hide the creature in a cave in the mountains of Crete ([73], ch. 1, par. 13; [74], bk. 2, ch. 13).

Conceived as a goat, it is said that Zeus, for fighting the Titans, made himself an armor with the skin of that very goat. This armor is known as aegis ([73], ch. 1, par. 13, l. 32; [74], bk. 2, ch. 13; [75], vol. 2, bk. 8, v. 354).

It is also said that one of the horns of this goat, after it broke, in multiple ways, according to the version studied, is the origin of the legendary cornucopia, that is, the horn of plenty. There are also other versions on the origin of the horn, namely that affirming that it is one of the god-river Acheloo's horns, pulled out by Heracles ([22], p. 24, p. 38; [23], p. 53, p. 251).

Certain creatures belonging to the religious and the mythical arenas have features similar to goats. They are Pan and the satyrs, characterized concretely by their caprine features and nature.¹⁷ About the first one, Isidore ([4], bk. 8, ch. 11, par. 81) explains Pan's etymology this way: "Pan dicunt Graeci, Latini Silvanum, deum rusticorum, quem in naturae similitudinem formauerunt; unde et Pan dictus est, id est omne. Fingunt enim eum ex universali elementorum specie" (Greeks call Pan and Romans, Silvanus, to the god of the country, to whom they gave a similar appearance to nature; hence he was called Pan, that is, everything, for he is imagined as being endowed with all kinds of elements). The particular god Pan described by Isidore has horns, which would be the representation of sun

¹⁷ Even so, in their primary form it seems satyrs wore horse ears and tail, as seen in ceramic pieces dating from the 5th century. Some studies have demonstrated caprine satyrs did not exist in the Peloponnese. In fact, it seems that caprine satyrs are rather Hellenistic and were created following the figure of Pan. However, there are other facts that may justify those first satyrs were presented as he-goats: Paposilenus, satyrs' father, wears a furry mesh as clothing. His descendants, for their part, would wear a sort of furry apron with a phallus fixed on it. This feature, together with a long beard, belongs not to a horse but to a he-goat. On this, cf. ([27], p. 252).

and moon beams ([4] bk. 8, ch. 11, par. 81); he also has plenty of spots on the skin, which represents the stars in the sky. In the same fashion, he has goat hoofs, which proves the strength of the earth. This special version of classic Pan is in fact Isis, the Egyptian goddess: “Isis lingua Aegyptiorum terra appellatur, quam Isin uolunt esse” (The land is called Isis in the language of the Egyptians as they want it to be Isis) ([4], bk. 8, ch. 11, par. 84).

As regards satyrs, according to Isidore ([4] bk. 11, ch. 3, par. 21), they are little men with pug-noses, horns in their foreheads and legs like goats.

Quite similar to them are fauns, whose origins are rooted in the Roman world, but they were soon to be identified with Greek satyrs. Initially, fauns were conceived as a single god whose worship place was located in the Palatino. Their name must be interpreted in the sense of ‘benefactor’ or ‘protector’, as he protected shepherds and flocks. This made easier their identification with Pan. Little by little, they lost their divine nature and turned into one of the legendary kings of Lazio prior to the arrival of Aeneas. Eventually, without losing his divine character, he multiplied himself, turning into a sort of wood and country geniuses, companions for shepherds. After their identification with satyrs, they also acquired a physiognomy half human, half caprine ([22], p. 193).

All those caprine-like characters inherited the bad name of he-goats with respect to lust. That is why there are countless stories where they are presented chasing or assaulting both nymphs and young boys. It is not strange, therefore, that Alciato in his emblem LXXII makes a connection between lust and not only he-goats, but also fauns and satyrs ([76].

The commentary on the emblem makes clear that goat hoofs were iconographically related to the Devil in the Middle Ages, although in ancient times, they were related to lust. In the emblem, one can read that the Faun wears a lettuce wreath; a series of aphrodisiac properties are commonly assigned to this plant. The character depicted in the engraving of this emblem is Pan, god of shepherds. He is characterized, among other things, for his great sexual activity, as he chased young boys, as well as nymphs and, if he was not successful in his hunt, he would satisfy himself ([76], p. 108).

Also in the mythical scene, the goat is part of an interesting hybrid creature, the chimera. According to mythographers, its front part was that of a lion; the central was goat-like; and the rear was either of a snake or a dragon. At least Hesiod figured a creature like that in an early period ([77], 319 ff.), where one can confirm that the term used to refer to goats, *χίμαιρα* (actually “young goat”), is identical to that used to refer to the three-fold beast. This being was formed by three heads: lion’s, goat’s and snake’s heads; and in addition, the goat-head exhaled fire. In a Latin context, this beast is also mentioned by Isidore who very precisely repeats the description by Hesiod ([4], bk. 11, ch. 3, par. 36).

To conclude this already extensive set of symbolic values associated with the caprine species, one should remember something. In a field that is in between mythology and astronomy (and thus, also astrology), goats or any of their hybrid cognates are also present somehow in those constellations that inhabit the night sky.

Therefore, it was supposed that one of the zodiac constellations, Capricorn, was constituted in its front part by a goat and, in the rear, by a fish tail. This was explained as Pan’s son’s catasterismus, who was raised by Zeus. Pan’s son also helped him during the Titanomachy by means of a conch shell. When he blew it, he shooed the Titans. In other versions of the story, Pan himself would chase them away ([78], p. 89, n. 113; [79], pp. 144–45).

This is a winter constellation, and as such, its appearance in the sky announced the inclemency typical of the cold season of the year ([78], vv. 287–295).

From an astronomical point of view, Capricorn is the shelter for Saturn and the place in which Mars is praised. In the origin of the world, this sign was found in the West. According to Macrobius, ([80] bk. 1, ch. 12, par. 2), the sign of Capricorn is a place in the sky through which discarnate souls ascend to the divine ether after death, while Cancer is the sign for the descending of the souls from that very ether to incarnate ([81], p. 83).

According to Manilius ([82], bk. 4, vv. 243 ff.), this sign favors or governs all that is related to fire, which also recalls a certain relationship between goats and a series of things. Their ardent

temperament's most prominent translation took place in sexuality and in the fact that it was thought that they usually underwent fevers, due to their nature. Indeed, the Chimera's goat-head was the one in charge of exhaling fire. Likewise, with reference to fire,¹⁸ it governs everything related to metal forges or bread ovens. Furthermore, the preference for warm clothing, as it is a winter constellation, must be noted. As for their nature, it is said that Capricorn-born natives will know their way around full of self-doubts: when young, natives will be Venus' slaves, that is slaves to love. They will even commit crimes for that reason, although they improve during old age.¹⁹

Returning to astronomy, if talking about *Auriga* (constellation), its major star is known as *Capella* ("kid", *cabrita* in Spanish). *Capella* is among the seven brightest stars of the sky and its origin, in agreement with mythology, would be the castration of the goat Amalthea. The animal is the one that breastfed little Zeus ([78], p. 78, n. 64). This star, together with its neighbors known as Kids (Latin *Haedi*) and also integrated in *Auriga*, plays an important meteorological role. Its rise (7–9 September) and its morning twilight (11–23 September), announced rains and tempests ([78], vv. 156–65; [84], bk. 1, v. 205).

3. Presence of Goats and Goat-Like Creatures in Picasso's Work

About those values, what is to be found in Picasso? First of all, it is well known when Picasso moved to La Californie in Cannes in 1955, he shared his home with a series of pets. Among them, there was a goat bought by Jacqueline Roque from a neighbor. The animal was given to Picasso in his seventy-fifth birthday, and it was baptized as Esmeralda ("emerald" in English), although it seems that Picasso named her "Biquette". Esmeralda or Biquette moved freely in the garden and first floor, but had a short life. The goat died soon after because she ate harmful herbs with fruition ([85], p. 132; [86], pp. 221–22).²⁰ It is thought that very goat served as a model for Picasso's famous sculpture *La chèvre* (1950), which is among his most notable works.²¹ Nevertheless, there are two "versions" of the sculpture: the original, made with waste materials (a wicker basket, pottery pots, a palm leaf, metal, wood, cardboard and plaster) in Vallauris and housed at the Picasso Museum in Paris ([87], OPP.50:017)²². Later, also in 1950, he built a bronze version in Vallauris, as well. Two copies are preserved: one at the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) in New York and the other at the Picasso Museum in Paris ([87], OPP.50:060). Hence, as a matter of dates, it is clear that Esmeralda did not serve as a model at least for this remarkable version of one of the most famous Picassian goats.

Apart from this personal anecdote, at a glance at Picasso's production, it can be seen that goats are among the most prominent animals within the artist's extensive bestiary developed through his large production.²³ In addition, his interest for the goat figure was pretty early, as proven in a certain number of works. Some of them were sketches, drawn when he was an adolescent. They were created when the artist lived in Catalonia (more precisely in Horta de San Juan) and are quite faithful to those animals, being probably sketches from life. Maybe attributing some symbolic meaning to those early representations is a little daring.

¹⁸ It is not possibly a mere matter of chance that in Hindu mythology he-goats were associated to generator fire and sacrificial fires (yajna). They served also as god Agni's (Hindu god of fire) mount. Hence, they became solar animals. On this issue cf. ([42], p. 224; [83]).

¹⁹ According to Bouché-Leclercq, the caprine side of the sign must be blamed for the passionate behavior among youth and the serenity during old age typical of the rear part of the sign, the fish tails, as Manilius emphasizes ([79], pp. 145–46).

²⁰ The different testimonies found in those sources do not coincide with each other. Cox and Povey specify Jacqueline suggested to the local officials in the Communist Party to give to Picasso a goat as a gift for his seventy-fifth birthday, as he was keen on goats [85]. Nevertheless, since the delivery of the gift was delayed, Jacqueline herself gave him a kid she bought from a neighbor. Olivier argues that Picasso was the one who gave a kid to Jacqueline at Christmas 1956 [86].

²¹ Critics consider there is a clear precedent for this sculpture, a drawing by Ripolin. It is a charcoal and Conte crayon drawing on wood precisely entitled *La chèvre*, created in Antibes in November of 1946. It is preserved at the Picasso Museum in Antibes. The drawing represents in detail a goat lying on the floor. Its head, neck and legs have been drawn with special care, being the only colored parts. It is as if this detailed representation of the animal would have served as a preliminary study for the creation of the sculpture four years later (cf. [85], pp. 131–32).

²² OPP: Online Picasso Project.

²³ "[goats and sheep] This group of animals occupy a middle ground in Picasso's Bestiary" ([85], p. 119).

As an example of this early interest in goats, one should note his work *Fillette à la tresse et chèvre*. It is a sepia pen and ink drawing on paper dating from 1896, which can be found at the Picasso Museum in Barcelona ([87], OPP.96:242). In his sketch, the young artist emphasized the upper part of the figures in the composition, the girl's head, and her braided hair. In the case of the animal, the head was crowned by sharp and twisted horns and concluded with a prominent full beard. Those features cannot be assigned to other creatures than to a he-goat.

To this first period also belongs *Études de chèvres*, a Conte crayon drawing on white paper from 1898, preserved at the Picasso Museum in Barcelona ([87], OPP.98:099). It is made up by realistic sketches of goats (both male and female) in different positions.

When talking about animals in Picasso's production, it is necessary to talk about etchings (sugar lift etching and dry point), from 1936, with which the artist illustrated an edition of Comte de Buffon's *Histoire Naturelle*, French naturalist and encyclopedist of the eighteenth century. In this case, gladly enough, goats were among the represented animals ([87], OPP.36:147).

Although it is unclear whether Picasso took Buffon's text as a reference to represent his goats or not, the truth is that when reading Buffon's work, a series of coincidences can be noted between the last one and Picasso's etching, which may lead the observer to think that Picasso may have taken into consideration, to a certain extent, what the encyclopedist said; although, it is usual to suppose that none of the thirty-two animals represented in the artist's original etchings were based on Buffon, but on Picasso's preconceived ideas [88].²⁴

Thus, Buffon remarks about the nature of goats that: "Ce n'est qu'avec peine qu'on la conduit, et qu'on peut la réduire en troupeau: elle aime à s'écarter dans les solitudes" (It is not without difficulty that one is able to lead it and to tame it to become part of the flock: it loves seeking solitude) ([89], p. 65; 94).²⁵ The Picassian depiction of goats reflects how those animals usually leave the flock and move away to secluded locations; he usually portrays them in a type of place whose vegetation is known as "Mediterranean forest", brimmed with shrubs and bushes.

Later on, Buffon states: "elle est robuste, aisée à nourrir; presque toutes les herbes lui sont bonnes, et il y en a peu qui l'incommodent" (It is robust and easy to feed. Almost every type of plant is good enough to nourish it, and this does not bother it) ([89], p. 65). The robustness invoked by Buffon also has its reflection in Picasso's production; also, that goats are used to devour the surrounding vegetation, as their buxom udders show.

When analyzing the behavior and nature of goats, Buffon, who compares caprine with ovine species, remarks about their perfect adaptation to dry and very hot places, typical of their habitual habitats: "Le tempérament, [...] ne paroît cependant pas dans la chèvre différer essentiellement de celui de la brebis. [...] à l'exception de quelques-unes auxquelles la chèvre n'est pas sujette; elle ne craint pas, comme la brebis, la trop grande chaleur; elle dort au soleil, et s'expose volontiers à ses rayons les plus vifs" (Yet, the temperament, in the case of the goat, does not seem to differ essentially from that of the sheep. [...] apart from some features that the goat does not have: in opposition to sheep, it is not upset due to great heat; it sleeps in the sun, and it willingly exposes itself to the brightest sunbeams) ([89], p. 65). Obviously, that vegetation Picasso took a great effort to represent is typical of a dry place and it advocates the climate harshness described by Buffon.

Maybe the most interesting point in Buffon's prose is that he provides anatomical descriptions of the ideal goat for mating, which may have been taken into consideration by Picasso when drawing the figure of the goat: "seulement on peut observer que celles dont les corps est grand, la croupe large, les cuisses fournies, la démarche légère, les mamelles grosses, les pis longs, le poil doux et touffu, sont les

²⁴ "He also did not refer to Buffon's text at all, instead choosing animals that caught his fancy and illustrating them according to his own ideas".

²⁵ The work in [90] is a facsimile copy of "Picasso: eaux-fortes originales pour des textes de Buffon" Martin Fabiani éditeur: Paris, 1942, copy n° 141 given as a gift to Dora Maar by Picasso the 17th of January of 1943 and preserved at the BnF (National Library of France), after its donation to the collections in 1999. In addition, the booklet contains a study by Antoine Coron.

meilleures” (One can observe that those with large bodies, broad rumps, strong thighs, brisk gait, large udders, long teats, and soft and thick fur are the best) ([89], p. 67). Indeed, the Picassian goat seems to fulfill much of features remarked on by Buffon, particularly the size of the body and rumps, all which is relative to their udders and especially their thick fur, a feature in which Picasso took great pains to depict.

Finally, in his description, Buffon recommends to separate goats from cultivation places and putting them in uncultivated and barren lands, where they will not have a problem finding food: “elles trouvent autant de nourriture qu’il leur en faut, dans les bruyères, dans les friches, dans les terrains incultes et dans les terres stériles: il faut les éloigner des endroits cultivés” (They find the food they need in heaths, in the wilderness, in uncultivated soils, and in barren lands; they must be kept away from cultivated lands) ([89], p. 68). According to what was already mentioned, the location in which Picasso places those animals follows those recommendations.

It should be understood, once again, that it is for no means sure that Picasso took into consideration the text he was illustrating. Nevertheless, the conspicuous coincidences commented on above are noteworthy. This may lead one to think that within Picasso’s creative freedom, highly likely, he intended to express in his etching Buffon’s general features for goats.²⁶ Moreover, it may be added that given that Buffon’s text comprehends the traditional portrayal of caprine species since Antiquity, if Picasso would have read it, he would have had access to all of the panoply of features summarized in the first section of this research.

On the other hand, there is a certain number of works in which Picasso seems to be invoking the traditional relationship between goats and lechery and lust. Those aspects, apparently, attracted him to this kind of animal.²⁷

Without any doubt, one of the most well-known and notable works is *Girl with a Goat* (*La jeune fille à la chèvre*), an oil on canvas dating from 1906, which can be found at the Barnes Foundation (Merion, PA, USA) ([87], OPP.06:019). In the painting appears a young woman, naked, as a central figure. Maybe she has just left the bathroom, as she seems to be fixing her hair to dry it; this woman, according to some critics, was inspired by classical sculptures, Ingres, Gauguin or Puvis de Chavannes ([85], p. 127). At her right (from the spectator’s point of view) appears a naked boy carrying a pot on his head. His presence has been related to, for example, the work entitled *Les deux frères*, a gouache on cardboard also from 1906, which is found at the Picasso Museum in Paris. In this work, two naked children close to a drum and a pitcher with flowers are presented. The elder boy carries a younger one on his shoulders ([87], OPP.06:001). Finally, at the young woman’s left, there is a white goat that is looking at her. It seems that the composition, except the inverted positions of the boy and the goat, has been inherited from a late work of Gauguin, *The Bathers* ([93], p. 447).²⁸

Nevertheless, Picasso saved the expression of lechery for the caprine kind; not so much for goats as for goat-like creatures, since from Antiquity, they have been considered as incarnations of lust and for that very reason they were part of Dionysus’ retinue, to wit, satyrs and fauns mainly.²⁹ This may have to do with two important facts: first, in representing the caprine kind, Picasso only seemed interested in goats, whereas those examples of he-goats are scarce (and, if truth be told, almost irrelevant). It is as if the author only paid attention to symbolism associated with he-goats—their overwhelming sexuality and their ardent nature, basically—in these mythological hybrids; secondly,

²⁶ This coincidence between the description by Buffon and the Picassian illustration is also to be observed in the case of the cock and the ram ([91], p. 344). Regarding the ram, see ([92], pp. 226–27).

²⁷ “Yet we also see a playful delight in the frolicsome sexuality of these creatures, in those antics for which they have been denigrated, but which to Picasso were an enduring source of irreverent pleasure” ([85], p. 119).

²⁸ Likewise, Richardson adds that the women leaving the bathroom, who were being increasingly stylized, would be related to some terracotta statuettes dating from the 2nd century representing hermaphrodites flying ([93], p. 447). They are preserved at the Louvre Museum.

²⁹ “Despite this flirtation with the erotic goat, Picasso reserved the lascivious rule of the devil over the woman for his satyrs” ([85], p. 127).

as some critics affirm repeatedly, fauns in particular constitute some sort of Picasso's alter egos, as previously was the Minotaur, as the context in which these figures appear is not mythological, but rather can be considered as an autobiographical key ([94], p. 308).

By way of example, about satyrs, *Satyre, Cupidon et jeune fille* (1906) should be cited ([87], OPP.06:315). In this piece appears a naked woman and Cupid, although this last one of a lesser size than the woman. Together with them, the classic satyr makes his apparition. He has goat legs, and he wears little horns on his head. *Satyre, faune et centaure (Murs gravé)*, is a work dating from 1957 and 1959, an engraving that concretely belongs to the Regjeringskvartalet collection, Oslo ([87], OPP.57:354). In it, there are two of those goat-like characters taken from the classical myth and the more habitual Picassian centaur. Finally, *Satyre jouant de la flûte* is a drawing with pen and wash on paper from 1946, belonging to Sotheby's collection ([87], OPP.46:118). It depicts a satyr, with goat horns and legs, sitting and playing the flute, the instrument whose usual performer in Picasso's production would be fauns.

As regards the representations of fauns, the most habitual of the caprine adaptations in Picasso are inherited from classical myths. Those adaptations are numerous, and the majority correspond to the years following World War II, more precisely the 1946–1947 biennium. In that period, the artist was in Antibes with his young lover Françoise Gilot. Still, there were not merely a few representations of those hybrid creatures during the 1930s, a period in which they often acted as a sort of Minotaur copies, and hence, they could be identified as the artist himself.

In much of cases, fauns, together with the already usual centaurs, appear dancing, playing the flute and often accompanied by naked women, who can be identified as nymphs, in a cheerful atmosphere and of patent eroticism and sensuality. It is not strange, thus, that criticism associated them with Picasso's zest for life ([94], p. 308; [95], p. 150).

By way of example, see *Faune, cheval et oiseau*, Indian ink, watercolor and gouache from 1936, which is found at the Picasso Museum in Paris ([87], OPP.36:068). It presents a faun whose only visible caprine feature is little horns on his head; it is a composition in which it was to be expected to appear a Minotaur and which can be seen as a good example of the presence of this mythological figure in years prior to World War II.

The inherent eroticism in the apparition of this figure is palpable in *Faune dévoilant une femme*, a sugar aquatint and varnish. It dates from 1936 and can be found at the Picasso Museum in Paris ([87], OPP.36:255). In this work, he makes his apparition a knelt faun, a copy of the Minotaur and thus of the artist. The faun uncovers a naked woman lying down, probably asleep. About the faun's morphology, another rather usual animal feature can be seen: a tail.

Faune blessé et femme, alternative title for the composition *Minotaure blessé et Naiade*, is an oil and charcoal painting from 1938, which belongs to Maya Widmaier Picasso's collection ([87], OPP.38:018). In there, a faun (copy, once again, of Minotaur, as proves its alternative title) is associated with a naiad, a kind of classical nymph related to freshwater streams.

Another work from 1938, *Faune à la diaule et danseuse*, a burin engraving preserved at the Serge Sorokko Gallery ([87], OPP.38:131), is another example prior to the reproductions of fauns after the War. In this work, he blends the motifs of the flutist faun (a double flute or diaulos), dance and the presence of a woman, with all of the erotic connotations they entail.

Faune flûtiste et danseuse à la maraca et au tambourin, an etching from 1945 painted in Antibes, is preserved at the Picasso Museum in Paris and the MOMA in New York ([87], OPP.45:068). It shows music and dance motifs, which will be progressively more habitual after the War and which supposedly reflect the joy because of the end of the conflict and the Mediterranean influence. That last one made Picasso recall his natal city, Malaga. In this case, the eroticism evoked by the scene is pretty clear, as the dancer is dancing naked.

In *Faune jouant de la diaule, nymphe au compotier et centaure*, a graphite drawing on vellum paper preserved at the Picasso Museum in Antibes ([87], OPP.46:075), shows the motifs seen so far, as well. The change comes with the inclusion of a centaur wearing horns, which is the Picassian version for this sort of mythical creature, and armed with a trident. The fruit basket carried by the nymph may

also be a symbolical allusion to this happy and sensual atmosphere, which evokes the sempiternal power of nature and its creatures.

Jouer de flûte et faune dansant, a charcoal drawing from 1959 belonging to a private collection ([87], OPP.59:281), shows a faun dancing, although the flutist in it seems to be a human being, maybe a shepherd.

Sometimes, a goat is also associated with those characters, as in an ink drawing on transparent paper entitled *Musicien, nymphe à la chèvre et danseuse au tambourin*, from 1955, which belongs to a private collection ([87], OPP.55:403). A dancer and a nymph appear naked. The nymph seems to lift a little goat over her head; all of them together with a usual naked faun, sitting and playing the flute.³⁰ In addition, the faun and goat motifs will be protracted in time. There are some examples from the 1970s, as *Paysage avec faune et chèvre*, false linocut from 1963, belonging to a private collection ([87], OPP.63:391).

Without a doubt, the work that best summarizes Picasso's joy of living in the years after the War, when he lived in Antibes, is *La joie de vivre*. It was created with oil and Ripolin paints applied on fiber cement, measuring 120 × 250 cm and dating from 1946. It is preserved at the Picasso Museum in Antibes ([87], OPP.46:001). The painting presents a dance scene with a very joyful and colorful atmosphere, in which a naked woman and two dancing goats take a part; this may be explained because of the good hearing attributed to goats since Antiquity. In addition, it should be noted the strange behavior of some goats that allowed the discovery of the place in which Delphi was built, between a centaur and a faun, both flautists, in front of a seascape ([94], pp. 308–9). This work is, apparently, a parody of Matisse's *Bonheur de vivre* (1905–1906) [96]. Yet, it is usually presented as a celebration of peace, although it is also a celebration of love and joy associated with peace. The relationship developed between Picasso and the young French artist Françoise Gilot in that period has been already mentioned. It is not idle to think that the couple is present in the painting: he would be seen as the faun, the character unanimously considered as Picasso's alter ego, as previously was the Minotaur ([94], p. 308). The central figure may be Gilot herself. Of course, the use of the dancing goats is connected to the use of the animal as a symbol for lust.

On the other hand, although the habitual thing is that those goat-like creatures were male, there are some female examples as in the case of faunesses. See a work entitled *Femme chèvre et nu*, whose alternative title is *Faunesse et femme*. It is an etching from 1945, part of Sotheby's collection ([87], OPP.45:054), where the caprine figures correspond with a naked fauness, sitting with her legs and arms crossed and, close to her, an also naked woman who is backwards and standing. On the fauness, the only details that informs about her caprine nature are two small horns on her head.

In those representations in which fauns appears, it is not strange to find kids, as well. They are symbols for innocence, tenderness, and ingenuity, lowering thus the sensuality and eroticism in the composition. That is the case of *Faune assis jouant de la diaule, nymphe assise et chevreau VIII*, dating from 1946 and painted in Antibes. It is a graphite on Arches vellum paper preserved at the Picasso Museum in Antibes ([87], OPP.46:201). Here, the faun appears playing the diaulos, seated and completely naked, as well as the nymph. She, seated on the ground, attends the audition together with a merry kid. The young goat, attentive, looks at the faun performing the piece. Despite the innocence touch added by the young goat to the scene, the atmosphere is still quite sensual.³¹

There is another version of those scenes in which a flautist faun is accompanied by a kid or by (either dancing or not dancing) goats: it is that one in which the flautist is a human being, who does not wear the usual little horns and who must be associated with the figure of a shepherd. That is the case of, for example, *Flûtiste assis à coté d'une chèvre*, whose alternative title is *Berger et chèvre*. This work

³⁰ Cf. also *Faune et chèvres*, a linoleum dating from 1959 which belongs to the Sotheby's collection ([87], OPP.59:083).

³¹ Like this are, for example, *Faune assis jouant de la diaule, nymphe assise au tambourin et chevreau V* (which presents an alternative title, *Faune à la flûte, femme nue et chevreau*) ([87], OPP.46:202)); or *Faune assis jouant de la diaule et chevreau allongé* ([87], OPP.46:209), where a sense of security and innocence predominates over sensuality and eroticism, as the image of the naked female character.

is a graphite pencil drawing on paper that dates from 1946, the property of a private collector of Barcelona ([87], OPP.46:408). This scene may be connected to Arcadian happiness evoked by those images in which hybrid characters of the classical myth noted above appear. However, in this case, the scene is not so sensual and erotic as the one above. Another quite similar example is *Berger musicien et chèvre*. It is a painting on white clay ceramics dating from 1947 or 1948, approximately. The painting was created in Vallauris and can be found at the Picasso Museum in Antibes ([87], OPP.47:393). In this case, the shepherd plays the diaulos.

On the other hand, goats are also present in Picasso's production as sacrificial animals; however, they lack any obvious religious connotation. That is the case of *Femme sacrifiant une chèvre*. This is a pencil drawing on paper from 1938 that is preserved at the Picasso Museum in Paris ([87], OPP.38:408). The drawing reproduces a violent slaughter scene performed by a woman. Her feet are more or less recognizable under the sacrificial table. Also noticeable is a plate for collecting blood on the floor. Her left arms seem to appear out of nothing, between the goat's legs; her right arm seems to emerge from her mouth, and it holds the knife that has been stabbed into the body of the animal. The goat, in supine position and with its legs tied, appears on the sacrificial table ([85], p. 127).³² The woman close to the goat does not entail a more or less subtle hue of eroticism, but the complete animalization of the female figure ([97], p. 77)³³. Maybe one can ask him or herself why Picasso chose a goat for this drawing. The answer may very well be, always with the circumspection to be expected when formulating this type of hypothesis, that if the goat is a representation of an overwhelming eroticism and sexuality, it has been apparently slaughtered by the female.³⁴

Related to its role as sacrificial animal, Picasso represents a series of goat-head works, sometimes shaped as skulls. Both motifs are related to still lives and memento mori. In this context, the goat head plays the same role as bull or sheep heads. They were especially frequent in Picasso's art in 1939. Sheep heads were particularly usual from the 30th of September to the 29th of October; in that period, he drew an important number of sketches of ram heads and jaws ([92], p. 232).

As it seems, the production of a great number of works in a defined period may be the result of Picasso's pessimism or frustration. In this case, it should not be consigned to oblivion the fact that World War II began in September 1939 with the invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany and France's and England's declarations of war. This event closed a particularly difficult year for Picasso: Franco's triumphs in April, the subsequent fall of the Spanish Republic and the exile underwent by hundreds of thousands of people were the state of affairs in Spain in 1939. In addition, Picasso lost his mother in Barcelona during that spring; during summer, his father died in a car accident (the automobile belonged to Ambroise Vollard, his friend and merchant for a time). In addition, Picasso suffered certain changes in his personal life ([92], p. 233).

On the other hand, it is widely known that at a precise moment at the beginning of the 1950s, when Picasso lived with Françoise Gilot and after she gave him a goat as a gift, he got himself a goat head. He desiccated the head on a tree and probably he used it as a "model" for still lives created around that period and in which do appear this type of head ([85], pp. 132–33). See for example *Crâne de chèvre* or *bouteille et bougie*. They both are oil paintings created in the spring of 1952, the year in which goats were the focus of many works.

³² The authors remind two important and interesting details that may serve to define the work: first, he created *La femme au coq* that very year. Secondly, he wrote a short play in 1947 whose title is *Les quatre petites filles*. In this play, one *filles* kills a goat and dances with the corpse in the garden. Other girl pulls its (beating) heart out, and a third girl introduces the heart in the mouth of a doll.

³³ The authors specify that animalization is accentuated when it comes to Dora Maar's features.

³⁴ Picasso had already begun his affair with Dora Maar in 1938. He had been growing apart from his wife Olga Khokhlova after she realized the already long relationship that her husband maintained with Marie-Thérèse Walter. From that relationship, Maya was born. Additionally, Marie-Thérèse did not like either that the artist had a new muse and lover, Dora Maar.

Additionally, it is not a matter of chance that prior to presenting the goat head or skull in still lives in 1952, the artist was interested in goat heads and necks. A certain number of works created since 1952 on different media prove so.

Hence, see *Tête de chèvre de profil*, dating from 1950. It is a painting on a white clay plate, created in Vallauris, and which belongs to Sotheby's collection ([87], OPP.50:008). The polychromatic representation of the animal is constituted only of a head and a neck, and it is very realistic. The animal appears devouring a blade of grass. *Tête de chèvre* is another version of the composition above. It is a painting on white clay ceramics, concretely a plate, which is partially enameled. *Tête de chèvre* was also created in 1950 and belongs to Sotheby's collection, as well ([87], OPP.50:035).

In the same fashion, there are different examples of works focused on goat heads from 1951. They must be also understood as preparatory exercises for still lives dating from 1952. All of them are pretty like one another and are generically entitled *Crâne de chèvre*. One of those drawings dates from the 20th of December of 1951. It is a charcoal and pencil drawing that belongs to a private collection ([87], OPP.51:017); there is another one that dates from the 29th of October of 1951, an Indian pen and wash drawing on paper preserved at the Picasso Museum in Antibes (borrowed from the Picasso Museum in Paris) ([87], OPP.51:263). There are also some instances in which what is represented is not a goat head, but rather a skull. That is the very case of a wash drawing from the autumn-winter of 1950. It is part of a private collection ([87], OPP.51:148).

After this long preparatory process, Picasso finished by 1952 a series of excellent still lives in which a goat head had the main role, usually accompanied by a bottle and a candle. That is the case of *Crâne de chèvre, bouteille et bougie*. This painting is an oil on canvas dating from the 12th of December 1952. It is housed at the Tate Modern Gallery, London ([87], OPP.52:140). This composition is by far the most abstract and complex from among the still lives of 1952. Moreover, it is considered as the zenith of the motif in this period.³⁵ The other three remarkable still lives of the cycle are *Crâne de chèvre, bouteille et bougie*, which is an oil on canvas from the spring of 1952, which belongs to a private collection ([87], OPP.52:222), *Nature morte à la tête de chèvre*, which is another oil on canvas dating from March of 1952 and which belongs to Marina Picasso's collection ([87], OPP.52:227), and *Crâne de chèvre, bouteille et bougie*. It is also an oil on canvas and was created in the same dates as the paintings above. It can be found at the Picasso Museum in Paris ([87], OPP.52:146). The burning candle and the bottle seen in all of them are common motifs for expressing the passing of time and, therefore, the brevity of life.

In those cases, one should ask him or herself why Picasso paid such obsessive attention to this animal for the creation of still lives in this period. The answer is, of course, difficult. The creation of those pieces of art does not correspond with any relevant event in Picasso's life. They do not present any evidence to clarify this situation either.³⁶

Could those works be inspired by the very cause that led Picasso to paint two of his most important paintings in 1952? See *La guerre*: it is an oil on plywood measuring 1020 × 470 cm. It was painted between the summer and December of 1952. It is kept in the Temple of Peace in Vallauris ([87], OPP.52:094); the second painting would be *La paix*, another oil on plywood, measuring the same, painted during the same period and also found in the Temple of Peace in Vallauris ([87], OPP.52:155). Those paintings were preceded by more than 300 preparatory drawings that, in fact, constitute a single pictorial motif. Therefore, they are usually called by a joint title, *La guerre et la paix*. The beginning of the 1950s coincided with the Korean War, as is widely known. It was one of the bloodiest episodes in the Cold War, in which two blocs emerging from the World War II confronted each other. *Les Massacres de Corée*, which dates from 1951, is an allusion to the conflict. It should not be forgotten that those were years of extreme political activism. He joined the French Communist Party and became vice president of the World Peace Council ([98], p. 128; [99]). In sum, it may be possible

³⁵ Cf. the "Commentary" accompanying the image in ([87], OPP.52:140).

³⁶ "Their appearance without any such landmark to underwrite them is a reminder that one cannot always attribute intimations of mortality to the *nature-morte* (still-life), not simple motives to the person that paints it" ([85], p. 133).

that such still lives in which goats had main roles were a response to that political activism, to the concern about such a tumultuous period and to the open confrontation between two blocs (led by the USA and the USSR, respectively).

Lastly, and as a mere anecdote, Picasso offered his particular version of the Chimera, a monstrous hybrid creature with goat-like body parts. This version is an Indian ink pen drawing on paper entitled *Le monstre* or *La chimère*, dating from 1935 and preserved at the Picasso Museum in Paris ([87], OPP.35:025). The heinous creature represented in the drawing has little to do with the classical Chimera. It shows only one head, whereas the classical monster has three. That one head would be, if at all, a lion head with a sort of mane, a hairy tail and talons similar to those of birds of prey. Of course, there is no such a thing as a goat-like member in Picasso's *chimère*.

4. Conclusions

In conclusion, goats together with animals such as bulls, horses, doves, or cocks are part of Picasso's world, both in his life and art. His interest in this type of animal led him to represent goats in a long series of works, but lacking a clear symbolic meaning. Among those pieces of art, an etching must be highlighted. This etching illustrated the description of the goat given by Buffon in *Histoire Naturelle* ([89], pp. 59–71). This may prove, or so it seems, that Picasso did take into consideration Buffon's text to draw the image of his particular version of goats. If this is so, Picasso would have had access to a wealth of ideas on goats (already inherited from Antiquity and as described in the first part of this paper) by means of the French encyclopedist's writings.

Regarding their symbolism, one of their main readings is their relationship with lust and an exceeded sexuality. Nevertheless, this meaning is usually embodied in two mythological creatures that present caprine morphologies: satyrs and fauns. Specifically, fauns usually appear as embodiments of the artist himself in many pictorial compositions mainly in the 1930s and the 1940s. Those fauns are usually accompanied by naked women and the other usual Picassian creatures, centaurs playing the flute and sometimes dancing to convey a sense of Picasso's happiness in the Mediterranean environment in the French Riviera. It was a merry Arcadia, as shepherds also appear as copies for fauns, even playing the flute. Sometimes, goats are also seen in those works, even dancing, as in *Joie de vivre*. This recalls the strange behavior of some goats that allowed the discovering of Delphi. When a kid appears in one of those Picassian pastoral scenes, it evokes innocence, tenderness, and ingenuity, but without losing the typical erotic connotation of this works.

Likewise, goats need to be understood as sacrificial animals in Picasso's production, but lacking any religious meaning. They were usually seen in works created during the 1950s, particularly from 1952, which is the Picassian "year of the goat". In that period, Picasso created a great number of pieces of art depicting this animal, whose main motif was still lives. One can observe representations of goat heads or skull, with the same meanings as bull or ram heads in still lives dating from the end of the 1930s. They appear together with other usual motifs related to memento mori, such as bottles or burning candles. As noted above, if some type of connotation needs to be attributed to all of them, maybe it should be related to Picasso's most politically active years. That period coincided with bloody conflicts, such as the Korean War, one of the most violent events of the paradoxically-called Cold War.

Acknowledgments: This paper has been written within the framework for research project *Marginalia Classica Hodierna. Tradición y recepción clásica en la cultura de masas contemporánea* (FFI2015-66942-P). This study has been translated from Spanish by Jessica Carmona-Cejudo, to whom we are very much obliged.

Author Contributions: Delia Macías Fuentes has worked mainly the classic sources that deal with the goat and its symbolism. Cristóbal Macías Villalobos has worked mainly on the presence of the goat in Picasso and has reviewed the entire article.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Aristotle. *Histoire des Animaux*, edited and translated by Pierre Louis. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964–1969, 3 vols.
2. Thomas of Cantimpré. *Liber de Natura rerum. Editio Princeps Secundum Codices Manuscriptos*, Teil I: Text. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1973.
3. Pliny the Elder. *Naturalis Historia*. Available online: http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Pliny_the_Elder/home.html (accessed on 23 March 2017).
4. Isidore of Seville. *Etimologías*, (Bilingual edition), edited and translated with notes by José Oroz Reta, and Manuel A. Marcos Casquero; Madrid: BAC, 1982–1983, 2 vols.
5. Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie. *Le Bestiaire Divin de Guillaume*, Introduction by Célestin Hippeau; Geneva: Slatkine, 1970.
6. *Bestiario de Oxford. Manuscrito Ashmole 1511 de la Biblioteca Bodleian*, translated by Carmen Andréu, codicological and aesthetic study by Xénia Muratova; Madrid: Ediciones de Arte y Bibliofilia, 1983.
7. Pierio Valeriano. *Hieroglyphica sive de sacris Aegyptiorum, aliarumque gentium literis commentarii*. Basileae: per Thomam Guarinum, 1567.
8. Cesare Ripa. *Iconología*, translated from Italian by Juan Barja, and Yago Barja, translated from Latin and Greek by Rosa María Mariño Sánchez-Elvira, and Fernando García Romero; Madrid: Akal, 1987, 2 vols.
9. Isabel Mateo Gómez. *El Bosco en España*. Madrid: CSIC, 1991, 2nd ed.
10. Claudius Aelianus. *Historia de los Animales*, introduced and translated with notes by José María Díaz-Regañón López; Madrid: Gredos, 1984, 2 vols.
11. Herodotus. *Historia*. Edited by M. Balasch. Madrid: Cátedra, 2007, 5nd ed.
12. Louis Charbonneau-Lassay. *El Bestiario de Cristo. El Simbolismo Animal en la Antigüedad y la Edad Media*. Palma: José J. de Olañeta, 1997, 2 vols.
13. Juan Eduardo Cirlot. *Diccionario de Símbolos*. Barcelona: Labor, 1978.
14. Horapollon. *Hieroglyphica*, edited by Jesús María González de Zárate, Greek text translated by María José García Soler. Madrid: Akal, 2011.
15. Kenneth Kittell. *Animals in the Ancient World from A to Z*. London-New York: Routledge, 2014.
16. Catullus. *Poesías*, revised and translated by Miguel Dolç. Madrid: CSIC, 1990, 3rd ed.
17. Homer. *Odisea*, translated by José Manuel Pabón. Madrid: Gredos, 1982.
18. Verónica Marsá González. “La portadora de la palabra de Dios.” In *Protai Gynaikes: Mujeres Próximas al Poder en la Antigüedad*. Edited by Carmen Alfaro Giner and Estíbaliz Tébar Megías. Valencia: SEMA, 2005, pp. 41–50.
19. Aulus Gellius. *Noches Áticas I*. introduced and translated with notes and indices by Manuel-A. Marcos Casquero, and Avelino Domínguez García; León: Universidad de León, 2006, books 1–10.
20. Festus. *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Edited by Wallace Martin Lindsay. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913, reprint. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965.
21. Varro. *De re rustica*. Edited by Georg Goetz. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929, Available online: http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Varro/de_Re_Rustica/home.html (accessed on 23 March 2017).
22. Pierre Grimal. *Diccionario de Mitología Griega y Romana*. Barcelona: Paidós, 1984, 2nd reprint.
23. Antonio Ruiz de Elvira. *Mitología Clásica*. Madrid: Gredos, 1995, 3rd reprint.
24. Eurípides. *Bacchae* edited with introduction and commentary by Eric Robertson Dodds; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970, 2nd ed.
25. José Vara Donado. *Origen de la Tragedia Griega*. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 1996.
26. Francisco Rodríguez Adrados. “¿Aristóteles o reconstrucción interna y comparación? Sobre el origen de la tragedia.” In *Teatro Español. Autores Clásicos y Modernos: Homenaje a Ricardo Doménech*. Edited by Fernando Doménech Rico. Madrid: Fundamentos, 2008, pp. 341–350.
27. Albin Lesky. *Historia de la Literatura Griega*. Barcelona: RBA, 2005, 2 vols., vol. I, pp. 249–67.
28. Albin Lesky. *La Tragedia Griega*. Barcelona: El Acantilado, 2001.
29. Patricia E. Easterling, and Bernard MacGregor Walker Knox, eds. *Historia de la Literatura Clásica (Cambridge University)*. I. *Literatura Griega*. Madrid: Gredos, 1990, pp. 288–93, and 397–403.
30. Mary Louise Hart. *The Art of Ancient Greek Theatre*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2010.
31. Ruth Scodel. *An Introduction to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

32. Charles R. Beye. *La Tragedia Greca: Guida Storica e Critica*. Rome: Laterza, 2001.
33. Justina Gregory. *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
34. Umberto Albin. *Nel nome di Dioniso. Il Grande Teatro Classico Rivisitato con Occhio Contemporaneo*. Milan: Garzanti, 1999.
35. Pausanias. *Descripción de Grecia*. introduced and translated with notes by María Cruz Herrero Ingelmo; Madrid: Gredos, 1994, 3 vols.
36. Anne Baring, and Jules Cashford. *El Mito de la Diosa. Evolución de una Imagen*. Madrid: Siruela, 2005.
37. José Luis Morales Marín. *Diccionario de Iconología y Simbología*. Madrid: Taurus, 1984.
38. Serafín de Ausejo. *La Biblia*. Barcelona: Herder, 1994.
39. Alberto Colunga, and Lorenzo Turrado. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam. Nova Editio Logicis Partitionibus Aliisque Subsidiis Ornata*. Madrid: BAC, 1982.
40. José Miguel Petisco, and Félix Torres Amat. *Sagrada Biblia Traducida de la Vulgata latina Teniendo a la Vista los Textos Originales*. Valencia: Alfredo Ortells, 1988.
41. Herbert Haag, Adrianus van den Born, and Serafín de Ausejo. *Diccionario de la Biblia*. Barcelona: Herder, 1987.
42. Jean Chevalier, and Alain Gheerbrant. *Diccionario de los Símbolos*. Barcelona: Herder, 1986.
43. André Louf. "Caper emissarius ut typus Redemptoris apud Patres." *Verbum Domini* 38 (1960): 262–277.
44. Bradley Hudson McLean. *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*. Supl. Series 126, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
45. Robert A. Kraft. *Barnabas and the Didache*, volume 3 of *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*; Edited by Robert Grant. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1965.
46. Philippe Bobichon. *Justine Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon*. Fribourg: Fribourg Academic Press, 2003, 2 vols.
47. *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera. Pars I, Opera Catholica; Adversus Marcionem*. Turnholt: Brepols, 1954.
48. Origenes. *Kata Kelsou*. Introduced, and translated with notes by Daniel Ruiz Bueno; Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1967.
49. Albert Bloime. "William Holman Hunt's *The Scapegoat*: Rite of Forgiveness/Transference of Blame." In *Iconotropism: Turning toward Pictures*. Edited by Ellen Spolsky. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2004.
50. Mark Roskill, and Herbert Sussman. "Holman Hunt's 'The Scapegoat': A Discussion." *Victorian Studies* 12 (1969): 465–70.
51. Kenneth P. Bendiner. "William Holman Hunt's *The Scapegoat*." *Pantheon* 45 (1978): 124–28.
52. Anne-Marie Charbonneaux. *Les Vanités dans l'Art contemporain*. Paris: Flammarion, 2005.
53. Hubert Comte. *Natures Mortes de l'Antiquité à nos Jours, la Vie Silencieuse*. Paris: Casterman, 1992.
54. Sybille Ebert-Schifferer. *Still Life: A History*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998.
55. Charles Sterling. *La Nature Morte de l'Antiquité au XXe Siècle*. Paris: Macula, 1985.
56. Gleason Archer. *Reseña crítica de una Introducción al Antiguo Testamento*. Spanish translation. Grand Rapids: Editorial Portavoz, 1987.
57. María Dolores-Carmen Morales Muñoz. "El simbolismo animal en la cultura medieval." *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie III, Hª Medieval* 9 (1996): 229–55.
58. Jacques-Albin-Simon Collin de Plancy. *Dictionnaire Infernal: Édition Princeps Intégrale*. Verviers: Éditions Gérard & Co., 1973.
59. Virgilio Freddy Cabanillas. "El bestiario del Averno: sobre animales y demonios." *Alma Mater* 15 (1998): 19–36. Available online: http://sisbib.unmsm.edu.pe/bibvirtual/publicaciones/alma_mater/1998_n15/bestiario.htm (accessed on 28 August 2016).
60. Jurgis Baltrušaitis. *La Edad Media Fantástica: Antigüedades y Exotismos en el arte Gótico* Madrid: Cátedra, 1987, 2nd ed.
61. Rosemary Ellen Guiley. *The Encyclopedia of Demons & Demonology*. New York: Facts on File, 2009.
62. Alfonso Fernández Tresguerres. *Satán: La otra Historia de Dios*. Oviedo: Eikasía, 2006.
63. Philippe Borgeaud. *Recherches sur le dieu Pan*. Rome: Institut Suisse de Rome, 1979.
64. Udo Becker. *The Continuum Encyclopedia of Symbols*. New York: Continuum, 2005.
65. Aristotle. *De generatione animalium*, critical edition by Hendrik Joan Drossaart Lulofs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
66. Francis J. Carmody. *Physiologus Latinus versio Y*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939.
67. *Bestiaires du Moyen Âge* translated and introduced by Gabriel Bianciotto; Paris: Stock, 1995, 3rd ed.
68. Cicero. *De natura deorum; Academica*, with an English translation by Harris Rackham. London: Heinemann, 1967.

69. Virgil. *Aeneis*, Introduction by Vicente Cristóbal and translated with notes by Javier Echave-Sustaeta. Madrid: Gredos, 1997.
70. *Fábulas de Esopo. Vida de Esopo. Fábulas de Babrio*, introduced and translated with notes by Pedro Bádenas de la Peña, and Javier López Facal. Madrid: Gredos, 1985, 1st reprint.
71. *Oppianus Apameensis: Cynegetica, Eutecnius Sophistes: Paraphrasis Metro Soluta*, edited by Manolis Papathomopoulos. Monachii: K. G. Saur, 2003.
72. *Libro de las Utilidades de los Animales*, translated with notes by Carmen Ruiz Bravo-Villasante. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1980.
73. Eratosthenes. *Catasterismos*, translated by José Ramón del Canto Nieto. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 1992.
74. Hyginus. *Fábulas. Astronomía*. Edited by de Guadalupe Morcillo Expósito. Madrid: Akal, 2008.
75. Servius. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Vol. II, *Aeneidos Librorum VI-XII commentarii*; edited by Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1986.
76. Alciato. *Emblemas*, edited by Santiago Sebastián. Madrid: Akal, 1993, 2nd ed.
77. Hesiod. *Obras y Fragmentos*, introduced and translated with notes by Aurelio Pérez Jiménez, and Alfonso Martínez Díez. Madrid: Gredos, 1983.
78. Aratus. *Fenómenos; Geminus, Introducción a los Fenómenos*, introduced and translated with notes by Esteban Calderón Dorda. Madrid: Gredos, 1993.
79. Auguste Bouché-Leclercq. *L'astrologie grecque*. Bruxelles: Culture et civilisation, 1963.
80. Macrobius. *Comentarios al Sueño de Escipión*, edited and translated by Jordi Raventós. Madrid: Siruela, 2005.
81. André Le Boeuffe. *Astronomie, Astrologie. Lexique Latin*. Paris: Picard, 1987.
82. Manilius. *Astrología*, introduced and translated with notes by Francisco Calero, and María José Echarte. Madrid: Gredos, 1996.
83. Alain Daniélou. *The Myths and Gods of India: The Classic Work on Hindu Polytheism*. Rochester: Inner Traditions International, 1991.
84. Virgil. *Georgics*. Vol. 1, Books I-II; Edited by Richard F. Thomas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
85. Neil Cox, and Deborah Povey. *A Picasso Bestiary*. London: Academy Editions, 1995.
86. Olivier Widmaier Picasso. *Picasso: Retratos de Familia*. Madrid: Algaba Ediciones, 2003.
87. Enrique Mallen. *Online Picasso Project*. Hunstville: Sam Houston State University, 1997–2017.
88. John Szoke. "Eaux-fortes originals pour les texts de Buffon." Available online: <http://www.johnszoke.com/essays/eaux-fortes-originales-pour-les-texts-de-buffon> (accessed on 28 August 2016).
89. Leclerc, Comte de Buffon. *Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière, Avec la Description du Cabinet du Roi*; Imprimerie Royale: Paris, 1771; Volume V. Available online: http://www.buffon.cnrs.fr/ice/ice_page_detail.php?lang=fr&type=text&bdd=buffon&table=buffon_hn&typeofbookDes=hn&bookId=5&pageChapter=La+Ch%C3%A8vre+et+la+Ch%C3%A8vre+d%E2%80%99Angora.&pageOrder=59&facsimile=off&search=no&num=0&nav=1 (accessed on 28 August 2016).
90. Pablo Picasso. *Eaux-Fortes Originales pour des Textes de Buffon/Picasso-Reprod. Facs*. Paris: BNF/Seuil, 2015.
91. Cristóbal Macías Villalobos. "El simbolismo del gallo y su reflejo en la obra de Picasso." *Ágora. Estudios Clásicos em Debate* 14 (2012): 325–50.
92. Cristóbal Macías Villalobos. "El simbolismo de la oveja y su presencia en la obra de Picasso." In *Virtuti Magistri Honos. Studia Graecolatina A. Alberte Septuagesimo Anno Dicata*. Edited by Cristóbal Macías Villalobos and Salvador Núñez. Zaragoza: Libros Pórtico, 2011, pp. 187–235.
93. John Richardson. *Picasso. Una Biografía*. Vol. I, 1881–1906. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1995.
94. Carlos Alcalde, Pablo Asencio, and Cristóbal Macías Villalobos. "Picasso y la mitología clásica." *Myrtia* 22 (2007): 297–317.
95. José María Blázquez. "El mundo clásico en Picasso." In *Discursos y ponencias del IV Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos: Barcelona y Madrid, 15-19 de abril de 1971*. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 1973, pp. 137–55.
96. Pablo Picasso. "Paintings, Quotes, and Biography." Available online: [http://www.pablocassio.org/joie-de-vivre.jsp#prettyPhoto\[image2\]/0/](http://www.pablocassio.org/joie-de-vivre.jsp#prettyPhoto[image2]/0/) (accessed on 28 August 2016).

97. Marie-Noëlle Delorme, Marie-Christine Enshaian, Brigitte Léal, and Dominique Dupuis-Labbé. *Picasso. La Passion du Dessin*. Paris: Musée Picasso, 27 Septembre 2005–9 Janvier 2006; Barcelona: Museu Picasso, 8 Février–8 Mai, 2006; Berlin: Museum Berggruen, 26 September 2006–7 Januar 2007; Réunion des Musées Nationaux Museu Picasso de Barcelona-Musée Picasso de Paris, 2005–2007.
98. Gertje R. Uteley. *Picasso: The Communist Years*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press, 2000.
99. Sylvie Forestier. *Pablo Picasso: La Guerre et la Paix*, photographs by Georgio Dettori, and André Villers. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1995.



© 2017 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).