

Corrections to Deirdre Bair, *Saul Steinberg: A Biography* (New York: Nan A. Talese/Doubleday, 2012).

December 31, 2013

As the central resource for Saul Steinberg scholarship and the custodian of the artist's legacy, the Foundation is responsible for ensuring the factual accuracy of published material that will further the development of a reliable reference literature on Steinberg.

It is for this reason that the Foundation read both the first and second drafts of the typescript of Bair's biography, pointing out the need for corrections throughout. Since many of these corrections were not made in the final book, we are providing the list below, in the hope that it will prevent the reiteration of inaccuracies in the work of future researchers. It would be difficult for readers to recognize most of the errors, since the sources cited are often in publicly inaccessible files or institutional archives.

In a book intended to appeal both to scholars and the interested general public, it is not unexpected to find some material presented as fact but left unsourced by documentary notations. Given the number of flaws in the sourced material, however, the Foundation is wary of accepting as factual what it cannot independently verify. In an effort to advance the cause of Steinberg scholarship, we have sometimes added references.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

- Steinberg bequeathed all his papers to the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University (YCAL), but the 133 boxes have not yet been catalogued by the Library. Consequently, SSF does not have a complete file of source material and has not been able to verify all the statements and references in the book.
- Types of errors.  
The items in the list below fall into several general categories: misreading and confusion of documents and other sources; misleading or incorrect note references that do not document what Bair claims they do; missing or incomplete references; misquotations or mistranscriptions; misdating or misidentification of photographs; unacknowledged use of translated material; authorial embellishment of source material presented as fact.
- Unusable references.  
References are sometimes excessively generalized, such as "ST's YCAL correspondence" (hundreds of letters in 133 boxes); "ST's letters to HS at AAA" (Steinberg's letters to Hedda Sterne at the Archives of American Art fill more than a thousand microfilm frames); source material is "scattered through the uncatalogued YCAL boxes." Such indefiniteness, moreover, suggests far more documents relevant to a subject than could exist.

With the exception of notebooks and other bound material, most of the papers at YCAL are contained in named folders within boxes. Since each box may contain scores of documents, the folder name is an essential finding aid. Missing folder names have been provided when known to the Foundation.

Note: in some cases, multiple folders for the same subject are not numbered. The original sequence may have been inadvertently altered by researchers. The folder numbers given here are those known to the Foundation.

- Ambiguity of reference system. Sources are found in the notes section beginning on p. 598, where boldface phrases indicate corresponding passages in the text. But for those without the documentary material at hand, the note can be unclear as to what part of the text the reference covers; it may be for the phrase alone, for preceding text, or for an unspecified section of material that follows. We have tried to clarify whenever possible.

- Journal 1940-42

The document is a handwritten journal, in Italian, that ST kept, now divided between two folders at YCAL, box 89: “Tortoreto 1940-42” and “Miscellaneous 1940-42.” The journal was translated by The Saul Steinberg Foundation (SSF), later amended by Mario Tedeschini Lalli (MTL), and published in MTL’s “Descent from Paradise,” pp. 356-67 (see Abbreviations, below). Bair was provided with SSF’s translation in 2007 and subsequently asked to update her quotations and references to the version published in MTL’s essay. Where she has not done so, updates are provided. In many cases, Bair refers only to the original Italian manuscript at YCAL, although she used the translated document; here too correct references are supplied.

The frequent reference to the presence of one of the folders in box 20 is erroneous. No part of the journal is in that box. “Box 20” was an error in the 2007 translation file (it was corrected in the final publication).

The document is sometimes mistitled as “Wartime Diary” or “Diary 1940-42”; “diary” was SSF’s initial description, superseded in the published version.

MTL’s publication of the journal ends with the June 20, 1941, entry. The rest of the journal remains unpublished; Bair is using the translation supplied to her by SSF.

- ST letters to Aldo Buzzi

ST’s letters to his friend Aldo Buzzi, written in Italian, were edited by Buzzi and published as *Saul Steinberg: Lettere a Aldo Buzzi 1945-1999* (Milan: Adelphi Edizioni, 2002). In addition to a typescript English translation of this book, commissioned by SSF, Bair was given a typescript, in Italian, of the complete letters, including unpublished (and untranslated) material. On several occasions, Bair was asked to distinguish throughout her notes between citations to published letters (where Bair uses SSF’s translation) and the unpublished and untranslated material— out of respect for Buzzi’s fine editorial decisions and to save later researchers a futile search for an unpublished passage in the published book. This Bair has not done. Instead, in the note on p. 602 for **It was only then that he learned**, she offers this rationale: “As these letters have only been privately translated into English but not published by SSF, I do not distinguish here between the published and unpublished portions in the Italian book, because I have no way of knowing what may or may not eventually appear in an English publication.”

Throughout the notes, SSF has indicated unpublished passages as necessary; translations of such passages are Bair’s, not those of SSF.

- ST letters to Hedda Sterne. ST’s letters to his wife, Hedda Sterne, are at the Archives of American Art, Hedda Sterne Papers. Upon Sterne’s death on April 8, 2011, a microfilm of the papers was made available to the public in AAA branches throughout the country. ST’s letters to HS are on microfilm reel 144. To facilitate the work of future researchers, a frame number is provided here. The frame numbers are not always legible on the microfilm; some are deduced from manual counting, but should be in the approximate range.

- Paragraph indications: the enumeration of paragraphs in the list below includes partial paragraphs.
- Boldface phrases in the list match those used in the book's notes section.

### Abbreviations

- AAA: Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.  
 AB: Aldo Buzzi  
 HS: Hedda Sterne  
 MTL: Mario Tedeschini Lalli, "Descent from Paradise: Saul Steinberg's Italian Years (1933-1941)," *Quest: Issues in Contemporary Jewish History*, no. 2 (October 2011), pp. 312-84; online at <http://www.quest-cdecjournal.it/focus.php?id=221>  
 R & S: Saul Steinberg with Aldo Buzzi, *Reflections and Shadows*, translated from the Italian by John Shepley (New York: Random House, 2002)  
 R & S *Outtakes*: Bair's abbreviation for unpublished sections of R & S. The original Italian typescript is at SSF and was translated by James Marcus.  
 S:/: Joel Smith, *Saul Steinberg: Illuminations*, exh. cat. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), with an introduction by Charles Simic  
 SSF: The Saul Steinberg Foundation  
 ST: Saul Steinberg  
 TNY: *The New Yorker*  
 YCAL: Yale Collection of American Literature, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. The Saul Steinberg Papers are Uncat. Mss. 126.

## CORRECTIONS

### Chapter 1

p. 1, last line, re ST's efforts to obtain a US visa, aided by "the intercession of everyone from Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt to his American uncles and cousins, to several international publishers and agents and the editors of *The New Yorker*...."

It was not Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt (1794-1877) who assisted Steinberg, but the newspaperman and publisher Cornelius Vanderbilt IV (1898-1974), or Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr., as printed on his letterhead. The right Vanderbilt makes his entrance later (pp. 59 et al.).

Only one agent was involved in the effort to get ST out of Italy, Cesar Civita; the aid of international publishers is unknown to the Foundation.

### Chapter 2

p. 3, re: ST's birthdate; note on p. 598, "**his parents celebrated.**"

Bair gives conflicting and erroneous information. In paragraph 1, "June 15, 1914, in the Julian (then being phased out) but June 28 in the Gregorian [calendar]." In the next paragraph, however: "On the birthday his parents celebrated, June 14 (June 28 in the modern calendar." June 15 (Julian) = June 28 (Gregorian) is correct.

As for the birthday his parents celebrated, noted twice on p. 3 as "June 14," the documentary evidence confirms that his parents—and his sister, Lica—knew that his birthday was June 15. One document, from a 1994 ST diary, is cited in Bair's note. Others: A birthday telegram from Lica, June 15, 1956, and another, June 15, 1960; a postcard from ST's parents to ST and HS, June 14, 1957, "Tomorrow it's Saul's birthday." All these missives are in the Romanian letters (see Bair's abbreviations, p. 598).

That Hedda as well as ST's niece and nephew "believe the family celebrated on June 14" (cited in the note, apparently from interviews) cannot override the documents.

p. 3, last paragraph, where ST compares his life to the history of the twentieth century, as “an immense prank played not only on him but on all of humanity.”

The source is a letter Steinberg wrote to Aldo Buzzi, February 5, 1990, quoted in *S:I*, p. 232: “The news of the world makes me think that for many years we’ve been the victims of an immense prank, which has lasted perhaps since the year of my birth, 1914.”

p. 5, 5 lines from bottom, re ST’s paternal grandmother, “**whose patronymic was never recorded**”; note on p. 598.

In the note, the translator’s name for the unpublished translation of ST’s letters to AB should be John Shepley, not Sheply.

The reference to *R & S Outtakes* is incorrect. There is no discussion in these texts of the Steinberg genealogy or family history.

p. 10, last paragraph, “**He was between six and eight months old** when [the Steinberg family] left Râmnicul-Sărat to live in Buzău...”; note on p. 600.

In the note, Bair points out that ST made contradictory statements about whether the family went from Râmnicul-Sărat to Buzău or directly to Bucharest. Confirmation for the Buzău sojourn appears in the uncut version of ST’s letter to AB, October 1, 1998: “Mio padre nel 1918, quando, avendo perso la guerra, cavalli etc., visse nascosto *assieme a noi* nella casa del nonno, a Buzău” (“My father in 1918, when, having lost the war, horses, etc., lived in hiding, *together with us*, in grandfather’s house in Buzău”). Note that “*assieme a noi*” was cut from the published version.

p. 11, paragraph 1. Some of the information about Moritz’s military career is sourced by the 1991 diary entry, cited near the start of the paragraph; some appears in two different letters to Aldo Buzzi, September 29, 1998, and October 1, 1998 (uncited). That Moritz hated horses and didn’t properly groom them, however, appears in neither source.

p. 11, penultimate sentence of paragraph 1, that “the infant Saul thought [his father’s disguise while in hiding] made him look like a **prehistoric monster**”; note on p. 600.

Neither of the two letters to AB cited in the note contains the word “monster” or any similar dramatization. In the October 1<sup>st</sup> letter, Moritz’s beard and headgear “made him look almost prehistoric.”

p. 11, paragraph 1, last sentence, “**Saul’s strongest memory** was of being caught up in his father’s arms and scratched by his beard”; note on p. 600.

In the letter to Ian Frazier, July 10, 1998, cited in the note (copy at SSF), ST reports only that “In 1919...my father reappeared victorious in Bucharest and scratched me with his beard.”

p. 11, paragraph 2, “**Goaded by Rosa**, Moritz did not resume his job as a printer...”; note on p. 600.

The October 2, 1988, ST letter to AB, cited in the note, says nothing about the statements made in this sentence.

p. 13, paragraph 3, “[ST’s Uncle] **Jacques’s formidable wrath**”; note on p. 600.

Although some of the material in this paragraph comes from ST’s description in *R & S*, nothing is there said about Jacques’s being angry.

p. 13, last paragraph, “**one of the largest red-light districts**”; note on p. 600.

“*Pezzetti*,” which begins the note, is given here as a title, but it was merely SSF’s informal name for the material Bair abbreviates as *R & S Outtakes*.

p. 14, paragraph 2, lines 1-4, beginning “Adolf was the uncle Saul liked least”; and note on p. 601, a “**fat lame man**.”

ST does call Adolf a “fat lame man” in *R & S*, p. 20, the source cited. But that ST liked him the least and that the whole family only referred to him as “the other bookseller” is not in ST’s account: “...the youngest of the sisters, Ana, the least good-looking and also the least esteemed. She had married Uncle Adolf, the other bookseller, a fat, lame man.”

p. 14, 3 lines from the bottom, “**he was content to pore over them**” [postcards in the collection of a neighbor’s crippled son]; note on p. 601.

Bair’s reference in the note to the 1940-42 Journal, without a specific entry date, is followed by: “Also, drawing bearing the date August 19, 1941, Ciudad Trujillo, YCAL, Box 20.” These are not two separate documents and the latter is not in box 20 (see General Comment for *Journal 1940-42*). The journal contains a map ST drew of Strada Palas in Bucharest, where he grew up, dated by him August 19, 1941; one house is designated “il ragazzo parallitico” (“the crippled boy”).

p. 16, paragraph 1, “**Too many geniuses—Steinberg claims only his own**”; note on p. 601, referencing this quotation from an “Italian television interviewer.”

The Sergio Zavoli interview described as an “electronic file” is a file supplied to Bair by SSF of the transcript of the 1967 interview published in *Riga*, no. 24 (2005), issue dedicated to ST, pp. 77-90. The passage quoted is on p. 77.

p. 16, paragraph 2, “**To solve once and for all**”; note on p. 601.

Here and elsewhere, Bair uses the hand-corrected typescript of Grace Glueck’s interview with ST at AAA rather than the more polished and accessible version in *Art in America*, “The Artist Speaks: Saul Steinberg” (November-December 1970). The typescript is a transcription of a taped interview with many errors in spelling and comprehension corrected by hand. In the present case, for example, Klee is sometimes transcribed as “clay.”

There is no “for all” in either version. The published quote, p. 114 in *Art in America*, reads: “To solve for once the problem of Klee, I want to say this—that Klee did not influence me. I like Klee, of course, but the relationship between him and myself is that we both are ex-children who never stopped drawing.”

p. 16, paragraph 2, “**every explanation**”; note on p. 601.

For the quote “every explanation is an over-explanation.” The wording in both the typescript and published version reads “every explanation is over-explanation.”

p. 16, paragraph 3, quotation from Klee, “**a line is a dot that went for a walk**”; note on p. 601.

The boldface phrase in the note mistakenly says “a line is a thought that went for a walk.”

p. 16, last paragraph.

The paragraph is unsourced, but implies a source in *Reflections and Shadows*. The quoted passage, “Steinberg volunteered that he had once asked himself ‘how children and lunatics used to draw,’” is not from the published version of *Reflections and Shadows*, but from the unpublished section entitled “How I Draw” in the manuscript Bair abbreviates *R & S Outtakes*. The passage below about “childish manner” is from the same source.

ST’s self-description as an illustrator is not in this text, nor is the passage quoted at the end of the paragraph (“the same one I acquired back then”) in the Glueck transcript cited in the note.

p. 17, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s two earliest drawings, “**one is a six-sided pyramid**”; note on p. 601. “Unfortunately, neither drawing is of reproduction quality.”

The available scans are inadequate for reproduction, not the drawings themselves.

p. 17, paragraph 3; note on p. 602, “**There is an aura about the portrait.**”

In the note, after referring to two sets of interviews, Bair adds other references: “ST to AB, particularly letters written between 1996 and 1999; ST diary writings, YCAL, Boxes 75 and 95.” It would have been useful to know which ST to AB letters in this three-year period (there are scores of them) and which diary entries, of what date, are relevant to the contents of this paragraph.

### Chapter 3

p. 18, end of first paragraph, “He received no feeling of normalcy from interacting with his peers”; note on p. 602.

The note citation to *R & S Outtakes* is to the section entitled “Drawing for *The New Yorker*.” ST says: “During my childhood and adolescence, due to my nature and to the strangeness of my reactions to things, I felt abnormal—a feeling that was endorsed by the world of adults, who were continually scolding me. Only in art did I find normality: that is, an area in which I functioned, in which I reacted, not only according to my own lights but to those of society.”

The additional reference to “mss. Pages in YCAL, Box 38” may refer to loose pages of the same text in some folder in the box.

p. 19, paragraph 1, “It was only then that he learned”; note on p. 602.

For Bair’s “explanation” in the note of the published vs. unpublished ST letters to AB, beginning “As these letters,” see above, General Comments, ST letters to Aldo Buzzi.

p. 21, paragraph 2, “He commuted [to school in Bucharest] on a decrepit American streetcar, and that was where he had the experiences that led to his discovery of how deeply anti-Semitism had permeated everything”; note on p. 602.

ST describes the streetcar in the Cummings interview cited, but the interview does not suggest that the streetcar experience led ST to discover Romanian anti-Semitism.

p. 22, paragraph 4, last 2 sentences, “Steinberg’s memory of wartime hunger stemmed from the time when he was four or five and Rosa trained him and Lica...”; note p. 603.

The note reads: “ST Diary, n.d., YCAL, Box 75.” This “undated” diary is dated 1991 by ST—as Bair correctly cites it elsewhere. The diary entry relevant to the text here is the page following the May 25 entry.

p. 23, last line to p. 24, lines 1-2, “It was hard for Saul in particular, who saw himself as participating in ‘a social class revolution’...”; note on p. 603.

The note cites an ST letter to Hedda Sterne, “July 15 and 16, 1944.” There is no such letter; a letter of July 14-15 (AAA, reel 144, frames 245-246) is the source for the quotations about Moritz in the next two sentences. The quotation “social class revolution...,” however, does not appear in this letter or elsewhere in the ST-HS correspondence.

p. 24, paragraph 2, last sentence, about ST and some of his friends being dismissed by others as “the ‘serious boys’”; note on p. 603.

Concerning the references in this note to two publications by Eugen Campus: Bair cites a “first set” of Campus articles: “first set” was merely a descriptive heading in SSF’s translation to distinguish articles that appeared in two different publications.

The bibliographic citations of Campus’s essays in later notes are inconsistent and confusing. To clarify for the reader, all the Campus essays were published, in Romanian, in a collection of his essays entitled *Deschizând noi orizonturi...* —as cited at the end of this note. They were translated by Emil Niculescu for SSF. Subsequent clarifications will appear as necessary.

p. 25, paragraph 3, line 3, he read avidly; note on p. 602.

The date of the second letter cited is September 25, not September 26.

p. 25, paragraph 3, “**when he became proficient in Italian**, he read some of them [French novels] again in translation...”; note on p. 603.

The cited letter to Aldo Buzzi, September 25, 1986, says nothing about ST reading French novels (or anything else) in Italian translation.

p. 25, last paragraph, lines 1-3, “his **Uncle Harry visited** from New York,” when ST “was ten”; note on p. 603.

The year was 1925 and ST was eleven, as he says in the letter to Aldo Buzzi cited in the note. The source for ST’s description of Romania as a “primitive civilization” is the same letter.

p. 604, note for p. 26, line 5, “**I was different.**”

The abbreviated citation of Eugen Campus’s article “Elective Affinities” precedes three variant forms of the full reference, three of which should in any case be to different articles (as indicated below). The correct reference is: Eugen Campus, “Elective Affinities (Conversations with Saul Steinberg),” first published in Campus’s collection of essays, *Deschizând noi orizonturi...*, pp. 367-71 (as cited by Bair in the note for p. 24, paragraph 2; see above).

p. 27, lines 2-3, “**He was shocked by things he had not been taught** about the true histories of other eastern European nations”; note on p. 604.

The note, to the Cummings interview, is actually the source for the preceding quotation about patriotism and hating Hungarians. The correct transcription reads: “I had studied a fictitious history made by - adopted by politicians. It was made to cause us to be patriotic and to hate the Hungarians and to be proud of the small countries.”

## Chapter 4

p. 29, epigraph, “**I accepted a kind of compromise**”; note on p. 604.

For the full reference to Campus’s “Elective Affinities,” see above, comment for p. 604, note for p. 26, line 5. The page number should be 368.

p. 29, paragraph 1.

The information about the *shadchanim*’s visit to the Steinberg home is from the Eugen Campus article cited as a source for the opening epigraph.

Bair goes on to say that “Saul was rejected when the admissions committee for the school of architecture [of the University of Bucharest] pronounced him deficient...in mathematical ability and skill in drawing. They deemed him far more talented in languages and shunted his admission to the university’s liberal arts division, the Faculty of Arts [*sic*, for Philosophy] and Letters.”

These statements then become the basis for other biographical assertions. But the documents tell a different story:

Bair here claims that ST only studied in the liberal arts division because he was rejected by the architecture school. No sources are given either for the skills in which ST was allegedly deficient or for the notion that it was the architecture school committee that sent him to the liberal arts division. Moreover, all the documents known to SSF, including those cited by Bair, indicate that he applied to the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Bucharest, not in 1932, when he finished high school, but only after a year in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. In a document dated September 13, 1933, the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters validated a copy of his high school transcript, which he needed in his application “for entry to the *Ec. de Architectura* of the university” (YCAL, box 89, folder “SS Romanian Passport 1939”). It was the rejection of his application that led him to apply to the Politecnico in Milan, where he was enrolled by late 1933.

The passage from Eugen Campus's "Elective Affinities," quoted in the epigraph, continues: "Matchmakers [*shadchanim*] started to show up at our house, offering rich partners for the future architect, even agreeing to sponsor my studies for a prolonged duration. *Fortunately, I did not pass the admission examination, and so I left for Milan.*" Again, the two events—failing the exam and departure for Milan—are presented as sequential and thus in the fall of 1933.

p. 29, paragraph 2, "**This was the first-ever rejection** in all Steinberg's years as a Jewish wunderkind, which may have been why he spent his only year at the University of Bucharest lackadaisically reading philosophy and literature"; note on p. 604.

The note does not document the supposed 1932 date for the rejection from architecture school. It cites a letter from Jacques Ghelber, October 19, 1953, to ST. This letter, in Romanian, is among the Romanian letters at YCAL, which Bair read in the translation by Emil Niculescu, commissioned by SSF. That translation, including the bracketed passage, reads: "I have more appreciation [for what? For Saul's language skills?] than those at the School of Architecture." The bracketed passage was an inquiry added by the translator, who wondered at the nature of the "appreciation." Bair transforms this into "more appreciation for Saul's [word not clear; possible translation is *skills*]...." There is no word here at all, and the vagueness of the passage doesn't justify Bair's claim in the same note that "This is the single most direct comment that explains why ST went to Milan."

(SSF's efforts to gain access to ST's Bucharest University records have been foiled by Romanian bureaucracy.)

p. 31, paragraph 2, penultimate line, "**He also joined them** [his lycée classmates] **to hike**"; note on p. 605.

The cited reference to ST's letter to Aldo Buzzi is from an unpublished and untranslated part of the letters.

The title of the Campus article cited is incorrect. It is not "Elective Affinities" but "Nature and Art (Conversations with Saul Steinberg)," p. 56 in Campus's book for the reference to hiking (see above, comment for p. 24, paragraph 2).

p. 31, paragraph 3, "**he always insisted** that he made few, if any close friends during his school years in Bucharest"; note on p. 605.

The note claims that ST wrote "capsule biographies" of his lycée classmates on the back of a photo sent to Aldo Buzzi, August 7, 1998. The passage Bair quotes from one of the "biographies" is in the body of the August 7 letter, given here for some reason in the original Italian, though it is among the published and therefore translated letters to Buzzi: "Leventer, perfect shadows, dead 4 years ago, rich, faithful wife and son"; similarly, "una rovina bizantina di Bucharest" in the same letter.

Further in the note, ST's description of Eugen Campus is not from the July 7, 1998, letter to Buzzi but from the letter dated October 3, 1987. Neither is the next quotation about the literary circle at Campus's house, which is from Campus's "Elective Affinities," p. 368.

p. 31, paragraph 4, "**This was where Steinberg first understood** how essential the study of literature and literary criticism were to the acquisition of knowledge"; note on p. 605.

"Information that follows is from writings by Eugen Campus..." The information in the next paragraphs about the architects Marcel and Iuliu Iancu (Janco) does not come from Campus, who never mentions the brothers.

The bibliographic citations of Campus's articles that follow in the note need correction. The title Bair gives as "ST: Recent Work" should be "Saul Steinberg, portrayer of our times," and appears on pp. 254-57 of Campus's book (see above, comment for p. 24, paragraph 2). The page references cited for the review "ST—The Discovery of America Today" are for the book, not the original publication in *Minimum*. The last reference, to Campus's "Elective Affinities," conflates two different articles. The one "first published in *Viața*



*Noastră*” is not “Elective Affinities” but “Nature and Art (Conversations with Saul Steinberg)”; see above, comment for p. 31, paragraph 2.

p. 33, paragraph 2, line 4, “Campus described him as having a ‘timid and taciturn’ personality”; note on p. 605.

The title of the cited Campus article originally published in *Minimum* is not “Elective Affinities” but “Saul Steinberg, portrayer of our times.” The quotation is from p. 254 of the republication in Campus’s book.

p. 33, last 3 lines: Having failed to gain admission to the school of architecture, “they [ST, Bruno Leventer, and Mihail Perlmutter] all enrolled in the university’s liberal arts division.”

See comments above, for p. 29, paragraph 1, especially the document dated September 13, 1933. No references are provided for when Leventer and Perlmutter were denied entrance, but ST’s application was rejected after he spent a year in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. Again, no evidence suggests that he enrolled in the liberal arts division *after* being rejected by the School of Architecture.

p. 34, lines 6-7, “Steinberg began to think that going abroad to study architecture would get him out of home life...”; note on p. 605.

The citation to Campus’s “Elective Affinities” article as a reference for this paragraph is misleading. Although it does speak of ST’s discontent with his home and school life, it does not source his thoughts about going abroad, or Ghelber’s “enthusiastic reports about his architectural studies,” or anything about Leventer’s “foreign research.”

p. 34, penultimate paragraph, line 1, “Steinberg’s argument for going to the Regio Politecnico”; note on p. 604.

In addition to citing interviews, Bair adds that other sources for this point are “from the Romanian letters, cited specifically where appropriate.” None is ever cited.

p. 34, penultimate paragraph, line 5, “What would happen to her [Saul’s mother]...if her beloved only son left her”; note on p. 605.

In the note, Bair writes: “Within his family, he was either Sauly, Salitza, Saulica, or some other variant of his given name.” In the Romanian family letters, he is always “Saulica,” the Romanian diminutive of Saul, pronounced with a hard “c.” “Sauly” is merely the English translation of Saulica; “Salitza” is unknown to SSF.

## Chapter 5

pp. 36-37, paragraph 1, and p. 606, note for p. 36, line 5, “at Viale Lombardia 21.”

Several points of confusion have to be unraveled concerning with whom and where ST lived in Milan.

Bair claims that in Milan, ST, Leventer, and Perlmutter “moved from student housing into one furnished room after another until they found something fairly decent and affordable at Viale Lombardia 21.”

There is no evidence that the three of them always lived together (and “fairly decent and affordable” is Bair’s interpolation). The reference in the note is to the “Handwritten List of Addresses”—a numbered list of Milan residences, year by year, that ST made from his refuge in Santo Domingo (it is in the folder “Santo Domingo 1942,” YCAL, box 2). In this list, ST indicates that he went to Milan with his two friends: “1933-34 - Bocciato [“failed,” i.e., the entrance exam to the Bucharest architecture school] Milano, Ciucu [Perlmutter], Leventer.” After that entry, he lists two addresses that he shared “con Ciucu”: 1934-34, Via della Sila 34; 1935-36, another place on the Via della Sila (the landlady’s name differs). No other roommates are listed.

It does appear, however, that Leventer shared one accommodation with ST, though not at Viale Lombardia 21, as Bair writes. Leventer himself gives two different addresses for what is clearly the same room. In his letter to ST of November 27, 1956 (among the Romanian letters; not cited here by Bair), he refers to “the grinning horse above my bed” on “Via[le] Lombardia 21.” But in his letter of December 30, 1959 (as in the note), he describes “our famous room with ‘terrazzo’ and ‘testa di cavallo’ on Via della Silla [*sic* for Sila] 21.” The equine decoration suggests that this must be the same place and that Leventer is misremembering addresses, as he does in the letter of February 7, 1960 (as in the note)—“the room and the terrace on Viale Lombardia 21.” The absence of any Viale Lombardia address on ST’s detailed list confirms that Leventer’s reference to that street is erroneous and that the room was on the Via della Sila—either that listed without number for 1935-36 (above) or possibly Via della Sila 21, listed by ST for 1936-37, though without mention of roommates.

In sum: the documentary evidence does not support a claim that the three friends always lived together or that they shared any rented rooms on the Viale Lombardia.

More confusion: Bair describes the room on the Viale Lombardia 21 [*sic* for Via della Sila] as having “a window that opened onto a tiny balcony just big enough to hold a potted plant, which they jokingly called a ‘terrazzo.’” But the note for this description on p. 606 (“**a tiny balcony just big enough**”) refers to an ST drawing inscribed, as Bair correctly notes, “Milano/My room—Bar del Grillo.” ST’s room above the Bar del Grillo, Via Pascoli 64, was the last place he lived in Milan. The drawing, with a windowsill full of potted plants, is reproduced in Smith, *S:I*, p. 252, and MTL, fig. 2; fig. 3 is a photograph of ST at work in the same room. Bair’s description thus conflates a drawing of a later address with the earlier room with a “terrazzo” and “testa di cavallo.”

The note on p. 606 for p. 36, “**at Viale Lombardia,**” begins: “Conflicting documents give several addresses for ST’s first residence in Milan. In ‘Handwritten List of Addresses,’...he wrote Ampero, but his official Politecnico documents give it as Ampère 46.” The documents are not in conflict. If one looks closely at the list of addresses, it too says “Ampère 46.”

p. 37, paragraph 2, line 1, ST’s “official registration in the school of architecture was dated November 17, 1933, and on December 16 he was officially enrolled....”

November 17 was the date of his application to enroll, not his registration. Thus in the document in the Politecnico files, dated November 17, “Saul Steinberg...fa domanda di essere iscritto al corso primo della Facolta di Architettura”—“Saul Steinberg is applying for enrollment in the first course of the Faculty of Architecture.”

“His actual entry to the school [the Politecnico] had come in September...” But on September 13, he was still applying for admission to the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Bucharest (see above, comment for p. 29, paragraph 1). The Politecnico files contain two transcripts of the high school records needed for application to the Politecnico, one in the original Romanian, the other an official translation by the Italian Consulate in Bucharest; both documents are dated October 27, 1933.

p. 37, paragraph 3, line 7, “**a rich correspondence**”; note on p. 606.

In the note, after again citing the published edition of ST’s letters to AB, Bair adds: “The English translation of the published texts and summaries of the portions excised and unpublished were prepared for SSF by John Shepley (through 1978) and James Marcus (1979-99)...”

Bair is referring to a chart she received from SSF that distinguishes published from unpublished letters and summarizes their contents. It was prepared neither by Shepley, who died in 2003, before SSF received all the letters from AB, nor by James Marcus. See General Comments, ST letters to Aldo Buzzi.

p. 38, line 5, “Tommaso Buzzi.” The correct spelling is Tomaso (and note a different misspelling three times on p. 43 and again on p. 44).

p. 38, last line, “[the bar, Il Grillo] became an **iconic talisman** for triggering happy memories”; note on p. 606.

The ST to AB letter cited in the note, April 6, 1987, says nothing about the Bar del Grillo as a trigger for later memories. ST only speaks of the staff and the origin of the bar’s name, as quoted by Bair in the next two paragraphs.

p. 39, paragraph 4, ST’s “entire world [Milan in the 1930s] was bounded by a few streets located midway between the Metro stops of Piola and Lambrate....”

The first line of the Milan Metro did not open until 1964.

p. 39, last sentence, “His world became even smaller when Ciucu Perlmutter moved elsewhere and he and Bruno Leventer were left alone to settle in under the dreadful *testa di cavallo*.”

See above, comment for pp. 36-37.

p. 40, 8 lines from bottom, “**first-class noticer**”; note on p. 607.

The date of the interview with Roger Angell cited in the note for this phrase is presumably 2008, not 1908.

p. 40, penultimate line, “**the terrace of our villa** in the shade of the dwarf palms”; note on p. 607.

In the note, this phrase is correctly credited to Bruno Leventer, in a letter to ST dated November 27, 1956. But Bair then adds: “ST wrote: ‘I told her [Lica, ST’s sister] about our parties with del Castro and Ciucu.’ The same was true in the years when ST lived at 64, Via Pascoli, in the room above the Bar del Grillo.”

ST was not responsible for the above words. The source for the quotation is the same November 27 letter from Bruno Leventer; he is the person who spoke to Lica. As for the goings-on in ST’s room on Via Pascoli, no evidence is cited for this statement.

p. 41, paragraph 2, “...even though Saul insisted that the only thing he took notice of on his long, exhausting marches around Milan was ‘the luxury of women,’ his notebooks attest that he saw much more.”

It’s unclear to what “notebooks” Bair refers. All that survives of this nature from ST’s Milan years is a small group of single-sheet drawings at YCAL, box 39, folder “Vecchi Disegni.” Besides the San Lorenzo drawing, referred to later in the paragraph, none of the dozen sheets shows anything more of Milan. The statement that he regularly drew “the life of the streets, rendering everything he saw with his characteristic firm black line and giving everything a touch of the whimsical and imaginative that was uniquely his own”—if such a corpus ever existed, no one today has ever seen it.

p. 42, paragraph 3, line 4, “**Students often postponed** final exams until long after they completed the courses...and that is what Steinberg did”; note on p. 607.

The note reference, to Mario Tedeschini Lalli’s essay, is misleading. MTL, p. 329, only speaks of ST’s postponement of exams—because he was busy working for *Bertoldo*. Bair turns ST’s postponements into a school-wide practice.

p. 42, end of paragraph 3, “What remained strong from these years were the memories of ‘**places that don’t belong** to geography but to time’”; note on p. 607.

After citing *R & S* for the quotation, Bair adds a reference to Francesca Pellicciari, whose thesis purportedly has an “Indige [*sic*, for *Indice*] Delle Immagini” with “a partial list of some of these drawings....” Pellicciari’s “List of Illustrations,” beginning on p. 503, is just that—a list of all 255 reproductions in the thesis. Bair is referring to ST’s memory drawings of Milan from the 1970s, some of them reproduced elsewhere in the thesis.

p. 43, paragraph 3, concerning Tomaso Buzzi's instruction in "documentary" drawings at the Politecnico: "Steinberg's versions of some of the 'documentary' drawings were of interiors as grand as the Galleria [di Milano]...."

There is only one known drawing by ST of the Galleria di Milano (reproduced in the plate insert following p. 398), but it is dated 1951 and thus cannot be considered, as Bair implies, among ST student works.

p. 43, paragraph 3, describing ST's "documentary" drawings, as "**Straight walls appear slanted and off-kilter**"; note on p. 607.

Among the descriptions of the 1951 *Galleria di Milano* that Bair mentions in the note is a Roland Barthes essay, cited as "'All Except You, Saul Steinberg. *Scritti* (Turin: Einaudi, 1976)." The essay, "All Except You," is the eponymous title of a book published in 1983, not 1976, by Repères: Éditions d'art (Galerie Maeght, Paris), with drawings by ST. Barthes's remarks are made in the paragraph headed "Labyrinthe" on p. 69. The essay seems to have been republished by Einaudi in a 1998 Italian translation of Barthes's essay.

p. 45, lines 1-5, discussing what ST brought back to Milan from summer vacations in Bucharest: a "suitcase full of salami, halva, peach preserves and cakes. His friends were happy to share the 'pink, green and blue box of sugary treats'...piled on top of...what Saul dismissed as merely 'some drawings'"; note on p. 608.

The salami, halva, and cakes are mentioned in ST's letter to his parents cited in the note; the peach preserves must come from elsewhere. The reference that follows to Aldo Buzzi's 1946 article, however, is misleading. Buzzi is describing in his own words the contents of ST's suitcase on only one occasion, when ST first arrived in Milan from Bucharest in 1933; thus the colorful box of treats. But ST's alleged "dismissal" of "some drawings" is an invention. Buzzi merely notes that the suitcase also contained "some drawings" (*dei disegni*).

p. 46, paragraph 3, "**Ada remained a major presence,**" concerning ST's support of his Milan girlfriend Ada until her death; note on p. 608.

The note reads: "YCAL documents show that ST paid \$1,000 each month...for her care...." It would have been helpful to cite where, among the thousands of papers at YCAL, this documentation is to be found.

p. 47, paragraph 3, "a new satirical **newspaper called Bertoldo**"; note on p. 608.

The reference in the note's *Bertoldo* bibliography to Giorgio Soavi's 1973 exhibition catalogue essay is incorrect. Soavi is dealing with ST's recent works and says nothing about *Bertoldo*.

Later in the paragraph: "Leventer was a fan of *Marc'Aurelio*, and one morning shortly after the fall term started, he was lazing about and reading *Bertoldo*." No sources are cited for the claim, but in none of Leventer's letters to ST does he mention anything that could be interpreted as "lazing about and reading *Bertoldo*."

End of paragraph: "I remember how stubborn you were...he [Bruno Leventer] later recalled during a conversation with Steinberg"; note on p. 609. The reference is to a letter, not a conversation.

p. 47 bottom-p. 48, line 3, quotation from Carlo Manzoni about his first meeting with ST.

The translation Bair uses here is in MTL, p. 319.

p. 48, paragraph 4, "more than two hundred drawings Steinberg would publish [in *Bertoldo*] until June 1938, when the racial laws imposed by Mussolini forbade Jews, particularly foreign Jews, from working in Italy."

The racial laws were not issued at a single moment, but over time. The laws affecting Steinberg were those for foreign Jews, ordered to leave the country in September 1938, though an exception was later made for university students who had not yet completed their degrees; see MTL, esp. pp. 327-28, with both published and archival sources. The laws prohibiting Jews

from working in Italy (for non-Jewish clients) came later; they did not affect Steinberg, since foreign Jews were already under an expulsion order.

As Bair herself notes on p. 53, paragraph 2, state-sponsored anti-Semitism did not begin until July 1938.

Steinberg's last *Bertoldo* drawing was published on March 19, 1938 (not in June). He then left the newspaper for greener pastures in *Settebello*, where he published his last drawing on September 10, 1938, when the expulsion order was issued (MTL, pp. 320, 328).

p. 48, paragraph 5, Bertoldo "aimed for 'a public that almost immediately was in on our game of allusions...'" ; note on p. 609.

In the note, Bair writes: "The novelist Italo Calvino wrote cartoon captions for a while, but it is not known if he provided any for ST's drawings."

Using a pseudonym, the very young Calvino published captioned cartoons—the drawings were his—in *Bertoldo*, in the regular feature "Il Cestino." See *Guareschi e il Bertoldo*, cited elsewhere by Bair (e.g., p. 608, note for newspaper called *Bertoldo*), pp. 25-32, esp. pp. 27-29, with reproductions.

p. 49, paragraph 2: "Soon after his earliest publications [in *Bertoldo*], Steinberg was given pride of place on what the editors called 'the interior page,' one devoted solely to cartoons. Not only was it the place to be, but often there were no other drawings but his."

SSF has microfilm scans of the complete seven-year run of the twice-weekly *Bertoldo*, 1936-43. During ST's tenure at the magazine only three issues had "pages devoted solely to cartoons" (April 6, 1937; July 16, 1937; January 4, 1938); each of these pages carried about eight cartoons by different artists. Only one ST cartoon appeared among these, in the July 16, 1937, issue. (Excluded here are a smattering of full-page single features in cartoon-strip format or with multiple vignettes, such as ST's "Panorami," or [not ST] "Il Giro del Mondo.")

It isn't clear what Bair means by the "interior page," since the newspaper was normally a six-page affair; the above-cited three pages of cartoons were all on the back page.

In a dozen issues from mid-June to mid-September 1939, the front page of *Bertoldo* did regularly carry only cartoons. But this was after ST's departure.

p. 49, last paragraph, "Steinberg still shared a room with Leventer."

See above, comment for pp. 36-37.

p. 50, lines 6-7, In the *Bertoldo* editorial office, "Steinberg normally sat in a corner, quietly sketching..."; note on p. 609.

The Pellicciari reference in the note should be to p. 80, not pp. 34-35, which constitute a blank page and a reproduction. That ST "normally sat in a corner, quiet sketching," however, seems to be Bair's addition.

p. 50, last paragraph, "Flush with success" [at *Bertoldo*]; note on p. 610.

ST's letter to Buzzi, cited in the note, is unpublished.

p. 51, paragraph 2, "General news publications were directed to 'satirize attitudes and political mentalities that go against Fascism'..."; note on p. 610.

The missing page reference to MTL in the note is p. 321, note 31, discussing the evolution of the propaganda ministry.

p. 51, paragraph 3.

The first quotation ("carried errors, bad taste, venial and mortal sins") is from the Oreste del Buono text cited in the note on p. 610; the translation is in MTL. But a few lines below, "to walk the thin line between compliance and satire," is quoted not from del Buono, but from MTL, also cited in the note, who discusses the problem of *Bertoldo* and Fascism.

p. 52, line 1, "'a terrible idea, blackmail'" [to write a thesis on ST's *Bertoldo* work]; note on p. 610.

The note begins: “Angelini, ‘L’attività italiana di Saul Steinberg,’ discusses this throughout.” Angelini nowhere discusses ST’s objections to his thesis.

Only half of the quotation on p. 52 is from the cited letter to Buzzi, March 28, 1983; the other half is from a letter of July 11, 1980; both the quoted passages are unpublished.

MTL, pp. 322-24, gives a detailed analysis of ST’s later anxieties about his *Bertoldo* work.

## Chapter 6

p. 53, paragraph 2, regarding the imposition of racial laws in 1938: “The general public did not pay much attention to this campaign, because Jews in Italy had been highly assimilated for several centuries.”

As any history of Jews in Italy will reveal, “high assimilation” did not begin until after the revolution of 1848. Until then, Jews suffered persecutions, inquisitions, and expulsion orders, making Italy “for several centuries” an unfriendly and often dangerous place.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_the\\_Jews\\_in\\_Italy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Jews_in_Italy)

p. 54, paragraph 2 - p. 55, end first full paragraph.

At the beginning of this chapter, Bair provides a note (p. 610, “sovereign contempt”) with her sources for the discussion of Mussolini’s racial laws over the next three pages. Five of the works are historical studies of Fascist Italy. Only MTL’s essay discusses ST.

p. 55, lines 1-2, concerning the jobs ST’s friends arranged for him, “One project that survives is an advertisement for ‘Dynamin, the Super Shell...’”; note on p. 611.

The “Dynamin-Super Shell” advertisement cited is one of several ads for the gasoline. The commission, and Erberto Carboni’s role in it, is discussed in detail, with illustrations, in MTL, pp. 329-30 and figs. 10-12.

p. 56, last line, through end of paragraph 1 on p. 57: “He kept a partial list of the work he did between the spring of 1940 and the end of 1941”; note on p. 611.

The note refers to the 1940-42 journal; however, the information does not appear there in list form but rather as scattered items among other journal entries; see MTL, note 64, for the specific journal entries to these works.

Bair’s note adds that this was a “diary/journal” (see General Comment, Journal 1940-42) ST “kept during his incarceration at the Tortoreto detention center.” But the journal entries begin in December 1940, when ST was in Milan, and continue to January 1, 1943, when he was already in New York. There is no evidence that he wrote the journal only during his internment in Tortoreto, May 2-June 6, 1941; nor, obviously, could the entries for post-June 1941 dates have been written there. By “the end of 1941,” ST had been in Santo Domingo for nearly six months.

In the last paragraph on p. 62, Bair gets the date for the commencement of the journal right.

p. 57, line 1, that ST sold works to “other newspapers and magazines”; note on p. 611.

“Other newspapers and magazines” is not a quote from the journal entry for December 30, 1940, cited in the note, though the entry does source “useless and ridiculous work” later in the sentence.

p. 57, line 6, “a nice drawing”; note on p. 612.

The corrected translation of ST’s description of a drawing he did for Pietro Chiesa reads: “a beautiful drawing” (MTL, p. 332). In the note, the title of MTL’s essay is incorrect.

Further reference for “His friend Vito Latis”; note on p. 612: detailed material on Vito Latis, including research in the Latis archives and conversations with Latis’s widow, can be found in MTL, p. 331.

Bair's reference in the note to Maria Vittoria Capitanucci's 2007 study of the long careers of Vito and his brother Gustavo lacks page numbers. The relevant pages (see MTL, note 59) are 37-47, 181, 188.

p. 57, line 9, regarding ST's decorative panel for the Sacerdotti villa that Latis built in Rapallo, "which Steinberg dubbed 'Milanese Bauhaus.'"

ST did not refer to the villa (which he probably never saw) in this way. As MTL, p. 331, note 59, correctly puts it: "[Latis's] first important building, a villa on the Ligurian coast, was built in the style that Steinberg would later call 'Milanese Bauhaus.'"

p. 57, lines 9-11, "**The commission Latis gave him** was far more remunerative: to make a painting for a large wall in the house [i.e., the Sacerdotti villa]..."; note on p. 612.

Greater remuneration is Bair's addition, which may have resulted from her misunderstanding of the commission: it was not "a painting for a large wall," but "a shutter door on a bar" (journal, May 7, 1941; MTL, p. 362). Bair cites a footnote in MTL, which concerns how ST may have spent the money from the commission, but neglects to refer to the text discussion, pp. 331-32, where the dimensions of the work are given, courtesy of the present owner: 132 x 117 cm (52 x 46 in.). Moreover, no records exist to document how much ST was paid for any of his under-the-radar work.

Further in the note, the passage referred to in ST's January 26, 1946, letter to Buzzi is unpublished.

p. 57, paragraph 2, line 6, "**He never imagined** that he would become officially stateless," referring to ST's passport situation in later 1940; note on p. 612.

The note reads: "Information about ST's passport(s) and travel visas are in YCAL, Box 89, folder 'Tortoreto.'" ST's *only* passport at this time is in box 89, folder "SS Romanian Passport 1939." There are two folders titled "Tortoreto" in Box 89 (not to be confused with the folder "Tortoreto 1940-42" in the same box, which contains part of the journal). The first contains a photocopy of the travel affidavit issued by the American consulate in January 1941, which ultimately allowed ST to board a ship for New York. The original of the letter is with the passport. No other "information" appears to be in these folders.

p. 58, paragraph 3: "Well before they got to the United States, the Civita brothers [ST's agents] began to sell Steinberg's drawings...."

Should read: "Well before *he* [i.e., ST] got to the United States." The first ST drawings the brothers sold were in 1940, a year after they arrived in New York. For a chronological listing of ST's non-*New Yorker* magazine features, see Smith, *S:I*, "Features" section of bibliography, pp. 269-72.

p. 58, paragraph 4, "**Steinberg's luck was better** with *Town & Country*, where the editors raved about his drawings..." note on p. 612.

The note reference is to an entry in ST's 1940-42 journal, December 18, 1940, but no sheets from the journal are in the cited box 20. The relevant text in the December entry reads (MTL, p. 359): "I made a painting for [Cesare] Civita using an earth brown-tempera." The painting was more likely a gift than a work sent for publication, all of which at this time consisted of drawings. The *Town & Country* feature noted by Bair was a black-and-white line drawing. SSF is unfamiliar with sources for the claim that the *T & C* editors raved about ST's work.

p. 58, paragraph 4, "**This was very good news**" (that Brazilian publishers were interested in his work); note on p. 612.

The two references to Smith, *S:I*, are garbled: "*S:I*, p. 29 and p. 237, n. 37" and "*S:I*, p. 27, no. 34, p. 237." Neither n. 37 nor p. 27 is relevant to the subject at hand. The reference should be *S:I*, p. 29 and p. 237, n. 34.

p. 59, paragraphs 2 and 3; note on p. 612 for "**Vagabonding with Vanderbilt.**"

Lawrence Danson's essay, "An Heroic Decision," cited for the boldface passage, also seems to be the source for much of the information in these two paragraphs.

p. 60, paragraph 2, line 5, on the order from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that Hungarian and Romanian Jews be "**expelled from the Kingdom**"; note on p. 612.

The correct translation is "removed from the Kingdom," as in MTL, p. 340 and note 87, cited by Bair. MTL points out that the Ministry's "allontanati dal Regno" is a euphemism.

p. 60, paragraph 2 lines 8-9, "**various friends...allowed him to sleep**" at their homes," while ST was hiding from the police; note on p. 612.

The cited part of ST's letter to Buzzi, November 23, 1945, is unpublished.

p. 61, lines 2-3, that "someone...came up with **the idea of using the Dominican Republic** as a temporary haven until he could get to New York"; note on p. 613.

The undated letter cited in the note is from Cesare Civita to "Mrs. [Henrietta] Danson," not to her son Lawrence. The latter's article, "An Heroic Decision" (cited in the note for p. 59, "**Vagabonding with Vanderbilt**"), refers to and quotes from the letter.

p. 61, paragraph 2, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr. to the Dominican consulate in Washington, recommending ST as "**a very talented and worthwhile resident**"; note on p. 613.

Following the citation of Danson's article, Bair adds: "others [i.e., copies of relevant correspondence] are scattered throughout the uncatalogued YCAL boxes." See General Comments above, Unusable References.

p. 61, paragraph 2, "**The Washington consul's reply**" to Vanderbilt's letter of recommendation; note on p. 613: "Information that follows is from YCAL, Box 20, Folders "Tortoreto 1940-42" and "Miscellaneous 1940-42."

Both of these folders are in box 89, not box 20. The correct folder in box 20 is probably "Xerox Henrietta Photocopies of Correspondence with SS before 1942." None of the "information that follows" is from this correspondence. The Washington consul's reply is quoted and discussed in Danson, p. 60.

p. 61, paragraph 3, ST's American family and Cesar Civita "gathered the money in New York to **purchase a ticket in his name** on a U.S-line ship"; note on p. 613.

The Portuguese document cited without source in the note was published in the Alberto Dines article referenced in the next note. Most of the rest of the paragraph is based on this and MTL, as cited in the note for the next paragraph.

Except: "From July 26 until November 27, 1940, Steinberg raced back and forth across several countries, trying to put his travel papers in order." The implication is that he was permitted to leave Italy at will. But this is precisely what he could not do without the proper papers. His single attempt to fly to Lisbon, via Barcelona, in September failed (see below).

The rest of the paragraph and the next are muddled:

Bair confuses the paperwork leading up to the September 1940 departure with that for ST's successful flight in 1941. The "affidavit of travel" from the American consul was obtained in January 1941.

There is also confusion between the Portuguese *tourist* visa for which ST applied in May 1940 (application rejected; MTL, p. 338), with the *transit* visa he obtained on August 29 (MTL, p. 342, section entitled "An Aborted Escape" for this and information below). The latter enabled him to board a flight to Lisbon on September 6.

p. 61, last 3 lines: "Steinberg was shocked when stony-faced customs police would tell him only the official reason, that his application had expired."

Bair is discussing events during the spring of 1940. But there was no actual confrontation with customs police at this time. ST applied for a tourist visa to Portugal in May 1940; an expired application was the official reason given for rejecting the visa request in a



handwritten note on a telegram dated May 15, 1940, from the Portuguese consul in Milan to the authorities in Portugal; hence he never got the tourist visa (MTL, p. 338). His only confrontation with the police took place in September (see below).

p. 62, line 4, **“Undeterred, he contacted the Portuguese consul in Milan again”**; note on p. 611: “For details of the flight [to Lisbon in September 1940], see Danson, ‘An Heroic Decision,’ pp. 61-62.”

Incorrect source; neither Danson nor his family knew any such details, which were assembled by MTL. The Portuguese document cited without source in the note was published by Alberto Dines, “Black Friday.”

p. 62, paragraph 3, ST “was convinced that [he was forcibly returned from Lisbon in September 1940 because] the Lisbon authorities had confused him with ‘another Steinberg, a Communist Steinberg, on their list.’...Even though such a mix-up was never proven, it made a convenient excuse as he headed back to Milan in abject despair.”

Since this “Communist Steinberg” comes up later as a biographical participant in the narrative (see below, comments for p. 63, lines 2-4; p. 80, paragraph 3; p. 82, paragraph 4), the evidence for his existence has to be parsed for factual content.

As Bair says in the next paragraph, ST never knew the real reason he had been sent back. But there is no evidence that *at the time* he hypothesized a confusion with an actual Communist. The note on p. 613, **“another Steinberg,”** offers two sources. The first is Danson, “An Heroic Decision,” p. 61. Danson writes: “My mother told me that Saul had gone to Portugal but had been turned back at the border when the authorities confused him with another Steinberg, a Communist Steinberg, on their list.” As the contemporaneous correspondence with the Dansons and others indicates, Saul’s American family knew nothing about this phase of his efforts to get out of Italy.

Bair’s note continues: “Although this was never verified, ST did repeat the story to HS [Hedda Sterne], who said ‘it was one he liked to tell.’” It does make a good story and ST loved to tell good stories, such as the one where he forged a visa stamp in his passport to get out of Italy—so engaging that it was not replaced with fact until 2006 (Smith, *S:I*, p. 27 and note 32). The “Communist Steinberg,” with only second- and third-hand oral sources, is of this same postwar genre. He has no place in a factual narrative.

p. 62, paragraph 4, on ST’s trip to the Romanian legation in Rome: **“as long as he had to stay in Rome overnight”**; note on p. 613.

The note incorrectly refers to the 1940-42 journal (see General Comments Journal 1940-42); and again, the citation to box 20 is incorrect. For the cited December 12, 1940, journal entry in English translation, see MTL, p. 358.

In the text, Bair writes: “He even enlisted the aid of the Panamanian consul, who told him to go to Rome and deal directly with the Romanian legation”; and “as long as he had to stay in Rome overnight, he went sightseeing.” The relevant portion of the December 12 entry reads:

then, following a phone call with the Panamanian Consul, went at 10 in the evening to Rome.

I arrived at 8 in the morning and went to the Romanian Legation without any result. Spent 3 hours in the waiting room.

I saw in passing two magnificent gates, in a beautiful green, next to the Teatro Marcello near the gate of the Ghetto.

Thus ST did not say that the Panamanian consul recommended the Rome trip; what the consul told him remains uncertain; and he didn’t go “sightseeing,” but merely noted down what he had seen “in passing” (“Ho visto di sfu[g]gita”).

There is chronological confusion in the narrative sequence here and in the next paragraph:

In this paragraph, ST goes to Rome seeking renewal of his Romanian passport. He made this trip on December 12 (or possibly December 11), as the above entry records. But the next

paragraph on p. 62 begins: “When he returned to Milan [from Rome] he had further bad news from the Spanish consulate. His transit visa through Spain had been revoked...” This revocation is reported in ST’s December 6 journal entry (of which more below).

p. 62, last paragraph, lines 4-5, “he began to keep a cryptic diary-journal of his travails.” Readers may not understand that this is the “Journal 1940-42” already referred to several times (see General Comments).

All the references to journal entries in Bair’s notes for the next few pages (p. 613, “**I am anxious right now**” through p. 615 “**die of heartbreak**”) should be to the translation published in MTL, pp. 357-62, which sometimes corrects the earlier translation used by Bair. Once again, all references to YCAL, box 20, are incorrect, as is the citation of two folders for the same quotation or statement, since part of the journal is in one folder, part in the other.

p. 63, lines 2-4, “He also remembered the ‘other Steinberg,’ who might have kept him from leaving; what hurt most about this confusion was what he decided was an ‘accusation of bad faith,’ that is, that he had not been honest.”

Bair is discussing ST’s forced return to Milan from Lisbon in September 1940 and his recollection of that event in the December 6 journal entry. But he did not “remember” or connect the “accusation of bad faith” to the “other Steinberg,” i.e., the hypothetical Communist Steinberg with whom he was confused at the Lisbon airport in September (see comment for p. 62, paragraph 3). The journal entry reads (MTL, p. 357):

3 months since the return from Lisbon - Today - as if to celebrate the date, the Spanish consul cancelled the visa already issued because [my] passport [was] expired.

Accusation of bad faith. Enough.

As Bair notes in the last paragraph on p. 62, the Spanish visa was revoked because ST’s Romanian passport had expired on November 29. The “accusation of bad faith” can only refer to the Spanish consul’s finger-pointing at ST, since the visa would not have been issued had ST been candid about the expired state of his passport. The visa, with a large red “Anulado” scrawled across it, is on p. 12 of ST’s (expired) Romanian passport, YCAL, box 89, folder “SS Romanian Passport 1939.” The visa is dated December 6, the date of ST’s journal entry, which suggests that it was both issued and cancelled on the same day.

p. 63, paragraph 2. The quotations in this paragraph are from the December 6 journal entry. “A really black day Friday” should read “pitch-black day, Friday” (“Oggi, giornata nerissima, Venerdì”); MTL, p. 357.

“He had gone to Rome for the Spanish transit visa on a Friday.” The first Spanish visa, for the aborted trip to Lisbon in September, was issued in Rome on September 3, 1940, a Tuesday. But the one to which Bair seems to be referring, that issued on December 6 (a Friday), came from the Spanish consul in Milan (as stamped on the visa page in ST’s passport).

p. 63, last paragraph, lines 2-3, “He courted Giovanni Mosca at *Bertoldo* with an early Christmas gift of painted wood blocks....”

ST’s gift to Mosca is noted in the December 7 journal entry; MTL, p. 357.

p. 64, paragraph 2, “And then, just before her birthday at Christmastime in 1940, his mother Rosa threatened to complicate his life even further....”

The note at the end of the paragraph is to ST’s letter to his parents, January 7, 1941 (“**not really alone**,” p. 613), assuring them that he was fine. But what Rosa said to complicate his life—threatening to come to Milan to “take care of him,” etc.—is not mentioned in ST’s letter. Among the surviving family letters, there is no December 1940 letter from Rosa to ST. The source of this statement is unknown to SSF.

p. 64, last paragraph, through end of paragraph, p. 65, concerning the Steinberg family’s welfare during a pogrom in Bucharest: “The Olteni...who kept the dairy store on the corner surprised the Steinbergs by aiding them with much-appreciated ‘Gentile kindness.’”

The letter from Rosa and Moritz Steinberg to ST, February 12, 1941, cited in the note, does not contain the words “Gentile kindness,” nor were they “surprised”; rather, they considered themselves “lucky”: “we were lucky that the Olteni from the dairy store on the street [not on the “corner”] turned out to be decent folks.”

p. 65, paragraph 2, “a certain Captain Vernetti”; note on p. 612: “He actually formed cordial relations with some of them [the local police], particularly ‘a certain Captain Vernetti,’ who arranged for him to have ‘postponements’ from arrest or deportation.”

The note refers to p. 2 in a typescript “San Vittore and Tortoreto” at YCAL, Box 78, folder “Tortoreto, translated by Adrienne Foulke.” This typescript represents the first translation, made in early 1978, of what became the second chapter of Steinberg’s *Reflections and Shadows*, published posthumously in another translation. The original Italian text follows in the same YCAL folder. But Bair may have gotten her sources confused. Foulke’s translation is “Commissioner Vernetti” (p. 4); “a certain Captain Vernetti” appears in MTL, p. 347.

Further, “postponements” is not in either the English or Italian typescript. It comes from ST’s journal entry for January 8, 1941, also cited by MTL, though the translation of *proroghe* was amended to “extensions”; “postponements” only appears in the original, uncorrected translation of the journal.

p. 65, paragraph 3. No sources are provided for this paragraph. See MTL, p. 347, for the telegram of February 21, 1941, from the prefect of Milan and the December 30, 1940, journal entry concerning ST’s visit to the American vice consul.

Note, however, that Bair has the February 21 telegram from the prefect of Milan going to ST “at the Grillo,” where ST lived. The telegram was not sent to ST but to the Ministry of the Interior.

p. 65, last paragraph, “There must have been other former foreign students who fell into this curious Catch-22 situation” (of being told to leave but lacking the requisite visas); note on p. 614.

The note to documents in the Archivio Centrale dello Stato ends: “These documents were found...by MTL, who generously made them available to me.” The translation of these official Italian documents, from different government departments, some of them scrawled over with notations in several hands, is MTL, pp. 347-48.

p. 66, lines 3-4, “By the time Steinberg received this decree on April 16, he had resigned himself to going [to the internment camp]”; note on p. 614.

The preceding quotation from the decree—that because ST is “unable to leave the Kingdom, he should be assigned to a concentration [internment] camp”—is from a March 12, 1941, letter from the Prefect of Milan to the Ministry of the Interior; see MTL, p. 348, also for the translation used.

The note on p. 614 does not cover the above material, but rather refers to a journal entry of May 7 (giving the wrong name and YCAL box number; see General Comments, *Journal 1940-42*) in which ST says he was “already out” by April 16. See MTL, p. 348, for an analysis of this entry.

The note ends: “Unless otherwise noted, information that follows is from the “Wartime Diary” (*sic*). Presumably, Bair refers to the next three paragraphs, through line 6 on p. 67. The relevant journal entries are: April 27, April 28, and May 7, 1941; MTL, pp. 361-63, which is also the source of the translations used in Bair’s quoted passages.

p. 66, lines 5-7, “The sympathetic Captain Vernetti was the officer who arranged the details of [ST’s] arrest. On April 17 he told Steinberg to put his affairs in order and to report back in one week, prepared to be sent to a detention center....”

Neither the April 17 date nor Captain Vernetti’s advice that ST “put his affairs in order” is in the journal; see the entries covering this period, MTL, p. 361.

p. 67, paragraph 2, “**The two major categories of detainees** [in the internment camps] were Jews (both Italian and foreign) and political dissidents...”; note on p. 614.

In the note, Bair claims that ST’s “old friend Giovanni [*sic* for Giovannino] Guareschi, the editor-in-chief of *Bertoldo*] was among the detainees in the internment camps,” with reference to Guareschi’s “How I Got Like This,” the introduction to his famous *Little World of Don Camillo* (1950). Guareschi was never in an internment camp. His text merely says he was “arrested by the political police. Then a lot of people worried about me and they finally got me released.” He was arrested in Milan on October 14, 1942, and released the next day. See: <http://www.giovanninoguareschi.com/1940-1943.htm>

Nor could he, as an Italian and a Gentile, have been part of the same internment system that swept up Steinberg, as the literature, including that cited by Bair elsewhere in her notes, makes clear; see MTL, pp. 339 and 350.

p. 67, paragraph 3, concerning the different types of internment under Mussolini’s regime. Bair gives no sources for this paragraph. The subject is discussed, with further references, in MTL, p. 339.

p. 67, last paragraph, “**On May 1 at 9 a.m., he was taken down**”; note on p. 614.

Concerning the reference to the 1940-42 journal in the note, see General Comments above; and again the box 20 citation is incorrect.

p. 67, last paragraph, “**Aldo was waiting** [to see ST off to the internment camp at Tortoreto] with his luggage and their friend Dr. Pino Donizetti, who brought a large sack full of medicines [to the railroad station], especially quinine...”; note on p. 614.

The note only contains biographical information about Donizetti. Sources for the rest: the May 1, 1941, journal entry (MTL, p. 363) says: “Don[izetti]. gives me medicines.” *R & S*, p. 34, is the source for the quinine against malaria.

The translations from the journal entry in the rest of the paragraph are those in MTL.

p. 68, paragraph 2, “Escorted by policemen from Sicily, he and the other prisoners were put on board a train...” And: “The prisoners were herded into the railway station waiting room [at Ancona, on the way to Tortoreto] and told to sleep as best they could...”; and note on p. 614 for **They went from Bologna to Rimini**.

Not cited in the note is the journal entry that records the trip. But that entry, for May 1, 1941 (MTL, pp. 363-64 and 349-50), says only: “Arrive Ancona at midnight. Sleep in the station until 6:30 in the morning.”

That the prisoners were “herded” and “told to sleep as best they could” is an interpolation. There is no evidence that there were “other prisoners”: in *R & S*, p. 34, ST recalls that he was alone with the two policemen in the train compartment.

p. 68, paragraph 3, “There were actually two separate camps in Tortoreto; Steinberg was in the one called Tortoreto Alto, and the other was Tortoreto Stazione.”

Bair has it reversed: ST was in Tortoreto Stazione; see MTL, p. 350.

Later in the paragraph, concerning ST’s description of the Villa Tonelli, where he was interned, as being Moorish in style and representing a castle: the description is anachronistic. ST did describe it thus in the March 25, 1955, letter to Hedda Sterne, cited by Bair (note on p. 614 for “**a truly romantic prison**”; AAA, reel 144, frame 697); also *R & S*, p. 40, “it had been renovated—fixed up and painted pink.” Both these descriptions concern the villa as he saw it on a visit in 1955. But in the next paragraph in *R & S*, p. 40, ST realizes that he was looking at the wrong villa. There was nothing Moorish or castle-like about the villa where he was interned in 1941. See MTL, figs. 18 and 23, for contemporaneous drawings of the Villa Tonelli by ST’s fellow detainee, the architect Walter Frankl.

See also comment for pp. 241, last 3 lines - p. 242, line 3.

p. 69, line 2, that the “pope supplemented the stipend [to the prisoners in Tortoreto] with an extra six lire every day **as an allowance**”; note on p. 614.

The note on p. 614 refers to *R & S*, pp. 38-39. The next paragraph and part of the third are also sourced by these pages.

p. 69, paragraph 3, “[The girls] flirted [with ST], calling for Paulo, the Italianization of Saulo, the nickname Steinberg was given by his friends in Milan....”

For Paulo, read Paolo. It would have to be the Italianization of Saul not “Saulo.”

Further in the paragraph, the quotation “enforced abstinence,” given without source, seems to be *R & S*, p. 39, where ST speaks only of “abstinence.”

The unsourced quotation at the end of the paragraph about ST’s longing for Ada is from the journal entry of May 23, 1941, MTL, p. 365.

p. 69, paragraph 4, “[Walter] Frankl made a tongue-in-cheek drawing that showed the Villa Tonelli....They intended sarcasm with a proclamation of the word *Duce!* at the top of the page...followed by a statement that the detainees were profoundly grateful for the stipend....”

The drawing and its message constituted a formal thank-you note, signed by the prisoners, being sent to Mussolini himself; see MTL, p. 351, with references, and Fig. 18. The expression of gratitude may have been forced, but if the prisoners valued their lives, it could not have been recognizably sarcastic.

p. 70, paragraph 1, lines 1-3, ST describing his reading of “*Huckleberry Finn*, particularly the part where ‘*Tom Sawyer takes off his hat*’...”; note on p. 615.

The quotation from the May 6, 1941, journal entry, as well as the quoted passage at the end of the paragraph, are from the translation in MTL, p. 364, except that Bair changes ST’s dashes—which he uses as periods—to commas.

In the note, the YCAL reference is to the wrong folder; it should be “Miscellaneous 1940-42.”

p. 70, paragraph 2. The San Vittore and Tortoreto drawings referred to here are reproduced in MTL, figs. 16 and 17.

The quote “*die of heartbreak*” at the end of the paragraph (and note on p. 615) is from the journal entry of May 28 (not May 21, as in the note), as published in MTL, p. 365; the YCAL “box 20” citation is again incorrect.

p. 71, paragraph 1, “His American relatives had previously made contact with an Italian group known by the acronym DELASEM (Delegazione per l’Assistenza degli [*sic*, for agli] Emigranti Ebrei...,” formed for the purpose of assisting Jews in Italy (whether Italian or foreign) to leave the country.”

There is no evidence presented in Lawrence Danson’s “An Heroic Decision” (cited earlier in the note for p. 59, **Vagabonding with Vanderbilt**) or in the family papers on which his article is based that the American Steinbergs had any contact with DELASEM. In all probability, either ST himself got in touch with DELASEM, or DELASEM sought him out in its efforts to help foreign Jews leave Italy.

No sources are given for the DELASEM material in this paragraph. Interested readers can consult MTL, p. 337f, with further references, both published and archival. DELASEM, as MTL documents, was formed to assist only foreign Jews (“Emigranti Ebrei”), not Italian Jews as well.

p. 71, paragraph 2, “on May 30...he received a telegram from DELASEM telling him that his Portuguese visa had arrived. There was no mention of a transit visa for Spain (although it came a few days later)...”

ST got the Spanish visa himself, from the consulate in Milan, after he had been released from Tortoreto. It is dated June 10, 1941, in his passport, p. 14; see MTL, p. 354 and note 139.

The sources for this paragraph are journal entries for May 30, June 5, and June 6; MTL, p. 365.

p. 71, paragraph 3. The unnamed sources for the information in this paragraph: journal entry of June 7 (MTL, p. 366); ST's account in an oral history given to the American Jewish Committee in the 1960s (MTL, p. 352); *R & S*, p. 36. The presentation to ST of "another of Walter Frankl's drawings of the Villa Tonelli" was actually a farewell pamphlet, reproduced in MTL, figs. 22 and 23; also p. 355.

p. 71, end of paragraph 4 and paragraph 5: "In the wartime 'Journal 1940-42,' however, he tells a different story" (from that in *R & S* about his departure from Tortoreto).

The story then told in paragraph 5, through p. 72, line 5, is not from the journal but from a letter to Aldo Buzzi, June 26, 1995.

Except: "Instead of going directly to Rome [from Tortoreto] with Gogg, Steinberg got off at the next station and boarded the night train coming *from* Rome and went to Milan to spend a day with Ada" (italics original).

The source of this itinerary, including an alleged disembarkation at the "next station" from Tortoreto, is unknown. In the letter to Buzzi, ST writes: "Departing from Tortoreto on June 6, I took a night train from Rome, seated, with all the perils, police, documents. Arrived safely in Milan, spent the day with Ada...." ST is here eliding part of the trip. Having arrived in Rome from Tortoreto, he took a night train from Rome to Milan: journal entries June 8, to Rome; June 10-11, in Milan. See MTL, p. 366 and note 136 for confirmation, through government documents, that he left Tortoreto for Rome on June 8. ST would not, at this stage, have jeopardized his chances of departure by violating the orders to go directly to Rome.

ST's stay at the Hotel Pomezia in Rome, mentioned near the end of the paragraph on p. 72, is from the June 12-16 journal entry (MTL, p. 366). In the letter to Buzzi, written more than fifty years later, it had become a "nameless hotel."

p. 72, paragraph 2: "On June 16 he and Gogg were allowed to board the Ala Littoria flight that took them to Lisbon....They stayed in Lisbon until June 20, at the Hotel Tivoli...."

Gogg may have accompanied ST from Tortoreto to Rome, and stayed with him in the Rome hotel (journal, June 15), but they do not seem to have flown to Lisbon together. The journal entry for June 20, the day of ST's departure from Lisbon, has: "Gogg arrived Thursday, [June] 19." Moreover, while ST's drawing of the Rome hotel (MTL, fig. 20) shows two beds, one of them marked "Gogg," the drawing of the Hotel Tivoli room (MTL, fig. 21) has only one bed.

p. 72, paragraph 3. The narrative here is based on, and quotations taken from, the journal entries. The publication of the journal in MTL ends with the June 20, 1941, entry. The relevant entries for this paragraph are those for June 21 and 23, YCAL, box 89, folder "Miscellaneous 1940-42," SSF translation.

p. 72, paragraph 4. The ambiguous handling of the reference system leaves the sources for this paragraph unclear. Some material comes from Danson's "An Heroic Decision," cited in the note above (**Henrietta Danson noticed sadly**, p. 615) and near the end (**They also supplied him**). But the authorities' refusal to allow ST to leave Ellis Island and the presence of Cesar Civita in the welcoming committee is based on a letter ST wrote to his parents, July 2, 1941, quoted in MTL, p. 354 and note 141. The letter is cited and quoted only in the last paragraph on p. 73.

The sentence "He could only greet them before customs guards hustled him off to the barracks on Ellis Island" is Bair's interpolation; as is that ST was "so close to the New York he had dreamed of but still so far away that he could not even see the famed Manhattan skyline." Since the skyline can't be missed from Ellis Island, Bair seems to think that ST was never allowed out of the barracks; we have no record of what restrictions were in force during his stay on the island.

p. 74, paragraph 2, “He drew his room [in Ciudad Trujillo] in a letter to Henrietta Danson...”; and note on p. 615.

The drawing is reproduced in Lawrence Danson’s essay “An Heroic Decision,” cited elsewhere.

p. 75, paragraph 2, “he thought the Dominican people ‘much primitive’...”; note on p. 613.

The note reference to the Journal 1940-42, entry for November 20, 1941, records the evening at the Godesteanus, mentioned a few lines below. “Much primitive” comes from a letter to the Dansons, October 1, 1941, not from the journal.

The location of the journal in “Box 12” is incorrect. The rest of the paragraph is not sourced by either journal entry.

p. 75, paragraph 3, concerning the drawings ST sold to American magazines while he was in Santo Domingo. “...the real excitement came when *The New Yorker* bought one and wanted more and *Mademoiselle* bought ‘four or five’...”; note on p. 615.

The reference in the note is to “a notebook in YCAL...of lists and sketches of work ST was doing for U.S. magazines...”

It is, rather, a list of drawings ST was sending to Civita’s office in New York, packet by packet and numbered sequentially. The descriptions are of subjects; journal names are rarely mentioned, since in most cases Civita was going to try and place them; see Smith, *S:I*, p.29.

The source for the *Mademoiselle* publications mentioned in the text is the letter to the Dansons cited in the next note. Neither of these references includes Gertrude Einstein’s communication with ST that “Cesar had sold some drawings” (line 4 of the paragraph).

As for *The New Yorker*, which “bought one [drawing] and wanted more....Then *The New Yorker* asked for more drawings....” The magazine’s enthusiasm for ST’s work during his year in Santo Domingo is not here documented. Only two drawings were published in 1941, five more through June 1942, including two spots.

p. 75, last paragraph, “He thought his malaria was cured, but by mid-October he was ill again....”

The October 12 letter to the Dansons cited in the note (“like a x-ray picture,” p. 615) says, “Now I’m well.” It is only in the later letter, November 17, that ST announces he has fallen ill with malaria.

p. 76, paragraph 1, referring to ST’s efforts to claim a parcel of clothing sent by the Dansons. “Customs officials [in Ciudad Trujillo] expected bribes, so they refused to give him a package...valued at \$25 until he paid an unofficial ‘tax’ of \$19. Since he was against it in principle and short of money besides, he asked a Dominican acquaintance who knew the custom officials to offer a smaller bribe, which was successful.”

The October 12 letter to the Dansons, cited earlier in the paragraph, reads (as written): “I was occupied all this time in the Coustom House with the parcel you have sent me. Here people are crazy and gangsters, so the parcel was taxed \$19 (19 U.S. dollars) because you have declared a value of \$25. Only yesterday I was able to have this parcel with a tip and the intervention of a Dominican, I kow.” Nothing here about principles or the offer of a smaller bribe.

p. 76, paragraph 3, concerning Rosa Steinberg’s fear that ST was in danger in Santo Domingo, and the efforts of her brother-in-law in New York, Harry Steinberg, to pacify her. The narrative in the paragraph implies a sequence of letters: “Harry tried repeatedly to tell her...Rosa ignored everything he said....” There is only one letter involved, that of January 7, 1942, from ST’s Uncle Harry to his parents, cited in the note on p. 615 (**After the United States entered the war**). As correctly observed at the end of the paragraph, “Whether Harry ever persuaded Rosa to calm down became a moot point, because mail service to and from Romania was severed....”

p. 77, paragraph 2, “**He [Aldo] makes it clear** that she is the guilty one,” referring to Aldo’s brief affair with Ada while ST was in Tortoreto; note on p. 615.

The note refers to a later part of the 1940-42 journal, not published by MTL. But the reference gives only the entry date, October 1, 1941. It should be YCAL, box 89, folder “Tortoreto 1940-42,” as well as the translation supplied by SSF.

p. 77, paragraph 3, “**She writes bullshit**”; note on p. 616.

p. 79, line 4, “**Several days later when Ada sent a photo**”; note on p. 616.

p. 79, paragraph 3, “**On any particular ‘today’**” and “**Dear Adina, poor little thing**”; notes on p. 616.

YCAL and translation references as in preceding comment.

p.79, paragraph 4, “**in great fear**”; note on p. 616.

YCAL and translation references as above. The date of the journal entry is November 20, not November 21.

p. 80, lines 1-2, concerning commissions the Civitas were obtaining for ST while he was in Santo Domingo, including “**a book jacket for Simon & Schuster**”; note on p. 616.

The “undated letter to H. & H. Danson, probably November-December 1941,” cited in the note, is dated December 3, 1941, the date apparently having been cut off in the photocopy Bair was using. The journal entry cited for December 7, 1942, should be 1941. For the missing part of the journal citation, see above, comment for p. 77, paragraph 2.

p. 80, line 3, “**silence from New York**”; note on p. 616.

For the missing part of the journal citation, see above, comment for p. 77, paragraph 2.

p. 80, line 6, “**‘I continue confusedly my work...because I’m almost penniless now,’ he told the Dansons, and he was grateful for the three pairs of shoes and the \$50 they sent at Christmas**”; note on p. 616.

The note reference to the “undated” letter to the Dansons must be that for the December 3, 1941, letter (see comment above for p. 80, lines 1-2), which mentions the three pairs of shoes, but doesn’t speak of a \$50 gift; nor is the quotation in that letter. The additional reference in the note to the December 7, 1941, journal entry is irrelevant to the subject of this paragraph.

p. 80, end of paragraph 1, he “**entered three pictures in the annual exhibition sponsored by the Museum of Fine Arts. He was pleased with his success** but somewhat puzzled to find out that he had been labeled a ‘surrealist’”; note on p. 616.

Of the two letters to the Dansons that begin the note, the first—January 15, 1942—doesn’t exist. The March 16, 1942, letter reads: “In January it was here the National Exhibition of Fine Arts and I had great success with 3 small paintings.” In the cited journal entry of January 15, 1942, ST, referring to the same exhibition, says: “They call me a surrealist. 3 small pictures.”

There is no indication that ST was puzzled by the nomenclature, nor should he have been. Many of the surviving paintings from the late Italian years and Santo Domingo are decidedly surrealist in style (unlike ST’s contemporaneous drawings). We do not know which works were exhibited or if those three paintings are extant. But if ST was called a surrealist, they were probably paintings in his surrealist style, rather than the one suggested by Lawrence Danson, cited in the note.

The reference at the end of the note to the journal entry of November 24, 1941, where ST describes having completed a “neoclassical tempera...” is not relevant here.



p. 80, paragraph 3, “Enough time had passed that he could start the New Year by trying to get a place in the Romanian quota [for a US visa], but once again, just as in Lisbon, he feared the specter of **“the ‘other Communist’ Steinberg”**”; note on p. 616.

The note refers to the Danson correspondence, an “undated letter...internal evidence suggests early 1942.” This is the letter now dated December 3, 1941, which Bair had earlier dated November-December 1941 (see comment for p. 80, lines 1-2). As for the “internal evidence,” “early 1942” would not be possible. ST writes: “The best gift you can give me is some good notice—in January or Febr. about my emigration visa.”

The narrative woven in the text contradicts known documentation:

In his efforts to obtain a US visa, ST did not fear being confused with the **“‘other Communist’ Steinberg”** (see comment for p. 62, paragraph 3; the real reason is given on p. 62, paragraph 4 and in MTL, pp. 342-43). No Communists are mentioned in any of the sources or in the December 3 letter to the Dansons. That letter seems to be the basis for the somewhat confused account that follows in the paragraph here, since no other source is given. ST’s text (as written):

The best gift you can give me is some good notice—in January or Febr. about my emigration visa. I’m afraid it will be long and hard and if Washington says O.K. (that day will be a greath one [for me] here [in Ciudad Trujillo] also I’ll have to fight with the U.S. Consul. For instance, I should like to go at the consulate because I don’t know what I may answer - One question for instance is: Did you be deported from the U.S.? I’m not sure, I was deported or not. A[t] Ellis Island the ofical through an Italian interpreter said: You can’t enter into the States during one year. He didn’t pronounce the word ‘deported’ but during the trip at San Juan (Puerto Rico) I was closed in my room and I heard the word ‘deported’ and they had afraid I’m dangerous and with the idea to rest at Puerto Rico. Now I know to be deported is very bad and so if I’ll talk with the U.S. Consul I will be sure. Now I speak enough English to tell him this things but I need to know if it’s right to speak about deportation.

When ST feared having to tell the US Consul in Ciudad Trujillo that he had been “deported,” he did not understand the relatively neutral significance of the word. He only had a transit visa to enter US waters in order to catch his boat to Santo Domingo. “Deported” here simply meant that he did not have a visa to enter the US and was therefore sent on his way. No reason to expect otherwise. But Bair writes: “[At Ellis Island] the interpreter asked a routine question about why he had been sent back from Lisbon, and Steinberg thought he had to explain about the confusion with the ‘Communist Steinberg’ that had sent him back to Italy, which he equated with deportation.” Again, see the text of ST’s letter above, which contains nothing about Lisbon or the so-called “Communist Steinberg.”

p. 81, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s efforts to obtain a US visa, as recounted in his correspondence with the Dansons; and note on p. 616, **“is better don’t mention.”**

The note begins: “ST, undated letter to H. & H. Danson; internal evidence suggests October 1941.” This is the same December 3, 1941, letter that Bair has previously dated, on “internal evidence,” November-December 1941 and early 1942 (see comments for p. 80, lines 1-2, and p. 80, paragraph 3). There are no other undated letters in the ST-Danson correspondence.

The next reference, “Letter to Harry Steinberg, October 12, 1941”: the letter was written to Henrietta and Harold Danson.

ST does say in this letter that “anti-Semitic laws prohibited from working after 1939” (end of paragraph), but, as often happened, he got his dates mixed up. It was 1938, as Bair herself says; see above, comment for p. 48, paragraph 4.

p. 81, paragraph 3: the uncited source for this paragraph and the quotations is the December 3, 1941, letter to the Dansons. But there is nothing in the letter about obtaining a “Dominican certificate attesting that he had been in residence there.” ST writes, recalling the instructions he was given at Ellis Island: “At Ellis Island the clerk...said that if I’ll enter in the States I have to make one request at Washington -- I don’t speak about my papers. The application here

[i.e., that from the US Consul] ask the born certificate and 2 police certificates (from Rumania and Italy)....”

p. 81, paragraph 4, concerning the documents of support gathered for ST’s US visa application, **“Civita also furnished a statement of ST’s earnings”**; note on p. 616.

The note quotes a memo from Ik Schuman of TNY to Harold Ross and James Geraghty. The mysterious “TNYR” location of the memo should be *The New Yorker Records*, Manuscript Division, The New York Public Library. “TNYR” was the abbreviation used by Joel Smith, *Steinberg at The New Yorker* (Abrams, 2005), when he quoted from the memo, pp. 16f. and note 5.

p. 82, lines 3-4, correction for the quotation from Vanderbilt’s letter: “This is an extraordinary record for an artist who has not yet seen our country” should read “who is not even in our country.”

p. 82, paragraph 2, lines 3-4, “James Geraghty, the art editor of *The New Yorker*, who had seen his work in other magazines” persuaded TNY editor Harold Ross to support ST. The note on p. 616, **“I have seen his work on the editorial pages,”** must be for this passage. The quotation in the note from Joel Smith, *Steinberg at The New Yorker*, is made nonsensical by a transcription error: “cartooning under watchful Fascist eyes had taught Steinberg to poke fun at war in general rather than condemn its opponents”; for “opponents,” read “proponents.”

p. 82, paragraph 2, **“Even better was the agreement Civita arranged”** for ST with TNY; note on p. 617.

The first reference in the note is to “Ik Schuman contract letter form to Cesar Civita, as ‘attorney or agent’ for ST, May 15, 1942.” The date should be May 14; Cesar Civita was not “attorney or agent.” “Attorney or agent” is typed underneath the signature line to indicate that either ST’s attorney or his agent could sign. The document was signed by “Chas. Civita, Attorney/Cesare Civita or agent.” Cesar’s father, Charles Civita, was a lawyer; Cesar was not. The error is repeated on p. 86, 4 lines from the bottom.

The second reference is to “Cesar Civita to Ik Schuman, July 1, 1942, spelling out details of an agreement...” The letter-contract is not to Ik Schuman. It is a contract between Civita and ST, spelling out legal obligations between artist and agent, including commissions. On p. 87, paragraph 1, Bair gets the correspondents right.

p. 82, paragraph 3, **“His application [for a US visa] had been approved”**; note on p. 617.

The unmentioned source for this paragraph and the quotations is the letter ST wrote to the Dansons on April 29, 1942.

p. 82, paragraph 3, **He had his visa in hand**; note on p. 617.

The citation of the Gertrude Einstein letter to ST of June 1, 1942: the letter is at YCAL, box 1, folder “Correspondence 1942.”

p. 82, paragraph 4. Once again, ST’s hypothetical fear of being confused with an alleged “Communist Steinberg” is nowhere in the documents (see above, comment for p. 62, paragraph 3). More likely, it was his fear of the “deportation” issue at Ellis Island; see the letter quoted above, comment for p. 80, paragraph 3.

The sources for the quotations “to be in New York...” and “my matter” are the letters to the Dansons, May 16 and May 26, 1942.

p. 82 paragraph 5. The Gertrude Einstein letter to ST, quoted in the text, is that of June 1, 1942, YCAL, box 1, folder “Correspondence 1942.”

p. 83, paragraph 2. The chronology of Einstein’s letters to ST is confused. “Miss Einstein ended her letter sweetly: ‘Don’t you think you should have sweet dreams now...’ But this wasn’t

soothing enough for Steinberg, and she had to write again: ‘There is not the slightest danger...’”

The first quotation is from the June 1, 1942, letter; the second, assuring ST that there was no danger (of running afoul of the authorities), is from the May 25 letter. Thus Einstein did not “write again.” The quotation also has several transcription errors.

## Chapter 8

p. 84, epigraph, “**Who the hell knows where my home is**”; note on p. 617.

ST’s letter to HS, January 18, 1944, AAA, the cited source, is reel 144, frame 093.

p. 84, line 6, on ST’s first impressions of New York. “**The ‘Cubist elements’ that became his lifelong totems assaulted his eye...**”; note on p. 617.

The note reads: “Some of these are referred to in Jacques Dupin’s essay, *Derrière le miroir*, no. 192, June 1971.” Dupin makes no such references. Discussing ST’s use of different styles of art, he merely says—between mention of Fauvist color and Mondrian’s squares—that ST articulates Cubist facets. There is no further discussion of Cubism.

p. 84, last line, “**In later years, he regretted that he had only sketched and not made ‘large paintings’...of ‘diners, girls, cars...’**”; note on p. 617.

Bair is discussing ST’s reaction to “the New York of 1942.” However, ST’s letter to AB, December 15, 1984, cited in the note, does not express regrets about what he didn’t do in 1942. ST wrote: “At home to look at some old drawings from ‘51-‘52, not bad—I should have made large paintings back then—subjects: diners, girls, cars....”

p. 85, paragraph 3: When ST arrived in New York, he had “a room waiting for him in a Greenwich Village hotel, the Adams, on the corner of 11<sup>th</sup> Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue...**the first street he knew in the United States**”; note on p. 617.

The Adams Hotel is unknown to SSF. According to the documents, the first place ST lived in NY was 45 West 11<sup>th</sup> St, in the middle of the block between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Aves. Thus in a letter of July 30, 1942, from Robert Pilpel of Refugee Aid in Central America to the Joint Relief Committee in Ciudad Trujillo, assuring the committee that ST had repaid the \$25 dollars borrowed. His address is given as 45 West 11<sup>th</sup>; YCAL, box 1, folder “Correspondence 1942.” A diary entry (in Italian) for August 5, 1942, notes that he had moved to 51 West 11<sup>th</sup> St., a couple of doors down from no. 45; Deskaide diary in YCAL, box 89, folder “Miscellaneous 1940-42.” He was still there on November 23, 1942, when he received a telegram from the Office of War Information; YCAL, box 57, folder “1942 Letters”; and on January 22, 1943, on his Application for Commission or Warrant, U.S. Naval Reserve, section A, “Personal and Family Record”; copies of ST’s military records are at SSF.

Bair’s note on p. 617: “He gave his address as 412 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue on his application for a commission in the navy, BNP953, Revised 1942, YCAL, Box 20.” 412 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue (which is, in any case, between 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Sts., not at 11<sup>th</sup> St.) was not ST’s address, but that of Local Board 17 of the Selective Service; see below, comment for p. 98, paragraph 1. “BNP953, Revised 1942” is merely the printed name of the naval form; it doesn’t date the document. The application, dated January 22, 1943, is as given above, with the 51 West 11<sup>th</sup> St. address.

p. 86, lines 3-4 from bottom, concerning the contract between *The New Yorker* and ST via Cesar Civita, “**It was signed by Ik Schuman**”; note on p. 618.

Once again (comment for p. 82, paragraph 2 above), Civita is erroneously referred to as ST’s “attorney or agent” and the contract date in the note should be May 14, 1942, not May 15.

p. 87, paragraph 1, lines 4-5, concerning the contract between ST and Civita, July 1, 1942: “the agreement unfairly gave Civita an unusually high 30 percent of all monies received....”

There was nothing “unfair” about this arrangement; it was typical for magazine artists at this time.

p. 87, paragraph 2, lines 6ff., “He [ST] also responded to *The New Yorker’s* memo [July 2, 1942] to its artists about...[the] ‘need for vacation art’”; and “Steinberg responded” to a later memo [August 4, 1942] “to start thinking about Christmas”; notes on p. 618 for **He also responded and Several weeks later a second memo arrived.**

How ST responded to these TNY memos is unclear. In the dozen drawings he published between his arrival in New York on July 1, 1942, and the end of the year, none could qualify as “vacation art” and none has anything to do with Christmas.

p. 87, last paragraph, “**here he was helped by Harold Ross**”; note on p. 618.

The YCAL folder name for the documents cited in the note is “Correspondence 1942.”

p. 88, last line-p. 89, line 1, “[ST] thought a lot about Mickey Mouse and decided that he was a negative ‘character...with a lot of influence on the street’”; note on p. 618.

The Jacques Dupin interview cited as a source for ST’s take on Mickey Mouse (and also the source for the quotations in the next paragraph) is not in *Derrière le miroir*, as the note claims. Rather, it is an unpublished interview of January 11, 1978, in French; typescript translation at SSF, pp. 9-10.

p. 89, paragraph 3, line 2, “‘**Damn!**’ he wrote. ‘The New Year begins on a Friday’...”; note on p. 618.

The note reads: “ST, January 1, 1943, YCAL, Box 20, Folder ‘Tortoreto, 1940-42.’” Readers will not understand that this refers to a continuation of the Journal 1940-42, which remains unpublished (see General Comments, Journal 1940-42, last paragraph); the translation is that of SSF. The folder is still in box 89, not box 20.

The quotations that follow in the paragraph are from the same entry. The entry, however, says nothing about New Year’s Day customs or passing his citizenship exam.

p. 92, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s first visit to Hedda Sterne, in her apartment at 410 East 50<sup>th</sup> Street, just east of First Avenue: “He told how the taxi let him off at the wrong end of 50<sup>th</sup> Street and how he walked the length of it to the East River before finding her building”:

The note on p. 618 (“**You explained me by phone**”) refers to a letter ST wrote to HS, January 18, 1944 (which is AAA, frames 094-096). But it wasn’t the taxi driver who made a mistake: ST said: “I went off in 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and 50<sup>th</sup> and I started looking for the number 410 the wrong way toward 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue so I went back and liked very much the other part of the street, I went up to the end to give a look in the river then back again downstairs to your mailbox....”

The quotation a few lines down in the paragraph, that ST “had such trouble opening the door that he ‘ringed twice the buzzer,’” is incorrect. ST wrote: “I had trouble opening the door (I always had) and you ringed twice.” He meant that Hedda was ringing down to the street entrance to open the door.

The quotations at the end of the paragraph and in the next are from the same letter.

p. 92, beginning of paragraph 3, “Hedda greeted her guest casually and asked him to entertain himself while she went to her studio to finish a painting.”

HS’s reason for absenting herself is not given in the January 18, 1944, letter; perhaps the source is one of Bair’s interviews with HS. But it doesn’t accord with ST’s own recollection in the letter. Bair’s quote from the letter later in the paragraph—“in the few minutes I spent looking around with you drawing in the other room”—contains a significant mistranscription: ST wrote “dressing,” not “drawing.”

p. 92, last paragraph, concerning the falsification of Hedda Sterne’s age. “She told [ST] that she had been born in Bucharest in 1910, which made her four years older than he, but for the rest of his life he never allowed her to admit her true age; he made her tell people she was born in 1916 and was therefore two years younger.” No source is given for this statement.

A variant version appears on p. 636, in the note for p. 187, **Vogue followed by placing her**: “When ST and HS married, HS shaved five years off her age [thus a birthdate of 1915] at ST’s insistence, because he did not want anyone to know she was his senior.” The cited source is an interview with HS, October 11, 2007.

There is, however, a third version of the saga of Sterne’s age. Sarah Eckhardt, who spoke with HS extensively while preparing her exhibition catalogue *Uninterrupted Flux: Hedda Sterne, A Retrospective* (reference below in comment for p. 100, photo), notes on p. 117 of that book: “The error [in giving HS’s birthdate as 1916] dates from Betty Parson’s nomination of Sterne for *Life*’s ‘19 Young Americans’”—a March 20, 1950, feature about the best American artists under age thirty-six. This is the same account HS gave to SSF, interview, March 22, 2005.

While the *LIFE* magazine feature may have been the first time Sterne’s birthdate was publicly misstated, Sterne did speak privately (as she did to Bair) about ST’s unease with her seniority and her willingness to conceal it for his sake.

p. 92, last paragraph, concerning ST’s command of English, “Hedda recalled....He really didn’t know the language to speak it, he couldn’t properly order a dinner in a restaurant....”

This is Hedda Sterne’s recollection, filtered through more than six decades. It seems questionable, however, that the man who penned reasonably articulate letters to the Dansons from Santo Domingo, albeit with grammatical errors, was incapable of communicating in English after having spent seven months in New York.

p. 95, paragraph 2, “He told her [HS, in a letter] it was because he liked her ‘as a girl, a woman, a lover, and a very decent person.’ A year later, when he wrote the ‘boy-friend-girl-friend’ letter [see p. 92, top], he tried to explain it better”; followed by a quotation.

The note on p. 619 refers to ST’s letter of January 18, 1944 to HS for “as a girl....” (AAA, frame 096). But the next quoted passages were not written “a year later”; they’re in the same letter.

## Chapter 9

p. 97, epigraph, concerning Navy evaluations of ST, “**“This applicant has about everything disqualifying that could exist”**”; note on p. 619.

There are several transcription errors in punctuation in the quotation.

Contrary to the note, the quotation comes from two different documents, not one, in ST’s military records. The first paragraph, source uncited by Bair, is from an untitled document, with different, unsigned handwritten comments on ST’s qualifications. The passage quoted is dated February 3, 1942 (not “January 26 & 28”). The source for the second paragraph is as cited, save that the date of the “Report of Investigation” is January 25 (not “January 26 & 28”).

ST’s military records are not in the National Archives, Washington, D.C., but in the division of the National Archives at the National Personnel Records Center, St. Louis.

p. 97, paragraph 1, “William J. ‘Wild Bill’ Donovan, the head of the OSS, confided to his close friend the *New Yorker* editor Harold Ross that the military had an urgent need for skilled artists and cartoonists who could perform a variety of services,” followed by a description of such services:

No sources are given. Communication between Ross and Donovan in this period can only be inferred from documents in the military records and *The New Yorker* archives at the New York Public Library; see Smith, *S:I*, p. 30 and note 42. That Donovan “confided” to Ross about the military’s needs is undocumented.

p. 97, paragraph 1, line 11, “**he spoke Romanian and Italian fluently, French and Spanish decently, and English haltingly**”; note on p. 619.

On the character of ST's English at this time, see above, comment for p. 92, last paragraph.

In the note, Bair correctly says that ST did not list German on his "Officer Qualification Report, May 25, 1945" in YCAL, box 20 (the folder is "Navy," 2 of 2, though the title of the document is "Officer Qualifications Questionnaire"). However, in ST's Application for Commission or Warrant, U.S. Naval Reserve, January 22, 1943 (cited above, comment for p. 85, paragraph 3), he includes among his language skills "some German." ST was apparently ambivalent about admitting knowledge of German, which he had studied for several years in high school. See also Bair's earlier discussion of ST's German, p. 603, note for **Despite his high grades.**

p. 98, paragraph 1, concerning the back-and-forth efforts to get him a Naval commission. "**He found all this activity slightly puzzling**, because he had spent the last months of 1942 and the beginning of 1943...watching as his Selective Service classification changed from 4F (unsuitable) to 1A when his local draft board decided...that he was 'otherwise qualified for service in the Armed Forces'"; note on p. 619.

Bair here inverts the sequence of ST's Selective Service classifications, which then becomes the cause for ST to be "puzzled." In the note, she cites the "Notices of Alien's Acceptability from Local Board No. 17, 412 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue" as giving a classification of 4F on August 24, 1942; no location is given for this document. However, in the military records, Enlisted Personnel File, "Report of Physical Examination and Induction" from Local Board no. 17, he is classified as 1A on that August date. And in ST's Deskaide diary (YCAL, box 89, folder "Miscellaneous 1940-42"), the page for August 24 contains a single line, in Italian: "classificato 1A." The second document Bair refers to, without title or repository—"the 1A was dated January 21, 1943"—must be the postcard ST received from the Selective Service Local Board, "Notice of Classification," wherein he is reclassified as 4F, January 21, 1943 (YCAL, box 20, folder "Navy," 2 of 2). On p. 619, the note for **no mention of any mental disorder**, Bair gets the date of the 1A classification right, but draws no emotional consequences from it.

p. 98, paragraph 2, "Everything in his prior life and work made him a prime candidate for the OSS Morale Operations (MO) in the European theater. However, in its unfathomable bureaucratic omniscience, someone in Washington decided that Saul Steinberg was better suited to the navy than the army and his talents could best be put to use with a landlocked naval unit in western China. He was assigned to the Sino-American Cooperative Organization, a group known by the acronym SACO, ostensibly a division of the OSS but one that worked mostly independently of it."

ST "was better suited to the navy than the army": This erroneously implies that the OSS was only affiliated with the Army. The OSS was independent of any other military branch; OSS members were seconded from all branches of the military. No one decided that ST was better suited to the Navy than to the Army. The Army was a possibility once ST had been classified 1A in August 1942. But he wasn't drafted. Rather, the behind-the-scenes machinations of Ross and Donovan eventually got him a commission in Naval Intelligence, and it was the Navy that sent him to China.

SACO was not a division of the OSS. Histories of the China Theater (including the books cited on p. 622, note for "**the Rice Paddy Navy**") make clear that SACO and the OSS had a joint operation, under the command of Cmdr. Milton Miles of the Navy—until December 1943, when Donovan wrested the OSS from Miles's authority.

p. 98, paragraph 3. The paragraph claims direct action from Donovan of the OSS on ST's behalf: "Donovan...began the complicated vetting process....Donovan made a highly unusual arrangement....The officer gave Donovan the report he wanted...."

As above (comment for p. 97, paragraph 1), Donovan's actions can only be inferred. Although there is no doubt that Donovan was behind the machinations with the Navy, it is misleading to attribute specific actions to him; similarly, on p. 99, lines 6-7, "when Donovan read the report, he told the doctors to schedule a second exam."

p. 98, last line - p. 99, line 3, concerning ST's examination over a period of several weeks "by various navy doctors who...diagnosed him as having, in navy parlance, 'PSN-mild-ND,' a mild psychoneurosis...."

This was not a Navy diagnosis given in January-February 1943, but that of the Selective Service Board, August 24, 1942 (see comment for p. 98, paragraph 1, for this document).

p. 99, paragraph 1, "Mentally, they [the Navy doctors] diagnosed him as having, in navy parlance, 'PSN-mild-ND,' a mild psychoneurosis that had never before been diagnosed.... [In later evaluations t]here was **no mention of any mental disorder**, and the original diagnosis was dismissed as nervousness over the exam and frustration at [ST's] inability to express himself in English"; note on p. 619.

The note cites two Navy Reports of Physical Examination in the military records, January 21 and February 16, 1943, with both referring to the report of the Selective Service. The first, in the Medical File section of the records, does not refer to it; the second, in the Enlisted Personnel File, is merely a copy of the Selective Service Board's August 1942 examination report, endorsed on February 16, 1943, by a Naval officer.

The dismissal of the diagnosis and the reasons given for it are not in Navy documents. Rather, they are the admitted guesswork of an archivist at the National Personnel Records Center, writing to SSF, email July 11, 2005, in answer to an inquiry about the meaning of PSD.

p. 99, paragraph 2, "**The rush was on....**Everything was crammed into the same day, February 19, and in one swearing-in ceremony after another, Saul Steinberg took the oath to become a U.S. citizen, was commissioned as an ensign in the Naval Reserve, was assigned to the Morale Operations Branch of the OSS, and **received orders to report for duty** at the landlocked naval base in Chungking, China"; notes on p. 620.

Only the first two events took place on February 19; the third never happened and the fourth happened later. Thus:

The MO was not officially formed until March 3, 1943 (see <https://www.cia.gov/news-information/featured-story-archive/2010-featured-story-archive/oss-morale-operations.html>). Its beginnings were inauspicious and unproductive; see Christof Mauch, *The Shadow War Against Hitler* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), pp. 135-36. In addition, point 9 of a memo to General Donovan, dated August 24, 1943, from F.C. Oechner, Chief, MO branch, "Report on MO activities, North African Theater" (OSS Records, National Archives and Records Administration, RG 226, entry 99, box 40, folder 1), explains the role of the Washington office: "It is desired here to acknowledge fully the work being done by MO Washington staff in providing operational suggestions."

Moreover, all the military records and other documents confirm that ST was not assigned at this time to the OSS but to Naval Operations in Washington (see comment for p. 98, paragraph 2 concerning the OSS in China). Plans were afoot by early March to send him to Chungking (two memoranda in the Officer Personnel File, both dated March 9, one stating that he has "been assigned to duty for the Navy Department at Chungking, China," cited by Bair in the note for this passage). But the orders to ship out did not come until April, from the Chief of Naval Operations, who assigned him to the US Naval Observer in China (memorandum to ST from Chief of Naval Personnel via Chief of Naval Operations, April 18, 1943, in Officer Personnel File).

p. 99, paragraph 3, first sentence, the uncited source for the Navy's request to the State Department is the March 9 memoranda just cited.

p. 99, paragraph 3, concerning ST's preparations when he received news of his assignment to China. "**He was in a frenzy** to put his life and work in order, starting with updating the life insurance policy he had prudently bought several months earlier when he had registered for the draft"; note on p. 620.

For the earlier "life insurance" policy, the note cites a Travelers Insurance policy dated June 29, 1942, YCAL, box 1. This is not a life insurance policy but a short-term travelers

insurance policy (folder, "Correspondence 1942"). ST arrived in Miami on June 28, 1942, stayed overnight, and left the next day by bus for New York. The policy, with a 1pm time-of-sale, insures ST while "riding as a passenger in or on a public conveyance...."

The second reference, "letter to Harry Steinberg, April 4, 1943...YCAL, Box 1" is unknown to SSF as among the contents of Box 1.

p. 99, lines 4-5 from bottom, "...an entirely new set of orders arrived: **the navy was not sending him to China immediately**, but to Washington..."; note on p. 620.

China was never an "immediate" post; see note for paragraph 3. The Navy document cited in the note, dated February 23, 1943, only references the order to proceed to Washington. For this document, see below, comment for p. 104, paragraph 2, the note on p. 620, **he was assigned instead.**

p. 100, photo captioned "Steinberg and Sterne before he was sent to China" (i.e., before May 1943).

The photo reproduced is the lower half of a famous shot taken by George Platt Lynes in late 1944-45, after ST returned stateside. ST and HS are in front of a wall-size ST drawing of a woman on a horse, which is not visible in this reproduction. See the full photo, as well as another from the series, in Sarah L. Eckhardt, *Uninterrupted Flux: Hedda Sterne, A Retrospective*, exh. cat., Krannert Art Museum, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2006, p. 119. A print of the photo among the Hedda Sterne Papers at AAA has a handwritten inscription on the back: "Mr. and Mrs. Saul Steinberg 1944." ST is wearing the epaulettes of a Lt. (jg), a rank he did not officially achieve until October 1944, though he mentions having been promoted in a letter to Hedda, June 19, 1944 (AAA, reel 144, frame 244). See also Officer Personnel File, memo from BuPers to ST re "Temporary promotion" October 25, 1944; the military records do not contain a document that finalizes the promotion, but ST is referred to as Lt. (jg) in all subsequent records, until November 1945, when he was promoted to lieutenant (Officer Personnel File, "Statement of Temporary Appointment," November 1, 1945; "Acknowledgement of Notice of Temporary Appointment," November 14, 1945).

p. 100, last paragraph - p. 101, line 3, "There was a lot of work to finish before he went to Washington [to assume his Naval duties in the spring of 1943]...Victor Civita...had landed a prestigious and remunerative commission for Steinberg to design the jacket and create the illustrations for *Chucklebait: Funny Stories for Everyone*, a children's book by the noted author **Margaret C. Scoggin**"; note on p. 620.

*Chucklebait* was first published in 1945, not 1943. The note refers to a payment check sent by the publisher, Alfred A. Knopf, "to Civita on behalf of Lt. Paul [sic] Steinberg." The \$300 check cited by Bair (which is folder "1943 Correspondence" in box 1) is dated January 26, 1945; that it was found in a folder marked "1943 Correspondence" means little—the contents of the YCAL folders remain those of ST, who cared nothing for the niceties of filing. Many folders contain material unrelated to their tab name.

As for the payee on the Knopf check: in 1943, ST was still an ensign. So whatever he was trying to finish before he left for Washington, it wasn't the *Chucklebait* assignment.

On p. 154, Bair puts the book in the 1945-50 period.

p. 101, photo captioned "Steinberg and Betty Parsons with two unidentified guests at the opening of his first gallery exhibition" (at the Wakefield Gallery, New York, April 1943).

The photo is not from 1943. Note: ST's hairline, which has receded far more than in the Lynes photo of 1944-45 on the opposite page; and the dark-rimmed glasses, which he did not begin to wear until he returned from military service in Europe. Throughout the war years, his glasses were rimless (as in the photo on p. 107). Betty Parsons, too, looks much older than she would have been in 1943. The photo may have been taken at the opening of Parson's Steinberg show in 1952 or on another occasion. See the photo of Parsons in Lee Hall, *Betty Parsons: Artist, Dealer, Collector* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1991), p. 78 top, there dated c. 1953-54.



p. 103, last 5 lines - p. 104, lines 1-2: discussing Duell, Sloan and Pearce's offer to publish a collection of ST drawings. "Steinberg had never heard of the publisher, but in early March he told Civita to proceed with negotiations but to confer with Hedda in every instance. He prepared to leave for Washington, thinking that the contract would be settled before he finished Officer Candidate School..."; note on p. 620.

The note correctly dates the ST letter to HS November 17, 1943, when ST was writing from his post in China; thus not "in early March," as "he prepared to leave for Washington." On the date of his arrival in Washington, see below, comment for p. 104, paragraph 2, note on p. 620.

The unsourced statement that ST thought he was going to Officer Candidate School (also mentioned on p. 99, bottom, and p. 104, beginning of paragraph 2) is not among any documents known to SSF. Bair may be confusing the reference in another document; see next comment.

p. 104, paragraph 2, "In Washington, he did not go through OCS as expected, because the length of time it would take for 'such training would hamper and restrict the war effort.'"

This quotation is taken from the document cited two lines below, note for He was assigned instead on p. 620: Memorandum from the Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel, dated February 20, 1943, subject: "Exemption from indoctrinal training course, SAUL STEINBERG." An indoctrinal training course is not Officer Candidate School. Moreover, since the document is dated February 20, the day after his combined naturalization and commission, he was still in New York, not Washington.

Further in the note on p. 620: "In a document dated 5/29/45: Officer Qualifications Questionnaire, YCAL, Box 20 [the folder is "Navy," 2 of 2], ST mistakenly gave his time in D.C. as '3/43 to 6/43,' when he was only there during the months of April and May."

ST was not mistaken. The military records show that he arrived in Washington on March 1 or March 2, 1943: in the Officer Personnel File, a memorandum dated February 23, 1943, from the Chief of Naval Personnel to ST in New York, orders him to report for a physical examination "in your District...If found physically qualified...you will further proceed to Washington, D.C., and report to the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department..." At bottom is a handwritten endorsement, dated March 1, 1943, from the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, that ST "reported this date." A memo from the BuPers to ST, July 18, 1944, concerning a possible promotion: "for the purposes of promotion you are regarded as having commenced active duty on 2 March 1943, the date you first reported for active duty to the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D.C."

Further in the paragraph: "He was billeted in a hotel apartment...he made no friends and was often lonely." This information is not in any of the documents cited.

"Every day he reported for duty at Morale Operations...":

He was not assigned to Morale Operations (see comment above for p. 99, paragraph 2). As Bair says a few lines above, he was assigned to the Interior Control Board—a Navy department under the Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

In an April 2, 1944, letter to HS (AAA, reel 144, frame 182), ST recalls a visit from her to his room in Washington in the spring of 1943: "you spent the afternoon in bed, reading and when I arrived from the Navy Dept..."

For more on ST's assignment at this time, see comment below for p. 104, paragraph 3.

As to what ST did during his Washington assignment, Bair's claim that he learned about "different kinds of propaganda...qualities of paper and ink," and listened to "general lectures on the psychology of native populations and occupying armies..." (lines 12-14) is here undocumented.

Last sentence of paragraph: "Mostly he learned about the kinds of printing facilities he could expect to find, supply links for the products he needed, and how his group was to communicate and cooperate with other MO facilities"; note on p. 621.

The ambiguous note reads: "A page about these details is in YCAL, Box 1." In box 1, folder "1943 Correspondence," there are two pages of instructions for setting up printing

facilities, but these refer to the establishment of the MO office in Rome in June 1944—the names handwritten at lower right are those of staff members in that office.

p. 104, paragraph 3, “**Much of the time he spent sitting in the corridor** outside the office of Kay Halle, who worked in Morale Operations...[and] put him to work creating cartoons that were subsequently distributed in Germany and Italy”; note on p. 619.

Again (see comment for p. 99, paragraph 2), ST was not working for Morale Operations in Washington in 1943. The note refers to an article by Norman D. Atkins, “Steinberg’s Wartime Cartoons: Anti-Nazi Propaganda Found at the Archives,” *The Washington Post*, June 30, 1984. Atkins is writing about a then recently declassified portfolio of drawings among the OSS Records at the National Archives and Records Administration (RG 226, entry 99, box 40, folder 6). The portfolio is titled: “MO—Collection of Cartoons Produced by MO Artist Lt. (jg) Saul Steinberg....” The works Atkins describes and illustrates, including those Bair cites at the end of the paragraph—caricatures of Nazi and Japanese soldiers—could not have been done in spring 1943. First, they are credited to “Lt. (jg) Saul Steinberg.” In 1943, ST was an ensign (and remained at that rank until October 1944; see comment for p. 100, photo).

Second, the drawings are in a section of the portfolio headed “Drawings made for MO-MTO [Morale Operations-Mediterranean Theater of Operations] for use in leaflets, newspapers, etc.” MO operations in the MTO did not commence until several months later; see OSS Records, NARA, as in the preceding paragraph, report of Lt. (jg) John D. Wilson, February 3, 1945: “OSS Morale Operations began in the Mediterranean Theater at the time of the Allied landings in Sicily in [July] 1943.”

Finally, in the Officer Qualifications Questionnaire, which ST filled out on May 29, 1945 (YCAL, box 20, folder “Navy,” 2 of 2; also referred to above, comment for p. 104, paragraph 2 and the note; below, comment for pp. 106-07), ST lists as his “ship or station”: “VCNO [Vice Chief of Naval Operations]. Interior Control Board, Washington, D.C.”

As for Kay Halle, whose account, via Atkins, is the source of Bair’s claim that ST was working for MO in Washington in the spring of 1943: the date of 1943 is given nowhere in the *Washington Post* article. Halle’s recollection that, having discovered that ST could draw, she said “Look, we need you” is ambiguous. That she wasn’t referring to “creating cartoons” for distribution in Germany and Italy is amply documented. A December 6, 1944, memo Halle wrote from Washington to Eugene Warner, who ran the MO in Rome (OSS Records, NARA, RG 226, entry 92/A, box 87, folder 1675), reports that she had “been with the MO since last April [i.e., 1944],” that she had “helped establish the Reports and Records Situation Office. Slowly, out of a chaos of material we have been reaching some sort of order in the recording and presentation of MO Missions—Rumor Campaigns—Leaflets—Infiltrations and all the rest. Saul Steinberg is with us and giving us a great hand in collecting and identifying the MO printed material....”

Thus: Halle was not charged with creating original material, but in keeping records of what had already been produced. She was not in Morale Operations in Washington in 1943, and neither was ST. The work with ST must have taken place after he returned to the States in October 1944 and was stationed with the OSS in Washington. The portfolio of drawings at NARA was most likely assembled by him at that time: among other things, it contains two ST drawings, ink and watercolor, of the MO offices in Algiers and Naples—drawings that serve no propaganda purpose but merely visualize the workplace. The addition of such drawings, whether done from memory or brought back to the States, would have been appropriate for the official “recording and presentation of MO Missions.”

p. 105, line 4, “When he came home, there was always ‘scotch & wine & apple pie’”; note on p. 621.

The note reference for the quote to a November 27, 1943, letter from ST to HS is incorrect; it should be November 17 (AAA, reel 144, frame 055).

P.105, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s activities in Washington in the spring of 1943: “One of his most enjoyable assignments was illustrating a pamphlet for the OSS distributed to all new

recruits. **The pamphlet covered everything** from how candidates were chosen to what they should take with them to foreign lands...”; note on p. 621.

The note reads: “The pamphlet contains no identifying information about when it was compiled or by whom. A copy is in YCAL, Box 1.” No such pamphlet by ST is known to SSF among the extensive contents of box 1.

The reference in the note to “another pamphlet, entitled *China Theater...*”: the booklet is irrelevant to ST’s 1943 Washington period, since it was done during or after his China sojourn (July-December 1943).

p. 105, last paragraph, concerning the change-of-duty orders ST received on April 18. “**He was given eight days** to prepare to fly to San Francisco...”; note on p. 621.

The note reads: “The Change of Duty Orders is in YCAL, box 20.” The folder is “Navy,” 1 of 2.

## Chapter 10

p. 106, paragraph 1, concerning ST’s departure for China from San Francisco, life aboard ship, and journey from Ceylon and India to his station in China. None of the notes in this paragraph document the dates of his various arrivals and departures. That information can be found in the military records, Officer Personnel File, a single page dated June 4, 7, and 11<sup>th</sup>; in YCAL, box 20, folder “Navy,” 1 of 2, a certification of arrivals and departures, signed by ST on the letterhead of the Office of the U.S. Naval Observer, American Embassy, Chungking.

Note in this paragraph, “**a very unromantic sickness**”; p. 621: The ST letter to HS, November 6, 1943 is AAA, reel 144, frame 039. In the note for “**funnies on Sunday**,” also p. 621, the letter to HS of May 1, 1944, is frame 208. The January 20, 1944, letter to HS cited in the note for a later gambling loss is AAA, reel 144, frame 099.

Last sentence: “He compared being stuck there [in Calcutta] to being in a doctor’s waiting room, passing the time reading old, bedraggled magazines and hoping his turn would soon come.” No reference is given, but it apparently is ST to HS, June 29, 1943 (AAA, reel 144, frame 006). What ST actually says is: “My life is regular and quiet here, I have everything, even plenty of cigarettes now. They treat us very well. I read something, I made some drawings, been already to see a poor and old movie. I feel like in the waiting room again. Same kind of feelings, and the kind of spiritual life that can be found in the old magazines of a waiting room.”

p. 106, last paragraph - p. 107, line 2, on ST’s assignment in China: “Ostensibly he was to show other MO divisions how to set up and operate printing equipment, but in reality he did nothing, because equipment was either hard to come by or lacking and no one seemed to have any clear idea of what MO officers were expected to do even if the presses were up and running.”

There is no reference for this statement. But, as shown above (comment for p. 104, last sentence of paragraph 2), any ST involvement with printing equipment refers to the activities of the Morale Operations unit in Rome a year later.

As to what ST actually did in China, there are several versions of the story, most of them probably supplied by ST in the postwar years. The only documentary evidence we have comes from the Officer Qualifications Questionnaire, which ST filled out on May 29, 1945 (referred to above, YCAL, box 20, folder “Navy,” 2 of 2). On p. 3 of that document, he lists his Naval duties. For the period June-December 1943, he wrote: “U.S. Naval Observer, Chungking, Psychological Warfare Artist.” His duties were “to prepare background for future P.W. operations in China.” Whatever that means, ST was filling out the questionnaire for his superior officers who would be able to verify the accuracy of his statements. See also below, comment for p. 110, paragraph 2, where Bair claims different activities for ST in China.

p. 107, line 4, “He thought Calcutta was ‘**not a good place to live in...**’”; note on p. 621.

ST’s letter to HS, July 3, 1943, cited in the note, is AAA, reel 144, frame 008.

p. 107, paragraph 2, line 4, “clear sight of the Himalayas”; note on p. 621.

Referring to Steinberg’s illustrated pamphlet, “China Theater,” Bair says: “It was later reprinted in *All in Line* and *TNY*, February 5, 1944.” The pamphlet was not reprinted; some of the drawings, though by no means all, appeared in two *TNY* features, January 15 and February 5, 1944; a selection was later included in *All in Line*.

p. 107, paragraph 2, line 7, “perspiring like a waterfall”; note on p. 621.

The frame number for ST’s July 20, 1943, letter to HS, cited in the note, is 012.

p. 107, paragraph 3.

The quotations in this paragraph do not appear in ST’s correspondence to HS. The source is unknown to SSF.

p. 107, beginning line 7 from the bottom, “Malaria was rampant, and the mosquitoes were ‘like dive bombers asking for blood.’ He was glad that he brought the extra netting Hedda had insisted on....”

The uncited source for the “dive bombers” quotation is the July 20, 1943, letter to HS, cited earlier on the page. As for the mosquito netting, in the same letter, ST says that he was “glad for the good mosquito net I brought with me.” Neither here nor elsewhere is HS credited with the idea.

p. 107, photo caption, “Steinberg in China at his first wartime duty station.”

The photo may have been taken in Italy rather than China. There is a photograph at SSF, documented to ST’s Italian sojourn, that is identical in uniform and facial features.

p. 108, lines 3-5, “He was among some ‘very nice fellows’ who were billeted two or three to a room, and he drew his for Hedda, showing the mosquito netting enclosing the bed...”; note on p. 621.

For ST’s drawings, the note cites a photo insert in Milton Miles’s 1967 book, *A Different Kind of War*, which reproduces three drawings. One is of ST’s room; the other two are those described later in the paragraph—officers relaxing on deck chairs and Miles returning from the shower hut. But there is no evidence that the one of ST’s room, or any others here, were drawn for Hedda, and no such drawings appear in the ST-HS correspondence.

The unsourced “very nice fellows” quotation comes from a letter to HS, September 5, 1943, AAA, reel 144, frame 027.

p. 108, paragraph 3, “He had to be in ‘a special mood’ to draw for them [*The New Yorker*]”; note on p. 622.

The note reads: “OSS Pamphlet no. 69895, p. 14; reproduced in *All in Line* and *TNY*, January 15, 1944, p.18.” Readers may not understand that this OSS pamphlet is the same “China Theater” cited above (see comment for p. 107, paragraph 4, line 4; also for later reproductions). Nor is it clear how any of these drawings relate to “a special mood,” which comes from ST’s August 2, 1943, letter to HS.

p. 108, last paragraph, “...his impressions of daily GI life in China turned out to be the first in a series of highly successful drawing-essays he sent [to *The New Yorker*]...which totaled sixty-nine drawings filling twenty pages throughout 1944 and 1945. Many were originally drawn as illustrations for naval information and propaganda pamphlets.”

The dates and titles of these portfolios can be found in *S:I*, p. 237, note 53; they are discussed in greater detail, with illustrations, in Joel Smith, *Steinberg at The New Yorker* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2005), pp. 50-57.

As for the original purpose of the drawings, there is no evidence that they were done for military propaganda or informational use. The “China Theater” drawings in the undated pamphlet published by the OSS (see comment for p. 107, paragraph 4, line 4) could have been assembled and published after ST returned to the States in the fall of 1944 and was stationed

at the OSS office in Washington. The drawings in the other portfolios—North Africa and Italy—were first published in *The New Yorker*. Some of them do appear in the “MO—Collection of Cartoons...” (see comment for p. 104, paragraph 3), but the publications clearly postdate *The New Yorker* issues; some even reproduce the drawings with the magazine’s layout.

p. 109, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s activities in China, see comments for p. 98, paragraph 2, and p. 106, last paragraph, which also supplies the full reference for the Officer Qualifications Questionnaire cited in the note on p. 622 for “psychological warfare artist.”

p. 109, paragraph 3, Miles wanted to be addressed on a first-name basis, “which was awkward for the somewhat puzzled Saul”; note on p. 622.

Equally puzzling is the second reference in the note: “Miles, *A Different Kind of War*, index, p. 621.” The index listings on that page run from “Miles, Milton E. (*cont’d*)” to “Naval Gun Factory.” The lengthy index, incidentally, does not include Steinberg.

p. 110, paragraph 2, “During the brief time Steinberg served under Miles’s command, one of his major tasks was to assess whatever information the front-line spies gave him and...to prepare everything from leaflets that were dropped behind enemy lines to brochures that instructed both American and Chinese soldiers in how to engage with the maximum respect for each other’s culture. He also drew derogatory cartoons of Japanese leaders that were dropped from planes....One of his most important assignments was to analyze data gathered by agents and draw precise maps of the South China coast that would guide downed airmen to safe passage outside Japanese-held territories.”

On p. 106, last paragraph (see comment there), Bair gives a different account of ST’s activities—that he was supposed to set up printing equipment but “in reality he did next to nothing.” On p. 109, paragraph 2, Bair quotes from the only documented evidence we have for ST’s work in China: that he “prepared background for future P.W. operations in China” (emphasis added). See comment for p. 106 on these two points.

By p. 110, however, ST is busy multitasking as an intelligence analyst, propaganda artist, and mapmaker. No references are provided for this paragraph. Bair assumes that if SACO was doing it, so was ST. But the SACO literature cited by Bair (note on p. 622 for p. 109, “the Rice Paddy Navy”) puts most of the group’s operational work in the period after ST’s departure in late December 1943.

As for the “derogatory cartoons of Japanese leaders...dropped from planes”: Bair seems to be referring to the drawings in the “MO—Collection of Cartoons Produced by MO Artist Lt. (jg) Saul Steinberg...,” but this collection was assembled in 1944 and the caricatures of Japanese leaders were probably done after ST returned to Washington; see comment for p. 104, paragraph 3.

“...and draw precise maps of the South China coast.” Mapmaking is a highly specialized skill in which ST had no training; anyone wanting to save downed airmen would have assigned a mapmaker, not an architect-cartoonist, to the task.

p. 110, paragraph 3, “Steinberg contributed one of the best known and loved [SACO emblems] when he drew a poster that also became a sleeve patch”; note on p. 622, “A third banner at the bottom.”

There was no “poster,” but rather a drawing, which did not become a sleeve patch. In the note, Bair says that the drawing is at YCAL, but whatever is there must be a photocopy: the original drawing, ink and watercolor, was sold at Doyle New York, November 30, 2005, lot 64, and is now in a private collection.

In her paragraph on the drawing, Bair describes the three inscribed banners. The note begins: “The first two banners are from Les Hughes’s article ‘SACO (Naval Group China),’” followed by a website link that does not show any banners.

p. 110, last paragraph, on ST’s transfer from China to Algiers, December 1943: “His official orders detailed a journey that would eventually deposit him in Algiers, Algeria, on ‘temporary

duty.’ The orders were confusing, not only because they were issued by the army rather than the navy, but also because once the temporary duty in Algiers ended, he was to receive a new set that would send him back to his official posting with SACO in Happy Valley.”

The orders were not issued by the army but by the US Naval Observer (Milton Miles), military records, Officer Personnel File, restricted memorandum dated December 6, 1943.

p. 111, paragraph 2, while awaiting transportation to Algiers, ST “chafed at one delay after another as he experienced firsthand the military complaint ‘Hurray up and wait.’”

In none of ST’s letters to Hedda, written between December 8 and his departure on December 19, does he express annoyance at any delays.

The December 8 letter to Hedda, cited in the note on p. 622 as a source for this paragraph (“**On December 8 he told Hedda**”), is AAA, reel 144, frames 060 and 061.

p. 111, paragraph 3, on ST’s itinerary to Algiers; note on p. 622, “**some excitement with [Japanese] Zeros.**”

The note refers to a January 1, 1944, letter to HS. There are two letters of that date. The quotation comes from the second letter (AAA, reel 144, frame 078). ST’s quarters “in a barracks with fifty other men” is from the first (frame 081: “I was sleeping with 20 or 50 other people”).

The rest of the paragraph is partly sourced by the January 1 letters, but some statements seem to be Bair’s interpolations, as in the italicized passages below:

In Karachi, he was “*unused to the spit and polish of dress uniforms and silver flatware at table* [and] drank so much of the local Manhattan cocktail that he was sick for two days.” ST wrote: “we had a hasty celebration and I drank too much of a local Manhattan cocktail and I was very sick for 2 days, almost died. I spent Christmas in a naval Liaison house, very chic and formal but an unbelievable turkey diner.”

In Cairo, “*He tried to see the places Hedda had seen on a trip with her mother and brother before the war....*” ST wrote: “I’ve been in town and didn’t have much good time but I enjoyed the idea that you’ve been here before....”

“The smells [of Cairo] reminded him of Romania and the Levant *but mostly reminded him of Italy, the place he still thought of as his real home...*” ST wrote: “I mean by ‘home’ the old country with levant people and the kind of half civilization.” No mention of Italy.

The note refers vaguely to a naval document at YCAL for ST’s itinerary from China to Algiers. That document is a payment endorsement from the US Navy Operating Base at Oran, for air travel from Kunming to Algiers, dated January 5, 1944, YCAL, box 1, folder “Navy,” 1 of 2.

p. 111, paragraph 3, through end of paragraph, p. 112.

The letters to Hedda of January 1 and January 6, cited in the notes (“**curious outfit**” and “**He was even more noticeable,**” p. 623), do not source the statement that “the local Morale Operations unit put him to work setting up printing presses and doing other mechanical work for which he had no prior experience and no aptitude”; similarly, the recollection of his army colleagues fifty years later that he was “taciturn.”

On the difficulty of finding a new naval uniform on an army base, and “because it was cold, he had to borrow a non-regulation army overcoat. He grew tired of having to explain to superior officers why he was out of uniform.” All ST says in the cited January 1 letter is: “now I have only one uniform and I have to keep it clean[.] Next naval base I’ll buy clothes and everything, I have too much money anyway.”

p. 112, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s reaction to his new posting in Algiers; note on p. 623, “**At work he had problems.**”

The document cited in the note—an interview with ST conducted by Major Coon on November 8, 1944—does not refer to Algiers alone, but to ST’s experience in Italy as well.

p. 112, paragraph 3, note on p. 623, “**publisher, editor, and lover of Hedda.**”

The letter to Hedda cited in the note (January 20, 1944) is AAA, reel 144, frames 98-99.

Last sentence: "Several days later, he was 'happy happy happy' because she sent a telegram in which she did say yes [to his marriage proposal]. 'God bless you for that,' he replied, adding several gushing paragraphs to tell her again and again just how happy she made him"; note on p. 623, "**happy happy happy.**"

It was not "several days later," there are no "gushing paragraphs" added in the short January 22, 1944, letter, cited in the note (frame 100), and the letter does not concern ST's marriage proposal. ST only says that he is happy to have received HS's telegram, no subject indicated. There seems to be only one extant telegram from HS to ST in this period, and it too doesn't speak of marriage: January 19, 1944, "All well darling your unchanged/Hedda Stafford" (YCAL, box 86, folder "Hedda Sterne Letters," 2 of 2). HS accepted ST's proposal in a letter of February 17, 1944, YCAL, box 85, folder "Hedda Sterne letters, 1940s," 6 of 8: "You funny boy, you ask me to say yes—naturally, it's yes." ST refers to HS's acceptance in the March 30 letter (frame 178).

p. 113, paragraph 1.

The two letters to HS cited in the notes are: January 24 (possibly January 25), 1944, frame 110; February 14, 1944, frame 137.

p. 113, paragraph 3, "On February 24, after a rough flight in heavy rain, fog, and wind, he reached the southern Italian province of Calabria. "**I was really scared,**" he admitted to Hedda; note on p. 623.

The date of the letter cited in the note should be March 4, not March 1 (frame 164). But it doesn't say that he landed in Calabria, though the weather report is correct; as Bair remarks a couple of lines later, ST was not permitted to reveal his exact location.

The letter cited as a source for the quotation at the end of the paragraph, "**I'm finally here...**," should be dated February 29, not February 24 (frame 1963).

p. 113, paragraph 4

The two note references (p. 623, "**some of the real war**" and "**this sort of scenery**") are ambiguously placed. Only the first quotation—that ST was "finally seeing 'some of the real war'"—comes from the cited letter of March 11, 1944 (frame 165). The rest of the quotations in the paragraph are from the March 20, 1944, letter (frame 171), cited at the end.

Transcription errors: for "towns and hills" read "mountains and hills"; for "this sort of scenery, which is beautiful in reality but which usually turned out to be corny..." read "this sort of scenery which is beautiful in reality will turn out to be corny."

pp. 114-116, the account of ST's life in Italy through June 1944, based on ST's letters to HS. The letter references and sources on p. 623 need some sorting out.

p. 114, paragraph 1, "**In Italy, I used to be**": the March 11, 1944, letter cited in the note (frame 165) is not the source for what precedes concerning the billeting and transportation arrangements for ST's unit. The March 30 letter ("**silly and sad**") is frame 177. The rest of the paragraph, however—ST's bittersweet emotion about his family, the fear that "his superiors [might] think of sending him to Bucharest, even if only for temporary duty," is not in the letter.

p. 114, paragraph 2. No sources are cited. The information comes from the April 10 letter (frames 188-189), except for the part about inoculations.

p. 114, paragraph 3, note on p. 623, "**coming attractions**": the April 24 letter cited is frame 201. But the next passages—ST shops for his and Hedda's future home and buys "junk"—are from an uncited letter of May 22, frames 220-221. The April 27 letter, which sources "**off by himself to buy postcards**" and the next quotation on p. 115, is frame 206. "**Almost cried for days,**" from the May 10 letter, is frame 212.

p. 115, paragraph 2, "**He gave up on reaching Rome**": the three letters cited in the note source the whole paragraph, May 12, 19, and 22 (frames 213, 218, 220).

p. 115, paragraph 3, “I don’t know what’s wrong with me, but as soon as I get used to one place I have to move.” This quotation is from the May 22 letter (frames 221-222), not cited in the note. The correct transcription: “I don’t know what’s the matter with me...” Of the three letters cited in the note, May 25, 28, and 31, that of May 28 doesn’t seem relevant; the other two (frames 223, 226) speak of ST’s efforts to win a promotion, but there is no mention of a “salary increase” or of Hedda teasing him. The May 28 letter (frame 225) is the source for the quotations opening the next paragraph.

p. 115, paragraph 5, “**news of the Normandy invasion**”: the June 7 letter cited in the note is frame 233. The June 11 letter, referred to in the text only, is frame 235. ST does say that he spends evenings in his office making drawings, but that the drawings were “for *The New Yorker*” is only implied, not stated. Finally, “His uncle Harry wrote to say that he had received two telegrams from Moritz and Rosa sent via the Red Cross, and they were well.” The passage in the June 11 letter (frame 238) reads: “Uncle Harry received another letter (Red Cross) from my folks. They say they are all fine.”

p. 116, paragraph 1, ST was “**running around and busy as hell**, extremely unusual for me.” Part of the passage in the cited June 11 letter (frame 239) is elided without indication. It reads: “I’ve been running around and busy as hell and even today I had to work most of the time (which is extremely unusual for me now and before that.” The July 1 letter, cited for “**a bastard who ate him**,” is frame 245.

p. 116, paragraph 2. The same July 1 letter is the source for this paragraph (frame 243), though the quotation is mistranscribed. For “entire cities completely forever destroyed where people still wandered look for things,” read “entire cities completely forever destroyed and still people around looking for things...”

p. 116, paragraph 2, “He kept a small black notebook in which he drew ‘**frightened villages**’”; note on p. 623.

This “notebook” in YCAL, box 3, seems to be not from 1944 but a postwar sketchbook from the early 1950s. ST is describing a visit to southern Italy—ceiling decorations of churches, a Kodak Printing house—and Monte Carlo. A ticket stub from a Monte Carlo casino is inserted in the book. He writes at one point, “frightened village around the church.”

p. 116, paragraph 3, concerning ST’s promotion to Lt. (jg).

No source is cited. It must be the letter to HS of June 19, 1944 (frame 244), where ST recounts the problem with the color of his uniform, mentioned in the next sentence.

p. 117, paragraphs 1-3, more clarification in the correspondence with HS.

paragraph 1, note on p. 623 for “**accumulated for days**”: the cited July 21-22 letter is frame 247. The next sentence, describing ST’s quarters in elegant houses once belonging to Fascists, is not in this letter; nor that “he managed to sleep in ‘fancy beds in fancy houses’ without running water or electricity.” The last statement comes from the July 1 letter (frames 243-244), but the quotation is incorrect. It should read: “I have nothing except bed and fancy rooms but there’s no water nor light.”

paragraph 2, the quotation “hungry population [*sic*, for “populations”] who don’t realize they’ve lost the war” is from the July 21-22 letter (frame 248). A few lines below, “I’m **very much disgusted** about the whole business,” is frame 280 in the letter cited.

paragraph 3. All the quotations in this paragraph are from the August 4 letter, cited midway (“I **changed in many ways**”), frames 255-256.

p. 117, paragraph 4, “**One old friend he met by happenstance** [in Italy in 1944] was the journalist Mikhail Kamenetzki, who had taken the name Ugo Stille after he endured many of the same tribulations as Steinberg during his quest to immigrate to the United States”; note on p. 623.

Bair implies here that the tribulations of immigration caused Kamenetzki to change his name. On p. 649, however, note for p. 288, “**Ugo often traveled for his job**,” the name is



correctly identified as a pen name used by Kamenetzki and the poet Giamme Pintor in the 1930s, when they wrote a column together for the magazine *Oggi*.

In the next sentence, Stille's desire to write an article about ST is sourced by the letter to HS, cited in the note, which is frame 287. But this letter, of which Bair says in the note "n.d. but internal evidence suggests late August 1944," cannot be from 1944. It can be no earlier than 1948. Bair quotes from the letter: "I invited for lunch today Kamenetsky and his new wife." Stille married an American, Elizabeth Boger, in 1949. ST also mentions going to an air-conditioned theater to see a Bob Hope movie and remarks on the crowds in Long Island. Thus a meeting between Stille and ST took place in New York sometime after 1948; the one in Rome in 1944 never happened.

"It was even more awkward [i.e., seeing old friends when ST finally got to Rome with the military] with **two of his Bertoldo friends**, Mario Ortensi and Mario Brancacci"; note on p. 623. ST's letter to HS (frame 255), cited in the note, does not mention Ortensi or Brancacci, speaking only of "a few old friends or so called friends of mine." It is ST's letter to Buzzi, September 12, 1945, uncited, that gives their names.

p. 118, paragraph 2.

lines 3-4: "He wrote [to Hedda] that he hoped to see his father on his father's birthday, July 15..."

The uncited source is ST's letter to HS, July 14-15, 1944 (frame 245). The same letter is the source for the next sentence re "Italian women in bathing suits..." (frame 246).

But Bair continues (lines 8-9): "His next letter was more straightforward..." The August 2 letter to HS, cited in the note on p. 624 for "**To let her know he was back in Rome**," is not the next; three dated letters were sent between July 15 and August 2. The latter (frame 253) is the source for the quote that precedes the note, but the quotation is mistranscribed. The last clause is not "I'm dirty and my eyes burn." ST wrote: "I'm again in a bad place, hot & flies and uncomfortable, I'm dirty and dirty again, the shirt is pasted on my skin, my eyes are burning."

The quotation in the last sentence is also mistranscribed: "in a neighborhood where regulations and etiquette dominated, as was usual with outfits far from the front lines." ST wrote: "I'm one of the sloppiest naval officer in this neighborhood where they all care very much for regulations and etiquette as it is usual with outfits very much behind the lines." The undated letter is frame 288.

p. 118, paragraph 3, note on p. 624 for "the exciting news."

The August 16, 1944, letter to HS cited in the note is frame 261.

p. 118, paragraph 3, concerning ST's two-week posting to Toulon, where "his assignment was to deliver 'certain classified materials' to the OSS regiment somewhere in Provence"; note on p. 624.

The note citation to the orders from Eugene Warner, MO Chief in Rome, is correct (the folder in YCAL, box 20, is "Navy"), but Bair goes on to explain why ST was probably selected: "some of the most important information that guided sabotage operations and propaganda campaigns on the French Riviera originated in OSS field offices in Caserta and Algiers....Steinberg was probably chosen because he had previously made a number of similar trips between Italy and North Africa."

Corrections: Warner's orders are dated September 11, 1944. ST was in Rome by then, as was Warner, not in Caserta or Algiers. Though ST seems to have traveled between Italy and North Africa before ending up in Rome, there is no evidence that these were courier trips.

Moreover, ST may have been chosen to deliver classified materials because he was going to southern France on another mission. In YCAL, box 67, folder "Naval Documents," there is (along with another copy of Warner's orders) a "To Whom It May Concern" letter from Charles Robin, Public Relations Officer, USN, also dated September 11, in which he asks that ST be given assistance as needed: "Lt. (jg) Steinberg is an artist and is on temporary duty in the Southern France area to find and develop material for sketches."

p. 118, last paragraph, to end of paragraph on p. 119, concerning ST's brief trip to Bucharest from Rome.

**"Steinberg learned that an American plane was being sent to Bucharest";** note on p. 624. The folder for the travel orders signed by Col. Gavin in YCAL, box 67, is "Naval Documents."

"By mid-September he was back in the homeland he had previously wanted to be free of forever"; note on p. 624. The September 3, 1944, letter to HS, cited in the note, precedes the Bucharest trip and does not mention it. On p. 119, paragraph 3, Bair observes that ST did not write of his Bucharest trip to Hedda. In fact, the September 3 letter is the last dated correspondence between the two until 1946.

p. 119, paragraph 2, **"He knew that his parents were still living on the street where the workshop was, Rahova Road, and he decided to go there first, even though Lica was the person he most wanted to see";** note on p. 624.

The note is misplaced. It documents the last sentence of the paragraph concerning the marriage date of ST's sister, Lica, not what follows.

p. 119, paragraph 3, on ST's raiding the PX for food to take to his family.

No sources are given for this statement; nor does the "raid" appear in ST's later recollection of the trip to Eugen Campus, mentioned at the end of the paragraph—which is the article "Nature and Art (Conversations with Saul Steinberg)," cited two notes earlier.

p. 119, paragraph 4, on ST's visit to his parents' home, as told to Campus; note on p. 624, **"caricature of Prince Charming."**

Significant parts of the paragraph are interpolations not in the Campus text cited in the note. Bair writes: "He told Campus that when he got out of the jeep that took him to his parents' house, he was shocked to see how it and all the others on the street looked abandoned and boarded up. As he stood there gazing up and down the bomb-damaged street, a curious child who had never seen a navy uniform began to wave American flags and dance around him and the jeep. Steinberg asked in Romanian what had become of his family and all the neighbors. The child told him everyone still lived there, but they had all gone to the synagogue because it was Yom Kippur. Steinberg surprised his parents when they returned from the services, but the visit was disturbing and he left as soon as he could get away: With the jeep outside and all the PX loot dumped on the table, he felt like a 'a caricature of Prince Charming....'"

The account published in Campus (pp. 54-54) is much briefer: "I got out of the American jeep on Rahova Road and was shocked to see that my parents' house had been abandoned. Its windows were boarded up. A child, who was walking around the jeep with American flags and admired my uniform, reassured me: 'They left for the synagogue. It's Yom Kippur.' I was reunited with my parents and then left quickly. The scene is a caricature of Prince Charming...."

p. 120, paragraph 1; note on p. 624, **"a closed chapter."**

The note reference to ST's December 27, 1955, letter to Buzzi does not source this and the following quotation. The source is the Campus article, p. 54. Later in the paragraph, Bair writes: "In his old age, he reminisced about the 'disasters of a visit to the tribe'...." This and the rest of the quotation are from the Buzzi letter, but in 1955, ST was hardly "in old age."

p. 121, paragraph 2, concerning the interrogation of German prisoners of war by the MO unit in Rome to **"determine which could be persuaded to assist the Allies";** note on p. 625.

The note begins with biographical information about "Lindner" and "Williams," neither of whom is mentioned here. Lindner is Edward Lindner, one of ST's colleagues at the MO office in Rome, cited in a note for the next page, **"Steinberg was able to indulge."**

The “untitled typescript version of ‘Operation Sauerkraut’ article, National Archives” is probably “The Story of the Sauerkrauts,” MO-MEDTO, 2677<sup>th</sup> HDQ. DET. OSS (PROV), printed in Rome, May 1945; NARA, OSS Records, RG 226, entry 213 [WN#09052], copy at SSF.

At the end of the paragraph, Bair writes: “In many of the MO brainstorming sessions, Steinberg’s colleagues who spoke German were struck by his replies: despite his fluency in the language, he always replied in Yiddish.” No source is given, but it is apparently an interview with Lindner by Sheila Schwartz, September 17, 2002. What Lindner actually said was, “the common language of some of the OSS staff was German, which they spoke better than English. ST could follow the German conversations because of his knowledge of Yiddish, and he often answered in Yiddish.”

p. 121, paragraph 3, “Steinberg’s drawings filled each issue of *Das Neue Deutschland*...”

An inflated claim. Although *DND* was a highly successful propaganda endeavor, only eleven issues were published, June 15, 1944-April 15, 1945, seven of them after ST returned to the States. Nor did ST’s drawings “fill each issue.” There was usually only one drawing, occasionally two, per issue, and only one in the entire run can firmly be attributed to ST—that reproduced and discussed in Smith, *S:I*, fig. 18 and p. 32, the Hitler drawing described by Bair (which is captioned “Der Schuldige,” “The Guilty One”).

As for “To poke fun at the Volkssturm...Steinberg resurrected the Zia Elena figures from his *Bertoldo* days, this time as two fat German housewives on roller skates, wearing Nazi armbands and wielding brooms and umbrellas instead of guns.” This was not a drawing for *DND*, but rather a postcard dropped behind German lines. At top is printed “Volkssturm,” at bottom “Schwere Panzer” (a play on the Schwere Panzerabteilung, the famous German heavy tank division). For a reproduction, see <http://www.psywar.org/sauerkraut.php>. It is one of the postcards Bair describes on p. 122, paragraph 2.

p. 122, paragraph 2, “In his work, Steinberg was able to indulge in one of his lifelong passions: postcards...[which] provided some of his earliest practice at different kinds of handwriting that filled so many of his drawings after the war, particularly the fake diplomas....He also created official-looking rubber stamps...”; note on p. 625.

The note begins: “Information that follows is from Edward Lindner, interview with Sheila Schwartz, September 17, 2002.” All Lindner says in that interview is that he and Barbara Podoski “came up with ideas for postcards supposedly from the underground movement.”

It isn’t clear why ST’s practice at “different kinds of handwriting” (presumably legible) evolved into the faux script of his later fake documents, which were consistently written in one “handwriting.”

p.122, paragraph 5 to end of paragraph on p. 123, concerning ST’s MO drawings, “all of which showed the new turn his work had taken...he had completely stopped drawing with pencil and now used only pen and India ink. There was a crisis when he lost the fountain pen Hedda had given him...but she sent a variety of others to replace it...”; note on p. 625.

The note is to ST’s letter to Buzzi, November 23, 1945, but the contents of that letter are irrelevant to the subject. In the letter of January 26, 1946, ST writes: “I’ve also done a lot of work on my own, done thousands of free drawings (haven’t used a pencil in ages, I now draw directly in pen).” What ST means is that he wasn’t using pencil for underdrawings (although many drawings of the period and after show such pencil work). But the remarks have nothing to do with his MO period. Bair’s claim that he “stopped drawing with pencil” remains undocumented.

No sources are given for the lost fountain pen. A letter to HS, February 19, 1944 (frame 149), reports a lost fountain pen but not that HS had given it to him. HS had sent him pens, but these were *drawing* pens, i.e., the steel-nib pens he favored for his art (January 20, 1944, frame 98; February 9, 1944, frame 127).

p. 123, paragraph 2, “**Around this time, he began to decorate** his letters to [Hedda] with some of the rubber stamps that became one of his favorite postwar devices, among them the fingerprint and the pointing finger with various admonitions (‘rush,’ ‘secret,’ ‘confidential,’ etc.)”; note on p. 625.

Only two letters to Hedda show the hand with pointing finger, the cited one of August 10, 1944 (frame 258), and another of August 13 (frame 260). None shows fingerprints; nor are there any rubber-stamp “admonitions.” The latter can be found, among other places, in a 1954 sketchbook at YCAL, inv. 3128.

“**After the war he took delight in telling** the apocryphal tale of how he used the pointing finger marked ‘secret’ to identify his underwear...”; note on p. 625. The *PM* article cited in the note is titled “Saul Steinberg’s Secret Underwear,” and was published in the Magazine section, March 10 (not March 11), 1946, p. M5.

p. 123, paragraph 3, note on p. 625 for “**a group execution he had witnessed.**”  
The February 14, 1944, letter to HS, cited in the note, is AAA, frame 137.

p. 123, paragraph 4, “In Italy, Steinberg saw a convoy of German prisoners, ‘**just kids 16, 17 years old...**’”; note on p. 625.

The note cites a letter from ST to HS, “n.d. but internal evidence suggests late September 1944, AAA.” Late September 1944 would be impossible. The letter (frame 278) begins: “Dear, I’ve been again in the last 3 days on the road and I came back last night and found 6 letters from you (12 to 22 February).” Thus it was probably written sometime in March.

p. 124, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s drawing lessons to fellow soldiers in China; note on p. 625, “**After the war, Steinberg wanted.**”

The note sources this paragraph as “Undated letter to HS.” The letter is not undated. It’s the same February 14, 1944, letter (frame 138) cited above (see comment for p. 123, paragraph 3). There are several transcription errors and interpolations. The passage reads:

“It’s amazing to see the drawings made by people who never in their life made drawings. My idea is that everybody should know how to make them because every child makes drawings. But the trouble is that growing up they want to make pictures looking like photographs with real proportion and perspective and that’s wrong because it’s science, trick.

I just take a small group of sailors and tell them: take it easy, here’s a sheet of paper and a pencil, don’t worry about reality, make it wrong, make from memory a scene that impressed you and you remember well, make details and keep working for one hour. They usually make their home, hometown, family. They make excellent things and new beautiful compositions. I make that for fun but I have in mind after the war to pick up people and give them paper pencil colors and being my guests for a week or so with the obligation to work a few hours a day for me turning out art work.”

p. 124, paragraph 3.

No sources are given for this paragraph about ST’s fear that he would be unable to convey his experience of war in writing or drawing. The quotations are taken from the same ca. March 1944 letter cited above and misdated (see comment for p. 123, paragraph 4); frame 279.

p. 125, paragraph 2, concerning Peter Sichel’s recollection of ST in the MO. “He thought Steinberg was a ‘strange and private man’ who went out of his way to avoid telling even the most ordinary fact about himself. **Sichel wondered how much** of his behavior was due to Steinberg being a naval officer...in the midst of an army unit...”; note on p. 625.

The note refers to a Sichel interview with Sheila Schwartz, September 13, 2002, and an email from Sichel, August 27, 2002. Neither source mentions ST’s reluctance to speak about himself or tries to explain this behavior.

p. 125, paragraph 4, concerning ST's drawings of the wartime theaters in which he served: "The affection he felt for the men with whom he served in China is evident in the drawings he chose to include in his first book, *All in Line*, published the year after he returned to civilian life."

No particular "affection" for ST's fellow soldiers in the Far East can be read into *All in Line* (1945). The second half of the book is entitled "War" and contains drawings (or variants) of those already published in *The New Yorker*. The China portfolios were published in January and February 1944; those of Italy, North Africa, and India at various points through April 1945. (For the dates and titles of these portfolios, see *S:I*, p. 237, note 53; also comment for p. 108, last paragraph.) ST was planning a separate book of war drawings (ST to HS, February 11, February 14, and April 20, 1944, frames 930, 138, and 197-99, respectively), which ultimately became the *All in Line* section.

*All in Line* was not published "the year after he returned to civilian life." ST was still on active duty in Washington and New York until December 13, 1945, when he received an "honorable release to inactive duty" in the US Naval Reserve (Notice of Separation from the U.S. Naval Service, YCAL, box 20, folder "Navy," 1 of 2).

p. 126, paragraph 2, "On November 8, 1944, several days before Steinberg received orders to return to Washington and was released by the 2677th MO, he was interviewed by an intelligence officer in the OSS"; note on p. 626.

ST received orders to return to the US on September 13, 1944; he landed at the Patuxent River naval base on October 4 (travel orders to return to Washington, signed by F.C. Pishon, September 13; on the reverse, an endorsement of arrival at the base, October 4; both in the military records, Officer Personnel File); Bair gets the date correct on p. 141. The interview, conducted by Major Carleton S. Coon, thus took place in Washington. ST's words are transmitted in the third person by Major Coon.

This is the same interview already cited on p. 112, paragraph 2, note for **At work, he had problems**. There it is YCAL box 48, folder 2; here it is box 9, no folder cited. The original document is in the OSS Records, National Archives and Records Administration, RG 226, entry 99, box 48, folder 2.

p. 127, paragraph 3, "After the interview,...Steinberg was on his way back to Washington...." He was already there. See preceding comment.

Note on p. 626 for "**It arrived safely at Hedda's**," referring to the boxes of collected material and souvenirs ST shipped back. After citing interviews with HS, the note continues: "Also, many of them are distributed throughout YCAL boxes." See General Comment above, Non-specific references. Similarly for the next note, "**Some of the elaborate engravings**": "These too are distributed throughout the YCAL boxes."

p. 128, paragraph 3, "Because Steinberg was attached to the army for so long, the last [officer fitness report] he received from the navy came from Milton Miles, then his commanding officer in Chungking, on May 31, 1944."

This puzzling statement needs some clarification. ST was only on "temporary duty" with the OSS in Europe: see the December 6, 1943, orders from Miles that ST proceed to Algiers "and upon arrival report to the Chief of the Office of Strategic Services for temporary duty" (military records, Officer Personnel File). Thus all the time ST spent in North Africa and Italy, he was still officially a naval officer under Miles's command and only Miles could evaluate him. ST had been back in Washington for a month when he was finally detached from duty with the Naval Observer, Chungking (Officer Personnel File, memo from Randall Jacobs to ST, November 10, 1944).

As for Miles's evaluation of May 31, 1944, not sourced, it is in the military records, Officer Fitness File. Bair writes: "Miles described Steinberg as 'excellent in intelligence, judgment, initiative, cooperation and loyalty,' but only 'mid-range in Force and Moral Courage' and 'low' in 'Leadership.'" The words, however, are not those of Miles. They are preprinted,

individual categories in a tabular evaluation sheet, in which the subject is rated by checking off one of five performance boxes.

p. 129, paragraph 1, “Meanwhile, in September 1944, he was terrified by the rumor that he would be given two weeks’ leave and then sent back to Rome. ‘I don’t want two weeks leave,’ he wrote to Hedda. ‘I want to go home and stay there!’”; note on p. 626.

The note reads: “ST to HS, n.d. but internal evidence suggests September 1944, AAA.” The letter (frames 289-290) does not date from September 1944. At the top, ST wrote “continuation June [1]944.” Later in the letter: “I sent the New Yorker 18 drawings from Italy and I’ll make a few more.” The “Italy” portfolios were published on June 10, July 8, and July 29, 1944.

The letter, moreover, does not speak of a “rumor” of a leave, nor that he would be “sent back to Rome”; Rome was only liberated by the Allies on June 5, 1944. ST’s words also reveal other misreadings in Bair’s text: “I don’t know how long I’m going to stay here [someplace in Italy] and as I told you I have new sound reasons to be optimistic about going home. I want to go home and stay with you, I don’t want to pay you a 2 weeks visit only.”

Later in the paragraph, to prepare HS for his loss of weight, etc., “he enclosed a drawing of a small dog that resembled a spaniel trying to jump a fence. ‘Greetings,’ read the caption. ‘This is me (I lost some weight).’” It is not a drawing but a photograph ST inscribed (frame 294)—a loose photograph among the Sterne papers that cannot be firmly attached to any letter.

p. 129, paragraph 2. The quotations are from the June 1944 letter cited in the preceding paragraph.

p. 129, paragraph 3, “He returned to New York on the first of October, and even though he had to report to Washington for duty with the OSS Naval Command when his one-month leave ended in November, his war was essentially over.”

ST returned to Washington, not New York, and it was on October 4; see document cited above, comment for p. 126, paragraph 4. His leave was two weeks, not a month; see comment for p. 141, paragraph 1, where the place and date of arrival are given correctly.

## Chapter 11

p. 130, epigraph, note on p. 626, “I’ll have hard time starting again.”

The note refers to a letter from “ST to HS, n.d., but internal evidence suggests January 1944, AAA.” The letter (frame 086) is clearly dated at the top, January 12, 1944, and is cited correctly five notes below.

p.130, paragraph 2, concerning the 30% commission ST’s agent received. For a partial source, see p. 134, paragraph 1.

p. 131, paragraph 2.

The source for this paragraph and the quotation is the same December 2, 1943, ST to HS letter (frame 056) cited in the previous paragraph.

p. 132, paragraph 1, concerning Knopf’s interest in publishing a book of ST’s drawings, via Miss Morrison, the publisher’s representative. “When it came to Steinberg’s business interests, Hedda was astute, and she told Steinberg that whatever passed between Geraghty [of TNY] and Civita [ST’s agent] was ‘of no concern to us if they [Knopf] offer a better contract’”; note on p. 626.

The note reads: “HS to ST, YCAL, microfilm of HS letters. Three other YCAL letters (HS to ST) make reference to Knopf’s offer: January 26 and 29, 1944, and (by internal evidence) February 1944.” Some of the Steinberg papers have been microfilmed, including

many of the hundreds of letters from Hedda. The vague reference to a “microfilm” at YCAL needs to be specified. The (mistranscribed) quotation comes from a letter of February 8, 1944, box 85, folder “Hedda Sterne letters 1940s,” 6 of 8. It concerns Geraghty’s reason for bringing in Knopf: “I think she [Miss Morrison] is a good friend of [Geraghty’s] which is of no interest to us if they offer a better contract.”

As for the “three other YCAL letters,” Bair here merely copies an annotation made by SSF in the first draft of her manuscript. Archival references were not provided on the assumption that Bair, who frequently cites Sterne’s correspondence to Steinberg, knew their location and would consult them. The January 26 letter is in the same box as the February 8 letter, folder 7 of 8; January 29 is in box 86, folder “Hedda Sterne letters,” 1 of 2.

p. 132, paragraph 2.

The source for the information and quotations in this paragraph is the January 12, 1944, letter cited in the note at the end of the paragraph, “**It was the sad time of my residence in Santo Domingo.**”

p. 133, paragraph 2, “When Civita told Steinberg that contracts were being prepared by Duell, Sloan and Pearce [for what became *All in Line*] and that he should allow the book to appear under their imprint, he was ready to stop dealing with Miss Morrison of Knopf. Hedda told him not to cut her off completely....”

It should be clarified that the Civita mentioned here is not Cesar, discussed in the preceding paragraph, but his brother Victor. Cesar was by then in Argentina; all correspondence concerning the book was either from Victor or the Civitas’ administrative assistant, Gertrude Einstein.

Civita’s advice to ST, and HS’s to ST, however, are not sourced by the February 2, 1944, ST letter to HS, cited later in the paragraph in the note on p. 626 for “**Saul trusted her judgment.**”

p. 133, paragraph 3, that ST told Hedda “Victor Civita should have nothing to do with the book,” and that “only after he had overseen the entire production process and the pages were ready to be printed would she have his permission to show the layout to Victor. No matter what Victor thought when he saw it, Steinberg intended to remain adamant: ‘If I like it, if it works, ok. If not, never mind the book.’”

Assuming that the source of this paragraph is the same February 2, 1944, letter cited in the preceding paragraph, Bair’s narrative doesn’t reflect the text of the letter (frames 112-114): “If Victor is active [it’s] because he feels like doing something for the money he gets. And all I’m asking him to do is just to cash the 30% and that’s all. That’s the reason I’m sending the drawings directly to the N.Y. and I don’t care for publishing in other magazines. The book situation is a mystery and I hope that Victor is not making too much of a racket out of it. Anyway I told him that I want to see the layout first, if I like it, if it works, O.K. If not, never mind the book.”

p. 133, paragraph 4 to end of paragraph on p. 134.

Some of the material is sourced by the February 2, 1944 letter, but not Hedda’s worry about Victor Civita’s response to ST’s mandate, the complaint of Geraghty and the other *New Yorker*’s editors that Civita’s agent fee was too high, or their correspondence with HS on the subject.

p. 134, paragraph 2, “...in February 1944 all Steinberg knew of the book’s progress came from Hedda’s infrequent letters....”

None of Hedda’s letters are cited for the information in this paragraph, save for one at the end concerning the publisher’s suggestion of a title for the book, “Everybody in Line”; note on p. 626, “**Steinberg didn’t really like it.**” The February 15, 1944, letter (cited as a “microfilm reel”) is in YCAL, box 85, “Hedda Sterne letters 1940s,” 7 of 8. But the letter merely says: “the publishers found a title they would like—‘Everybody in Line’—and asked me

what I thought of it. I don't think I know anything about it you think and answer please." Nothing about what Bair describes as the contents and arrangement of the book or the publisher's reasons for the title.

p. 134, paragraph 3, "Meanwhile, according to Civita, the cartoon Steinberg called 'the horrible A drawing' was causing a flurry of fan mail at *The New Yorker*, and DSP [Duell, Sloan and Pearce] was insistent that it had to go into the still unnamed book"; note on p. 626, "**the kind of silly cheap stuff.**"

The statement is partly sourced by the ST to HS letter of February 19, 1944, cited in the note (frame 150); but the letter does not mention DSP. In the next note on p. 626, "**getting madder and madder,**" the letter is frame 159.

p. 135, paragraph 2, "He was further distressed when he saw the second set of proofs sent by DSP, this time a selection of approximately eighty drawings on a roll of microfilm"; note on p. 626, "**He did not blame Hedda.**"

The March 29 ST to HS letter cited in the note is frames 179, 180. But it was Victor Civita, not DSP, who sent the microfilm; see Civita's letter to ST, January 31, 1944, YCAL, box 67, folder "Correspondence 1943" and ST to HS, April 20, 1944 (frame 199).

p. 135, paragraph 3, "One month later, in April, there was still no contract from DSP and no response from Civita about Steinberg's objections to the book's content. The only topics Civita wrote about were offers from businesses and commercial firms to make drawings for advertisements, publicity, and promotions."

No sources are provided for this paragraph. Neither ST's letters to HS nor Civita's to ST cover this statement. ST to HS, April 5, 1944 (frame 186): "I didn't answer a few offers to make drawings for advertising Companies, offers that came thru the N. Yorker" (thus not from Civita). The quotation "too far away" at the end of the paragraph is from this letter.

p. 135, paragraph 4, "Of the eighty or so [drawings] that Civita had chosen [for the book], Steinberg thought only twenty-six were worthy of inclusion, and he had his doubts about at least ten of those....Ross had [his China drawings] offprinted as a small booklet for Steinberg to send to friends and relatives"; note on p. 626, "**Meanwhile, at *The New Yorker.***"

The ST to HS letter cited in the note, April 20, 1944 (frames 197-199), does not speak of doubts about ten of the drawings. And it was not a "booklet" that Ross sent: "The N. Yorker sent me a set of my China drawings printed on heavy good paper, for me especially, to send them to friends & relatives." "Set" could as easily refer to a group of loose sheets.

p. 135, last paragraph.

This paragraph too is sourced by the April 20 letter. However, when ST was telling HS how many drawings of each wartime theater he had, he did not say, in Bair's paraphrase, that he "wanted to add at least a half dozen each from India and Egypt," but rather "a few more" from these places. At the top of p. 136, "he thought of making twenty more new drawings of 'captionless stuff,'" should read: "captionless usual stuff."

p. 136, paragraph 2, that ST hoped to prompt Civita to action about the DSP contract, "so he dangled the threat that he was entrusting Ross to find a new publisher or '**eventually [the] same one.**' When Civita did not respond, Steinberg did send the drawings to Ross—directly"; note on p. 626.

Confusion here. ST made no such threat to Civita. The April 20 letter (frame 199), not cited in the note, shows clearly that ST is dealing with both Civita and Ross: "I'll write Civita and Ross about it [the book] and they can think a publisher or eventually the same one." As for ST sending Ross drawings directly, the cited letter of May 31, 1944 (frame 289), reads: "I sent the New Yorker 18 drawings from Italy and I'll make a few more. These drawings (China & N. Africa) were usefull to my interests here, they made me quite a bit of publicity and I obtained things thru them. The Italian drawings are quite nice, best done so far." This shipment thus



does not concern the book, but rather drawings for the Italy portfolios that *The New Yorker* would publish on June 10, July 8, and July 29, 1944.

p. 136, paragraph 3.

The uncited source for this paragraph is ST to HS, June 3, 1944 (frames 231-232).

p. 136, paragraph 4, “Steinberg was depressed by the difference in the way Geraghty and Civita handled his affairs. **Geraghty was so eager** for some of his wartime drawings to appear in every issue that he figured out how to send telegrams that reached Steinberg in two days, while Steinberg sometimes had to wait a month or more for Victor Civita to address a pressing problem through regular APO mail. Shortly before he was sent back to New York, his attitude hardened. He continued to express the usual sentiment, that he dealt with Victor only because of his ‘debt of gratitude’ to Cesar, but now he let his resentment show: ‘Let him make the book if still actual. I don’t consider him much like my agent—I never did—he’s getting 30% without doing a thing.’ However, it was too difficult to change anything through the mail, so once again he resigned himself to the status quo until he could deal with it directly”; note on p. 626.

The note reads: “ST to HS, n.d. but internal evidence suggests Summer 1944, AAA.” The internal evidence, however, proves that the letter (frames 295-296) was written sometime in November 1943, which renders its contents irrelevant to this moment “shortly before [ST] was sent back to New York” [i.e., September 1944, though he was sent back to Washington; see comment for p. 126, paragraph 2]. The second paragraph of the letter refers to Geraghty’s telegram and its two-day arrival, but the subject of both the telegram and letter is *The New Yorker*’s enthusiastic response to the China drawings ST had sent—drawings which were published in the January 15 and February 5, 1944, issues: “Yesterday Geraghty (he’s the art editor) sent me a telegram (he knows how to address it so it came in 2 days). He says they are all enthusiastic about the drawings ‘Life in China’ I sent them and the N. Yorker is glad to publish them and to send as many as possible to have at least one in every issue.”

A date of ca. November 21, 1943, can be arrived at thanks to a letter from Harold Ross, editor of *The New Yorker*, to ST, November 19, 1943 (YCAL, box 39, folder “Correspondence 1940s chiefly from H.W. Ross”). In a P.S., Ross wrote: “We are at the moment preparing to send you a cable or wireless saying the China drawings have arrived.” The letter is addressed to ST at his China posting.

p. 137, paragraph 3, concerning the chronology of ST’s marriage proposal to HS and her acceptance. Bair is quoting from interviews with HS: “**When he was in the navy....**I refused to become engaged to him—how could I—I was still married....**He wanted to get married,** but this was not my idea. It took eighteen months before he wore me down and I said okay”; notes on p. 627 to interviews with HS.

When speaking with Bair in 2007, Hedda seems to have forgotten her correspondence with Saul, which proves that he proposed in January 1944 and she accepted in February of the same year; thus not “eighteen months.” And Bair seems to have forgotten that twenty-five pages earlier, she herself recounted the January-February sequence (p. 112, paragraph 3; see also comment above). That Hedda couldn’t become engaged because she “was still married” is belied by her trip to Reno in April 1944 to get a divorce—see the last two sentences on p. 136. And of course all this took place “when he [ST] was in the navy.”

p. 137, paragraph 4, “**Their courtship by mail gradually eroded Hedda’s ‘mountain of doubts’**”; note on p. 627.

The note reads: “HS letters to ST are on microfilm at Beinecke Library, YCAL, reels 144-45. She seldom dated them, usually writing only the day of the week.”

“Reels 144-45” are the reel numbers for Hedda Sterne’s papers at the Archives of American Art; only reel 144 contains letters from Steinberg. The YCAL microfilm reel is MSVF 2916 and each frame is numbered. The hundreds of letters from HS to ST on this microfilm at YCAL are in boxes 85 and 86, divided into twenty clearly named folders. Either a frame

number or a box number/folder name would have been more useful as a source for the statement, quotation, and presumed date of “mid-1943” than a vague reference to a many-framed microfilm.

HS’s dating of the letters: although she occasionally wrote “only the day of the week,” many letters are dated; the papers also include some postmarked envelopes that accompany letters.

The January 23, 1944, ST to HS letter cited later in the paragraph as a source for the rest of the quotations (note on p. 627, “**the ideas of other people**”) is AAA, frames 106-108. In the quoted passage, “I want to know what *you* say or think with *your* words,” the emphasis is added.

pp. 138-40, references to HS letters to ST at YCAL.

Like the preceding reference, the following notes refer only to a “microfilm reel” without indication of frame number or box number/folder name. The letters are therefore unfindable, so that neither the quotations and content, nor the dates suggested by “internal evidence,” can be verified.

p. 138, note on p. 627 for “**after the show**”

p. 138, note on p. 627 for “**without their even knowing it**”

p. 140, note on p. 627 for “**trying to be very ‘good and heroic’**”

p. 138, paragraph 1, “**Through them she met the artists**”; note on p. 627.

The correct page references to Sarah Eckhardt’s *Uninterrupted Flux* are pp. 118, 120.

P. 138, paragraph 2, “Saul never responded to [Hedda’s letters about her own art]; instead, his next several letters gave new instructions about how to deal with Victor Civita.”

No source is provided for this statement. We seem to be sometime in 1943. ST’s letters about dealing with Victor Civita begin in November 1943 (November 17, frames 51-52) and continue on for months. What the “next several letters” are is unclear, since those concerning Civita are interspersed with others that don’t mention him.

p. 139, paragraph 1, “[Hedda] was still engaged in contractual discussions with Miss Morrison, who was now talking directly to Victor Civita, and Hedda relayed the unsettling information that Victor and Miss Morrison agreed that new drawings should be more ‘imitative’ of the early work that Steinberg was trying to put behind him. What they really wanted was cartoons with captions, and when Hedda told him that, he channeled all his energies (and Hedda’s) into a book for DSP where he would have more control over the content. At the same time, Geraghty had posed a new and fascinating idea that Hedda thought Saul should consider. Geraghty showed a great number of Steinberg’s drawings to Ludwig Bemelmans....**Geraghty wanted to nurture and promote** Steinberg’s talent and he sought Bemelmans’s opinion of his ‘eventual development.’ Bemelmans was intrigued by Steinberg’s vision, so he studied the drawings and some of the letters Steinberg wrote to describe them. He said he was sure that Steinberg would eventually become a writer, and he told Geraghty to encourage him to go in that direction. Bemelmans and Geraghty both agreed that there was ‘something about [Steinberg’s] way of using absolutely simple daily words and giving them certain new sense and charm’ in his letters, and that this, in concert with the drawings, could lead him to excel in any number of genres. Hedda said Saul probably thought this ‘improbable,’ but to her it was ‘just normal’”; note on p. 627.

The many erroneous interpolations in the above paragraph can only be explained by comparing the printed text to the sole source cited in the note, mid-paragraph, “HS, YCAL microfilm reel, n.d. but internal evidence suggests May-June 1944.” For the unspecific “microfilm reel,” see above, comment for pp. 138-40. But in this case, the letter is dated in the first line, “Tues. 8 Febr.”; thus not May-June, which adds more chronological confusion to Bair’s ongoing account of the genesis of *All in Line*. For the location of the letter at YCAL, see above, comment for p. 132, paragraph 1.

The relevant passages of the letter, where HS reports to ST on a meeting she had just had with Miss Morrison of Knopf and James Geraghty: "...I also told [Miss Morrison] to contact Mr. Civita and see the rest of the drawings....My feeling was that Knopf will want more initiative [not "imitative," as Bair mistranscribes it] than the first publisher. But if there are cartoons which everybody thinks wonderful, perhaps you might put them even if as a work of art you don't like them much....Geraghty talked to Bemelmans and asked him what his opinion is about your eventual development and Bemelmans said that he is sure that you are going to write later too. They—I mean Geraghty said your letters are unusual and nice and something about your way of using absolutely simple daily words and giving them certain new sense, charm. Everything with much admiration and friendship. I repeat all this because I am sure it sounds improbable to you although it just sounds normal to me."

Absent from the actual letter: that "Victor and Miss Morrison really wanted cartoons with captions" (based on the misreading of "initiative"); that Geraghty "posed a new and fascinating idea..."; that Bemelmans was "intrigued by Steinberg's vision, "studied the drawings" or encouraged ST to "go in that direction" (i.e., as a writer); the analysis of the style of ST's letters is Geraghty's alone, not a joint opinion with Bemelmans; and neither said that the letters together with the drawings could lead ST "to excel in any number of genres."

The mistaken notion that Civita and Morrison wanted "cartoons with captions" might have wandered in from another, unrelated letter, HS to ST, January 26, 1944, box 85, folder "Hedda Sterne letters 1940s," 7 of 8: "Civita told me that you received a lot of fan letters for the A cartoon, and that you should send more real cartoons not just drawings...."

p. 139, paragraph 2, "**All I desire now** from life is to stay with you and make drawings. Let's forget about complications..."; note on p. 627.

The ST to HS letter of March 29, 1944, cited in the note, is AAA, frame 181. The transcription contains some errors: "All I desire now from life is to stay with you and make drawings.... [passage omitted] let's go together this time and forget about complication, let's ask things from life...."

The next quotation, that ST needed boredom "in order to make something good," is from the April 5 letter (frames 186-187) cited in the next note.

p. 140, paragraph 1, "His meticulous descriptions of how they would work was not exactly what she wanted to hear, especially when he told her he thought she should postpone the trip to Reno and stay securely married to Fred Stafford for the indefinite future. Instead of getting his furlough, he was being shunted from one posting to another, from North Africa to southern France and Italy, so near the fighting that he worried he might be killed and she would have given up her financial stability for naught."

No source is given, but it is the letter ST wrote three days earlier, on April 2 (frame 183), though Bair makes assumptions not in ST's text: "Now, my dear, about the 6 weeks Reno thing, I wrote you before. I didn't get any answer I was looking for [about the furlough]. It may come soon and be allright. It's not a question of time for I don't think it may happen too soon. I wrote you already, the reason is that you have to remain the way you are now only because I'm here away from you and it's not to safe around here. Don't be worried about it, I'm taking good care of myself as usual. I want you to know that that's the only reason (on the other hand I thought you may become free and get married from distance thru attorney or so, I think it's possible)."

As for postings in "southern France," there was only one, seven months later, to Toulon (see comment for p. 118, paragraph 3).

p. 140, paragraph 3, "**I feel lousy**. I'll write more when I feel different"; note on p. 627.

The June 19 V-Mail from HS to ST, cited in the note, is YCAL, box 85, folder "Hedda Sterne Letters 1940s," 8 of 8. The V-Mail does not source anything else in this paragraph or the preceding one.

## Chapter 12

p. 141, paragraph 1, “His orders were to report directly to the OSS Naval Command in Washington, ‘**where his services are desired...**’”; note on p. 627.

The note refers to “ST, Officer Personnel File (OPF), National Personnel Records Center (NPRC), copies in SSF folder ‘War Service—Archival Documents.’” For the correct reference to this document, see comment for p. 126, paragraph 2. “War Service—Archival Documents” is not a folder but the name of an electronic file prepared by SSF with a synopsis of the events recorded in the military records; it does not contain the records themselves.

As for the furlough to New York, mentioned in the next sentence, wherein ST “let his superiors know that he would be back when [the furlough] ended on October 25”: the uncited document for the furlough dates (October 11-October 25) is in the military records, Officer Personnel File, “Report of Leave of Absence.”

p. 142, paragraph 2, To ST, Perelman was “‘**indispensable as a teacher of pitfalls...**’”; note on p. 627.

The note for this quotation from the 1991 diary says “n.d., following entry for June 4, 1991.” The passage is part of a multi-page entry, all of it under the same June 4 date.

p. 142, paragraph 3, “**It was such a deep friendship** [between Perelman and ST] that Perelman later gave Steinberg his first-edition copy of *Ulysses*, signed by James Joyce, who was Steinberg’s favorite author”; note on p. 627.

It was not a first edition (1922) but a 1924 edition (Paris: Shakespeare & Company). After Bair’s book went to press, the volume was donated to the Berg Collection at the New York Public Library.

p. 144, paragraph 2, “**After he started to work** in 1945, he sent regular money and CARE packages to Aldo and Ada through Italy’s long postwar recovery”; note on p. 628.

The letters to Aldo cited in the note all refer to unpublished parts of the letters.

p. 144, paragraph 3, “It was still difficult to establish contact with [ST’s family], and here [ST] was helped by his uncle Harry, who diligently explored every channel through which Saul could funnel money, clothing, medicine...”

No source is given for this statement about Uncle Harry’s aide; it does not appear in the Romanian letters.

p. 144, paragraph 4, “The navy authorized him to commute to New York on weekends while wearing his uniform but did not grant travel or per diem expenses, which meant that he had to find more and more work to pay for everything.”

No source is cited. See the memo from the Commanding Officer, Naval Command, to the Chief of Naval Personnel, December 8, 1944 (military records, Officer Personnel File): “It is requested that the subject officer be authorized to travel between Washington, D.C., and New York, N.Y., in connection with his duties for the Office of Strategic Services....This travel will involve no cost to the government”; and (ibid.) memo to ST from Randall Jacobs, Chief of Naval Personnel, dated December 20, 1944: “You are hereby authorized to perform such travel, from time to time, between Washington, D.C., and New York, N.Y., as may be directed by the Commanding Officer, Naval Command, Office of Strategic Services....The above is authorized with the understanding that you will be entitled to no mileage or expenses in connection therewith.” The orders do not specify weekends and, on paper at least, were issued in connection with OSS duties.

Further in the paragraph: “His days were uneventful until he saw his latest fitness report, with the unnerving statement that he would be ‘**trained for a future overseas assignment**’”; note on p. 628.

The title of the document cited in the note is “Report on the Fitness of Officers.” The note continues, however: “His fear of recall is also mentioned throughout the 1945 letters to AB.” It is never mentioned in the six 1945 letters, either in the published or unpublished parts.

The next sentence in the text reports ST’s transfer to the Training Literature Field Unit in New York in May 1945. The uncited sources are: Randall Jacobs, Chief of Naval Personnel, to ST, May 23, 1945, subject: “Change of Duty”; and Report of Compliance with Orders, June 13, 1945—both in the military records, Officer Personnel File. The former document also informs ST that he is to “regard [himself] detached from duty in the Office of Strategic Services.”

p. 145, paragraph 2, “In September 1945, [ST] learned that Aldo Buzzi was ‘**alive and well**’ and was working as a writer and set designer for Alberto Lattuada and occasionally for the exciting newcomer Federico Fellini. Steinberg knew of Fellini, for they had met by chance in a restaurant in Rome where Fellini was trying to eke out a living by sketching patrons for a few lire”; note on p. 628.

Neither the published or unpublished parts of ST’s September 5, 1945, letter to Buzzi speak of Aldo’s activities. ST’s meeting with Fellini is not recorded in the ST-AB correspondence.

Later in the paragraph, ST describes “his life as a stateside sailor: the worst part was having to ‘**get up every morning** and go to an office...’”; note on p. 628.

The correct quotation in the letter to AB cited in the note: “Unfortunately I’m still in uniform and the trouble is that I have to get up early every morning and go to an office.”

p. 145, paragraph 3, “‘**Those were the years,**’ Hedda recalled, ‘when I cooked for whoever dropped by’”; note on p. 628.

The note refers to an entry in ST’s 1991 diary that has nothing to do with this subject.

Later in the paragraph, concerning the dinner party with *New Yorker* friends who came up with the title *All in Line* for ST’s book: “They all agreed that it was a perfect title because of its many resonances....Steinberg was so pleased with the title that he immortalized the tableau of all the guests as they sat around discussing it in his daily diary for the week of April 26-May 2nd. He captioned it ‘title for book and world of future,’ and noted beneath it—perhaps as his way of indicating better times to come—that this was the same week when Mussolini was hanged in Milan and Hitler committed suicide in his bunker.”

The general agreement about the title and reasons it appealed to the company do not appear in any documents. The “tableau” of guests is not on the “April 26-May 2” pages. It’s in the January 6 entry—see Bair’s own reproduction on the next page. ST noted Mussolini’s death on April 26 and Hitler’s on May 1, not “beneath” the January 6 “tableau.”

p. 145, last paragraph to p. 146, end of paragraph 1, discussing the success of *All in Line*, the 20,000 copies sold, and the book’s selection for the Book-of-the-Month Club; note on p. 628 for “**Fan mail poured in to the magazine.**”

No sources are given for the statistics; see Joel Smith, *Steinberg at The New Yorker* (Abrams, 2005), p. 19. Smith’s note 14 seems to be the source for Bair’s note that “Reader responses are in YCAL, Box 57, and TNYR, Box 62,” since TNYR is Smith’s abbreviation for the magazine’s archives at the New York Public Library, not otherwise explained in the present book (see also comment above for p. 81, paragraph 2).

The readers’ responses, however, were not to *All in Line*, but to the earlier publication of the drawings in *The New Yorker*, as Smith makes clear; that’s why the letters were sent to the magazine.

p. 147, paragraph 3, ST remarking on the forties and fifties, “the years...when American art began to flourish after a long period of neglect. He thought that **because the artists who were his friends** had spent their youth in ‘poverty and neglect,’ by the time they became famous they were already ‘almost posthumous’”; note on p. 628.

The note refers to *R & S Outtakes*, “The Rose Is from the Cabbage Family,” instead of the proper section, entitled “Landscape.” ST said “poverty and obscurity” and “nearly posthumous.”

p. 148, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s comparison of the American art world to the Tokyo Ginza; note on p. 628, “it contains the two most important.”

Some of the quotations cited in the paragraph from ST’s section “Ginza 1964,” in *R & S Outtakes*, depart from the translation approved by Aldo Buzzi and given to Bair: “One desires and one fears them”; “it’s true. I wanted them too”; “truthful and logical.” The correct text reads:

“The art world is a kind of Ginza, and once you enter, there’s no use being squeamish. It’s a difficult world, a special one, full of mysteries, containing the two most important and poisonous things in life: fame and money. We want to have these things, and to defend ourselves from them at the same time. They’re enticing, they’re diabolical. I didn’t become an artist because I wanted fame and money. I did want them, actually, but I wanted more than that. Just as love is an embellishment, a temptation offered by nature to make us procreate, I would say that money and fame are a form of bait, which make us produce art. I’m always wary of those young people who chatter about the dedication and nobility of art. As I see it, this is a topic for adults, who know what they’re talking about. I find it more sensible when a young person views art as a theatrical stage, where you show up to be seen, to be noted. It’s a cynical attitude, but much more logical and real. People who talk about Art with a capital A make me suspicious.”

p. 148, paragraph 3, concerning ST’s efforts to get money and packages to his family in Romania: “**Armed with the official approved list** [of allowable goods to ship], Hedda shopped for items that Saul paid to send every week...”; note on p. 628.

The cited letter from ST to his parents, June 7, 1946, makes no mention of Hedda shopping or of any approved goods. ST only says: “A month ago I sent her [his sister] some dresses and cosmetics and I’m regularly sending you some packages every week. Tell me what you need or what you would like to receive and you’ll have it. Now the mail is almost normal and soon it’ll work even faster.”

“**When medicines were finally approved**, he sent penicillin until Moritz told him that the crooks involved kept and sold more than half of it”; note on p. 628. The note cites a letter from ST to HS, February 2, 1947; it should be the letter of March 2, 1948 (frame 303), i.e., nearly two years later than the period under discussion.

“For Lica he sent cosmetics and dresses...[and] he sent several hundred dollars both to her and to his parents several times each month.” No source is provided, but it would appear to be the June 7, 1946, letter cited earlier in the paragraph. The letter, however, does not speak of frequent transfers of money, but of packages:

“I’m pleased that you’re finally getting my letters. I’m sure that you haven’t received many of them and others have been lost. I recently received a letter from you and every day I wait to receive a telegram from you about Licuța. A month ago I sent her some dresses and cosmetics and I’m regularly sending you some packages every week. Tell me what you need or what you would like to receive and you’ll have it. Now the mail is almost normal and soon it’ll work even faster. I sent you money again through HIAS. You haven’t written me if you received the two hundred dollars I sent you a few months ago.”

p. 149, paragraph 1

The information in this paragraph is sourced by the same June 7, 1946, letter used in the preceding paragraph.

p. 149, paragraph 3, ST describing his mother’s desire to emigrate to France rather than Israel: “**No matter how much loneliness and suffering** [she had] from French xenophobia...”; note on p. 628.

The note refers to an entry in ST's 1991 diary as "undated, but following May 19." This entry is continuous with the dated page that precedes it.

p. 150, paragraph 2, concerning ST's artist's statement (a few lines of false handwriting) for MoMA's 1946 *Fourteen Americans* catalogue: "Miller...chose not to reproduce it in the catalogue, so [ST's] page is blank."

There is no blank page in ST's section; it merely lacks the statement that begins other artists' sections, but is otherwise filled with type and images.

p. 150, last paragraph, the MoMA show "was also the first time he attempted to show...[his] 'false documents,' inspired by calligraphy and books about handwriting analysis (he had a large collection)...."

At ST's death, a handful of books on calligraphy and handwriting analysis were found in his library. If the collection was once large, the evidence is unknown to SSF. More important, there were no false documents in the MoMA show (see the checklist in the catalogue, p. 80). Nor could there have been, since ST had not yet produced them. In 1946, he was just beginning to experiment with the genre of willfully illegible handwriting—the small "artist's statement" he gave to Dorothy Miller may have been the first example. The first full documents date from 1947 (*S:I*, fig. 28). The works that Bair goes on to describe were not publicly exhibited until 1952, in ST's show that year at the Parsons and Janis galleries, New York.

"At various times he gave them to friends to celebrate everything from diplomas (as to Primo Levi, whose diploma from the University of Turin also bore the detested 'raza [*sic*, for razza] Hebraica') to travel passports (Henri Cartier-Bresson...)" ; note on p. 629.

The note reads: "Some of his writings, pamphlets, and books are scattered through YCAL boxes [see above, General Comments, Unusable References]; others are in the collection of books in his personal library that were given to Anton van Dalen." That the contents of ST's New York library contain false documents is unknown to SSF, which was involved in an early inventory of that library.

As for the diploma supposedly given to Primo Levi, the note refers to a letter from Levi to ST, July 18, 1985, YCAL, box 38 (SSF's records show that the letter is in box 64, folder "Correspondence 1985-1987"). That letter, however, concerns their real diplomas, not one of ST's false documents.

p. 152, paragraph 2, "[Charles] Addams helped Steinberg buy his first car, a 1947 gray Packard convertible with a red leather interior. Saul and Hedda drove the behemoth to Jamaica, Vermont, in the summer of 1947"; note on p. 629.

What ST bought in 1947 and drove to Vermont was not a Packard but a 1941 Cadillac convertible (though it does not seem to have been purchased from Igor Stravinsky, as Bair, citing *S:I*, p. 35, says; see comment for p. 169, paragraph 2). According to the note, HS and Ruth Nivola, in interviews, "insisted that the Cadillac was [ST and HS's] second car, bought after they sold the Packard." But these sixty-year-old memories should not override documentary evidence, some of which Bair herself cites—the June 1947 New York State vehicle registration as well as the bill of sale, both for a 1941 Cadillac. And in ST's 1991 diary entry for May 25 (YCAL, box 75), he remembers a visit to Saratoga Springs in 1947, with "The old Cadillac tip toeing on gravel making even more noise at signs of Quiet please."

No documents are cited for the purchase of the Packard. The Cadillac, moreover, is a convertible with leather interior—as in ST's 1947 ink drawing, reprod. in *S:I*, p. 35. In 2004, Sarah Eckhardt showed this drawing to HS, who identified it as "done in 1947, the year they bought the Cadillac to drive to Vermont" (Eckhardt, email to SSF, February 24, 2004).

"We went up there [to Vermont] in complete ignorance"; note on p. 629. The note refers to alphabet booklets that ST made for Pietro and Claire Nivola, the children of Ruth and Tino, in 1944 and 1954, respectively. A copy of the one for Claire is at YCAL, box 34, "Keep Correspondence," 2 of 2; SSF has a copy of the earlier one for Pietro.

p. 152, paragraph 3, “In their many road trips, [ST’s] erratic driving often resulted in detours that led to thrilling adventures, such as the one a few years later when they drove their second car, a second-hand Cadillac bought from Igor Stravinsky, to the West Coast”; note on p. 629.

Concerning the Cadillac, see preceding comment. The note reads: “Alexander ‘Sasha’ Schneider rented the Packard that summer, then later bought it. ST to HS, n.d. AAA.” The automobile trip to the West was in 1956 (*S:I*, chronology, p. 258; Eckhardt, *Uninterrupted Flux*, chronology, p. 122), which would give a date to “that summer.” But it couldn’t have been the undocumented Packard (see above). The ST to HS letter (frame 455), moreover, dates from the spring of 1948 and doesn’t mention the make of the car. The letter can be dated by ST’s references to his imminent departure for Paris, where he is to meet HS; he was in Paris by April 22 (*S:I*, chronology, p. 255). The relevant text reads: “I also arranged to rent the car to Sasha at 100 dollars a month instead of selling it. I feel better, I didn’t want to sell the car.” See also comment for p. 169, paragraph 2.

No sources are given for the quotations in the rest of the paragraph; they might come from the HS interview cited at the start of the paragraph (“was a bad driver”; note on p. 629).

p. 153, last two lines to p. 154, top, “Once his position at *The New Yorker* was firmly cemented, much of his life during the years 1945 to 1950 was centered on proliferating commercial work that ranged from the ‘highbrow to the low’”; note on p. 629.

The note reads: “Examples of all this work and correspondence relating to them are in the uncatalogued YCAL boxes at the Beinecke Library, and a still incomplete listing is in the ‘Features’ section of ‘Selected Bibliography,’ *S:I*, pp. 169-272.”

For the unhelpful reference to all the YCAL boxes, see above, General Comments, Unusable References. The correct pages for the “Features” section in the *S:I* Bibliography are 269-272.

p. 154, paragraph 1, concerning ST’s “commercial work during the years 1945 to 1950.”

No details or sources are given for the works mentioned in this paragraph, and there are several errors. First, not everything fits into the 1945-50 period: the “ads for companies that manufactured copper tubing and sheet metal [Lewin and Mathes], and the Noilly Prat vermouthe campaign” were both in 1955. The archives of SSF include a large notebook of ST’s advertising work; see also Smith, *S:I*, pp. 44, 50, and 102, with reproductions.

“He did many dust jackets for books, among them the highly successful *Chucklebait* series for children by Margaret Scoggins.” SSF’s records show only seven book covers in this period (and only two for the years after 1950). On p. 100, paragraph 1, the first *Chucklebait* book was incorrectly dated to 1943; see comment above.

“He created wallpapers and fabrics, some of which featured his representations of landmarks in Paris, Venice, Milan, and Rome.” There were no fabric/wallpaper designs for the three Italian cities. For some of ST’s work in this genre, see Smith, *S:I*, pp. 44, 108, 255, and fig. 41.

“*Vogue* sent him to Washington to do political drawings, and *Harper’s Bazaar* sent him to Paris to cover the fashion shows.” The *Vogue* drawings, which represent exterior scenes of Washington and interiors of various government offices, appeared in the February 1, 1946, issue, pp. 132-37. Documentation for the statement that ST was sent by *Harper’s Bazaar* to cover fashion shows is unknown to SSF. The May 1947 issue contains a feature entitled “Monsieur Steinberg’s French Notebook,” pp. 82-85; the drawings therein have nothing to do with fashion. These two publications, along with the other magazines cited by Bair, are listed in the “Features” section of the *S:I* Bibliography. SSF has illustrated notebooks of all these publications.

The January 26, 1946, letter to Aldo Buzzi, cited in the note on p. 630 for “toward streamlined bad taste,” is also the source for the rest of the quotations in the paragraph.

p. 154, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s attitude toward *The New Yorker*: “Drawing for it made him feel that he was doing ‘a useful task’ that allowed him to be ‘an active part of society’”; note on p. 630.



In the note, there is again a reference to the non-existent “title” of *R & S Outtakes* (see above, comment for p. 147, paragraph 3). The “Drawings for *The New Yorker*” section, as cited, is also the source for the rest of the discussion, through p. 155, paragraph 3.

p. 155, paragraph 4. The sources cited in the five notes for this paragraph on p. 630 are several ST letters to Aldo Buzzi, but the references are sometimes jumbled.

ST’s complaints about “crowds that behaved as if they were in the funhouse at a fair” (unsourced) is from the letter of November 18, 1945.

“He thought Salvador Dalí and the crowds at his exhibition were well suited to each other, as he was ‘a clever pirate who cheats his buyers and they get what they deserve.’” The reference is to letters of November 18 and 23, 1945. But Bair here conjoins passages in each letter to have ST remark on the crowds at Dalí’s exhibition. The crowd complaint is unspecific. Of the Dalí show, ST only wrote, “Today I saw a Dalí show,” followed by the “clever pirate” remark.

“Always a voracious reader, he found Flaubert ‘**better than ever**’ in *Three Tales*; Proust ‘sort of’ bored him.” The note refers to a letter of June 15, 1946. But it is the letter of April 29, 1946, that contains the Flaubert response, and the letter of July 23, 1947, in which ST finds Proust boring.

“He liked Tolstoy and often returned to *War and Peace*....” “Often returned” is Bair’s addition.

“**Most of all when he read**, he was studying the history of the United States.” All ST actually said in the cited letter of April 29, 1946, was: “I’m studying, more than reading, the history of the U.S.A.”

p. 155, last paragraph, concerning ST’s trip to the Carnegie Institute to judge a show of children’s painting. The uncited source is the ST-AB letter of April 29, 1946.

p. 155, last 2 lines to line 2, p. 156, “**In June, while spending the summer** in Provincetown on Cape Cod (‘a more violent place than the Italian Riviera’), he got word that Jim Geraghty had secured a press pass for him to cover the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials”; note on p. 630.

The note refers to two ST-AB letters, June 8 and June 15, 1946. The first references ST’s description of Provincetown. The second, however, does not document the statement about Geraghty securing a press pass, etc. After telling Buzzi that he was sailing to Europe in the beginning of July, ST added: “I got the *New Yorker* to send me as a correspondent. I’m especially curious to go to Germany and also to see the Nuremberg trial.”

p. 156, paragraph 3, concerning ST and Giacometti; note on p. 630, “**Steinberg was entranced with the laconic.**”

The title given in the note for the whole of what Bair refers to as *R & S Outtakes* is again incorrect (see comment for pp. 147, paragraph 3 and 154, paragraph 3); what is in the cited “YCAL, Box 38” is the original Italian, not the English translation SSF supplied to Bair. The Giacometti text was published, along with other “Outtakes,” in Saul Steinberg, “Portraits and Landscapes,” *The Paris Review* (Winter 2010), pp. 27-28.

p. 156, paragraph 4, concerning ST and Sartre. The unreferenced quotation at the start of the paragraph, that ST visited Sartre “‘because of my own snobbery,’” is from the Sartre section of *R & S Outtakes*, published in *The Paris Review* (Winter 2010), pp. 29-30. The typescript translation Bair used was amended in the publication to read: “I was urged to visit Sartre by Gjon Mili, the photographer from *Life*, and also by my own snobbery.”

ST’s portrait of Sartre, signed and dated 1946, is reproduced in *The Paris Review*. The original drawing, along with that of Simone de Beauvoir, is at SSF.

p. 157, paragraph 1, “Steinberg was furious with Sartre’s contention that ‘**the Jews had survived only because** of their persecution...’”; note on p. 630.

See comment for p. 156, paragraph 3, for the mistitling of *R & S Outtakes* in the note. The word “because” is not italicized in the original.

“Several years later, when Hedda was in Paris without Saul, he scolded her for forcing Sartre to recognize and greet her in the Bar Pont Royal. He thought **she should have snubbed Sartre**, as she was far too good for the likes of him”; note on p. 630.

The note reads: “ST to HS, n.d., AAA.” The letter (frame 449) must date from 1948 (thus not “several years later”), since elsewhere in the letter ST refers to HS’s visit to Mexico “last year,” a visit that took place in 1947. ST doesn’t suggest that HS should have snubbed Sartre. He only says: “What do you mean when you wrote you didn’t let Sartre think he didn’t know you, you went and talked to him?”

p. 157, paragraph 2 through paragraph 2, line 4. No sources are given for any of the statements made.

p. 157, paragraph 3, “The meeting [with Ada in Rome] went badly, and although he did not tell her he was married, **‘she figured it out’**”; note on p. 630.

The quoted part of the ST-AB letter of August 22, 1946, cited in the note, is unpublished.

p. 158, lines 1-2, “He was quartered [in Nuremberg] with other American correspondents in the Faber Castle...sharing a room the size of a basketball court.”

In the above August 22 letter, ST mentions staying at Faber Castle, which he describes as a “florid thing”; nothing about American correspondents or the size of the room.

p. 158, paragraph 1, ST reporting to Buzzi on his visit to Germany. “There was too much **‘pointless misery and destruction**, especially in Berlin, where the ruins of bad architecture created ugly buildings and ruins”; note on p. 630.

Misquotation. In the cited letter of August 22, 1946, ST wrote: “My trip to Germany was sad, I saw too much pointless misery and more destruction than anyplace else. Berlin especially is very tragic, the city being very large and ugly”; followed by three more sentences describing Berlin’s bad architecture, then the last sentence—“Which only goes to show that bad architecture creates ugly buildings ugly ruins.”

“His drawings of the devastated landscape and the wretchedness of daily life appeared in the portfolio ‘Berlin’ in *The New Yorker* on March 29 and April 12, 1947.” The description of the “Berlin” portfolio matches ST’s letter to Aldo, but is out of synch with the published drawings, which generally focus on the not-unpleasant off-duty lives of GIs.

p. 158, paragraph 2, “**They [St and HS] had been in Europe for six months**, which was almost three months longer than they had originally intended to stay, and Saul had ‘loafed’ and done no work”; note on p. 630.

The ST-AB letter of January 15, 1947, cited in the note, is the source for the duration of the European sojourn and ST’s self-acknowledged loafing. It is also the source for the quotations in the last two sentences. The material in the three intervening sentences, however, concerning the difficulty of finding transport back to the States and their lack of winter clothes, remains unsourced.

p. 158, paragraph 3. No sources are given for any of the statements made concerning ST’s rental of two different studios, but Bair has the chronology confused. Having returned from Europe in December 1946 (preceding paragraph), ST “rented a studio at 38 West 59<sup>th</sup> St....But even the studio space was not enough room for Steinberg’s many projects, so he also rented office space at 107 East 60<sup>th</sup> Street.”

The East 60<sup>th</sup> St. office was rented in January 1947; see the invoices for office furniture in YCAL, box 57, folder “1947.” The West 59<sup>th</sup> St. studio was not rented until two years later, February 1949; see the lease in YCAL, box 56, folder “Correspondence, Receipts, Bank

Statements, 1949.” (*S:I*, p. 254, erroneously gives 1947 as the date for the rental of both spaces.) Bair gets the date of the West 59<sup>th</sup> St. rental correct on p. 171.

“Saul told Aldo [the studio/office] would solve the problem of where he would live when he came to New York” and he installed “a bed and a carpet...for Aldo’s future comfort.” An unpublished part of the January 15, 1947, letter to Aldo notes that the new space will resolve the problem of Aldo’s lodgings in New York. In a letter of March 15, 1947, ST says: “Just now I’m in the studio. It’s nice to work outside but little by little it becomes like a job. I ought to install a bed and a carpet to get rid of the idea of an office.” Thus the bed and carpet were not for Aldo and they existed only in ST’s mind.

p. 159, paragraph 1, concerning ST’s efforts “to persuade Iris Barry...at the Museum of Modern Art, to curate a film festival, with which he would cooperate as another of his ongoing schemes to bring Aldo to New York.”

No sources are given. ST tells Aldo of his conversations with Barry about a “congresso dei documentari” in four letters (January 15, March 6, May 29, and July 23, 1947; all in unpublished parts), though none of them mentions his own “cooperation” with the project.

Later in the paragraph: “**It was Aldo’s wife** who held what Hedda called ‘the big job’ as her brother’s most trusted associate...”; note on p. 630. Following the reference to a 2007 interview with HS, Bair writes: “Letters throughout various boxes at YCAL bear out her contention”; see General Comments, Unusable References.

p. 159, paragraph 2, “**He was a guest at the elegant Gramercy Park mansion** owed by Benjamin Sonnenberg...”; note on p. 630.

Referring in the note to the drawings ST made of Sonnenberg, one of which was published in TNY, Bair says: “...that and others are probably those found in SSF 5154.” “SSF 5154” is the inventory number of the drawings in SSF’s collection. There are four drawings mounted on a single sheet, though the published drawing is not among them.

The remarks about Alexander Schneider’s dinners and ST’s “attention” to Geraldine Page are unsourced.

Discussing ST’s drawings and collages with a detached nose in connection with Nabokov’s study of Gogol, Bair writes: “[This nose] became one of his frequent references, almost a kind of symbolic shorthand for ideas of his own that he wanted to convey, particularly in the drawings that featured an enormous nose.” None of the examples cited in the note on p. 631 (“**At their first meeting they discussed**”) show an “enormous” nose. The noses in these, and in all the many other works that take off from Gogol’s story “The Nose,” are usually in proportion to the face.

Two lines from the end of the paragraph through line 2 on p. 160: “Nabokov told [ST] how to break his daily habit of smoking three or more packs....It took two attempts, but Steinberg followed Nabokov’s instructions and never smoked again.” The narrative is about the years 1946-47. ST quit smoking in 1972—and not on Nabokov’s “instructions” (see Smith, *S:I*, p. 65 and note 140). Bair herself tells a different (and more accurate) story on p. 427—that Nabokov recommended the clinic where ST went.

p. 160, paragraph 2. No sources are given for any of the statements made. The presence of “Henri and Monique Cartier-Bresson” during ST and HS’s 1947 trip to Mexico is undocumented. The name of Cartier-Bresson’s wife in these years was Ratna, nicknamed Elie.

p. 160, paragraph 3, “He made the Bonwit Teller mural quickly but was not pleased with it.”

No sources are given. See Smith, *S:I*, pp. 44, 46, with further references.

Concerning ST’s mural for the Skyline Room restaurant at the Terrace Plaza Hotel in Cincinnati, no references are given for the mural itself; see Smith, *S:I*, p. 46, with reproduction and further references.

“**He made a preliminary visit** to the site [in Cincinnati] in May, driving along the Pennsylvania Turnpike in his big Packard convertible”; note on p. 631. The note refers to “ST,

datebook for 1946, YCAL, Box 3.” It should be the datebook for 1947, which indicates that ST left for Cincinnati on May 20 and returned to New York on May 26.

Concerning the “Packard convertible,” see comment for p. 152, paragraph 2, about the confusion between the Packard and the Cadillac. As noted above, there is no documentary evidence that the Packard ever existed, or that ST and HS owned a car before the June 1947 purchase of the Cadillac, after the trip to Cincinnati.

Documentary evidence, moreover, suggests that the trip to Cincinnati was by train. The May 20 datebook entry records an evening departure—more plausible for an overnight train than a drive through the night. And ST did not have a driver’s license at this point. The same 1947 datebook shows three appointments for driving lessons after his return from Cincinnati (May 29, June 1, June 4). As for the Pennsylvania Turnpike, in 1947 it was a mere fragment of its present extent, beginning in mid-state and ending far short of the state’s western border; see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pennsylvania\\_Turnpike](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pennsylvania_Turnpike)

p. 160, paragraph 4, “Another request came in August, when he interrupted his Vermont vacation to rush to New York and supervise the installation of the Bonwit Teller mural and worry about the Cincinnati project.”

The uncited source for this statement is the ST-AB letter of August 4, 1947.

Lines 3ff., concerning ST’s murals for the American Export Lines ships. Again, the murals themselves are not discussed or sourced; see Smith, *S:I*, p. 46, with reproduction and further references. In the note on p. 631 for “**The industrial designer Henry Dreyfuss**,” the full reference to the “article in *Interiors*, December 1948” is Bernard Rudofsky, “For the Honor of the Fleet: Murals for American Export Lines.”

In the same note, Bair describes “the original book” which Dreyfuss gave to the Century Association as containing “a page about ST’s murals plus the separate blueprints pertaining to them.” There are no blueprints in this book, just a couple of printed plans, unrelated to ST’s mural, which is shown in a single photo. The book is a presentation volume, with pasted-in photographs of public rooms and staterooms on the ships.

p. 161, paragraph 3, “In Romania, **the Russians were threatening to close** the frontiers and cut off immigration, and Rosa was growing frantic that she and Moritz [ST’s parents] would not be able to leave”; note on p. 631.

The two letters to AB cited in the note (December 5, 1947, and February 24, 1948) source the rest of the paragraph, but the cited February 19, 1950, letter from Lica (ST’s sister) is irrelevant, having been written two years later. The quotation at the end of the paragraph, from the February 24 letter, is mistranscribed. It should read: “I put whatever modest strength of organization I have only into the work itself but if I have to spend anything beyond that (such as life, money, supervision, strategy) then the work—quality—turns out badly.”

p. 161, paragraph 4, “[Hedda] went to Paris before New Year’s 1948 to prepare for their [ST’s parents] arrival, which, because of Rosa’s requirements, she compared to setting up a small village.”

The “small village” remark is not Hedda’s but Saul’s. In the February 24 letter, he writes: “Hedda is already in Paris setting up a little village for them when they arrive.” No mention of Rosa or her “requirements.”

In the note on p. 631 for “**He was in such a bad mood**,” the undated letter from ST to HS at AAA is from 303.

p. 161, paragraph 5, “**He told Aldo that it was no small matter** to have to face taking on the responsibility for five or perhaps even seven new Romanian dependents”; note on p. 631.

The cited source is the ST-AB letter of February 24. Both the text and the note state that one of ST’s aunts and her son were originally part of the immigration plans. This information is not in the letter.

p. 162, lines 4-6, “Ever since childhood, he had ‘always looked for ways to escape and avoid families’”; note on p. 631.

The date of the ST-AB letter cited in the note is December 27, 1955, not December 17.

## Chapter 13

p. 163, paragraph 1. The note on p. 631 for “He wanted to join her in France” only documents ST’s reluctance to fly. The rest of the paragraph is unsourced.

p. 163, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s longing for HS when she was in Paris; note on p. 631, “At night the building was full of noises.”

The several ST-HS letters referred to in the note are AAA, frames 304-320.

p. 164, paragraph 1, concerning ST’s shorthand for assignations in his appointment books; note on p. 631, “his only nod to discretion.”

The note reads: “Some examples from YCAL, Box 2, 1948: ‘D’ in a circle with ‘10-11,’...” There are two 1948 appointment books, a pocket diary and a year book, but both are in box 3.

p. 164, paragraph 2, note on p. 632, “Worried that she might retaliate.”

The ST-HS letter cited in the note is frame 307.

p. 165, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s friendship with the violinist Alexander “Sasha” Schneider; note on p. 632, “Saul was a dedicated poker player.”

The note begins: “Sometime in the late 1940s, ST began to make drawings on musical notation paper, one of which appeared on Schneider’s LP album.” In an uncited letter of February 14, 1948 (frame 312), ST says: “Sasha played the records of his walses. They are really beautiful. I’ll bring them to you. I’ll do the cover for the album.” It is unknown whether this cover was ever done. In the late 1970s, ST did make a poster with a drawing on music paper for a Schneider concert at Carnegie Hall, using a work dated 1967 (SSF, inv. 4430).

p. 165, paragraph 3 to p. 166, line 2. No sources are given for any of the statements made.

p. 166, paragraph 1, ST “had just done a series of drawings for the magazine [*Vogue*] that did not ‘come out well’ and [Alexander] Liberman [of *Vogue*] rejected them. No publication had done this in recent years...”; note on p. 632.

The note references “ST to HS, February 17, 1948, AAA. ‘A pity the *Vogue* drawings didn’t come out well.’” The February 17 letter (frame 313) does not contain this passage, which is found in a letter dated February 2 (frame 302). This is all ST wrote on the subject; nowhere does he say, nor is there any other evidence, that Liberman rejected the drawings. ST was apparently conveying to HS his own dissatisfaction. (He may have been referring to the series entitled “Man’s Burden,” which appeared in the March 1, 1948, issue of *Vogue*.)

The February 17 letter does contain a passage that might reference an otherwise unsourced statement a few lines above: “Irving Penn invited him to an opening of his photographs, where he chatted with Tatiana and Alexander Liberman about future projects he might do for *Vogue*....” All ST says, however, is: “In the afternoon I went to a party of Penn where I saw again all the Libermans and Bouchés.”

p. 166, par. 2, “He was working hard every day and drawing constantly, but much of what he submitted to publications that had hitherto accepted everything was now being culled, sometimes with a high percentage of rejections. When a politically themed drawing he was trying to make for a *New Yorker* cover during the forthcoming election cycle was rejected—“something corny with eagles and floating allegories”—it made him look back...at the earliest drawings he had done for the magazine; he concluded that they were “mediocre,” and could

not see any genuine progression or development in his work since then. He worried that he might become **‘forced by necessities to perfect my mediocrity’**”; notes on p. 632.

Each sentence contains an error of fact or date.

1. As with the *Vogue* drawings in the preceding paragraph, there is no evidence that ST’s drawings were rejected by TNY or anyone else; “high percentage” is an invention—one need only look at the long list of magazine publications in this period in the “Features” section of the *S:I* Bibliography (esp. p. 270). Bair leaps to her conclusion from the February 29, 1948, ST-HS letter cited in the note (frame 319). But all ST says is: “I’m going to work today, want to make a *N. Yorker* cover for the elections, something corny with eagles and floating allegories.” Whether he ever actually made the drawing is unknown, as is the magazine’s response.

2. The note sourcing “forced by necessities to perfect my mediocrity” is to an undated ST-HS letter, which Bair dates to spring 1948 on “internal evidence” (frames 892-893), so that it can be connected to the non-existent rejection from TNY. But the clearest internal evidence firmly dates the letter a year later, to April 30, 1949, a Saturday, as ST wrote at the top. In the third paragraph, he describes “a big leftist parade and a big antileftist parade and from my office I could hear all afternoon the sound of tam-tam, drums, trumpets.” This parade took place on April 30, 1949; see *The New York Times* of that date, headline: “City to See 2 Loyalty Parades and Left-Wing March Today.” ST’s anxiety about mediocrity is thus unrelated to the planned “corny” TNY cover drawing described on February 29, 1948.

3. Furthermore, his perceived lack of progress in his work “for the magazine” is also unfounded. In the 1949 letter, ST says: “I worry generally about doing mediocre things that come out of working too much. What worries me most are the first drawings I ever made, they were mediocre. And I suspect that one never does more than what he did when he started. I worry about being forced by necessities to perfect my mediocrity.” He does not mention *The New Yorker*—he was working at the time for many other publications—nor is there any context in the letter to suggest that those “first drawings” were for TNY rather than, say, his *Bertoldo* work of the 1930s.

At the end of the paragraph, the unsourced quotation about ST’s pleasure at having received advertising commissions—“‘lots of money (no Victor [Civita] involved)’”—comes from the February 2, 1948, letter (frame 302).

p. 166, paragraph 3, “he was amazed by how much he had to learn about using oils and how difficult it was. **He was pleased when he taught himself** to spread color with a knife and with the tricks he picked up from studying the works of other painters in museums, particularly Matisse....[At a preview] of his friend Joan Miró’s show at MoMA, he went to see what techniques he might copy, but he left after ten minutes, sure that he would learn nothing while surrounded by a **‘sad bunch of snobs’**”; notes on p. 632.

The February 14 and undated letters cited in the first note are frames 312 and 894; the February 29 and March 1 letters cited in the second note are frames 320 and 322. Having noticed, however, that ST said he learned something from Matisse, Bair then projects this education onto the works of “other painters.” ST did not visit the Miró show to “see what techniques he might copy.” In his own words: “I went to the Miro opening. Sad bunch of snobs around, stayed only 10 minutes.”

p. 167, paragraph 1, re: ST’s dental problems. “He was now consulting dentists, endodontists, and dental surgeons for months on end....**Because his teeth gave him his worst ‘real hell,’** he was delighted when his primary dentist took a skiing vacation and he got a respite from the several-times-weekly sessions, which sometimes lasted for several hours’”; note on p. 632.

The only reference in the note is to an undated ST-HS letter (frame 329), which is the source of the quotation. This letter, however, does not speak of dental specialists, frequency of visits, or of his dentist’s skiing vacation; the latter is in an uncited letter (frame 315) dated “24”—which merely reports “Dentist went skying for a week”; no delight expressed. The letter was written on February 24, since ST refers to his “political cartoon for the *N. Yorker*”; this is the drawing of Thomas Dewey dreaming of sheep, published in the March 6 issue—ST’s only other political subjects for *The New Yorker* after the war involved covers in the late 1950s and

early 1960s. In another undated letter of the period (frame 446), ST recounts having spent six hours in the dentist's chair.

p. 167, paragraph 2, with reference to the Cincinnati mural; note on p. 632, **“Steinberg took Constantino Nivola.”**

The note includes a reference to Smith, *S:I*, “p. 239, n. 83.” The main discussion is on p. 46. ST's relationship with and response to Nivola, described in the first 6 lines of the paragraph, is unsourced, but seems to be from an undated ST-HS letter of the period, frame 345.

The letter quoted in mid-paragraph about the response of people in Cincinnati to the mural—**“silence from the upper classes and big insulting laughter and scorn from the uncultured”** (note on p. 632)—is frame 439.

The unsourced quotation at the end of the paragraph—that ST and HS did not “have to depend on or flatter people...” is from another undated letter of the period (frame 344).

p. 167, paragraph 3, concerning ST's opinion of the Cincinnati mural, “first liking it enormously, then wishing he could make significant changes, and finally throwing up his hands and wanting to walk away from it.” No sources are given for this statement.

Also unsourced is the second half of the paragraph—that ST eventually liked the mural because he could see it with “a single sweep of the eyes, and ‘that’s a pleasant surprise.’ It inspired him with new ideas about adding to and improving everything about it, but it was too late to make changes....” The source seems to be an undated ST-HS letter of the period (frame 330).

p. 167, paragraph 4, **“When Steinberg compared the murals for the ships** [those for the bars in the American Export Lines vessels] to those in the Cincinnati restaurant, he felt more secure about the new project....He thought he could do the full-scale drawings while he was in Europe with Hedda and have them shipped back to New York...”; note on p. 632.

The undated letter that sources these lines is frame 346. However, ST made no comparison between the two commissions: “The Dreyfuss people [Henry Dreyfuss's office, which commissioned the murals] agreed on all my conditions and will even accept to receive the drawings by mail, from Paris. So that as soon as I'll be in Paris I'll have to work a lot to finish the drawings.” The drawings, moreover, are not “full-scale.” They are drawing-paper size, photographically enlarged and affixed to the wall.

p. 168, lines 1-3, “Just as he started [on the American Export Lines project], a request for another mural came from an architect in Washington, D.C., who wanted him to make a large one for a hotel there.”

The uncited source of this statement is an undated ST-HS letter of the period (frame 337): “I want to finish the first sketch of the 4 ships (By the way another architect called me today, wants me to make a large mural in a hotel in Washington.)” The commission never went beyond the discussion stage.

p. 168, paragraph 2. No sources are given for this paragraph.

*“House and Garden* editors asked for twelve drawings they could use to advertise their magazine in *The New Yorker*.” ST convinced them that his ideas were “a lot funnier.” The source is ST to HS, undated letter of the period (frame 342). Since the ads began to appear in *The New Yorker* in late March 1948, the letter should probably be dated earlier in the month.

*“Holiday* magazine wanted him to sign a contract that would guarantee him a certain amount of work each year. He wanted to do it but thought he should first consult the editors at *The New Yorker*, who let him know they disapproved of his working for any other magazine on anything but a free-lance basis. He gave up the idea, but only after they gave something in return: correspondent credentials that he could use whenever he traveled.” This somewhat lengthy narrative seems to be drawn out of a single sentence in the same late March 1948 letter: “I gave up completely the *Holiday* magazine (the *N. Yorker* didn't like the idea of going

for them) and I arranged with the N. Yorker to have them give me credentials as a correspondent.” If there are other sources that mention a contract, its terms, or *The New Yorker’s* reason for disapproving, they are at present unknown to SSF.

p. 168, paragraph 3. Much in this paragraph is in need of correction.

Concerning ST’s arrangements to travel to Paris in 1948. He “was unable to secure the May 7 passage he wanted and had to wait until the fourteenth....[T]he only space available was a cabin...that he had to share with a quiet businessman, who used the room only to sleep and had no interest in pursuing a friendship with the famous artist.”

No sources are given. ST’s travel arrangements are discussed in his letters to HS, especially an undated one of late March-early April (frame 339). But the passage he wanted was April 7, not May 7. The source for the businessman who shared his cabin is unknown to SSF.

“**Monroe Wheeler invited him** to dinner with...Russell Lynes and Loren McIver, and Sasha Schneider gave a dual farewell party, because he was leaving on a concert tour”; note on p. 632.

The note does not give a source for the dinner invitation or the guests. The source is in the ST-HS correspondence, two undated letters of late March, but Bair gets the host wrong. In the first (frame 452), ST tells HS of receiving a telegram from Wheeler, who “wants me to come for diner”; in the second (frame 453), he reports: “Last night went to Lynes for diner. There was Monroe and Loren McIver, and that’s all.” Bair gets the host right on p. 177, last paragraph.

The note on p. 632 opens: “Lynes wrote ‘A Man Called Steinberg’ for *Harper’s Magazine*, 1946...” The article is entitled “A Man Named Steinberg,” and it was published in the August 1954 issue, pp. 44-52. See the *S:I* bibliography, p. 274, for five earlier Lynes articles on ST, 1947-52.

The uncited source for the Sasha Schneider party is ST-HS, early April 1948 (frame 337). It was not a “dual” party, but one for ST alone, held a week before ST’s departure because Sasha was leaving for a tour: “Yesterday Sasha gave me a party, a farewell party because he’s leaving tomorrow on tour.”

“**After a dinner at the home of architect Ben Baldwin**, Saul was able to give Hedda the good news from Betty Parsons, who was another guest, that two of Hedda’s large paintings of agricultural machines had been selected for a national tour of museums and for the prestigious exhibition of American painting at the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh. ‘Very important,’ Saul declared”; note on p. 632.

There is a confusion here between the two works that went on national tour and a work exhibited at the Carnegie Institute. The uncited sources are an ST-HS letter of later March 1948 (frame 443) and another of early April 1948 (frame 447):

Frame 443: “Before I left New York [ST was writing from Cincinnati] Betty called me to say she sold a painting of yours to somebody in Long Island. She can’t describe the painting, something with a pink ceiling she said. Also a painting of yours (white on white made after Mexico) was accepted for the Pittsburgh Carnegie Show (very important, congratulations pig and worst).”

Frame 447: “This evening I went to a party at the house of Ben Baldwin I saw there Betty who told me that two paintings of yours, the agricultural machines, the ones you like, were picked up for a tour of one year in all the museums of the country - organized by Museum of Modern art.”

In the note, Bair claims that ST “mistook” MoMA for the Whitney Museum. This is unlikely, since it was MoMA that was organizing national tours at that time, not the Whitney. Moreover, all the references in the note to exhibitions of Sterne’s work are to shows that took place a year to eighteen months later.

The brushes sent by Leo Lerman, referred to at the end of the paragraph, are sourced by the same April letter (frame 448).



p. 169, paragraph 1, “Hedda had been staying with her brother and his family in Paris, but once Saul arrived they wanted to rent an apartment that was big enough to work in, and Schneider thought he had the perfect solution. He wanted them to exchange apartments with Agnes Capri, a multitalented actor, singer, and theater producer, who had a stunning duplex on the Quai Voltaire....At first the idea excited Saul but the more he thought about it, the more it upset him. He did not know Agnes Capri, and even though her apartment was spectacular and she was vouched for in the highest terms by his trusted friend, Steinberg’s paranoia came to the fore and he rejected the exchange. **He told Hedda he could not bear to think of a stranger prowling among their things and possibly laughing at their possessions or sneering at their way of life**”; note on p. 633.

The above is a skewed and embellished account of the proposed apartment exchange, found in five ST-HS letters, all undated, only one of which is cited in Bair’s note: “ST to HS, ‘Wednesday,’ internal evidence suggests late April 1948, AAA” (it is probably frame 448, see below). The date of the letter, however, cannot be “late” April, since by that time ST was in Paris with HS; the idea of the apartment exchange had been abandoned before he boarded the ship for France in mid-April.

Further, that ST was “excited” about the idea, then “upset,” that it made him “paranoid” and he rejected the exchange...none of this is in the correspondence. And it was HS, not ST who handled the negotiations and ultimately rejected the exchange. The five letters can be approximately dated between later March and earlier April by following the sequence of the apartment narrative. The relevant passages:

Frame 453: “About renting studio or appt: I won’t. I don’t feel like having anybody stay were we work. It’s not an apartment, it’s a workshop.”

Frame 446: “Sasha just called to say that Agnes Capri, a dancer in Paris, will come here end of April and wants to exchange her duplex (Quai Voltaire) for something in New York. If that works I’ll store our papers and exchange. (She wants to stay in N.Y. two months) If you agree, call a woman named ALEX de ROTCHILD.”

Frame 340: “Write me soon about the outcome of Agnes Capri. I forgot to ask you that on the phone. I should know soon because if yes I have to clean up the apt. if not I have to send things in storage.”

Frame 448: “It’s a pity I don’t know yet what you arranged with Capri, I could organize the apartment. This Sunday I’ll anyway take lots of stuff from home and store it in the studio.”

Frame 897: “I’m very glad you didn’t make the deal with Agnes, I feel much better to have the place unspoiled by strange birds.”

p. 169, paragraph 2, concerning Sasha Schneider’s rental of ST’s car while the latter was abroad: “Schneider agreed to take the Packard convertible for \$100 a month. Saul was ecstatic, because he loved the car and didn’t want to sell it, but he was even happier when Igor Stravinsky...agreed to sell him a Cadillac convertible he no longer needed....”

There are no sources for this paragraph. On the chronic confusion between the (probably non-existent) Packard and the 1941 Cadillac ST purchased in 1947, see above, comment for p. 152, paragraph 2. Schneider did rent ST’s car, but no make or model is specified in what is presumably Bair’s source, an undated letter to HS, probably late March 1948 (frame 455), as ST is preparing for his trip. He writes: “I also arranged to rent the car to Sasha at 100 dollars a month instead of selling it. I feel better, I didn’t want to sell the car.” How “feeling better” accelerated to “ecstasy” is left unexplained.

No documentation is known at present to SSF for the purchase of the used Cadillac from Stravinsky (also mentioned in *S:I*, p. 35, but as purchased in 1947). In fact, the extant bill of sale, dated June 14, 1947 (YCAL, box 57, folder “1947 Correspondence”), confirms that the Cadillac was purchased from a car dealer: \$54 tax is charged; there was a partial cash payment with the order, the rest due on delivery, etc. Bair would have ST buying another Cadillac from Stravinsky the following year.

p. 169, paragraph 3, “In his last letter to Hedda before he sailed, Saul wrote that he could not bear to think of being separated from her ever again....He wanted to take her ‘**on the biggest and noisiest honeymoon**, in France...’”; note on p. 633:

The note reads: “ST to HS, n.d. but internal evidence suggests early May 1948, AAA.” The letter (frame 450) could not date from “early May,” since ST is writing it sometime before he sailed in mid-April. Bair then constructs another chronologically impossible sequence:

“The Berlin airlift had begun, and Hedda wrote back that she was terrified the Russians would start bombing and something would happen to him on the voyage to France or to her if she got on a ship and returned to NY. She was sure there would be a nuclear war, but **Saul told her not to worry** because wars always started in the fall and they might as well enjoy a Paris honeymoon before then”; note on p. 633.

If ST and HS were still writing to each other, it would have to have been before his arrival in France (he was in Paris by April 22; *S:I*, chronology, p. 255). But the Berlin airlift began in late June 1948, when ST and HS had been together for more than two months. The note reads: “ST to HS, ‘Wednesday’ to ‘Dear Rabbit,’ n.d. but internal evidence suggests early May 1948, AAA.” Again, an early May date is too late. Moreover, there is only one letter in the correspondence addressed to “Dear Rabbit” and including “Wednesday” (frame 453) and it is irrelevant here. The correct letter is frame 457; it is undated, but was written on March 28, 1948, since ST refers to the day as Easter, which was on March 28 that year. Whatever HS “wrote back” and when is unknown.

p. 169, paragraph 4, “In Paris they stayed in a hotel on the Boulevard Raspail rather than an apartment, just long enough to visit the galleries, where Steinberg thought ‘**a lot of bad art [was]** running around’”; note on p. 633.

The return address of the ST-AB letter of June 10, 1948, cited in the note, is “Hotel Pont Royal,” which is on the rue Montalembert. They were at the Hotel Le Royal on the Boulevard Raspail the following year, ST-AB, July 19, 1949 (unpublished), per the return address.

p. 170, lines 3-5, “Since February he had been bracing himself ‘**for the big Romanian cloud**’ that he expected to envelop him and that made him, a true skeptic, think he needed to get himself ‘psychologized’”; note on p. 633.

The ST-HS letter of February 28, 1948, cited in the note, is frame 318. ST said “psychoanalyzed,” not “psychologized.”

In the latter part of this paragraph, the statements that ST was “tired and depressed” at the thought of having to support his Romanian family, that the trip with Hedda was “less than satisfactory,” that “ST was his usual intense, controlled, unemotional self,” etc. are unsourced.

p. 171, paragraph 1, “He did a series of drawings for **the first large-scale work**, a new mural called ‘An Exhibition for Modern Living,’ curated by Alexander Girard for the Detroit Institute of Arts and later hung at the J.L. Hudson department store”; note on p. 633.

The mural for the Terrace Plaza Hotel in Cincinnati, installed in 1948, was ST’s first “large-scale work.” “An Exhibition for Modern Living” is the title of the landmark exhibition, not the mural, which is untitled. The exhibition did not take place first at the DIA and then in the department store, but only at the DIA. The J.L. Hudson Company financed the exhibition (see the credits page of the catalogue). A description of the installation at the DIA, as well as a floorplan with Steinberg’s mural marked out, can be found in *Interiors*, 109 (November 1949).

“As all the other architects involved in the project were exhibiting ‘**the best design (in their opinion)**’ of the past twenty years,’ Steinberg decided to depict ‘all the ugly or stupid things that have been done’”; note on p. 633.

Despite ST’s use of the word “architect” in the letter to AB cited in the note, the exhibition was devoted solely to interior design, as a glance at the catalogue makes clear (among the categories in the checklist are glass, pottery, textiles, furniture, lighting).

“By the time he finished he had twenty-four drawings, which were later put into a small exhibition at the art institute, where he hoped for a good sale. The show drew record crowds, but not a single one was sold. Girard was sorry to relay the bad news that the people in Detroit did not understand ‘values’”; note on p. 633.

The twenty-four drawings were never exhibited and never offered for sale. In a letter to Girard of May 31, 1949 (copy at SSF), ST writes: “you’ll understand my reluctance around the suggestion of having them placed for sale.” The letter from Girard to ST, November 5, 1951, cited in the note, refers to a private (and unsuccessful) exhibition of ST drawings that Girard held in his Grosse Pointe, Michigan, home two years after the “Exhibition for Modern Living.” The subject of such an exhibition had first been broached a year earlier in a letter of November 28, 1950, from Girard to ST (YCAL, box 56, folder “Correspondence 1950”). A year later, October 6, 1951, ST writes to Girard (copy at SSF): “Just mailed 27 drawings today...On the back of each drawing you’ll find...the price of the picture.” ST then asks Girard to “keep it as a local affair—don’t send invitations out of town...Just to legitimate clients.” He agreed to the show because he considered Girard “more a friend quasi un cugino [almost a cousin] than a gallery.”

Misunderstanding the date and nature of the exhibition, Bair goes on to make an erroneous connection between the failure of the (later) drawings exhibition and ST’s decision in 1949 “to concentrate on the positive.”

p. 171, last paragraph.

No sources are given for the way Simon Michael Bessie of Harper & Brothers “wooded [ST] with fine lunches and dinners in order to persuade him to prepare” a new book of drawings, or ST’s thought that he had enough previously published drawings to make up the book.

p. 172, paragraph 1, concerning early titles for the book that became *The Art of Living*: “He thought about ‘Wrong Century, Maybe,’ or simply ‘The Wrong Century’....For a short time he liked ‘Rapid Transit’...”; note on p. 633 for “**an old and honored title.**”

The ST-AB letter of June 1, 1949, cited in the note, only references “The Wrong Century.” The other two titles are noted in ST-HS, April 25, 1949 (frame 460).

p. 172, paragraph 2, “...the reception for *The Art of Living* was tepid. The book was published in early fall in an edition of 20,000 copies, but despite favorable reviews, by Christmas only 10,000 had been sold and Steinberg feared the book would be remaindered. All the reviews were positive and he thought some of them were ‘even intelligently written,’ but he still found it ‘a mystery what makes a book sell’”; note on p. 633.

The note refers to interviews with Wendy Weil, ST’s literary agent at the time, as a source for the above remarks. But all the statistics and quotations in the passage come from ST’s letter to AB, December 7, 1949.

p. 172, paragraph 3, “He was now [winter 1949] hiding from new work far more than accepting it...he was reluctant to take offers from prestigious publications....Carol Janeway at *Harper’s Bazaar*, Leo Lerman at *Mademoiselle*, and several editors at Knopf as well as other publishers and publications made offers. *Art News* hounded him with phone calls because he didn’t answer the editors’ letters...other artists, from college art students to wannabe illustrators, sent him their work or pounded on his door with portfolio in hand to ask for ‘the maestro’s’ opinion. **He complained of having to work** like a businessman for eight to ten hours every day, especially after he had to hire a Miss Elinor to take care of much of the detail. He wasn’t used to having anyone in his studio while he was working, and he didn’t like it. He didn’t even like having to give her directions about how to respond to the many requests....**Miss Elinor didn’t last long...**”; notes on p. 633.

ST’s letter to HS, May 20, 1949 (frame 463), cited in the first note, does not mention Janeway or Lerman. Lerman appears in the May 31 letter (frame 468); but the Janeway offer was a year earlier (letter of February 29, 1948, frame 320). Other statements—“several editors

at Knopf,” “*Art News* hounded him,” “other artists sent him their work or pounded on his door”—are inflations of what ST wrote in the May 20 letter:

I’ll stay home and relax (I’m having the life of the businessman, 8 or 10 hrs. a day work, without the advantages of such life like hating the work or loving it for the sake of money only. Today I got up at 9, went to office where I found Elinor doing perfect cleanliness and order in the studio....a boy came to show me his drawings and ask maestro’s critique. I discouraged him well enough....I had such phone calls as the insurance man, a Knopf editor about some drawings I did for them, Frankfurter of *Art News* about an illustration for some story they want to print, a wrong number asking if I’m a beauty parlor.

The second note refers not to Miss Elinor’s short tenure, but to folders filled with requests to ST “scattered throughout the YCAL boxes.” If these folders contain the sources for other information in the paragraph, they are unfindable. See above, General Comments, Unusable References.

p. 172, paragraph 4, “**Steinberg thought** [the Italian architect Ernesto] **Rogers was one of the tourists** who went home and wrote a book about ‘Me and America’ after three weeks in the country. He changed his mind as their first luncheon lengthened to fill five hours. When Rogers became intrigued by Steinberg’s description of Hedda’s latest paintings of machines and buildings, Steinberg took him to Betty Parson’s gallery to see them. Rogers left with ‘great admiration’ for Hedda and invited Saul to bring her to his home in Bergamo when they went to Italy in July”; note on p. 633.

The chronology of ST’s attitude to Rogers is incorrect. The letter cited in the note, which references ST’s remark about Rogers being like a tourist, is dated April 28, 1949 (frames 900-901). The rest of the paragraph is unsourced, but the luncheon took place three days earlier. In a letter of April 25 (frame 460), ST writes: “Today I spent about 5 hours with Rogers, we had lunch together and spent talking the afternoon. It was good. I’ll take him this week to see your paintings at Betty (he has great admiration for the way you look and talk).” That’s all ST says on the subject; nothing about Rogers being “intrigued by ST’s description of Hedda’s latest paintings.”

p. 173, paragraph 3, concerning Hedda’s pregnancy.

Bair is speaking about the period May-June 1949. She claims that Hedda “knew she was pregnant when she left New York” (HS left for Paris via a flight to London on April 24; ST-HS, April 25, 1949, frame 459), that she had an ectopic pregnancy, surgery in Paris, and went to the Riviera to convalesce. ST “told her he had consulted their family physician in New York for reassurance that the French doctors were giving her proper treatment, while she wrote from Juan-les-Pins urging him to stay in New York and finish his work...”; note on p. 633 for “**A flurry of telegrams ensued.**”

Hedda’s ectopic pregnancy, and the consequent surgery, took place in early November 1948. In an unpublished letter to Aldo Buzzi, November 9, 1948 (cited by Bair in the note without publication status), ST writes: “Hedda was very sick, she had an operation a few days ago (I don’t know the word in Italian, she had a premature delivery [*un parto prematuro*] and appendicitis), poor girl, she suffered a great deal but is now better, almost fine. She’s still in the hospital but will leave in about a week. Good thing that she didn’t get sick in Europe, it would have been more complicated. She got sick just after we got back here [to New York from their trip to Europe] but the doctors—those f... scientists—procrastinated, giving different opinions until the thing became critical. Now everything is all right, however.” (The simultaneous appendectomy may have been performed prophylactically when the ectopic pregnancy was terminated, a not uncommon procedure in those days.)

Bair would have Hedda suffering from a second ectopic pregnancy six months or so later. But the ST-HS correspondence at AAA that Bair refers to in the note, dating it May-June 1949, makes no mention of a pregnancy. ST only writes about the problem HS is having with her “stitches,” about which he consults their New York physician, Dr. Hurd. ST is referring to a consequence of the November surgery. Before the introduction of antibiotics and absorbable

synthetic stitches, abscesses could form on the internal stitches at the surgical site, causing an inflammation that forced a deep stitch to the surface, even months after surgery. Note that in his first letter to HS after her departure, he writes: “Take care of bua [Italian for booboo], go to doctor immediately” (April 25, 1949, frame 460).

The telegrams Bair cites, a flurry of three, are frames 464-465, 472-473, and 466; the letters, frames 487, 497, 485, and 931. The letter HS wrote to ST from Juan-les-Pins is unsourced. Also unsourced is the fact that the pregnancy was ectopic. The source is an email from Sterne scholar Sarah Eckhardt to SSF, August 14, 2007, who related a conversation with HS, though Bair may have gotten the information directly from Eckhardt.

p. 174, paragraph 3, “**I brace myself** for seeing [my] parents’”; note on p. 634. The ST-HS letter of May 31, 1949, cited in the note, is frame 469.

Later in the paragraph: “**If it were not for the parents,**’ he concluded, ‘I’d write you to come home’”; note on p. 634.

The note reads: “ST to HS, n.d. but internal evidence suggests June 2, 1949.” The letter (frames 474-475) cannot be this late. In the paragraph above the quoted passage, ST writes: “Only 2 weeks since you left, seems like much much longer.” Hedda left on April 24 (see comment for p. 173, paragraph 3), which puts ST’s letter sometime at the end of the first week in May.

p. 174, paragraph 4, “Work was piling up...For the first time in his life he suffered from insomnia and found himself drinking scotch heavily in order to relax and go to sleep.”

No sources are given. In the May 31, 1949, letter to HS (frame 468), ST mentions his insomnia. But the ST-HS correspondence does not document any heavy or chronic drinking. In an undated letter of May (frame 482), he reports “I’m dead tired and I’m having a scotch.” In another letter of the period (frame 508), “spent evenings at home drinking lightly.” In a third (frames 914-915), his alcohol intake seems to be medicinal: “I have a cold and am going early to bed with aspirins and wiskey”; he then takes a walk, “now sober again,” and then “had another drink. No more sober.”

p. 174, paragraph 5, “**We really have to move to the country,**’ he told Hedda, and this became a recurring theme in his letters”; note on p. 634.

The ST-HS letter cited for the quoted passage—“Friday evening of Memorial Day weekend,” 1949 (frames 491-492)—does not contain the quotation (and it is only headed “Friday evening”; Memorial Day is mentioned in the body of the letter). The correct citation is the letter of June (based on his progress with the drawings for the Detroit mural), frame 493.

Visiting the Nivolas in the country, he was “enthralled by Claire, **their ‘really beautiful’ daughter,**” while ignoring her brother, Pietro, “a very dignified little child”; note on p. 634. It is Claire who is both beautiful and dignified. The letter (frame 890) reads: “His little girl is really beautiful (and the boy was jealous because I paid attention to her), a very dignified little child.”

p. 175, paragraph 2, “There followed a **‘very trying evening’** with Cesar Civita, who was in New York ostensibly on other business but mostly to persuade Steinberg to renew his contract. Steinberg resisted and went home dead tired to drink a lot of scotch to get to sleep”; note on p. 634.

The note reads: “ST to HS, ‘Monday evening’ and ‘Thursday,’ n.d. but internal evidence suggests mid-June 1949.” The letter (frame 482) can only be dated sometime before May 26. ST speaks of Hedda’s forthcoming trip to the Riviera; on May 26-27, he sent a telegram, welcoming her to Antibes (frame 464).

The reason for Civita’s trip to New York is not given in the letter. What ST imbibed upon returning home was a single drink. As quoted above (comment for p. 174, paragraph 4): “I’m dead tired and I’m having a scotch.”

p. 175, paragraph 3.

Many of the sources for this paragraph are in the letter cited in the note on p. 634 for “**drinking lightly.**” But the ST-HS letter (frame 508) cannot be dated on “internal evidence” to the “end of June 1949.” ST sailed to France on June 21, as Bair herself observes on p. 177, line 4. The letter should be dated to early May. ST tells HS that he’s “postponed the trip to Detroit next week.” In the end, he didn’t postpone it, leaving on May 12; see comment for next paragraph.

p. 175, paragraph 4. At this point, the chronology of ST’s activities in the month or so before his departure to France becomes confused. On p. 174, paragraph 5, ST is visiting the Nivolas in the country on Memorial Day weekend—Memorial Day was May 30 in 1949. Page 175, paragraph 2, refers to events that allegedly took place after this weekend, but the ST-HS letter cited in evidence was written before May 26 (see comment above for p. 174, paragraph 5). The letter quoted in the next paragraph is datable to early May (see comment for p. 175, paragraph 3).

Now—p. 175, paragraph 4—after an (otherwise undocumented) “week of solitude,” ST “went to Detroit and was a guest in Alexander Girard’s home, ‘**an architect’s own dream house**’”; note on p. 634.

However, ST went to Detroit by overnight train on May 12. A letter dated “Monday morning” and beginning “back from Detroit” (frame 489) speaks of his activities in Detroit beginning on “Friday the 13<sup>th</sup>” through his departure, via another overnight train, on Sunday night; Monday is thus May 16. On May 17, ST writes a thank-you note to the Girards for their hospitality, which crosses with a letter of the same date written by Girard, expressing pleasure at ST’s visit (copies of both, SSF).

Bair’s note for the quotation and ST’s trip to Detroit reads: “ST to HS, ‘Monday’ and ‘Wednesday,’ June 1949.” The Monday letter is the one just cited, written on May 16; the Wednesday letter may be frame 497, which merely describes the mural but does not otherwise discuss the trip. The quotation—“an architect’s dream house” is from neither of these letters. The source is a letter written upon ST’s arrival in Detroit—“now morning 10 30, had good trip slept all night in train”—thus on May 13 (frame 487).

“On the way home he stopped in Cincinnati to check on the murals....” He never went to Cincinnati. In the May 13 letter, he is planning to go, but in the May 16 letter (frame 490), he explains: “I wanted to go to Cincinnati but no convenient train.”

On his return, ST was occupied by a “flurry of appointments,” including a visit to Harper & Brothers to “‘**help their ignorant editors make a blurb**’ for his book jacket...,” followed by a description of the various activities, through line 3 on p. 176; note on p. 634.

The note reads: “ST to HS, undated letters, probably June-July 1949.” All the information that follows, as well as the quotation, is from a single letter (frames 493-494), written a few days before his June 21 departure for Paris.

p. 176, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s dental troubles and a trip to Detroit.

No source is cited. It is apparently two letters to HS, written in early June (frames 495 and 499).

ST “worried about a flare-up [of his dental problems] when he boarded the train for another working trip to Detroit, to stay again with the Girards. **They entertained him** with the most interesting guests..., but mostly he spent several days on his own, walking around downtown Detroit because the mural needed details of the city itself”; note on p. 634.

The note reads: “ST to HS, ‘Monday morning after a Friday 13<sup>th</sup>,’ June 1949.” ST never went to Detroit in June. The letter Bair refers to is that datable to May 16 (see comment for p. 175, paragraph 4); the only Friday the 13<sup>th</sup> in 1949 was May 13.

Concerning ST’s visits to the dentist, see below, comment for p. 177, paragraph 2.

p. 176, paragraph 3, In Detroit, “Steinberg was invited to dine at the home of ‘**an architect called Saarinen,**’ who wanted him to think about creating a mural for the Ford Motor Company’s research institute...”; note on p. 634.

No source is given for this or the rest of the information in the paragraph (the note provides biographical information on Saarinen). It is the ST-HS letter of May 16, 1949.

However, that “the two men liked each other, especially after they discovered how much they had in common...” is not in this letter.

p. 176, paragraph 4 through p. 177, lines 1-3, concerning ST’s association with the journalist Ruth Gruber, her assistance in trying to get ST’s sister and family out of Romania, and the book jacket ST designed for her as “payback”; notes on p. 634 for “**most convincing letters,**” and “**it’s too late now.**”

The note for the first quotation is to an ST-HS letter, beginning “Saturday night,” which Bair dates “probably late June 1949” (frame 487). Impossible, since ST was already with HS in Paris late in the month. The letter can be dated to the third week in May, based on the movie ST mentions having seen and its opening in New York. The second quotation is referenced by another letter, also beginning “Saturday night” (frame 493), which Bair dates to June 1949. It was written a few days before his June 21 departure; see end of comments for p. 175, paragraph 3.

In none of this correspondence, however, does ST use the word “payback” or describe the book jacket design as “dull” (p. 177, line 3).

p. 177, paragraph 2, “**He was to sail on the *Queen Mary*, on June 21, 1949...but his teeth threatened to derail the departure**”; note on p. 634. Followed by a detailed description of ST’s visits to the dentist, his fear of extraction, getting drunk with Jim Geraghty, sobering up, Leo Lerman pounding on his door, etc.

This is the same material already discussed, though unsourced and with less detail, on p. 176, paragraph 2; see comment there. For these details, Bair’s note refers to “ST to HS, undated letters whose internal evidence suggests June 15-22, 1949, AAA.” There seem to be two letters involved with the dental matters and other statements made in the paragraph: frame 495, which should be dated around June 7 since ST says that “In two weeks I’ll have, I hope, all the Detroit drawings.” (The drawings were sent on June 20, the day before his departure; letter to Girard, dated June 15, 1949 [copy at SSF], announcing the planned shipment.)

The second letter, frame 499, is the primary source (including the quote about sleeping “for about 20 hours”), but this letter dates from early June, as confirmed by the datebook entries for the period (YCAL, box 3).

“...he fell into a deep sleep and did not wake up until late afternoon, when he heard Leo Lerman pounding on his door.” In this same frame 499, ST said that he went to the office “and slept for a while till Leo Lerman came to wake me up for some drawings.”

At the end of the paragraph: Geraghty wanted to “look at the preliminary drawings of the Detroit murals, as he was interested in buying some for a spread in *The New Yorker*. **Steinberg pulled out all his drawings...**”; note on p. 634.

The note refers to “ST to HS, ‘Thursday,’ probably between June 15 and June 18, 1949, AAA.” This is still frame 499, from early June—except that it was ST who was interested in selling the drawings, not Geraghty in buying them. All the letter says is: “Jim Geraghty came to visit me a little later (I’m trying to sell to N. Yorker the Detroit series).”

p. 177, paragraph 3, “Hedda...chastised him for behaving like ‘a loose man dancing with depraved de Kooning’ at one of Bill and Elaine’s raucous parties in their downtown apartment. He insisted that it had been a sedate evening during which he mostly chatted with Wilfredo Lam (whom he liked) and Stanley William Hayter (of whom he was wary).”

No source is given for this information. The quotation comes from an ST-HS letter, dated May 20, 1949 (frame 463), though ST does not describe the character or location of the party. However, ST met Lam and Hayter at another party, not hosted by the de Koonings, as he reports in another May letter (frame 509):

Went to party for Noguchi. Usual people de Kooning, Matter, Egan, (the gallery), Lam and 2 other people don’t know. First party I go since you left. Had good time because danced....All send you love and greetings. Will see de Kooning next week, nice man. (Heyter [*sic*] was there too, I forgot.)

“He liked de Kooning, who he insisted was ‘nice man’....through him he had found the key to understanding American abstract painters: ‘They’re primitives’”; note on p. 634.

The note reads: “ST-AB, December 7, 1949.” This is the source for ST’s comment on abstract painters; ST’s comment on de Kooning comes from the letter just quoted.

p. 177, paragraph 4, “Russell Lynes gave a small dinner where Monroe Wheeler and Loren Mclver were the only other guests, and Steinberg was able to enjoy the rarity of a serious conversation that was all about art”; note on p. 634.

The note reads: “When ST gave Lynes a drawing of a naked woman similar to the one he made for Cartier-Bresson’s bathtub,...Lynes reproduced it in needlepoint.” ST made no drawing for Cartier-Bresson’s bathtub. Bair may be confusing this non-existent drawing for Cartier-Bresson with a photo taken by the photographer of an ST drawing on the walls of a bathroom in an apartment on the rue Jacob, Paris—which Robert Doisneau also photographed—in 1955 (photos at SSF).

For the uncited source of the Lynes dinner in an ST-HS letter, see comment for p. 168, paragraph 3. This dinner, however, took place in 1948, the chronological point in Bair’s text where it is first mentioned. We are now in 1949. That ST enjoyed “serious conversation...all about art” is Bair’s interpolation. All ST says is: “Last night went to Lynes for diner. There was Monroe and Loren Mclver and that’s all. It was very dull.”

No sources are given for the information in the rest of the paragraph (through its end on p. 178). McKnight Kaufer and Glenway Wescott, the guests at another dinner hosted by Monroe Wheeler, are described in an ST-HS letter of May 1949 (frame 484). The dinner with Rosa and Miguel Covarrubias took place in 1948; the source is the letter in which ST speaks of renting his car (frame 455), as explained above, comment for p. 152, paragraph 3.

“He took Mel and Mark Rothko to lunch at a neighborhood French restaurant and to keep the conversation flowing with the taciturn Mark, he got them ‘happy with martinis.’” The source is a letter datable to May 1949 (frame 482), but ST’s spare account is embellished: “I took Rothko and his wife to lunch to a french restaurant in the neighborhood and got them happy with martinis.”

That Noguchi was the honored guest at a number of farewell parties ST attended is not sourced. A May 1949 letter (see comment for p. 177, paragraph 3) mentions one party.

“He cut short an evening with Bernard Rudofsky because he didn’t feel up to the serious arguments over architecture and city planning that he knew would ensue.” Again, no source is cited, but it must be the ST-HS letter written a week or so before ST’s departure to Paris on June 21 (frame 496); however, ST gives no reason for making it an early night: “I took Tino to dinner at Copain and had steak and talked very little and then we took a long walk to Rudofsky where he was visiting. I didn’t feel like an evening with Bernardo so I went to a movie called El Paso....”

p. 178, paragraph 2.

The paragraph recounts ST’s “intense reading” in the spring of 1949, but no sources are given. The list seems to be based on ST-HS letters, but at least three are from 1948: February 6, 1948, for *Moby Dick* (frame 305); March 3, 1948 (frame 324), for Rebecca West’s *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon*; Erskine Caldwell, two letters of February 1948 (frames 318 and 332).

In 1949, ST was reading *Billy Budd*, not *Moby Dick* (letter of Memorial Day, frame 921). In a letter of early June (frame 486), he has Havelock Ellis in hand. Another early June letter (frame 475) has him reading the stories of Ring Lardner. But nowhere in this correspondence does ST say that Lardner’s and Caldwell’s works “made him want to jump in the Stravinsky [*sic*] Cadillac and take to the open roads of the American Southeast in search of hillbillies and moonshine.”

“To his great surprise (and delight), aspects of Balzac’s *Comédie Humaine* made him ‘excited’ about the Detroit murals in a way that he had not been excited about any work ‘in months or years’”; note on p. 634.

Balzac enters the Detroit mural project only through a conflation of two different ST-HS letters, on two different subjects. In one, from early June 1949 (frame 486), ST is



discussing a planned book of drawings: “I’m all elated by the old project of doing a tremendous book of drawings that should cover as much of our time and places as necessary or possible, something like--what I think is (because I didn’t read it) the cycle *La Comedie humaine* of Balzac.” In another letter, mid-May to mid-June 1949 (frame 497), he says about the Detroit project, “I really got excited about this work as I wasn’t in months or years.”

The end of the note on p. 634 for “**To his great surprise (and delight)**” provides the source for the description of ST’s plans for the Detroit murals in the next paragraph. The cited ST-HS letter is found on frames 497-498.

p. 178, paragraph 2 through p. 179, end of paragraph, concerning ST’s description of his planned drawings for Detroit.

As Bair notes, not all the described drawings, or details of them, made it into the mural—the original drawings that were photographically enlarged are at The Detroit Institute of Arts. The mural was destroyed after the exhibition and no installation photos survive.

p. 179, lines 3-5, Describing part of ST’s plans for the Detroit mural: “**After this he veered back into repetitions** of the ‘cute house’...until the viewer’s eye stopped at a Moorish gas station...”; note on pp. 634-35.

The note reads: “The ‘6000 [*sic* for 6<sup>th</sup>] Avenue’ where he lived when he first arrived in New York became a recurring symbol that he used repeatedly in single drawings and book-length works. An example is *Canal Street* [1990],...where many of the drawings either hint at or replicate earlier images of the street.”

ST often drew New York streets, but few if any can be identified specifically as 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. As for *Canal Street*, the sixteen prints in the book depict the entrance to the Holland Tunnel—far to the west of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue—and the Canal Street Station Post Office, at the corner of Church Street. Other buildings and streets in the book are not identifiable. None of the works replicates “earlier images of the street.”

p.179, paragraph 2.

The uncited source for this paragraph is the same ST-HS letter (frames 497-498) in which ST describes the Detroit project.

“While recovering from the ectopic pregnancy, Hedda fell sick again with an unnamed ailment.” See comment for p. 173, paragraph 3.

p. 179, paragraph 3.

The source for the entire paragraph is the ST-HS letter (frame 519) cited midway in the note on p. 613 for “**‘about the stupid boring results of drinking.’**”

p. 179, paragraph 4, “He was so worried about the coldness of [HS’s] last few letters that he proposed a new way to demonstrate how much he loved her.” The paragraph continues with ST describing a game in which he would meet HS by accident in a small European city.

No references are given for the coldness of HS’s letters. The uncited source for the rest of the paragraph is an early June ST-HS letter (frames 520-521).

p. 181, paragraph 3, last two lines: “He thought of himself as working and working, but ‘inertia’ still came back, and with it insomnia.”

The source for this statement is not the ST-AB letter cited earlier in the paragraph, but that cited at the top of p. 182 for “**I’d rather lie awake at night**” (p. 635).

p. 182, last sentence, “Several years earlier, when Steinberg first went to work for *The New Yorker*, Jim Geraghty astutely assessed his personality by saying he needed ‘excitement.’”

No source is given. See Smith, *S:I*, p. 35, and note 61 for the full quotation.

The reader has by now grasped the extent of the factual errors in the book. A complete list, however, would amount to a book in itself. To preserve the Foundation's resources for other pressing projects, we offer below representative corrections for the remaining chapters, as a reminder of the need to corroborate factual statements with the Foundation. We welcome all serious inquiries.

#### Chapter 14

p. 193, paragraph 1, "He had a good excuse not to stay long with his parents in Nice [spring 1951]: he had to go to London to meet Roland Penrose for discussions about a solo exhibition of his work that was scheduled for one year later at the Institute of Contemporary Arts." And: Penrose and his wife, the photographer Lee Miller, "had just bought Farley Farm" in Sussex, "and they invited Steinberg to come for the weekend."

ST visited his parents in Nice in the spring of 1951, as Bair notes on the two preceding pages. The visit to Farley Farm, however, didn't take place until May 25, 1952, at the conclusion of the ICA exhibition. ST-HS, letter dated May 26, 1952 (AAA, frames 593-594): "Yesterday I went to have lunch at Penroses, nice house, paintings, etc. Went to see a hill in neighbourhood where there's a huge drawing of man - prehistoric (perhaps) drawing made by digging large paths on gras...." ST is referring to the famous Long Man of Wilmington in East Sussex. For Miller's well-known photograph of him at the site, see *S:I*, p. 256.

Penrose was not involved in the exhibition proposals. This fell to Peter Watson, an ICA board member, via Herbert Read, who was then at Princeton. Watson to Read, October 5, 1951 (YCAL, box 56, folder "Correspondence 1951," 3 of 4): "all of us on the Exhibition Committee are extremely anxious to arrange a Steinberg exhibition at the I.C.A. next year... do you think you could possibly get in touch with Steinberg in New York & find out if there is a possibility." In the same YCAL folder is Read's letter to ST of October 8, asking whether they could get together in New York to discuss the proposal.

#### Chapter 15

p. 205, lines 1-2, "It was more than a 'point of honor' for Steinberg to fulfill the Boston commission [for a department store mural]..."; note on p. 639.

In the note, Bair says that ST "never specified what the Boston commission was." The details can be found, however, in a letter to ST of June 30, 1952, from H.D. Hodgkinson, general manager of Filene's department store; YCAL, box 56, folder "1952." The commission was for murals in the 12-foot spaces at the entrances to the new building. Hodgkinson canceled the commission, blaming changes in the design, which would overpower the mural(s) "by fixtures and merchandise displays."

Later in the note, Bair cites an article mentioning the Boston project, "P Is for Prosciutto" in *Time*, February 11, 1952. She goes on to explain the title as referring to "an ABC booklet ST made for Claire Nivola when she was four years old," followed by a description of some of the entries, including "P is for Picasso, who is depicted standing with one foot on and holding a sword that passes through the Louvre." This is clearly not the "P Is for Prosciutto" *abecedario* which, if it was ever completed, has not survived. ST made the alphabet book for Claire Nivola (born 1947) two years later. It is inscribed by ST on the page for "Y, Z": "to Chiaretta from Saul who made this book for her in December 1954, New York"; photocopy at YCAL, box 34, folder "Keep Correspondence," 2 of 3.

There is more confusion about this book on pp. 288, last paragraph, to 289, line 2: "One of his gifts [to Claire Nivola] was a very personal book he called an *ABCedarian*, which he told Aldo was his way to 'avoid or postpone more urgent things...work without responsibility.' He was 'enjoying it a lot' as he illustrated every letter of the alphabet with a special meaning that was in many cases known only to him. He reserved the letter *E* for Elizabeth Stille"; notes on p. 649.

Since we are here in 1957, ST could not have been working on the 1954 alphabet book for Claire Nivola. Indeed, in the letter to Aldo Buzzi of December 30, 1957, cited in the note,

ST does not speak of such a book, nor does he call it an “*ABCedarian*” (which is, in any case, not a book but a person learning or teaching the alphabet): “To avoid or postpone more urgent things [probably the Brussels murals project] I’m doing a present for a child, a book of verses and illustrations. I’m enjoying it a lot. Work without responsibility.” The book is far more likely the one he made for Lucy, the young daughter of Elizabeth Stille, at this time. “Elizabeth” thus carried no “special meaning...known only to him,” but would have been obvious to Lucy. For this illustrated book of verses, see Alexander Stille, *The Force of Things: A Marriage in War and Peace* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2013), p. 271.

## Chapter 16

p. 220, paragraph 2, concerning Steinberg’s road trip with the Milwaukee Braves, on assignment from *LIFE* magazine: “**The players were intrigued** by the little man whose sketches captured the intensity of the game as well as its languor...”; note on p. 642.

The note reads: “Some of the drawings appear in *The Passport* (1954), others in *The Labyrinth* (1960).” There is one drawing in *The Passport*, four are in *The Labyrinth*. Bair neglects to mention the primary publication for which the drawings were made: “Steinberg at the Bat,” *Life*, July 11, 1955, pp. 56-61—a six-page color spread, with ten drawings. The drawings Bair describes in the rest of the paragraph are, with one exception, those in the books, not in *LIFE*.

Steinberg traveled with the Braves for one week, May 17-25, 1954; 1954 Year Book, YCAL, box 3.

p. 225, lines 1-2, “For the opening reception [for the publication of *The Passport*, 1954] he invited what would appear to an outsider to be a glittering list of celebrities....”

No sources are cited for this statement. The list of names that follows appears to have been drawn from a sheet in ST’s 1954 Year Book (YCAL, box 3), interleaved between August 18 and 19. Since there is no evidence that such a book launch took place, and the full list includes people living in England, France, and Italy, it is far more likely a list of recipients of complimentary copies.

pp. 225, last paragraph - 226, line 1, concerning ST’s mural project for the “Children’s Labyrinth” at the 1954 Milan Triennale: “He had created the designs on long sheets of scrolled paper before he left New York, then mailed them to Milan to be enlarged to the proper size for the wall. They were transferred a second time, to a kind of paper that could be placed directly onto the freshly applied plaster so he could do the actual *sgraffito*, incising the designs through the paper directly onto the walls.”

The above is an erroneous description of the process and ST’s participation. There was no second set of photographs. The walls were prepared with a dark coating. Then, as Smith recounts in *S:l*, p. 48, “Each [of the original drawings] was then enlarged onto wall-scale paper, which was laid over a fresh layer of wet plaster on the walls. Craftsmen, in a technique known as *sgraffito*, incised the designs and peeled the paper away.” ST himself only incised freehand on some remaining spaces; see *S:l*, figs. 45 and 46.

## Chapter 17

pp. 241, last 3 lines - p. 242, line 3, concerning ST’s 1955 visit to Tortoreto, where he had been interned in the spring of 1941. “As the bus belched its smoky way into the hills above Tortoreto, Steinberg chanced to glance out the window at the very moment the bus was passing the actual villa in which he had lived. ‘**There are—I didn’t know—two Tortoretos**, and I had gone to the wrong one!’ He made the driver stop the bus and jumped off in ‘the right one,’ Tortoreto Alto, where he walked around ‘recognizing with horror, every house, shop, tree, stores, types of people, dogs’”; note on p. 644.

Bair has again confused Tortoreto Alto and Tortoreto Stazione (see above, comment for p. 68, paragraph 3). The Villa Tonelli where Steinberg was interned was located in Tortoreto Stazione; see MTL, p. 350. Tortoreto Alto, as its name suggests, was a small hill town, about

five kilometers from the coastal town of Tortoreto Stazione. Thus ST could not have seen the Villa Tonelli from the bus making its way “into the hills above Tortoreto” and Tortoreto Alto is not “the right one.”

## Chapter 18

pp. 254-57. There are several instances here of a misleading use of sources. Among them:

p. 254, paragraph 3. “Hedda arrived [in Paris] on May 3, 1955, and moved into his room at the Hotel Pont Royal. Saul was sick of hotel living, and when their friend the painter Roberto Matta told him of an apartment at 26 Rue Jacob, he rented it sight unseen.”

No source is provided for this statement, but it seems to have been blown up from a passage in the ST-HS letter of April 27, 1955 (AAA, frame 754): “I met Matta in the street today, maybe we’ll get some apartment for rent here, for a few weeks. Would be nice. I’m sick of Hotel and I dread to go up & down cursing flunkeys.” That ST learned about the rue Jacob apartment from Matta is nowhere stated; as in many of ST’s letters to HS, independent thoughts are separated by commas. That ST “rented it sight unseen” is Bair’s contribution. They moved into the apartment on May 12 (1955 Year Book, YCAL, box 3).

p. 256, paragraph 2, concerning the correspondence of Rosa Steinberg (ST’s mother) in Nice to ST in Paris. “As if on cue, Rosa chose this moment to vent her frustration over Lica’s troubles [in getting a visa to leave Romania] by chastising Saul for buying such an expensive refrigerator, laying all the blame on Moritz as the one who put him up to it. She saved a portion of her ranting for Hedda, blaming her mother [i.e., Hedda’s mother] for ‘hiding’ her and Saul in Paris and selfishly refusing to let them go to Nice”; note on p. 646, “**envied for a moment.**”

The note refers to an ST-HS letter of April 15, 1955 (frame 744). ST says “mother desperate because of the expensive refrigerator blaming it all on father.” But in a letter of April 12 (frame 723), it was not the price of the refrigerator that bothered Rosa, but the cost of the electricity to run it—at least as ST envisioned the reaction of his penny-pinching mother: “I bought them a refrigerator, too big but noiseless. Terror of mother when finding out the thing will run day & night (only 10 francs a day worth of electricity but they’ll buy ice and put it in rather than use the unknown, the electricity).”

As for Rosa’s “ranting” about Hedda: no letters from Rosa or Moritz survive for the period from late January 1955 to early May. The only evidence for Bair’s elaborated statement is ST’s report to HS in a letter of April 25, 1955 (frame 750): “letters from mama - suspecting that I hide you here instigated by your mama - a childish mess.”

p. 256, last line - p. 257, line 4, “Confronted with bureaucratic slowness, worried about the need to bring in some cash, and not wanting to spend the summer in the heat of either Paris or New York, he sent Hedda home with instructions to rent a house on Cape Cod or anywhere else that had a sand beach, but definitely **NO** [the majuscule emphasis is Bair’s] **Stonington**”; note on p. 646.

The note reads: “ST to HS, ‘Friday night’ (April 1955).” Thus the remarks about a summer rental were written to Hedda prior to her *arrival* in Paris on May 3 (she left on June 19). ST did not “send her home” from Paris with any “instructions.” The relevant text of the letter reads: “About projects: I’d love to spend the summer - 2 months - by the ocean. Where? Even if you’ll come here for a while I’d still like to go back when hot weather comes. Cape Cod or anything else with a sand beach. No Stonington.”

## Chapter 19

pp. 262-73, ST’s trip to Russia (February 14-March 24, 1956). The pages describing ST’s activities are generally short on specific references, but many of the unsourced statements would appear to be from the cited 1956 National Diary (YCAL, box 7), a book ST used

exclusively for the Russian sojourn. His notations there are at best laconic and Bair seems to have fleshed them out with her own imaginings. Two examples:

p. 262, lines 10-12, concerning ST's preparations for the trip: "There was a lot to buy as well....He started with rubber stamps that read 'all rights reserved S St,' which was the signature he thought he would use on this trip."

ST's copyright stamps, which he had been using for several years, read "Copyright by Saul Steinberg All rights reserved." No stamps, including those on the Russian drawings, read "S St"—a form ST never used. The copyright stamps bear his full name, as was required by law. He probably abbreviated his name on the to-do list, from which shorthand Bair invents a "signature" for the Russian works. Moreover, ST's signature ("STEINBERG" or "ST") and the copyright notice are two different things, the latter appearing at the very bottom of a drawing, the former someplace above.

p. 268, paragraph 3, describing ST's visit to the theater in Kharkov. "He was 'picked up by girl in intermission' and left early. The next morning, in a different colored ink, he recorded a cryptic conversation in his diary wherein someone asks when the plane leaves and someone else responds 'At five'."

Though no source is given, it is the diary entry for March 6, 1956, which does not support the story. The passage reads:

--When does the plane leave? At 5?

--Please! (in Samarkand)

"Left early"—which suggests a liaison between ST and the girl who picked him up—is Bair's interpolation, as is the claim that the interrogator and responder are two different people. Finally, the conversation took place not in Kharkov, but in Samarkand, where ST arrived ten days later, resuming the diary with a pen of a different color.

## Chapter 20

pp. 277-279, on ST's advertising work. Errors of chronology, description, and fact abound. We are in the period immediately after ST's return from Russia in the spring of 1956. "Steinberg's work for Grey [advertising agency] was typical of the commercial work he did throughout the 1950s, particularly in the last half of the decade." In fact, this work tapered off considerably after mid-decade, and the advertising campaigns discussed range from 1945 to 1955. (The SSF archives contain a large notebook with all ST's advertisements.) Following are corrections for these pages.

p. 277, paragraph 3, "In that one, Steinberg drew a naked woman seated in a bathtub, similar to his drawing of the Paris bathtub"; note on p. 648.

Bair is describing an advertisement for Emerson televisions and radios, handled by the Grey agency. The cryptic note reads: "Joel Smith corroborates ST's habit of recycling old work for other purposes in *S:I*, p. 44." Smith was referring to ST's practice of recycling earlier drawings for advertising commissions. But Bair goes on to describe such drawings as if they were made for the commissions. This drawing was first published in TNY, February 19, 1949. The Emerson campaign dates from 1955. The drawing of a woman in bed, described in the previous paragraph, was published in TNY, December 18, 1948; both works were republished in ST's *The Art of Living*, 1949. See also comment below for p. 278, paragraph 3.

As for the "drawing of the Paris bathtub," it is nowhere else mentioned. The reference must be to a drawing in a bathtub in the Paris apartment at 26 rue Jacob (see above, comment for p. 254, paragraph 3), which was photographed by Robert Doisneau and Henri Cartier-Bresson (SSF archives). This "installation," however, was a recapitulation of a work of 1949 (reprod. on p. 153), which in turn relates to a series of woman-in-tub drawings that had appeared in *The Art of Living*.

p. 278, paragraph 1, last 4 lines, re: the *House & Garden* “for the House-Proud” campaign. This series of ads was published in TNY in April and May of 1948.

p. 278, paragraph 2, “Steinberg’s ads for Simplicity, the largest manufacturer of home sewing patterns, illustrate just how integral his nonsense drawings were to the sensible copy that came below them. A headline beneath his elaborately curlicued and swirled caricatures of women proclaimed ‘And she did it all by herself.’”

Using the plural, Bair takes one drawing to stand for all the ads in the campaign. There were at least eight different ads, all bearing the same slogan. Only one—a typical ST work of the early 1950s—can (somewhat imprecisely) be described as “elaborately curlicued...” etc. The woman is drawing a green dollar bill with a quill pen; hardly “nonsense.” The copy below explains how she will save money by sewing her own garments. None of the other Simplicity ads conforms to Bair’s description. In fact, they represent a brilliant compendium of ST’s visual vocabulary, using collage, rubber stamps, and sheet music integrated with drawn lines.

The Comptometer ads referred to later in the paragraph date from 1945.

p. 278, paragraph 3. “For Schweppes, he created a comedic double take when he drew a man and a woman in a living room whose furnishings resemble one of his interiors in *The New World*”; note on p. 648.

The Schweppes Quinine Water campaign was published in 1950. *The New World* was published fifteen years later, in 1965. The few interiors there bear no resemblance to those in the Schweppes ad; a more accurate comparison would be to the drawings in ST’s 1949 *The Art of Living*.

The note reads: “This drawing, like the ad he did for Postum in 1943, contains portions of subject matter used before.” The statement is nebulous. All of ST’s ads reflect, not surprisingly, the themes and motifs he was working with in any given period. Omitted here is the more relevant point—that ST recycled whole drawings to fulfill advertising assignments (though neither the Schweppes nor Postum ads do so).

p. 278, last paragraph, concerning the ads for Lewin-Mathes, manufacturers of copper pipes and tubing, which were published “under the general heading ‘We Teach Copper New Skill.’”

Only two of the ca. ten ads (1955-57) have this heading; the others are different.

## Chapter 21

p. 288, paragraph 3, last sentence, “As the relationship among the three [ST, HS, Elizabeth Stille] intensified, it was enlarged naturally to include Elizabeth’s children—first her infant son, Alexander, and later his younger sister, Lucy.”

The order of the birth of the Stille children is reversed. Lucy was born in 1951, Alexander in 1957; see Alexander Stille, *The Force of Things: A Marriage in War and Peace* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2013), p. 255.

p. 289, paragraph 1, re: the “E” in ST’s alphabet book for Claire Nivola. See above, comment for p. 205.

p. 291, paragraph 1, concerning the emigration of ST’s sister, Lica, and her family from Bucharest to Vienna in 1957. “...while [ST, in Milan] was bombarding officials and friends with telegrams and phone calls [about their arrival], they were doing the same to him. He decided he had do something, so he flew to Vienna after he sent wires to the station master at the main *bahnhof*, the International Refugee Committee, and the American consul, telling them all that he was on his way the next morning.”

The above is but half the story of ST’s efforts to meet the refugees; in the second half, he never went to Vienna. This makes more sense of the otherwise confusing rest of the paragraph, wherein ST receives assurance from his parents in Nice and the Vienna station master that his family had arrived and goes to Genoa to greet them. The only source for Bair’s

narration is in the note on p. 650 for “**In Nice, his parents were ‘frantic’**”: “Much of this correspondence, dated September 3 through 27, is in Romanian letters, YCAL, Box 8.”

The individual letters of the correspondence clarify the situation. In a letter to HS, September 3, 1957 (AAA, frame 797), ST writes:

Great confusion. Nobody knows anything. I hope that you’ll receive a cable (in case I locate them) before this letter. I’ll probably fly to Vienna tomorrow morning.

I spent the day telephoning & telegr. Vienna and Nice (including the Station Master of Vienna Westbahnhof, Refugee Committee, Joint, American Consul.)

Love Saul

But then he appends a note at the bottom of the letter: “Just received telegram from [his parents in] Nice - Everybody arrived well in Vienna, will be here tomorrow.” Then, on September 5, he receives a telegram from Lica’s husband, sent from Villach to ST in Milan: “ON THE TRAIN DOCUMENTS WITHHELD STOP COMPELLED TO TRAVEL TO GENOA” (YCAL, box 8, folder “Correspondence, 1958”). This is why, as Bair recounts later in the paragraph, ST went from Milan to Genoa to greet Lica and her family. The presumed trip to Vienna arises from a partial reading of the documents.

## Chapter 22

pp. 295-298, concerning Steinberg’s mural, *The Americans*, for the US Pavilion at the 1958 Brussels World’s Fair.

There are no references for most of the details about Steinberg’s work on the project. For an accurate overview and sources, see Smith, *S:I*, pp. 50-52, and cat. 37, pp. 142-43. Since the publication of Bair’s book, the murals were exhibited at the Museum Ludwig, Cologne. The well-illustrated catalogue for that show contains the most recent scholarship: *Saul Steinberg: The Americans*, ed. Andreas Prinzing, Museum Ludwig, March 22-June 23, 2013, especially the essays by Melissa Renn and Prinzing.

Among the errors in Bair’s account, unrelated to the Ludwig catalogue:

p. 295, paragraph 2, lines 1-2: “The American Pavilion was a domed building with an adjacent annex, both designed by Edward Durrell Stone.”

The American Pavilion had no dome. It had a nearly flat roof with a circular skylight at center. Photographs are available online; see also p. 16, fig. 1, in the Ludwig catalogue.

p. 296, paragraph 2, lines 1-4, “**Before he began** to arrange old drawings or make new ones, he studied techniques to find which one would work best and he made a series of notes about his overall intentions. As he promised himself to do after the 1954 *labirinto* mural in Milan, **he had worked on perfecting** the technique of *sgraffito* in the 71<sup>st</sup> Street basement, and he felt confident about adding it to the other techniques he planned to use in Brussels”; notes on p. 650.

The first note reads: “Statement for Murals for Brussels World’s Fair,” YCAL, box 6. Neither this nor any other document—from ST or the Pavilion organizers—mentions *sgraffito*. Bair’s second note refers to an ST-HS letter of 1954 about the use of *sgraffito* for the 1954 Milan Triennale project. The technique could not have been used on the planned freestanding walls in Brussels, since it would have required the application of a dark undercoat, with wet plaster above, so that the line could be scratched through. The undercoat and plaster would have prevented the use of collage (the “other technique he planned to use”), which was part of the project from the outset. See, for example, Bernard Rudofsky (ST’s friend and designer of the pavilion’s interior) to ST, December 5, 1957 (YCAL, box 6, folder “Correspondence 1957,” 2 of 3): “The technique: ink drawing, enlarged photographically or photostatically. In order to add sparkle and spots of color, I wish you could come to Brussels for a week or so, and complete the installed enlargement with printed matter, ribbons, buttons, passamenterie [*sic*], medals, etc. We would then glaze your montage with a washable mat finish.”

Moreover, there is no document by that exact name in YCAL, box 6. Bair is referring to a longhand statement by ST headed “Murals commissioned by the State Dept for the US

Pavillion—Brussels Worlds Fair"; it is attached to a typed description of the project, edited in ST's hand, which begins "Commissioned by the U. S. State Department through the architect Edward Stone for its pavilion, the mural—or murals..."; YCAL, box 6, folder "Correspondence 1959," 3 of 3. This text was drafted in 1959, months after the fair closed. It was written, in the past tense, as an introduction to the monograph on ST's Brussels murals then being prepared by Delpire Éditeur, Paris. (The project, described by Bair on p. 299, was never realized; see also Renn's essay in the Ludwig catalogue, note 58.) A letter from ST to Robert Delpire, April 26, 1959 (YCAL, box 6, folder "Correspondence 1959"), contains a typed version of the handwritten statement.

p. 296, paragraph 2, lines 4-6, "He finished fifteen pen-and-ink drawings, which were then photographed and enlarged to the sizes they would fill on the walls before brown-paper cutouts were made of most of them."

The brown-paper cutouts were not made from the enlarged drawings. The enlarged drawings were architectural settings that served as background for ST's cutouts of figures—the Americans—which he made and applied onsite.

p. 296, paragraph 2, lines 8-12, "Some of the titles he settled on were 'The Road, 'Main Street—Small Town,' 'Downtown—Big City,' 'Farmers,' 'Drugstore,' 'Cocktail Party,' and the all-American pastime, 'Baseball.' Because Europeans were fascinated by California and Texas, he included scenes from those two states and threw in Florida as well."

ST gave no titles for the 1958 presentation, and none appear in any contemporaneous articles. The titles Bair gives are those provided by ST for the 1967 exhibition of six of the murals in a traveling show that began in Brussels (Prinzing in the Ludwig catalogue, p. 101), organized by Pierre Baudson. Baudson had apparently asked ST to title each mural, which ST did in a letter to Baudson dated January 10, 1967 (Prinzing, fig. 2; copy at SSF). The titles given above are those in the 1967 letter.

p. 298, paragraphs 2 and 3 to p. 299, paragraph 1, concerning the relationship between ST and HS in the period following the completion of the Brussels mural in April 1958, as attested by their correspondence: "...he was depressed when he woke up [in his Paris hotel] but blamed it on 'a hangover of the three weeks excitement in Brussels,' conveniently ignoring the unsettled triangular situation he had left at home with Hedda and Elizabeth Stille. He invited Hedda to come to Paris and travel with him....**He urged Hedda not to doubt** either his love or his need for her...but the problem was, as she knew, that he felt the same emotions for Elizabeth Stille. Hedda replied with an uncharacteristically frank letter. '**Decisions, decisions,**' she began, as she addressed his instruction that she should not make hers on the basis of his 'desire or need.' She asked if he would allow her to make the definitive decision about him and Elizabeth if he were not so riddled with doubt"; notes on p. 651.

The narration implies that ST and HS corresponded about his affair with Elizabeth Stille (pp. 289-90). They did not. Both cited letters are about other matters. The letter from ST to HS, which Bair does not cite, is undated, but headed "Sunday," after his return to Paris from Brussels on April 16; thus it was written on April 20 (AAA, frames 824-825). The relevant passages read:

Dearest Rabbitser, I miss you a lot these days, I'm depressed. A hangover of the 3 weeks excitement in Bruxelles. Do you want to come here? I'm now off to Nice and in a few days to Spoleto....I'll look around for a home - if I'll find something I'd spend a few months in Italy. But I'm not sure, I have the jitters of Europe, insecure etc. Would you like to come? If you don't want to come here I'll come to NY right after I finish the Spoleto thing. I'll give up the play in London....Please answer immediately and advice without doubts of my love & need for you if you feel like coming here.

Love S



HS's "frank" reply is in an undated letter, which Bair cites as "YCAL, microfilm letters" (for this problematic reference, see above, comments for p. 132, paragraph 1 and p. 137, paragraph 4, among others). The letter is YCAL, box 85, folder "Hedda Sterne Letters, n.d.," 1 of 2, probably written April 24-25. The "decision" HS has to make is about whether she should come to Europe, as ST had asked; that's all. HS does note that ST told her she should act without "doubts of my love & need for you," and she does chastise him for asking her to decide, advising that he should make the decision based on "what you really need." But there is no mention of, or allusion to, Elizabeth Stille in this letter or elsewhere. The relevant passages read:

Decisions, decisions! And I don't think I can tell you a thing you don't already know. You say you miss me—to decide without doubting your love and need. If there were no reasons for doubt—if you yourself did not have them—would you leave the decision to me? But that's not the important part. I'd (as you well know) rather be far, with your goodwill—than the other way around. The important thing is to feel well—and work with appetite—with or without me. [HS then goes on to report on the painting of the house and suggests renting it if she goes to Europe.]

Note: HS's own doubts about ST's love and ST's counter-assurances are a leitmotif of their correspondence in the mid-1950s, when the marriage was under great strain because of ST's many affairs, some of which HS knew of or suspected. But it is most unlikely that HS had any suspicions about Elizabeth Stille at this time. In at least five letters to ST between March and May she mentions meetings with ES, alone or *en famille*—going to dinner, a concert, the theater, the circus (March 22, March 30, May 1, May 3, May 7; all YCAL, box 85, "Hedda Sterne Letters, n.d.," folder 2 of 2). There is no foundation for Bair's interpolation of ES into the above correspondence.

Bair continues at the bottom of p. 298, referring to the same HS letter: "For the first time, she told him how she thought he treated her as 'an object of dislike and irritation in New York,' where she had her 'functions' and served his needs because he was away from home so much that he seldom saw her." The statement is based on a mistranscription of the letter. HS wrote:

I like changes, I like travel, I love Italy—but I hate being an undesirable burden—an object of dislike and irritation. In N.Y.—I have my functions—I am serviceable and you don't see me much. Conclusion. It's for you to know what you want—what you feel—what you really need. Whatever you decide you'll have the blessing of [signed] Monster.

Thus HS did not claim ST treated her poorly in New York. She was distinguishing between her sense of usefulness at home vs. the fear that she would be a burden, a disruption to his work, were she to join him in Europe. The word "In" following "irritation" is clearly a capital letter that begins a new sentence.

## Chapter 23

p. 307, paragraph 2, speaking of ST's summer 1958 trip to the American South: "He filled a sketchbook with drawings from cities like Aberdeen, Maryland; South Hill, Virginia; Greensboro, North Carolina; Greenville, South Carolina; Chattanooga, Tennessee; Athens, Georgia; Middlesboro, Kentucky, Williamson, West Virginia, and Uniontown, Pennsylvania"; note on p. 652.

The itinerary is taken from that published in Smith, *S:I*, p. 258. The note inaccurately credits YCAL sketchbook 4891. Smith was quoting from Steinberg's handwritten itinerary on p. 21 of sketchbook 4929.

p. 312, paragraph 1, concerning Steinberg's negotiations with Hallmark for an illustrated calendar. ST objected to the proposed contract, which gave Hallmark complete title to the artwork. "'This is unfair and I cannot agree to it,' [ST] insisted. After several rounds of increasingly tense negotiation, Hallmark withdrew its claim of ownership and the matter was settled in Steinberg's favor"; note on p. 653 for "**could authorize anyone.**"

The note reads: "Robert H. Busler of Hallmark, April 17, 1959; ST to Hallmark, n.d. but shortly after; both YCAL, Box 6."

The dates of the correspondence (in box 6, folder "Correspondence 1959") are inaccurate. Busler's contract-letter is dated April 1. April 17 is the date of ST's response. A search through box 6, as well as correspondence folders for these years in boxes, 5, 8, and 14, has turned up no subsequent "rounds of...negotiation."

## Chapter 24

p. 318, on the end of ST and HS's marriage, wherein HS demands that ST leave.

The assertion is sourced to HS interviews with Bair. But the few documents that Bair cites offer conflicting evidence or are applied to the dissolution of the marriage without justification. Whether it was Dear John or Dear Jane remains uncertain.

At the bottom of p. 318, for example, Bair quotes HS to ST: "I am afraid that all you have is a fear of my possible ill-will toward you and the superstition that it might mythically [*sic*, for magically] affect you!...Just let me know and I'll vanish from your life as if I had never been. With all my love (strange isn't it?)." No source is given, but the passage is taken from an undated letter (AAA, frames 194, 195). If it does apply to the break-up of the marriage, the decision would seem to have been ST's.

In the first paragraph, Bair writes "**She had asked him to leave** because she could no longer endure 'the terror that grips the shoulders....'" The note for this passage, on p. 654, is to "ST, diary, May 19, 1991, YCAL, box 75"; it is also a "story repeated often" in HS's conversations with Bair. None of these conversations is quoted. What is quoted to describe Hedda's emotions at this time was written by ST more than thirty years later to define his own state of mind in 1991, one which, he felt, she shared during the marriage: "Visit Hedda at 4. Talk about the terror that grips the shoulders. She too had it during my tenure." There is no evidence that ST, in 1991, was alluding to the breakup of the marriage in the spring of 1960. Moreover, he uses "terror" in the previous day's entry to describe his own emotional condition: "Terror tries to creep back - I fight it." In the May 19 entry, the word also expresses his father's fear of his mother. It is chronologically and contextually misleading to apply the quotation to HS's feelings about the marriage in 1960, or even presume that it refers to the marriage rather than to the general existential dread they seem to have shared.

The "terror that grips the shoulders" passage was earlier misused on p. 289 to document the feelings with which "Hedda woke up every day" in the later 1950s because of ST's "philandering ways."

## Chapter 25

p. 328, paragraph 2, lines 6-7: Sigrid Spaeth [ST's new girlfriend in 1960] "was slightly taller than Saul, between five-eight and five-ten...."

The photograph reproduced on p. 327, taken c. 1960, shows Sigrid slightly shorter than ST—who was, at the time of his Selective Service Examination in August 1942, "5' 6 ¼" inches" tall (Military Records, SSF, Enlisted Personnel File). Assuming ST lost no height over the next eighteen years and Sigrid was not wearing heels in the photograph, she would be about 5' 5 inches in height.

## Chapter 26

p. 341, paragraph 3, concerning ST's correspondence with HS about subletting her New York apartment in 1961: "His most pressing task was to persuade her not to lease the apartment to

an artist friend who could only pay a miniscule rent. 'It's not fair; it's too cheap.' he told her, but once again she ignored his advice"; note on p. 658.

The note reads: "ST to HS, August 20, 1961, AAA. The artist is identified only as 'Ruth' in the correspondence from this period." Ruth is clearly Ruth Nivola, wife of his good friend Tino. As the rest of the letter (AAA, frame 873) makes clear, ST is writing from Springs, where the Nivolas lived across the road. The full passage reads: "Ruth asked me some time ago to write you that she would like to rent the apt in 71<sup>st</sup> street but she wants to pay only 250. I hesitated to write you because - and I told her so - it's not fair, too cheap."

## Chapter 27

p. 351, paragraph 2: "Steinberg, who was born into the working class and now moved easily within the upper classes...."

By no accepted definition of the term was ST's family "working class." One grandfather was a tailor, another a merchant, his father a small businessman with his own shop. "Lower middle-class" or "petite bourgeoisie" would be a more accurate description.

p. 355, paragraphs 2 and 3, concerning ST and the sense of smell: "**The story** [Gogol's "The Nose"] was especially resonant for Steinberg, whose sense of smell was so intense that he used verbal descriptions of how something or someone smelled almost as often as he used visual imagery to convey how it looked"; note on p. 661.

The note reads: "Tape transcription, 'Side B #28404,' p. 17A, SSF, published as 'The Artist Speaks,' *Art in America*, November-December, 1970, pp. 110-117." The reference to the transcription, located at SSF, is misleading. SSF's files contain a photocopy. The original transcription is at the Archives of American Art. The typed transcription, with many handwritten corrections and editorial markings (not by ST), was the basis for Grace Glueck's published interview, "The Artist Speaks" (see comment for p. 421, paragraph 2). The quotations that follow in Bair's note do not, however, appear in the published version.

At the end of paragraph 3, Bair writes: "Images of noses fill his sketchbooks, and in one, a man sits on a chair with a small table between him and another chair on which sits a gigantic nose. He called it 'I talk to my Nose about Childhood.'" This drawing (now at YCAL, inv. 3341) is not in a sketchbook. It is one of a series of "ex-votos" ST did in the 1980s with autobiographical texts below the drawings; see Smith, *S:I*, p. 212, for the series and, for a reproduction of the nose drawing, including the three additional lines of text, *Saul Steinberg*, exh. cat., Institut Valencià d'Art Modern, Valencia, Spain, 2002, p. 36.

## Chapter 28

pp. 370, last paragraph - 371, line 2: "His next stop [on a 1964 trip] was India—first Bombay...and then Calcutta, where his flight, 'Great Eastern 229!' touched down at midnight on New Year's Eve, 1964. He spent the next day at the New Market..."; note on p. 664.

In the 1964 datebook cited in the note, ST dated the Calcutta arrival to January 2, not New Year's Eve: "1/2 arrive midnight Great Eastern - 229!" "Great Eastern," moreover, was not the name of his flight but of his hotel—the same hotel where he had stayed in June-July 1943, en route to his wartime assignment in China. Hence ST's exclamation point. A photocopy of one of the 1943 hotel bills is at YCAL, box 1, folder "Navy," 1 of 2; a drawing inscribed "Great Eastern Hotel, Calcutta 1943" (Yale University Art Gallery, inv. 2006.52.103) was published in TNY, February 24, 1945. Another drawing of a hospital ward (unpublished) is at YCAL, inv. 5212, inscribed "June 12, 1943 G[reat].E[astern].H[otel]."

## Chapter 29

p. 377, last paragraph: "Once back [from a trip with Sigrid Spaeth to the American West in the summer of 1964], Saul...concentrat[ed] on the illustrations Aldo [Buzzi] wanted for a short book he was writing, which was intended for a primarily Italian audience: a loosely woven

description of his travels through America coupled with his philosophical musings on such topics as ‘the limitations of liberty.’ The text fit Steinberg’s current concerns, and some of his quasi-philosophical drawings seemed appropriate as illustrations....”

No references are supplied for the above, nor can a book of this description be found among Buzzi’s writings. In 1974, Buzzi did publish *Piccolo diario americano* (Milan, All’Insegna del Pesce d’Oro), with fifteen ST drawings, which recounts his US trip of 1954. However, the book contains no “philosophical musings,” and ST’s drawings are trifles—slight sketches of people, small-town architecture—that have no “quasi-philosophical” import. The hyphenated adjective best describes ST’s drawings for Paul Tillich’s *My Search for Absolutes*, published in 1967 (discussed by Bair, pp. 389-92).

## Chapter 30

p. 380, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s work on *Le Masque*, published by Maeght Éditeur in 1966: “Before [ST and Sigrid] left [for a trip to the Caribbean in January 1965], Steinberg had mailed to Maeght in Paris a collection of drawings plus the thirty-three photos that he and Inge Morath had decided upon for the publication that Maeght titled *Le Masque*”; note on p. 665.

The photos are those Morath took of people in social settings wearing ST’s paper-bag masks. Bair tells of Morath’s first encounter with ST’s masks, without source. The source is Morath’s introduction to *Saul Steinberg: Masquerade. Photographs by Inge Morath* (Viking Studio, 2000). But Bair, with a little help from Morath, gets the chronology wrong. “For their first session in 1956...,” she writes, using the date in Morath’s introduction, written more than forty years after the encounter. Morath began photographing the ST masks in 1959—the year he began to create them. The dates of the photographs, including those described by Bair, are fixed, ranging from 1959 to 1962, with most dating 1961-62. Magnum Photos, in cooperation with The Inge Morath Foundation, has posted the images at:

[http://www.magnumphotos.com/C.aspx?VP3=SearchResult&VBID=2K1HZOQI44B7\\_9&SMLS=1&RW=1185&RH=502](http://www.magnumphotos.com/C.aspx?VP3=SearchResult&VBID=2K1HZOQI44B7_9&SMLS=1&RW=1185&RH=502)

In a note on p. 666 for the passage “It was quickly apparent” (bottom of p. 380), Bair writes: “Accordingly to SSF, ST allegedly sent 33 photos but only 22 were used. SSF dates their beginning to 1959...” (followed by a reference to the above Magnum website). The number 33 is not an SSF allegation, but from Bair’s own statement quoted above; neither is the lesser number, arrived at by counting the mask photos in the book.

It should be made clear to the reader that the Morath photos constitute only about 10% of the reproductions in *Le Masque*; the rest of the images are unrelated ST drawings of 1965-66, most of which were not in the 1966 Maeght Steinberg exhibition. The works in the exhibition appear in *Derrière le miroir* (described on p. 381, paragraph 4).

p. 385, paragraph 2, concerning the apartment ST bought for Sigrid: “[H]e told her to find an apartment...and he would buy it for her. She jumped at the chance to have a permanent home, mortgage free and legally in her name, and choose one...at 375 Riverside Drive.”

No source is given, or any specific year, but the surrounding discussion puts the time frame around 1965. However, the apartment on Riverside Drive was a rental until 1983. On July 12 of that year, ST writes to AB that he “bought the apartment on Riverside Drive, which became a cooperative or condominium” (unpublished passage of the letter). The correct date for the purchase of the apartment appears on p. 500.

## Chapter 31

There is confusion throughout about the chronology of ST’s development, the sources cited, and the relationship between his drawings for philosopher Paul Tillich’s book *My Search for Absolutes* (1967) and those assembled in *The New World* (1965).

p. 389, paragraph 1: “In terms of the evolution of Steinberg’s oeuvre, 1966 was a watershed year. His subject matter took several interesting new turns as he used themes and ideas that

had been successful in the past to create work of a more philosophical nature, work that he said was ‘camouflaged as a cartoon’ but did not really belong in that category”; note on p. 667.

The note reads: “Stein [vanden Heuvel], unedited transcript of interview.” The full reference to this abbreviated citation does not appear until p. 393; see below, comment for p. 393, paragraph 2. Bair could only be referring here to the typescript in box 69, which contains mostly discarded material from what became vanden Heuvel’s “Straight from the Hand and Mouth of Steinberg,” *LIFE*, December 10, 1965, pp. 59-70. The quoted passage, however, appears only in the published version in *LIFE* (p. 66).

As for the first sentence of the chapter—that “1966 was a watershed year” with works “of a more philosophical nature”—the statement is puzzling. The description might apply to ST’s drawings for Tillich’s book, but the rest of the chapter discusses drawings from ST’s *The New World*, which includes works dating as early as 1960, some of them of a “philosophical nature.” Among other examples, the “Descartes” drawing cited on p. 394 was published in *TNY* December 22, 1962.

P. 392, lines 4-5 from the bottom, “Steinberg was working on his new book [*The New World*] during the time he worked on Tillich’s...”

*The New World* was published in October 1965, the same month Tillich died. As Bair notes on p. 390, there was discussion with ST about drawings for Tillich’s book prior to the philosopher’s death, but ST was too busy with other commitments. The contract was not signed until June 1966 (letter of agreement from Anthony Schulte to Alexander Lindey, YCAL, box 1, folder “Contracts 1944-67”). There is no reason to assume that ST was engaged with the Tillich drawings while assembling the drawings for *The New World*.

p. 393, paragraph 2, “In preparation for the book’s launch [publication of *The New World*], Steinberg gave a series of interviews to his friend Jean Stein in the summer of 1965...”; note on p. 393.

The note reads: “The interviews are collected as typescripts under the names of Jean Stein, Jean Stein vanden Heuvel and Jean Vanden and are in YCAL, Boxes 15, 16, 38, and 69....” Only one of these typescripts, that in box 69 (folder “Notes on ‘An Interview with Saul Steinberg’ by Jean vanden Heuvel, photocopy”), is from 1965. The typescript in box 16 was prepared as reading material for a 6<sup>th</sup>-grade class from the *LIFE* publication; box 15 contains a tape, probably of the interview in box 69; and the interview in box 38 is dated August 11, 1978.

p. 398, last 5 lines, “In *The New World*, this drawing [the man with the rabbit inside his head, used as the cover drawing for *The Labyrinth* in 1960] appeared on the back jacket flap, which Steinberg defended by saying that he had ‘no business to put a drawing on the jacket of a book of drawings.’ He thought it best to leave the rabbit man where he was, where he would be the reader’s last (and lasting) impression as he closed the book.”

ST’s remarks about the book jacket refer to the non-pictorial cover of *The New World*, not to the man-rabbit drawing on the back jacket flap of the book. The latter appears merely as a publisher’s advertisement for ST’s earlier book, *The Labyrinth*, whose title is printed in boldface beneath the image. The quotation isn’t sourced, though Bair seems to suggest that it comes from a Jean Stein interview; SSF cannot find this passage either in the published *LIFE* version or the transcript.

## Chapter 32

p. 406, paragraph 2, “His stipend for the three months [as artist-in-residence at the Smithsonian] was a handsome \$25,000, with an extra \$3,000 for the ‘unavoidable expenses of relocation’”; note on p. 669.

ST was at the Smithsonian for four months, and he received a total of \$11,332; see F.G. Barwick (on behalf of the Smithsonian) to ST, January 9, 1967, YCAL, box 16, folder “Correspondence, 1967,” 2 of 7. As the formal letter of invitation stated, that sum was made

up of “a regular stipend of \$2,083 a month [i.e., the annual of stipend \$25,000, pro rated]...[and] in view of the shortness of your stay and the unavoidable extra expenses of relocation...a special living allowance of \$3000 for the period of January 10-May 10, 1967”; S. Dillon Ripley to ST, undated, but probably January 1967, YCAL, box 16, folder “Correspondence, 1967,” 3 of 7.

In her note, Bair refers to another letter from Ripley to ST, but it is not clear what in the text it is documenting. The note also refers to an article that gives the correct amount.

p. 411, paragraph 3, “However, it was the rubber stamp—the ‘cliché,’ as Steinberg called it—that gave the real ‘political meaning’ to his work. For him, ‘the cliché is the expression of the culture of a period,’ and in his ‘territory, which is satire,’ he served up both ‘mediocrity and clichés’ whenever he criticized the things he did not like”; note on p. 671.

The note reads: “‘Saul Steinberg Interview,’ in YCAL, Box 67. This unidentified document is misidentified in *S:I*, p. 245, n. 126 as ‘June 1, 1968’ interview. The correct date is assumed to be 1986, but the interviewer remains unknown.” The document is not misidentified in *S:I*, where the date of June 1986 is clearly printed. The interview, which is in an unlabeled folder, has now been identified as by Jean Robertson. It is a typed draft, with changes and deletions in ST’s hand, for the exhibition brochure “Saul Steinberg,” Columbus Museum of Art (Ohio), 1986. “Political meaning,” however, is not in this interview. It comes from a passage deleted by ST in Meg Perlman, “An Interview with Saul Steinberg,” April 15, 1975, p. 1, YCAL, box 32, folder “Correspondence.” ST was not speaking of clichés, but of cleaning rotting tree trunks from his property in Amagansett, an activity which for him had “a moral, a political meaning.”

### Chapter 33

p. 413, line 8, a trip to Mexico in 1968 “where nothing was the same as he remembered it from his 1948 trip with Hedda and the Cartier-Bressons.”

The earlier trip, mentioned by Bair on p. 160, paragraph 2, was in 1947. They were accompanied by Miguel Covarrubias.

pp. 421-422. There are several imprecise references and quotations in this section concerning ST’s trip to Africa in 1970, all seemingly based on the same source.

p. 421, paragraph 2, “In later years Steinberg always joked that he went to Kenya to meet ‘a crocodile man [who] thought he was going to have a nice crock talk with me’”; note on p. 421. The note reads: “From what appears to be the earliest transcript of the conversations with Grace Glueck that became the article ‘The Artist Speaks,’ *Art in America*, November-December 1970, pp. 110-17.” The location of this transcript is not given; it is at the Archives of American Art, Oral History Program, and is edited by hand, probably by Glueck (see also comment above for p. 16, paragraph 2). Only one transcript is known. The correct quotation (transcript, p. 2) reads: “crocodile lover that he was going to have a nice crock talk with me.” The passage was edited for the published version (pp. 115-16): “He [the biologist] thought I was a crocodile lover because I have drawn them often and that as a conservationist and crocodileophile himself he was going to have a nice croc talk with me.”

p. 422, paragraph 2, line 4, “Steinberg observed how the biologist killed and dissected crocodiles”; note on p. 672. The note reads: “Information that follows is from Glueck, unedited transcripts of interviews, copies at SSF.” Again, there is only one transcript and it is edited. Of the remaining quotations on the page, all appear (sometimes with slight alterations) in the published version, save for “Nobody in the world...two systems” and “the monster...modesty and nonchalance,” which are only in the typescript. ST’s remark that the crocodile symbolized any “administration in evil form, political power in general...” should read (in both versions) “administration in every form.”

### Chapter 34

p. 428, paragraph 3, speaking of the drawing *Bleecker Street* (1970), which reflects “his serious explorations of materials and techniques that he had experimented with only briefly in the past. To render the drawing, he added graphite, colored pencil, and watercolor to his usual crisp black line.”

No watercolor was used in the drawing, but rather colored crayon; see *S:I*, cat. 66. The drawing was used as the cover for TNY, January 16, 1971.

p. 429, paragraph 3, “The last of the five *New Yorker* covers [in 1971] was far more serene, a collection of six small paintings he called ‘Six Sunsets,’ positioned to resemble two rows of postcards, mini-canvases depicting Steinberg’s fascination with the way the light changed throughout the day at Louse Point [the beach near his country house in Amagansett].”

No sources are provided for this sentence. The drawing (present whereabouts unknown) appeared as the cover of TNY, September 25, 1971, but SSF has no record that it was entitled “Six Sunsets” (a title used for other, related works). It was not the last cover of that year, but the penultimate. Nor do the landscapes depict or refer to Louse Point. Steinberg produced scores of these “postcard-style” landscapes, titled with names of cities around the world. They are differentiated only by the placement of rubber-stamp figures, suns, and other elements, almost none reflecting a specific locale. The images are willful clichés, their banality reinforced by the global titles.

p. 430, lines 10-11, “[ST] relished being in the distinguished company of Michel Butor and Roland Barthes, whom he knew through their essays for the two volumes about his work in the *Derrière le Miroir* series....”

Neither writer contributed to *DLM*. Butor wrote an introduction to *Le Masque* (1966) and Barthes wrote *All Except You* in 1983; see second comment above for p. 43, paragraph 3.

p. 433, paragraph 4, “Of all the work connected with the 1973 Paris show [at the Galerie Maeght], he was surprised by how pleased he was with the lithographs, especially the drawing he called ‘Le mois du coeur’ in homage to February and Valentine’s Day.”

No sources are provided for this statement. There were no lithographs in the 1973 Maeght show. ST may have been referring to the three limited-edition original lithographs published by Maeght on the occasion of the 1973 exhibition (*Union Square*, *Papeterie*, and *Bleecker Street*). The title “Le mois du coeur” does not appear in the checklist for *Derrière le miroir* or in any of the photographic records at the Galerie Maeght (copies at SSF).

p. 435, paragraph 2, “He began to make the tables, both the flat tabletop assemblages and the three-dimensional stand-alone pieces in the early 1970s....Steinberg called one of the most intriguing (and possibly concealing) ‘Furniture as Biography.’ It was one of the three-dimensional pieces which he chose not to sell and kept in the basement at Springs for years, although he allowed it to be shown late in his life, in 1987, under a different title (‘Grand Hotel’); once again he refused to sell it. On this table was a collection of furniture of the size usually associated with dollhouses....**Many were three-dimensional replicas of furniture** that was loosely reminiscent of the hotel rooms he stayed in during his travels...”; note on p. 675.

The “flat tabletop assemblages” refer to ST’s Drawing Table reliefs, also known as Table Series. They were not “flat,” but multimedia relief assemblages on wood, with painted, drawn, rubber-stamped, and carved objects; all were made to be hung vertically.

*Furniture as Biography*: Bair implicitly dates the sculpture to the early 1970s. The work dates from 1986 (*S:I*, p. 216), so ST did not “keep it in the basement for years,” refusing to sell it. He sent it to the Pace Gallery in 1987 for the exhibition “Steinberg: Recent Work” (reproduced on p. 22 of the catalogue), where it was for sale, along with everything else in the show. It did not sell. According to Pace’s records, it was returned to ST in 1989; sometime thereafter, he disassembled it. Several of the carved components remain at SSF.

The description of the carved furniture as “replicas” is inaccurate. In this table, as in other works of the type, the objects are simple, boxlike squares or rectangles, with lines drawn

around their edges. There is no specificity to any of them, and they serve as ciphers for bed, table, dresser, etc.

The note for these “three-dimensional replicas” reads: “He left them to Yale University and they currently make up YCAL, Boxes 134-72. The objects themselves were not in the YCAL bequest and are in SSF.” The last sentence is true. But what was “left to Yale” in the first sentence is a mystery; and boxes 134-72 constitute all the boxes with ST artwork at YCAL.

In the last paragraph on p. 435, the wood construction entitled *Library* is dated 1986-87.

## Chapter 35

p. 441, paragraph 4 - p. 442, line 2, concerning the reception of ST’s Drawing Table reliefs at the 1973 Galerie Maeght exhibition: “French audiences were not as captivated by the tables as the Americans had been, nor were the critics. Edith Schloss, the reviewer for an important arbiter of European taste, the *International Herald Tribune*, thought they had none of Steinberg’s sharp and precise irony or inventive wit. She dismissed his latest work....She heaped the most scorn on the table Steinberg was proudest of, the ‘Politecnico’....Steinberg was not prepared for critics who thought the tables were self-indulgent and sentimental....Despite the muted critical reception, sales were good, but that was not enough to assuage his miffed feelings”; note on p. 676 for “biting its own tail.”

Bair here misrepresents the critical reception to the Maeght show in order to give ST yet another cause for depression. The note cites Schloss’s review in the *IHT*, October 27-28, 1973. But Edith Schloss was not a French reviewer—she was a Rome-based American expat artist and art critic—and the *IHT* was not an arbiter of French taste. The French had their own reviewers, all of whom greeted ST’s tables with enthusiastic and thoughtful commentary. Among them: Gilbert Lascault, *L’Art Vivant*, October 18, 1973; Jacques Michel, *Le Monde*, November 11, 1973; B. Teyssèche, *Le Nouvel Observateur*, November 5, 1973; and Jeanine Warnod, *Le Figaro*, October 24, 1973.

As for the “Politecnico” on which Schloss “heaped the most scorn”: the work in question is *The Politecnico Table*, described by Bair on pp. 434-35 and reproduced in color in the plate section following p. 398 (*S:I*, cat. 71). Schloss never mentions this work (or any other) in her review; signed and dated 1974 (correctly dated in Bair’s caption), *The Politecnico Table* was absent from the 1973 Maeght exhibition. That Steinberg was “proudest” of it is another invention.

## Chapter 36

p. 449, paragraph 1, concerning the death of ST’s sister, Lica, in 1975: “Steinberg flew at once to Paris and was with [Lica’s] children when she was buried next to her husband and parents on July 18, 1975.”

Confusion here about burial sites. Lica died in Paris, and was buried in the Cimetière de Bagneux-Parisien (death notice in *Le Monde*, October 13, 1961, YCAL, box 14, “Correspondence, 1959-61,” 1 of 3), where her mother had been buried in 1961 (see the cemetery plan in YCAL, box 22, “Lica Correspondence,” 2 of 2). But Moritz Steinberg, Lica and ST’s father, was buried in Nice, near where he and Rosa were living at the time of his death; see Lica’s letter to ST, August 2, 1960 (YCAL, box 6, “Correspondence, 1960,” 1 of 2). Lica’s husband, Rica, died near Nice and was also buried there. “Sad news from Cachan [the Paris suburb where the family lived],” ST writes to AB in an unpublished part of his February 27, 1974 letter. “Rica, the husband of Lica, died. He was buried next to my father in Nice.”

p. 456, paragraph 2, concerning the traveling Steinberg exhibition in Germany and Austria: “[ST] was also drawn into the commotion connected with the ending of the two-year-long retrospective that began in Cologne in 1974 and was just now ending in Vienna.”



The text at this point puts us firmly in 1976. The exhibition, “Saul Steinberg: Zeichnungen, Aquarelle, Collagen, Gemälde, Reliefs, 1963-1974,” opened at the Kölnischer Kunstverein in November 1974. In August 1975, ten months and four stops later, it closed at the Museum des 20. Jahrhunderts in Vienna.

### Chapter 37

p. 463, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s famous *New Yorker* cover, *View of the World from 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue* (March 29, 1976): “After the magazine’s legendary reader, ‘the little old lady in Dubuque,’ enjoyed her moment of condescension with the cover, she and the rest of Steinberg’s viewers wanted to know why none of his typical landmarks were included....”

In 1924, *The New Yorker*’s founder Harold Ross envisioned a middle-brow audience for his new magazine—one that would *exclude* geriatric lowans: “*The New Yorker*,” he wrote in an oft-quoted prospectus, “will be the magazine which is *not* edited for the old lady in Dubuque” [italics added]. For the full prospectus, see Thomas Kunkell, *Harold Ross: Genius in Disguise* (New York: Random House, 1995), pp. 439-41.

### Chapter 38

p. 474, paragraph 2, concerning ST’s use of family photographs in 1978: “When he started to tinker with them, he began by making totally new drawings... until one day he discovered that by applying a thin overlay of black enamel to the photographs himself, he could turn them into perfect imitations of old-time photography.... Eventually both his new drawings and the transformed photographs became thematic portfolios for *The New Yorker* called ‘Uncles’ and ‘Cousins’”; note on p. 683.

The note reads: “*TNY*, December 1978 and May 1979. A description of ST’s technique is in ‘Old Photographs’ [AB #4], *R & S Outtakes*.”

The precise dates of the “Uncles” and “Cousins” *TNY* portfolios are, respectively, December 25, 1978, and May 28, 1979. *R & S Outtakes* are the unpublished parts of ST’s 1974 and 1977 taped conversations with Aldo Buzzi, which became *Reflections and Shadows* (see Abbreviations, above). Bair, however, misunderstands both the technique and its chronology. ST did not manipulate photographs or apply anything to them; rather, he invented a technique to imitate them. His description in “Old Photographs” reads: “I’ve made imitations of old photographs using enamel paint....The black enamel immediately gives the gloss, the polish, of photographs made on porcelain for gravestones; and also of certain photographs I saw as a child....With enamel I obtain the same effect. I put a random blob of paint on the paper, then push it around with a fingertip or a Kleenex, allowing the paint to settle by itself, forming something that in the end resembles a portrait....”

Bair misdates the invention by a quarter century. ST was recalling a technique he had introduced in the early 1950s; a spread of such faux photographs is reproduced in ST’s *The Passport* (1954). The “Old Photographs” segment was published in *The Paris Review*, no. 195 (Winter 2010), pp. 34-36, with a later example, attesting to ST’s continued use of the technique.

As for the alleged publication of “new drawings” and “transformed photographs” in the “Uncles” and “Cousins” portfolios: there are no photographs, transformed or otherwise, and the drawings are not done in the faux-photograph technique.

p. 478, paragraph 2, Around 1980, ST “took to visiting the many wooden churches on the east end of Long Island, where he drew them *dal vero* [from life]. He thought the structures were interesting....”

These drawings—some of which appeared in *The New Yorker* portfolio “Country Traffic,” December 1, 1980—are not *dal vero*, but rather rendered in a stylized, cartoon-derived mode. The real *dal vero* drawings, published in book form in 1983, are discussed by Bair on pp. 509-11.

## Chapter 39

p. 484, last paragraph - p. 485 line 3, “**Although Saul begged Sigrid** not to go to Mali, she left as scheduled in January [1981]....While she was away and for the next several months, Steinberg’s solitary nightly consumption of scotch and wine interfered with his ability to work, and he realized that he had to stop drinking. He found that with mineral water he could still become ‘**drunk out of habit**’”; notes on p. 685.

The only citation in the first note, ST to AB, January 30, 1981, merely says that Sigrid returned from Africa after two weeks. In the previous letter to AB, January 12, 1981 (not cited), ST writes: “Sigrid is leaving for Africa, as usual, and I’m full of qualms, doubts, fears.” That he begged her not to go is Bair’s interpolation.

“Drunk out of habit” is, as Bair indicates in the second note, from an ST to AB letter of March 18, 1980. It therefore cannot document Bair’s assertion that ST was drinking heavily “while she was away” ten months later.

p. 485, last paragraph, concerning the etchings ST began to make at Gemini G.E.L. in 1981: “**He did, however, throw himself enthusiastically** into work at Gemini, where he managed to make ‘Two Women,’ the first print of the half dozen or so that he made during the next several years...”; note on p. 685.

There were two prints begun in February 1981 according to Gemini’s Print Documentation sheets. The other was *Cedar Bar*. There is no way to determine which was the first. ST made thirteen prints with Gemini, not a “half dozen or so.”

## Chapter 40

p. 499, paragraph 1, referencing a quotation from Sigrid Spaeth, “‘**nobody can live like this**’”; note on pp. 687-88.

The note reads: “The following information is from a typescript dated ‘Sunday, Feb. 9,’ to which SS [Sigrid Spaeth] later added ‘Spaeth 1967,’ YCAL, box unidentified, copy in SSF.” The addition is not in Spaeth’s handwriting. Bair was looking at a photocopy given to SSF by a scholar working through the YCAL papers, who is responsible for the addition. Note that Bair is discussing the Spaeth-Steinberg relationship in the period 1982-83. The quoted passage, and those in the rest of the paragraph, date from 1967.

## Chapter 41

p. 504, paragraphs 1 and 2, “Steinberg began the New Year 1984 by avoiding ‘**the racket, the hysteria**’ of Christmas in New York and ‘hibernating in the heat of home’ in Springs. He had more important news than the weather to tell Aldo Buzzi: ‘**Bulletin: I stopped drinking.**’ For an entire month he had not had drunk wine or whiskey....He was also practicing another kind of control, a physical one that started when he ran away for three days during the fractious month of August 1983 to hide from Sigrid’s erratic behavior. **He had checked himself into a Zen temple** in the Hudson valley...”; notes on p. 688.

In the citations for this section, Bair implausibly redates letters to suit her narrative. The reference for “the racket, the hysteria” is correctly given as an ST-AB letter of January 16, 1984. But the note for “Bulletin: I stopped drinking” reads: “ST to AB, dated by him as July 12, 1983, but internal evidence suggests September.” That for “He had checked himself into a Zen temple” is similarly redated: “ST to AB, dated by him as July 20, 1983, but internal evidence suggests September.” Both these letters are firmly dated—by ST and, on the envelopes, by Buzzi, who added the dates to facilitate filing. Moreover, on p. 500, paragraph 2, where the narrative concerns events of July 1983, the same letters are cited with their correct dates.

P. 508, last paragraph, discussing *All Except You*, the 1983 book with text by Roland Barthes and nine drawings by ST. The note on p. 689 for “**Steinberg and Barthes had known and**

**respected**” begins: “Steinberg later used variants of some of the drawings in *The Discovery of America* and *Reflections and Shadows*...”

Only one drawing in *All Except You* (p. 59) relates to a drawing in *Discovery of America* (p. 175)—the *Ohio/Ohio* from the *Reflections* series (which is not in *R & S*). The chronological sequence, however, is incorrect. For *All Except You*, ST provided slight drawings with motifs lifted from larger, completed works. The drawing in *Discovery of America*, dated 1977, is a large, finished composition. None of the other drawings in *All Except You* is related to those in the two later books.

## Chapter 42

p. 527, last paragraph, concerning John Updike’s introduction to the exhibition catalogue of ST works owned by Jeffrey and Sivia Loria (1995): “In the end, Steinberg groused about the book but was also pleased with it. He told John Updike that his introduction made him ‘**happy to be taken seriously**’ by a man whom I admire,’ but he arrived at this opinion only after...correspondence...[wherein] he thought Updike was ‘over-nationalizing [his] art as the product of a Romanian looking at the U.S.’ Updike explained that ‘**the title and drift**’ of the book had led him to this emphasis...”; notes on p. 692.

Two different ST books and two Updike essays are here conflated into one. The book ST “groused about” was *The Discovery of America*, published in 1992 (discussed on pp. 533-37); Updike reviewed it, somewhat critically, in *The New York Review of Books*, December 3, 1992. The review occasioned a letter from ST to Updike on December 20: “I agree with you on everything....This is not a good book” (YCAL, box 58, folder “Correspondence, Obituaries, Clippings”). But ST did not tell Updike that he was “happy to be taken seriously”; these words were addressed to Aldo Buzzi in the 1992 letter cited in Bair’s first note.

Updike used parts of his review in the introduction to the Loria catalogue, about which he and ST corresponded. When Updike explains in the cited letter that “the title and drift of the book” led to what ST called an “over-nationalizing” emphasis, he’s referring to *The Discovery of America*, not the Loria catalogue.

## Chapter 43

p. 538, paragraph 3, “**Saul discovered that he was comfortable** in Prudence’s company, and he enjoyed her friendship so much that once he had made the ritual (and almost desultory) pass and been gently rebuffed...he no longer felt the need to seduce her”; two notes for the same passage on p. 694.

The notes read: “PC [Prudence Crowther] to ST, April 18, 1997, YCAL, Box 38; PC e-mail to DB, October 7, 2007, mss. comment, 2011”; and “PC, e-mail, October 7, 2007; mss. comment, 2011.” Crowther’s email unequivocally states that no such pass, ritual, desultory, or “almost” desultory, ever occurred, hence no rebuffing, gentle or otherwise. “Mss. comment, 2011” refers to a subsequent Crowther email, May 3, 2011, concerning the first draft of the text, wherein the error remains. Referring back to the original email, Crowther again asks that the lines be corrected. Bair to Crowther, email, May 5, 2011: “I will omit the phrase about the ritual pass and will rewrite the passage carefully,” yet both the wording and the general account remain unchanged. The “need to seduce” is Bair’s contribution.

## Chapter 44

pp. 555, paragraph 2 - 556, paragraph 1, concerning ST’s and AB’s work on the book posthumously published as *Reflections and Shadows*, based on taped conversations between ST and AB in 1974 and 1977 (see Abbreviations, *R & S* and *R & S Outtakes*). Bair misdates the chronology of the work in the 1990s and imagines content alterations that never happened. The year being discussed is 1994:

“Steinberg had another book in progress, one that he was not at all sure about, but Aldo Buzzi wanted it to happen and so he agreed to take it seriously...and for many years [they]

dithered over a typescript and an English translation....Now that both men had reached the venerable age of eighty [ST was eighty, but AB was eighty-four in 1994], Aldo insisted that it was time to work seriously” (p. 555, paragraph 2)....**Steinberg and Buzzi talked about** and sometimes reworked some of the material...whenever they were together, and Steinberg volunteered information for it whenever they were not, mostly in letters but sometimes in telephone conversations” (p. 555, paragraph 4); note on p. 697. The note sources the statement to an interview with AB, in which he “verified that he and ST either talked about or actually worked or reworked the book’s proposed content in the two decades before it was published in Italy [2001].”

Buzzi may have talked about the book to ST between the late 1970s and early 1990s, but the subject does not come up in any of ST’s letters. Nor was there any “reworking” of the material until 1992 or alterations from information that ST “volunteered.” If Bair’s summary of the AB interview is correct, AB seems to have misremembered the course of the work. The documents tell a different story:

There are ten folders of transcripts of the tapes at YCAL, four in the original Italian and six in English translation, some with only partial transcriptions (boxes 75, 76, 78, variously named “Steinberg translated by Adrienne Foulke,” “Libro Part I and II,” “Libro copia completa,” etc.). All date from 1977 and 1978. There are two Italian texts, the second edited for language in 1978 (box 76, folder “Aldo final edited MS 1978,” accompanied by an explanatory letter from AB dated December 2, 1978). This latter was used for the 2001 Italian edition, published by Adelphi Edizioni, with deletions (see below). The English translation by Foulke is dated January 18, 1978 (never used; a new translation was made for the 2002 English edition).

Sometime in 1992 (not 1994), AB sent ST a shorter version, with many sections deleted (those Bair refers to as *R & S Outtakes*). This is the version that was ultimately published. Box 75, folder “Translations Adrienne Foulke 1974, 1993, includes letters from Aldo Buzzi” (misnamed by YCAL—all the typescripts are in Italian and there was no 1974 translation), contains a letter from AB, November 28, 1992, in which he outlines his plan for the shorter book, enclosing a cut-and-paste photocopy of the 1978 final Italian transcript. ST responded on December 7, 1992: “Got your letter with the bulletins about Proust and my Italian book (which I have no wish to reread now, but will soon).”

It remains unclear who instigated the resumption of work in 1992. Bair gives credit to Buzzi. But ST, writing to Roberto Calasso of Adelphi to cancel the project (May 15, 1995, copy enclosed in ST’s letter of that date to AB, both unpublished), says that he “asked Buzzi...to prepare a shorter version.”

None of the quotations from ST’s letters to AB in paragraph 3 about his early years in Bucharest and Milan were made in relation to the book. On p. 556, paragraph 1, “the book...was left hanging in 1994,” should read 1995. “Reluctantly, Aldo withdrew it [from publication]”: it was ST who ended the project in his May 1995 letter to Calasso.

## Chapter 45

p. 563, lines 2-4, “**She** [Sigrid Spaeth] **made another journey to Mali** in January 1996, despite Steinberg’s contention that there was too much political unrest there”; note on p. 698.

The note reads: “A telegram from ST to SS in Bamako, Mali, tells her he read about ‘roads crowded with refugees from Nigeria. Please be wise. Come home’; YCAL, Box 113.” The telegram (actually a mailgram), in box 113, folder “Sigrid Spaeth’s Letters,” 1 of 2, is clearly dated February 1, 1983.

## Chapter 46

p. 575, paragraph 2. The year under discussion is 1997. “Steinberg looked for distractions from the illness and death that surrounded him by focusing on his Romanian years...[and] reaching out to classmates from the Lycée Basarab and the University of Bucharest....He went to see Bruno Leventer, who lived near him on Park Avenue....Leventer had had a stroke several

years previously and could not speak, so Steinberg had to carry on the conversation which, in his depression, was too exhausting to keep up for long.”

Leventer’s silence is understandable, since he had been dead for three years. See ST to AB, August 7, 1998, where ST describes a photograph of his lycée classmates: “Leventer, perfect shadows, dead 4 years ago.” The one-way conversation Bair describes actually took place in 1993: “I visited Bruno Leventer....He had a stroke, understands little and remembers less”; ST to AB, November 8, 1993.

## Chapter 47

p. 584, paragraph 1. “The apartment was perfectly constructed to hold a vigil for the dying, as Saul’s bedroom was...on the upper floor, while his friends downstairs could cook, talk, laugh, and sometimes cry without disturbing him....**In an effort to instill levity** into the sadness of what was essentially a death watch, Prudence and Aldo agreed that living in a duplex was the best way to ensure a good end.” The benefaction of a duplex was not a glib observation by Prudence and Aldo to lighten the mood while Saul lay dying, but rather a wry reflection shared by friends after his death (Aldo had returned to Italy two days before ST died); Prudence Crowther to Bair, email of November 28, 2011.

## Epilogue

p. 587, paragraph 3, concerning the testamentary disposition of ST’s art and papers and the portion bequeathed to “**the university’s [Yale’s] Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library**”; note on p. 702.

The last sentence of the note reads: “The university was not allowed to sell any drawings within the archives after 2009.” Bair reverses the facts. The relevant passage in ST’s will states: “I also authorize Yale University upon and following such anniversary [the tenth after his death, i.e., 2009] to sell any drawings included in such Papers.”

p. 591, paragraph 1, “...a major retrospective of Saul Steinberg’s art was organized by Joel Smith for the Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center at Vassar College. It then moved to the Morgan Library and Museum in New York before traveling...”; note on p. 703 for “**The question proliferated.**”

The above text suggests that the exhibition opened at Vassar College and then traveled to the Morgan Library. As the itinerary in the note explains, the Morgan Library was the opening venue. Bair neglects to mention the European tour of the show: Fondation Henri Cartier-Bresson, Paris, May 6-July 27, 2008; Kunsthaus Zürich, August 22-November 2, 2008; Dulwich Picture Gallery, London, November 26, 2008-February 15, 2009; Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg, March 13-June 1, 2009.